

U.S. OFFICE OF
GOVERNMENT
ETHICS

RESULTS FROM THE
ANNUAL
AGENCY ETHICS
PROGRAM
QUESTIONNAIRE
CY23

A
SNAPSHOT
OF THE EXECUTIVE
BRANCH ETHICS
PROGRAM

Table of Contents

Section 1 – Introduction.....	1
<i>Legal Requirement</i>	1
<i>Topics Covered</i>	1
<i>Changes to the Questionnaire</i>	2
<i>Methodology</i>	2
<i>Agency Response Rate</i>	2
<i>Data Limitations</i>	3
Section 2 – Key Highlights	4
<i>Ethics Officials & Resourcing</i>	4
<i>Financial Disclosure</i>	5
<i>Education & Training</i>	7
<i>Advice & Counsel</i>	7
<i>Ethics Pledge (Executive Order 13989)</i>	8
<i>Enforcement</i>	10
Section 3 – Compilation of Agency Responses.....	11
Appendix.....	43

Section 1 – Introduction

The United States Office of Government Ethics (OGE) leads and oversees the executive branch ethics program designed to prevent financial conflicts of interest.

Every year, each agency within the executive branch is required to submit to OGE a response to the Annual Agency Ethics Program Questionnaire (questionnaire). 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.

OGE uses the questionnaire to conduct oversight of each agency’s ethics program and uses the resulting data to report on the executive branch ethics program to stakeholders, including the public, Congress, and the ethics community. OGE also uses the data to make informed decisions about its priorities and allocation of resources.

This report combines and summarizes the 142 agency responses for calendar year 2023. Each agency’s response is available on OGE’s website in the [Agency Ethics Documents Search Collection](#).

Legal Requirement

Executive branch agencies are required to submit an annual report to OGE pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, as amended.¹ OGE collects the required report via the questionnaire.²

Section 4 of Executive Order 13989 requires OGE to provide an annual public report on the administration of the Ethics Pledge and the Order. This document serves as the public report.

Topics Covered

OGE uses the questionnaire to collect information about the following aspects of each agency’s ethics program:

- 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 13989)
- Special Government Employees

¹ See 5 U.S.C. § 13122(e)(1).

² See 5 C.F.R. § 2638.207.

Changes to the Questionnaire

In 2023, OGE added 3 new questions and substantively modified 3 questions. Noteworthy changes include the following:

Q14 asks a new question about agency staff readiness to support a potential Presidential transition, as required by regulation (5 C.F.R. § 2638.210(a)).

Q31 and Q32 ask new questions about the use of the PDF and Excel versions of OGE Forms 278e, 278-T, and 450.

Q24 includes additional response options related to inclusion and accessibility.

Q54 and Q55 change the format of the questions to numerical responses.

OGE also made a variety of non-substantive changes. These changes improved clarity, eliminated ambiguities, and removed outdated response options. OGE gave advance notice of these changes through its [Program Advisory 23-05](#), which includes a red-line version of the edits.

Methodology

The questionnaire covered agency ethics program activities that occurred in calendar year 2023. OGE provided an [advance copy of the questionnaire](#) to every Designated Agency Ethics Official in September 2023. OGE opened the survey on December 29, 2023, and agency responses were due on February 1, 2024.³

OGE allowed only one response per agency; accordingly, each agency's response reflects the data for the entire agency, including agency components.

OGE used a custom application to collect each agency response. OGE followed up with individual agencies based on a pre-determined set of selection criteria, including large changes from the previous year's response, internal inconsistencies with an agency's response, and narrative responses that were unclear or incomplete.

Agency Response Rate

For purposes of the questionnaire, the term "agency" refers to every entity that has a Designated Agency Ethics Official (DAEO). Each agency within the executive branch must have a DAEO.⁴ In addition, some entities, such as the Department of Defense (DoD) and the White House, appoint a DAEO to run the ethics program at the individual office or component level.

³ See 5 C.F.R. § 2638.207(a).

⁴ See 5 C.F.R. § 2638.104(a).

Thus, several offices within the White House and many components within DoD each have separate DAEOs who manage the ethics program for their respective office or component. OGE treats each of these White House offices and DoD components as distinct ethics programs and requires a separate response to the questionnaire from each.

For the 2023 Calendar year there were 142 agencies. All 142 agencies responded.

Response rate: 100%

Data Limitations

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

- OGE does not independently verify the information submitted by each agency. However, based on a set of criteria, OGE reviews agency responses for anomalies and, when necessary, requests clarifications from the agencies.
- OGE’s primary method for conducting oversight of agency ethics programs is through program reviews. OGE reviews agency ethics programs to identify and report on the strengths and weaknesses of the programs by evaluating (1) agency compliance with ethics requirements established in relevant laws, regulations, and policies, and (2) ethics-related systems, processes, and procedures for administering the program. The questionnaire serves as an input and is one of many data sources used to inform the program review. Reports summarizing the results of these program reviews are available on OGE’s website.
- Agency ethics officials may interpret the questions differently.
- The aggregate number for certain questions may be higher than reported, due to the exclusion of classified information.⁵

⁵ Questions 2, 17, 18, 21, 35-37, 43-45.

Section 2 – Key Highlights

This section provides key highlights from the aggregated responses of the 142 agencies that responded for calendar year 2023.⁶ The highlights focus on key aspects of the ethics program, including: ethics officials and resourcing; financial disclosure; education and training; advice and counsel; the Ethics Pledge (Executive Order 13989); and enforcement.

Ethics Officials & Resourcing

The executive branch ethics program is decentralized and relies on officials in each of the 142 agencies to carry out a compliant program for the employees of their agency.⁷ According to the 2023 questionnaire responses, more than 8,700 employees across the country supported the ethics program, either through substantive work, such as reviewing financial disclosures, or through administrative support, such as providing human resources or information technology services.

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.⁸ The questionnaire responses show that in 2023 **most DAEOs (84%) were career employees**. Although (60%) of DAEOs had spent less than 5 years in their current positions, 67% had 5 or more years of ethics experience. **Seventy-six percent (76%) of DAEOs spent less than 25% of their time on ethics.** ([See Q3](#))

Of the other employees supporting the ethics program, **1,126 (13%) individuals performed ethics duties close to full time (31 to 40 hours a week)**. The remaining 87% of employees supporting the ethics program worked on ethics anywhere from 1 to 30 hours per week, as part of other responsibilities. Therefore, when accounting for the reported number of hours worked per week by each individual, **2,666 full-time equivalent positions supported the ethics program across the executive branch in 2023.** ([See Q5](#))

Of the 142 reporting agencies, **62 (44%) reported needing more resources**. Agencies most frequently indicated needing additional resources in the area of human capital (53 agencies), followed by technology (38 agencies). ([See Q9](#))

Eighty-four percent (84%) of agencies reported their agency head or DAEO evaluated, prior to November 5, 2023, whether their agency’s ethics program has an adequate number of trained

⁶ Percentages represent the aggregate response. Percentages are not calculated for questions that allowed agencies to select more than one response. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number, except when the rounding would have resulted in a 100% for an individual response or 101% when adding separate percentages. When calculating percentages, responses of “not applicable” were not included in the denominator.

⁷ See 5 C.F.R. § 2638.104.

⁸ Each agency is required to have a minimum of two ethics officials, the Designated Agency Ethics Official (DAEO) and the Alternate (ADAEO). See 5 C.F.R. § 2638.104(a), (d). Larger agencies may dedicate additional staff to ethics.

agency ethics officials to deliver effective support in the event of a Presidential transition.⁹ ([See Q14](#))

Financial Disclosure

Disclosure of personal financial interests – such as assets, liabilities, and outside positions – allows ethics officials to help employees assess when personal interests might conflict with government responsibilities. The timely collection, review, and certification of public and confidential financial disclosures helps to ensure that the government’s business is conducted free from conflicts of interest.

Notification of Filing Status

OGE regulations require coordination between agencies’ human resources (HR) officials and ethics officials.¹⁰ Specifically, HR officials must notify ethics officials within specified time frames if an employee is required to file a financial disclosure. Prompt notification is necessary for timely disclosure and screening for potential conflicts of interest. Most agencies met the time frames ([See Q28](#) and [Q29](#)):

- **93% of agencies** reported that in all or most cases the human resources office(s) **notified the DAEO of appointments to public financial disclosure positions** within the 15-day deadline (105 of 113 agencies to which the requirement applied).
- **88% of 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 deadline (99 of 112 agencies to which the requirement applied).
- **93% of agencies** reported that in all or most cases the human resources office(s) **notified the DAEO of terminations from public financial disclosure positions** within the 15-day deadline (103 of 110 agencies to which the requirement applied).¹¹

Filing Compliance

The 2023 questionnaire results demonstrate a high rate of employee compliance with the filing requirements:¹²

- **More than 99% of those required to file public financial disclosures did so:** 29,365 reports filed out of 29,465 required. ([See Q36](#) and [Q58](#))
- **More than 99% of those required to file confidential financial disclosures did so:** 422,278 reports filed out of 423,341 required. ([See Q43](#) and [Q58](#))

⁹ See 5 C.F.R. § 2638.210(a).

¹⁰ See 5 C.F.R. § 2638.105.

¹¹ Confidential financial disclosure filers do not file a termination report. See 5 C.F.R. § 2634.903(e).

¹² For filing requirements, see 5 C.F.R. §§ 2634.201, .903.

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.¹³ In 2023, public filers submitted a reported **19,751 periodic transaction reports**. ([See Q38](#))

Timeliness of Review and Certification

Agencies should review reports promptly and must perform a technical review and conflict of interest analysis within 60 days of receiving a report.

- In 2023, agencies reported that they conducted **timely reviews for 93% of the reports certified**. ([See Q37](#), [Q44](#), and [Q59](#))

If no additional information or remedy is required, agencies must also certify the report before the 60-day period expires. However, final certification may necessarily occur later, if the agency needs to seek additional information or to take remedial action.

- In 2023, agencies reported that they **certified 89% of reports within 60 days** ([See Q37](#), [Q44](#), and [Q59](#))

Public Availability

Transparency plays an essential role in strengthening trust in government. Agencies must make the financial interests of certain high-level officials publicly available.¹⁴ Without this transparency, the public could not as meaningfully oversee the integrity of its government.

In 2023, agencies reported receiving a total of 1,473 requests for 24,951 documents under the Ethics in Government Act. ([See Q41](#)) In 2023, **OGE processed additional requests** from the public and the news media to inspect over **10,000 documents under the Ethics in Government Act**, including public financial disclosure reports, periodic transaction reports, certificates of divestiture, Ethics Pledge waivers, and other covered records.

Technology

Agencies continue to use technology to support their financial disclosure programs. As required by regulation, **all 142 agencies utilized Integrity, OGE's executive branch-wide electronic filing system**, for at least some of their public disclosure reports. In addition, 76 agencies reported using other electronic filing systems for other public and/or confidential reports. ([See Q32](#))

¹³ See 5 C.F.R. §§ 2634.201(f), .309.

¹⁴ See 5 C.F.R. § 2634.603.

Education & Training

An agency's ethics education program increases employees' awareness of their ethical obligations, helps them identify ethics issues that may arise in the work they perform, and provides employees with guidance and support for making ethical decisions.

Overall, the results from the questionnaire demonstrate a high rate of employee compliance with the core training requirements ([See Q17](#), [Q18](#), [Q21](#), and [Q57](#)):¹⁵

- **97%** of new Presidentially appointed, Senate-confirmed appointees **timely received their required initial ethics briefing.**
- **92%** of **new employees** **timely received their required initial ethics training.**¹⁶
- **97%** of public and confidential financial disclosure **filers received their required annual ethics training.**
- **98.5%** of **Special Government Employees** who were expected to serve on a board, commission, or committee **received their required initial ethics training** before or at their first meeting.

Forty-four percent (44%) of agencies established additional ethics education requirements, beyond the minimum required by regulation. ([See Q22](#))

In addition, **87%** of agencies **reported assessing risk** to determine the content, format, and/or timing of their ethics education, and **85%** of agencies **reported assessing the effectiveness of their education programs.** ([See Q23](#) and [Q24](#))

Advice & Counsel

The analysis and resolution of conflicts of interests are key to agencies and employees managing and minimizing the risk of ethical failure. A thorough analysis is the first step in ensuring that agencies and employees take appropriate steps to remedy a potential conflict of interest. By resolving potential conflicts before they happen, ethics officials help ensure that their agencies' decisions are made in the public's interest and are not unfairly influenced by personal financial interests. In 2023, **employees most frequently sought ethics guidance on: (1) outside employment/activities; (2) gift acceptance, and (3) financial disclosure reporting.** ([See Q25](#))

All employees must recuse from government matters that affect the financial interest of someone with whom they are seeking employment.¹⁷ Certain senior employees are also required to notify their ethics official in writing when they begin negotiating for employment

¹⁵ For training requirements, see 5 C.F.R. pt. 2638, subpt. C.

¹⁶ This excludes Special Government Employees expected to serve less than 60 days on a board, commission, or committee.

¹⁷ See 18 U.S.C. § 208; 5 C.F.R. § 2635.604.

with a non-federal entity to help ensure that they receive timely advice.¹⁸ In 2023, these **senior officials filed 1,383 notifications regarding negotiations for employment.** ([See Q26](#))

The criminal conflict of interest law at 18 U.S.C. § 208 prohibits an employee from participating in an official capacity in a particular matter in which the employee has a financial interest; however, an agency can issue a waiver of the prohibition in individual cases. In 2023, **agencies issued 147 such 18 U.S.C. § 208 (b)(1) waivers to employees and 353 18 U.S.C. § 208 (b)(3) waivers to Special Government Employees serving on federal advisory (FACA) committees.** ([See Q27](#))

Ethics Pledge (Executive Order 13989)

Executive Order 13989 requires certain individuals appointed to an executive branch agency on or after January 20, 2021, to sign an Ethics Pledge (“Pledge”). 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.

Compliance with the Ethics Pledge Signature Requirement

Agencies reported that **1,209 full-time, non-career appointees were appointed between January 1, 2023 and December 31, 2023.**¹⁹ Of those appointed, 1,113 were required to sign the Ethics Pledge and 1,112 (99.9%) have done so.²⁰ This number includes twenty-two (22) appointees who should have signed the Ethics Pledge in 2023, but who instead signed in 2024. ([See Q51](#))

Ninety-six **(96) appointees were not required to sign** for the following reasons ([See Q51](#)):

- 10 were appointed to an exempt, non-policymaking position; and
- 86 were appointed without a break in service after serving in another position for which the Pledge had already been signed.

¹⁸ See Representative Louise McIntosh Slaughter Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act, Pub. L. No. 112-105, § 17, 126 Stat. 291, 303-04 (2012); 5 C.F.R. § 2635.607.

¹⁹ The following advisories, located on OGE’s website, provide detailed guidance regarding the appointees subject to the Ethics Pledge: OGE Legal Advisory LA-21-07 (June 9, 2021), OGE Legal Advisory LA-21-05 (Feb. 23, 2021), OGE DAEOgram DO-09-003 (Jan. 22, 2009), OGE DAEOgram DO-09-010 (Mar. 16, 2009), and OGE DAEOgram DO-09-020 (May 26, 2009).

²⁰ The Department of Justice reported that, “One Schedule C employee resigned after only a few days and did not sign the Pledge before leaving.” One appointee who signed in 2023, was appointed in 2022. The Department of Defense Office of the Inspector General reported that, “The PAS was actually appointed in December 2022. Although not required to sign the Pledge because appointed without break in service after serving in another position for which the Ethics Pledge was already signed, the DAEO advised him to sign the Pledge from the New Administration. He signed a new Pledge and forwarded it with his Certification of Ethics Agreement Compliance in February 2023.”

Revolving Door Ban

Appointees who were registered lobbyists and/or registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act 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 2023, agencies reported that three **(3) appointees were registered lobbyists and/or registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act during the two years prior to their appointment.** ([See Q52](#))

Two (2) of the three (3) appointees had an ethics agreement addressing their obligations under paragraph 3 of the Ethics Pledge. The remaining appointee did not have an ethics agreement, per their agency, for the following reason:

- the appointee received a waiver to Pledge paragraph 3 allowing participation in certain activities related to their prior lobbying activities.

Ethics Pledge Waivers

Section 1 of the Executive Order requires all covered appointees to abide by several commitments in the Ethics Pledge, unless they are granted a waiver under section 3. With the approval of the White House, the Acting Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) designated the Designated Agency Ethics Official as the position at each executive agency to exercise section 3 waiver authority after consultation with the Counsel to the President.²¹

In 2023, seven **(7) agencies granted waivers to five (5) individuals.** A single waiver can waive more than one paragraph of the Ethics Pledge. Of the **six (6) waivers, 6 (six) waived paragraph 2** of the Ethics Pledge and **two (2) waived paragraph 3** of the Ethics Pledge. ([Q53](#))

Generally, paragraph 2 of the Ethics Pledge restricts an appointee's participation in particular matters involving specific parties in which the appointee's former employers or clients have an interest. Paragraph 3 of the Ethics Pledge restricts an appointee from seeking or accepting employment with an executive agency that the appointee lobbied within the two years prior to appointment.

²¹ OGE Legal Advisory LA-21-04 (Feb. 18, 2021).

Enforcement

Two (2) agencies reported a total of five (5) **violations of the Pledge** and one (1) **enforcement action**.²² ([See Q54-55](#))

Enforcement

Each agency is responsible for investigating and taking action against an employee who potentially has violated an ethics rule or law.²³ 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.

Thirty-five (35) agencies reported taking **609 disciplinary actions based wholly or in part upon violations of the Standards of Conduct** (multiple actions could be taken against one individual). **The largest share of disciplinary actions (44%) involved** violations of the regulation regarding **misuse of position**. ([See Q46](#))

Seven (7) agencies reported taking nine (9) **disciplinary actions** based wholly or in part upon **violations of criminal or civil statutes** (multiple actions could be taken against one individual). **Thirty-three percent of those actions were for violations of the primary criminal conflict of interest statute, 18 U.S.C. § 208**, which prohibits employees from taking official action that can affect a personal financial interest. ([See Q47](#)) Twenty-two (22) agencies reported a total of 60 **referrals to the Department of Justice** concerning potential violations of the criminal conflict of interest statutes. ([See Q48](#))

²² See the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Health and Human Services responses to Q54 and Q55. Individual responses are available on [OGE's website](#).

²³ See 5 C.F.R § 2638.107(d).

Section 3 – Compilation of Agency Responses

For each question, the **bold** number is the aggregated response for all **142** agencies that responded to the questionnaire. In parentheses is the percentage that the aggregated response represents. Percentages are not calculated for questions that allowed agencies to select more than one response. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number, except when the rounding would have resulted in a 100% for an individual response or 101% when adding separate percentages. When calculating percentages, responses of “not applicable” were not included in the denominator.

*United States
Office of Government Ethics*

2023 AGENCY ETHICS PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1. INTRODUCTION

Executive branch agencies are required to submit an annual report to the United States Office of Government Ethics (OGE) concerning certain aspects of their ethics programs (Section 5 U.S.C. § 13122(e)(1)). Your response to OGE’s Annual Ethics Program Questionnaire (the questionnaire) serves as your annual report.

OGE uses the data collected through the questionnaire in many ways, including sharing information about the entire executive branch ethics program with the public, Congress, and the ethics community. OGE also uses the information to carry out its oversight role, to gain knowledge about individual programs, as well as the overall ethics program, and to make informed decisions about resource allocations and priorities. OGE posts a summary of questionnaire responses and each agency’s unedited responses on OGE’s website. Therefore, please ensure your responses are suitable for publication.

OGE encourages each agency to use the annual exercise of completing the questionnaire as an opportunity to evaluate your ethics program.

DUE DATE: By regulation, the questionnaire is due to OGE by February 1, 2024. (5 C.F.R. § 2638.207(a)).

PART 2. INSTRUCTIONS

Your response to this questionnaire should reflect the 2023 calendar year (i.e., 1/1/2023 through 12/31/2023), except as specified. The answers provided should reflect the aggregate data for **your agency**. OGE will only accept **one submission per agency**.

Throughout the questionnaire you will be offered an opportunity to provide comments or explanations for your responses. Please use these comment sections to explain any discrepancies between levels of required activity and actual activity, and to explain significant changes from your 2022 report. To safeguard privacy, in your responses please avoid the use of Personally Identifiable Information (PII). After OGE has reviewed your questionnaire submission, you may be contacted for follow-up.

PART 3. DEFINITIONS

Agency Head: For purposes of this questionnaire, the term “agency head” means the head of an agency. In the case of a department, it means the Secretary of the department. In the case of a board or commission, it means the Chair of the board or commission.

D.C Metro Area: For purposes of this questionnaire, D.C. Metro Area means the District of Columbia, DC; Calvert County, MD; Charles County, MD; Prince George's County, MD; Arlington County, VA; Clarke County, VA; Culpeper County, VA; Fairfax County, VA; Fauquier County, VA; Loudoun County, VA; Prince William County, VA; Rappahannock County, VA; Spotsylvania County, VA; Stafford County, VA; Warren County, VA; Alexandria city, VA; Fairfax city, VA; Falls Church city, VA; Fredericksburg city, VA; Manassas city, VA; Manassas Park city, VA; Jefferson County, WV; and, Silver Spring-Frederick-Rockville, MD Metropolitan Division Frederick County, and Montgomery County.

Agency Employees: For purposes of this questionnaire, the term “agency employees” means any officer or employee of an agency, including a special Government employee. It includes officers but not enlisted members of the uniformed services.

Special Government Employee (SGE): For purposes of this questionnaire, the term “special Government employee” (SGE) means an officer or employee who is retained, designated, appointed, or employed, to perform temporary duties, either on a full-time or intermittent basis, with or without compensation, for not more than 130 days during any period of 365 consecutive days. The term “SGE” does not include enlisted members of the Armed Forces. It does, however, include these categories of officers or employees:

- Part-time United States commissioners;
- Reserve officers of the Armed Forces and officers of the National Guard of the United States (unless otherwise officers or employees of the United States) while on active duty solely for training or serving involuntarily.

PART 4. PROGRAM RESOURCES AND ADMINISTRATION

1. Agency: _____ **142**
2. Number of full-time agency employees as of December 31, 2023: _____ **3,752,433**
3. Information about the Designated Agency Ethics Official (DAEO):

a. Vacant (as of December 31, 2023)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Yes 1 (1%) ■ No 141 (99%)
b. Time in current DAEO position	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Less than 1 year 27 (19%) ■ 1-4 years 58 (41%) ■ 5-9 years 32 (23%) ■ 10 or more years 24 (17%)
c. Total years performing ethics duties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Less than 1 year 10 (7%) ■ 1-4 years 36 (26%) ■ 5-9 years 26 (18%) ■ 10 or more years 69 (49%)
d. Percent of time spent on ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 0-25% 107 (76%) ■ 26-50% 15 (11%) ■ 51-75% 7 (5%) ■ 76-100% 12 (9%)
e. Is the DAEO a career employee or a political appointee?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ career employee 119 (84%) ■ political appointee 22 (16%)
f. Number of reporting levels between the DAEO and the agency head.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 0 (the agency head is the DAEO) 3 (2%) ■ 1 108 (77%) ■ 2 26 (18%) ■ 3 4 (3%) ■ 4 0 (0%)

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

a. Vacant (as of December 31, 2023)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Yes (<i>skip to #5</i>) 133 (94%) ■ No 9 (6%)
b. Time in current ADAEO position	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Less than 1 year 27 (20%) ■ 1-4 years 63 (47%) ■ 5-9 years 26 (20%) ■ 10 or more years 17 (13%)
c. Total years performing ethics duties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Less than 1 year 12 (9%) ■ 1-4 years 30 (23%) ■ 5-9 years 27 (20%) ■ 10 or more years 64 (48%)
d. Percent of time spent on ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 0-25% 65 (49%) ■ 26-50% 23 (17%)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 51-75% 9 (7%) ■ 76-100% 36 (27%)
e. Is the ADAEO a career employee or a political appointee?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ career employee 129 (97%) ■ political appointee 4 (3%)

5. Number of employees, including the DAEO and ADAEO, who performed ethics program duties in 2023 (e.g., financial disclosure, education and training, advice and counseling, and 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	923	691	240	125	646	2,625
b. Outside the D.C. Metro area	2,277	2,666	536	185	480	6,144
TOTAL	3,200	3,357	776	310	1,126	8,769

*FTE = Full Time Equivalent

Example: The table below provides an example of an agency with 13 employees who performed ethics program duties in 2023.

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	1	0	2	2	1	6
b. Outside the D.C. Metro area	1	3	3	0	0	7
TOTAL	2	3	5	2	1	13

6. In what areas did contractors support the ethics program? Select all that apply.
- Not applicable (no contractors supported the ethics program) **84**
 - IT services (e.g., developing or supporting electronic filing systems, applications, websites, and/or databases, etc.) **52**
Please describe the IT support (optional): _____
 - Administrative support (e.g., tracking filing or training requirements, sending reminders, data entry, etc.) **21**
Please describe the administrative support (optional): _____
 - Substantive ethics support (e.g., providing training, initial review of financial disclosures, drafting advice for further review, etc.) **8**
Please describe the substantive support (optional): _____
 - Other (please describe) **0**

7. Did your agency **receive** ethics services or support from another federal agency or federal entity? Do not include contractors, OGE support, or OMB support of MAX.gov.
- Yes **30 (21%)**
Please provide the name(s) of the federal agency or entity: _____
Describe the services or support received: _____
 - No **112 (79%)**

[Question 7 Table 1](#)

8. Did your agency **provide** ethics program services or support for any board, commission, or agency that is independent of your agency?
- Yes **24 (17%)**
Please provide the name(s) of the board, commission, or agency: _____
Describe the services or support provided: _____
 - No **118 (83%)**

[Question 8 Table 1](#)

9. Does your agency's ethics program need additional resources? Check all that apply.
- No additional resources needed **80**
 - Human Capital **53**
 - Technology **38**
 - Other (specify) _____ **11**

[Question 9 Table 1](#)

10. Did the agency head meet with the ethics staff to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the ethics program in 2023?
- Yes **107 (77%)**
 - No **32 (23%)**
 - Not applicable (specify why) _____ **3**

Question 10 Table 1

11. Did your agency (e.g., ethics office, Inspector General, General Counsel, etc.) or any entity outside of your agency (e.g., GAO or private auditing firm) evaluate any aspect of the ethics program in 2023 (5 C.F.R. § 2638.104(c)(16))? **Exclude** program reviews conducted by OGE. Select all that apply.
- My agency (e.g., ethics office, Inspector General, General Counsel, etc.) conducted an evaluation **70**
 - An entity outside of my agency, other than OGE, (e.g., GAO or a private auditing firm) conducted an evaluation (please describe _____) **15**
 - No evaluation was conducted (*skip to #13*) **63**

Question 11 Table 1

12. What kind of changes resulted from the evaluation?
- Programmatic changes (please describe) _____ **43**
 - Policy changes (please describe) _____ **28**
 - No changes resulted (specify why not) _____ **19**
 - Recommendations still being considered (please describe) _____ **5**
 - Not applicable (specify why) _____ **4**

Question 12 Table 1

13. Of the following required written procedures, which did you have in place? Check all that apply:
- Financial disclosure program, including for the filing, review, and when applicable, public availability of public financial disclosure reports (5 C.F.R. § 2638.104(c)(8)(i)) **136**
 - Issuance of notice of ethical obligations in written offers of employment (5 C.F.R. § 2638.303) **136**
 - Provision of initial ethics training (5 C.F.R. § 2638.304) **139**
 - Issuance of ethics notice to new supervisors (5 C.F.R. § 2638.306) **129**
 - None. Explain what steps you are taking to implement the required written procedures: _____ **2**

Question 13 Table 1

14. Did your agency head or DAEO evaluate, prior to November 5, 2023, whether your agency's ethics program has an adequate number of trained agency ethics officials to deliver effective support in the event of a Presidential transition (5 C.F.R. § 2638.210(a))?

- Yes **119 (84%)**
- No (please explain) _____ **23 (16%)**

[Question 14 Table 1](#)

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

[Part 4 Table 1](#)

PART 5. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

15. Did the office(s) responsible for issuing ethics notices to prospective employees, pursuant to 5 C.F.R. § 2638.303, provide the DAEO with the written confirmation required pursuant to 5 C.F.R. § 2638.310?

- Written confirmation not required because my agency has less than 1,000 employees **85**
- Written confirmation not required because the DAEO’s office is responsible for issuing ethics notices to prospective employees **2**
- All of the offices provided written confirmation to the DAEO (*skip to #17*) **52 (94.5%)**
- Some of the offices provided written confirmation to the DAEO (explain why not all offices, then skip to #17) _____ **2 (3.6%)**
- None of the offices provided written confirmation to the DAEO (explain why not all offices, then skip to #17) _____ **1 (1.8%)**

Question 15 Table 1

16. Did written offers of employment for positions covered by the Standards of Conduct include the information required by 5 C.F.R. § 2638.303?

- All of the written offers included the required information **73 (94%)**
- Some of the written offers included the required information (please explain why not all offers) **5 (6%)**
- None of the written offers included the required information (please explain why not all offers) **0 (0%)**
- Not applicable because no offers of employment were made **9**
- Not applicable for another reason (please explain) _____ **1**

Question 16 Table 1

17. Initial Ethics Briefing

a. How many agency leaders, as defined in 5 C.F.R. § 2638.305(a), were required to receive ethics briefings by December 31, 2023? Exclude SGES that were expected to serve less than 60 days on a board, commission, or committee.	119
i. How many new agency leaders received their briefing within 15 days of their appointment?	116
ii. How many new agency leaders received their briefing beyond the 15-day requirement?	2
iii. How many new agency leaders have yet to receive their briefing as of today?	1

If applicable, please explain why some of the leaders received their briefing beyond the 15-day requirement or have yet to receive their briefing. _____

Question 17 Table 1

18. Initial Ethics Training

a. How many employees, as defined in 5 C.F.R. § 2638.304(a), were required to receive Initial Ethics Training (IET) by December 31, 2023 (5 C.F.R. § 2638.304)? Exclude SGEs that were expected to serve less than 60 days on a board, commission, or committee. (Note: Include employees who were not required to receive the interactive portion of the IET, as provided in 5 C.F.R. § 2638.304(a)(2).)	388,564
i. How many of those employees received IET within the 3-month requirement?	357,628 (92%)
ii. How many of those employees received IET beyond the 3-month requirement?	14,300 (4%)
iii. How many of those employee have not received IET as of today?	16,636 (4%)
iv. Do not track	0

If applicable, please explain why some employees received IET beyond the 3-month requirement or have yet to receive IET. _____

Example: If an employee started at the agency on December 15, 2023, 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, 2024, the employee has not completed IET, do not count that employee in your required numbers. Instead, include the employee in your 2024 questionnaire response to be filed in 2025.

Question 18 Table 1

19. Did the office(s) delegated the responsibility for providing initial ethics training (IET) provide the required written confirmation to the DAEO, pursuant to 5 C.F.R. § 2638.310?

- Written confirmation not required because my agency has less than 1,000 employees **81**
- Written confirmation not required because all IET was provided by an office under the DAEO’s supervision **36**
- All of the offices provided the written confirmation to the DAEO **23 (92%)**
- Some of the offices provided the written confirmation to the DAEO (explain why not all offices) _____ **1 (4%)**

- None of the offices provided the written confirmation to the DAEO (explain why not all offices) _____ **1 (4%)**

Question 19 Table 1

20. Did the head of the agency complete either initial ethics training and/or annual ethics training in 2023?
- Yes **135 (96%)**
 - No (specify why) _____ **5 (4%)**
 - Not applicable (specify why) _____ **2**

Question 20 Table 1

21. Required Annual Ethics Training

Type of covered employees (<u>Include SGE filers</u>)	# Required	# Received (of those required)
a. Executive Schedule Level I or Level II public filers (OGE Form 278e)	60	59 (98%)
b. All other public filers (OGE Form 278e)	23,687	23,467 (99%)
c. Confidential filers (OGE Form 450 and OGE-approved alternative confidential financial disclosure forms)	361,005	351,102 (97%)
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.)	38,700	38,144 (99%)
TOTAL	423,452	412,772 (97%)

If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of employees who were required to receive training and the number of employees who received training: _____

Question 21 Table 1

22. Did your agency establish additional requirements for the agency's ethics education program, pursuant to 5 C.F.R. § 2638.309?

- My agency established additional training requirements for employees performing ethics duties described in 5 C.F.R. §§ 2638.104-105 (ethics and human resources officials). Please describe: _____ **13**
- My agency established additional training requirements for other groups of employees, beyond those described in 5 C.F.R. §§ 2638.303-308 (notices to new employees and supervisors, initial ethics training, ethics briefings, annual ethics training). Please describe: _____ **51**
- My agency established additional training procedures (e.g., certification procedures). See 5 C.F.R. § 2638.309(c). Please describe: _____ **13**
- No, my agency did not establish additional training requirements. **80**

Question 22 Table 1

23. If your agency assessed risk to help inform the content, format, and/or timing of ethics education and communications, select all that apply (see [PA-19-05](#) for reference):

- Reviewed advice logs for common issues **87**
- Discussed upcoming work and agency priorities with senior staff **88**
- Talked to program managers about risks inherent in their work **80**
- Conducted surveys to identify common and emerging ethics risks **25**
- Talked to employees about the ethics concerns they encounter in the workplace **93**
- Other (please specify) _____ **24**
- My agency did not assess risk **19**

Question 23 Table 1

24. If your agency evaluated the effectiveness of your ethics education and/or communication, select all that apply (see [PA-19-05](#) for reference):

- Conducted self-assessments to ensure that required employees are receiving Training **89**
- Administered post-training evaluations to assess participants' perceptions of the training **47**
- Reviewed advice logs for increased activity after training presentations and Communications **63**
- Held discussions with agency leaders and employees to evaluate whether the training and communications they received supported them in managing ethics risks **70**
- Incorporated inclusivity principles in the development and delivery of ethics education **53**

- Ensured ethics education was accessible (508 compliant) to participants **68**
- Other (please describe) _____ **18**
- My agency did not evaluate the effectiveness of ethics education **22**

[Question 24 Table 1](#)

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

[Part 5 Table 1](#)

PART 6. ADVICE, COUNSELING, AND REMEDIES

25. From the list below, select the three topics that your employees most frequently sought guidance on in 2023. Please rate them in order, so that the first topic is the topic on which employees sought guidance the most frequently.

<p>Conflicting financial interests Most frequent topic: 16 agencies Second most frequent topic: 16 agencies Third most frequent topic: 14 agencies This topic was selected a total of 46 times</p>
<p>Gift acceptance Most frequent topic: 36 agencies Second most frequent topic: 25 agencies Third most frequent topic: 29 agencies This topic was selected a total of 90 times</p>
<p>Financial disclosure reporting Most frequent topic: 32 agencies Second most frequent topic: 25 agencies Third most frequent topic: 18 agencies This topic was selected a total of 75 times</p>
<p>Impartiality in performance of official duties Most frequent topic: 8 agencies Second most frequent topic: 10 agencies Third most frequent topic: 3 agencies This topic was selected a total of 21 times</p>
<p>Misuse of position, government resources, and information Most frequent topic: 3 agencies Second most frequent topic: 5 agencies Third most frequent topic: 8 agencies This topic was selected a total of 16 times</p>
<p>Outside employment/activities Most frequent topic: 34 agencies Second most frequent topic: 31 agencies Third most frequent topic: 29 agencies This topic was selected a total of 94 times</p>
<p>Post-employment restrictions Most frequent topic: 3 agencies Second most frequent topic: 14 agencies Third most frequent topic: 19 agencies This topic was selected a total of 36 times</p>
<p>Travel, subsistence, and related expenses from non-federal sources Most frequent topic: 6 agencies</p>

Second most frequent topic: 15 agencies Third most frequent topic: 12 agencies This topic was selected a total of 33 times
Other (specify) _____ Most frequent topic: 4 agencies Second most frequent topic: 1 agency Third most frequent topic: 3 agencies This topic was selected a total of 8 times

26. Number of notification statements of negotiation or recusal under section 17(a) of the STOCK Act submitted to the ethics office in 2023 (see 5 C.F.R. § 2635.602(a)): ___ **1,383**

27. Number of 18 U.S.C. § 208 waivers granted in 2023:

	Number Granted in 2023	Number Sent to OGE
a. 208(b)(1) waivers	147	145
b. 208(b)(3) waivers	353	355

If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of waivers granted and the number provided to OGE. _____

[Question 27 Table 1](#)

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

[Part 6 Table 1](#)

PART 7. FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEMS

28. 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 (specify why, below)	Never (specify why, below)	Not Applicable (specify why, below)
a. Public Filers	67 (59%)	38 (34%)	7 (6%)	1 (1%)	29
b. Confidential Filers	59 (52.6%)	40 (35.7%)	11 (9.8%)	2 (1.7%)	30

If not applicable, specify why. _____

Question 28 Table 1

If “never” or “in some cases,” please explain further: _____

Question 28 Table 2

29. 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 (specify why, below)	Never (specify why, below)	Not Applicable (specify why, below)
a. Public Filers	61 (55%)	42 (38%)	4 (4%)	3 (3%)	32

If not applicable, specify why. _____

If “never” or “in some cases,” please explain further: _____

Question 29 Table 1

30. Were all public and confidential financial reports, in calendar year 2023, filed using an electronic filing system?

- Yes, all reports were filed in an electronic filing system (skip to #32) **58**
- No **84**

31. Indicate which forms your agency uses. Check all that apply.

- 450 (pdf) **76**
- 450 (excel) **7**
- 278e (pdf) **25**
- 278e (excel) **8**
- 278-T (pdf) **13**
- 278-T (excel) **5**

32. Which electronic filing system(s) does your agency use?

- Integrity ONLY (skip to Additional Comments for this Part) **66 (46.5%)**
- Integrity **and** Other (specify) _____ **76 (53.5%)**

Question 32 Table 1

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

- Public Financial Disclosure (OGE Form 278e)
Provide the name of the other system: _____ **13**
- Periodic Transactions (OGE Form 278-T)
Provide the name of the other system: _____ **13**
- Confidential Financial Disclosure (OGE Form 450 or OGE-approved alternative form)
Provide the name of the other system: _____ **75**

Question 33 Table 1

34. Indicate your FY 2023 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 Integrity)	Confidential	
a. Amount paid to a non-federal vendor in FY 2023	\$64,732	\$5,577,971	\$5,642,703
b. Amount paid to a federal agency in FY 2023	\$0	\$1,713,986	\$1,713,986
c. Amount for all internal costs associated with operating an e-filing system (e.g., FTE, overhead, etc.) in FY 2023	\$198,511	\$1,425,768	\$1,624,279

Total FY 2023 actual costs	\$263,243	\$8,717,725	\$8,980,968
----------------------------	-----------	-------------	-------------

[Question 34 Table 1](#)

35. Indicate the number of filers who filed electronically in fiscal year 2023.

	Public (excluding filers in <i>Integrity</i>)	Confidential
Number of financial disclosure filers, not reports, who filed electronically in FY 2023	4,464	348,203

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

[Part 7 Table 1](#)

PART 8. PUBLIC FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

36. Report the number of public financial disclosure reports (OGE Form 278e) required to be filed by December 31, 2023, **excluding** SGEs, and the number of reports actually filed (i.e., received) by December 31, 2023.

OGE Form 278e Reports		PAS ²	Non-Career SES ³	Career SES ³	Schedule C	Other ⁴	TOTAL
a. New Entrant	Required		157	1,531	568	1,894	4,150
	Filed		156 (99%)	1,526 (99%)	559 (98%)	1,886 (99%)	4,127 (99%)
b. Annual	Required	697	833	9,659	1,245	9,545	21,979
	Filed	697 (100%)	830 (99.6%)	9,637 (99.7%)	1,242 (99.7%)	9,536 (99.9%)	21,942 (99.8%)
c. Termination	Required	53	145	1,092	223	1,283	2,796
	Filed	53 (100%)	142 (98%)	1,078 (99%)	217 (97%)	1,269 (99%)	2,759 (99%)
d. Combination ¹	Required	8	20	124	28	197	377
	Filed	8 (100%)	20 (100%)	123 (99%)	27 (96%)	197 (100%)	375 (99%)
Total	Required	758	1,155	12,406	2,064	12,919	29,302
	Filed	758 (100%)	1,148 (99%)	12,364 (99.6%)	2,045 (99%)	12,888 (99.6%)	29,203 (99.6%)

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 category in the chart, etc.

Example for new entrant and termination reports: If an employee joined (or departed) the agency on December 15, 2023, and the employee filed a new entrant (or termination) report

prior to the end of the calendar year, include the report in your required and filed numbers. If, on January 1, 2024, the employee has not filed a new entrant (or termination) report, do not count that report in your required numbers. Instead, include the report in your 2024 questionnaire response to be filed in 2025.

If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of reports required to be filed and the actual number of reports filed.

Question 36 Table 1

37. Note the number of public financial disclosure reports certified or otherwise closed by your agency during the calendar year. **Exclude** reports of SGEs. Of those reports, indicate how many were initially reviewed within 60 days and how many were certified within 60 days. “Initially reviewed within 60 days” means having completed a technical review and conflicts analysis. See 5 C.F.R. § 2634.605 and section 4.02 of the Public Financial Disclosure Guide.

OGE Form 278e Reports		PAS ²	Non-Career SES ³	Career SES ³	Schedule C	Other ⁴	TOTAL
a. New Entrant	How many reports did your agency certify or close in 2023?		159	1,477	536	1,912	4,084
	Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were initially reviewed within 60 days?		134 (84%)	1,374 (93%)	503 (94%)	1,712 (90%)	3,723 (91%)
	Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were certified or closed within 60 days?		103 (65%)	1,127 (76%)	392 (73%)	1,375 (72%)	2,997 (73%)
b. Annual	How many reports did your agency certify or close in 2023?	651	796	9,416	1,188	9,257	21,308
	Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were initially reviewed within 60 days?	631 (97%)	733 (92%)	8,701 (92%)	1,104 (93%)	8,171 (88%)	19,340 (91%)
	Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were certified or closed within 60 days?	527 (81%)	565 (71%)	7,245 (77%)	941 (79%)	6,655 (72%)	15,933 (75%)

c. Termination	How many reports did your agency certify or close in 2023?	51	153	1,047	214	1,272	2,737
	Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were initially reviewed within 60 days?	50 (98%)	149 (97%)	994 (95%)	209 (98%)	1,174 (92%)	2,576 (94%)
	Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were certified or closed within 60 days?	49 (96%)	137 (90%)	917 (88%)	195 (91%)	1,103 (87%)	2,401 (88%)
d. Combination ¹	How many reports did your agency certify or close in 2023?	9	19	128	25	196	377
	Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were initially reviewed within 60 days?	8 (89%)	18 (95%)	116 (91%)	23 (92%)	179 (91%)	344 (91%)
	Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were certified or closed within 60 days?	7 (78%)	16 (84%)	101 (79%)	22 (88%)	170 (87%)	316 (84%)
TOTAL	How many reports did your agency certify or close in 2023?	711	1,127	12,068	1,963	12,637	28,506
	Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were initially reviewed within 60 days?	689 (97%)	1,034 (92%)	11,185 (93%)	1,839 (94%)	11,236 (89%)	25,983 (91%)
	Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were certified or closed within 60 days?	583 (82%)	821 (73%)	9,390 (78%)	1,550 (79%)	9,303 (74%)	21,647 (76%)

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.

If applicable, please explain why some reports were reviewed more than 60 days after submission. _____

If applicable, please explain why some reports were certified or closed more than 60 days after submission. Check all that apply.

- additional information was being sought **63**
- remedial action was being taken **15**
- other (specify) _____ **24**

Question 37 Table 1

38. Number of periodic transaction reports filed, excluding those filed by SGEs:
 _____ **19,751**

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 space above. *Example 2:* If an employee files one report each month, each report is counted separately. Report “12”.

39. 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	4,474	424	99
b. Number of OGE Form 278-T Reports	565	444	166

40. Number of public financial disclosure filers reported in calendar year 2023 to the Attorney General for failure to file: _____ **9**

41. How many requests for public financial disclosure reports did you receive in 2023? Count each OGE Form 201 as one request, even if it contains a request for documents for multiple individuals. _____ **1,473**

42. How many documents requested under the Ethics in Government Act did you release in calendar year 2023? _____ **24,951**

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

Part 8 Table 1

PART 9. CONFIDENTIAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

43. Report the number of confidential financial disclosure reports required to be filed by December 31, 2023, **excluding** SGEs, and the number of reports actually filed by December 31, 2023.

	a. Required	b. Filed	
		OGE Form 450	339,868
		OGE-approved alternative form	52,076
Total	392,803		391,944 (99.7%)

Note: If a 450 filer leaves the filing position before the due date, the report is not required per 5 C.F.R. § 2634.903(a).

Example for new entrant reports: If an employee started at the agency on December 15, 2023, 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, 2024, the employee has not filed a new entrant report, do not count that report in your required numbers. Instead, include the report in your 2024 questionnaire response to be filed in 2025.

If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of reports required to be filed and the actual number of reports filed. _____

Question 43 Table 1

44. Note the number of confidential financial disclosure reports certified or otherwise closed by your agency during the calendar year. **Exclude** reports of SGEs. Of those reports, indicate how many were initially reviewed within 60 days and how many were certified within 60 days. “Initially reviewed within 60 days” means having completed a technical review and conflicts analysis. See 5 C.F.R. § 2634.605 and the Certification Requirements section of the Confidential Financial Disclosure Guide.

	How many reports did your agency certify or close in 2023?	Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were initially reviewed within 60 days?	Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were certified or closed within 60 days?
a. OGE Form 450 and OGE-approved alternative	379,765	350,616 (92%)	337,649 (89%)

If applicable, please explain why some reports were reviewed more than 60 days after submission. _____

If applicable, please explain why some reports were certified or closed more than 60 days after submission. Check all that apply.

- additional information was being sought **65**
- remedial action was being taken **22**
- other (specify) _____ **32**

[Question 44 Table 1](#)

45. Number of OGE 450 or OGE-approved alternative forms granted filing extensions in 2023: _____ **8,669**

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

[Part 9 Table 1](#)

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

46. Number of disciplinary actions taken in 2023 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). For purposes of this question, disciplinary actions include removals, demotions, suspensions, and written reprimands or their equivalents

a. Total number of disciplinary actions that met the above criteria	609
---	------------

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

i. Subpart A (General Provisions)	107
ii. Subpart B (Gifts from Outside Sources)	17
iii. Subpart C (Gifts Between Employees)	4
iv. Subpart D (Conflicting Financial Interests)	8
v. Subpart E (Impartiality in Performing Official Duties)	27
vi. Subpart F (Seeking Other Employment)	10
vii. Subpart G (Misuse of Position)	270
viii. Subpart H (Outside Activities)	65
iv. Agency’s supplemental Standards of Conduct	117

47. Number of disciplinary actions taken in 2023 based wholly or in part upon violations of the criminal conflict of interest statutes (18 U.S.C. §§ 203, 205, 208, and 209), failure to file or filing false public financial disclosures (5 U.S.C. § 13106 or 18 U.S.C. § 1001), civil matters involving outside earned income (5 U.S.C. § 13143), or outside activities (5 U.S.C. § 13144). For purposes of this question, disciplinary actions include removals, demotions, suspensions, and written reprimands or their equivalents

a. Disciplinary actions taken based on violation of ethics laws	9
---	----------

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

i. 18 U.S.C. § 203 (Compensation in Matters Affecting the Government)	0
ii. 18 U.S.C. § 205 (Claims Against and Matters Affecting the Government)	2
iii. 18 U.S.C. § 208 (Acts Affecting a Personal Financial Interest)	3
iv. 18 U.S.C. § 209 (Supplementation of Salary)	0
v. 5 U.S.C. § 13106 or 18 U.S.C. § 1001 (Failure to File or Filing False Public Financial Disclosures)	2
vi. 5 U.S.C. § 13143 (Outside Earned Income)	0
vii. 5 U.S.C. § 13144 (Outside Activities)	2

48. Number of referrals made in 2023 to the Department of Justice (DOJ) of potential violations of the conflict of interest statutes (18 U.S.C. §§ 203, 205, 207, 208, 209), failure to file or filing false public financial disclosures (5 U.S.C. § 13106 or 18 U.S.C. § 1001), civil matters involving outside earned income (5 U.S.C. § 13143) or outside activities (5 U.S.C. § 13144)

a. Referrals to Department of Justice	60
---------------------------------------	-----------

Of the referrals to DOJ (line a.), please note the DOJ referral status

b. DOJ Referral Status	
i. How many of those referrals were accepted for prosecution?	15
ii. How many of those referrals were declined for prosecution?	38
iii. How many of those referrals were pending DOJ's decision as of December 31, 2023?	7

Of the referrals to DOJ (line a.), please note the agency disciplinary status

c. Agency Disciplinary Action Status	
i. Of the cases referred to DOJ, how many resulted in disciplinary or corrective action?	4
ii. Of the cases referred to DOJ, how many resulted in a determination not to take disciplinary or corrective action?	6
iii. Of the cases referred to DOJ, how many are pending a determination as to whether disciplinary or corrective action will be taken?	29
iv. Of the cases referred to DOJ, how many involved employees who left the agency before the agency determined whether or not to take disciplinary action?	13
v. Of the cases referred to DOJ, how many involved 18 U.S.C. § 207, such that there was no option for disciplinary action?	10

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

- Yes **18**
- No (specify why) _____ **4**
- Not applicable because no covered referrals were made to DOJ **120**

[Question 49 Table 1](#)

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

[Part 10 Table 1](#)

PART 11. ETHICS PLEDGE ASSESSMENT (Executive Order 13989 (“Ethics Pledge”))

50. 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, 2023?

- Yes **69**
- No (skip to #53) **73**

Note: For guidance on what constitutes a full-time non-career appointee for purposes of the Ethics Pledge, see [LA-21-07](#)

51. For each category of appointee, provide the number of full-time non-career appointees appointed between January 1 and December 31, 2023, and indicate the number who did and did not sign the Ethics Pledge.

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 01/01/2023 – 12/31/2023	98	237	147	634	93	1,209
i. Signed the Ethics Pledge in 2023	85	221	122	582	81	1,091
ii. Required to sign the Pledge in 2023 but signed in 2024	1	3	0	13	5	22
iii. Required to sign the Pledge, but did not sign (please explain)	0	0	0	1	0	1
iv. Not required to sign the Pledge because occupied an exempt non-policymaking position (Schedule C or other comparable authority)	0	0	0	10	0	10
v. Not required to sign the Pledge because appointed without break in service after	13	13	25	28	7	86

<p>serving in another position for which the Ethics Pledge was already signed</p>						
<p>vi. Not required to sign for another reason (please explain)</p>	0	0	0	0	0	0

For each appointee identified in line iii, please explain why that appointee did not sign the Pledge. _____

Question 51 Table 1

For each appointee identified in line vi, please explain why that appointee was not required to sign the Pledge. _____

If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number appointed and the number who signed or did not sign the Pledge. _____

Question 51 Table 2

52. Registered Lobbyist/and or Registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act
- a. How many appointees were registered lobbyists and/or registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act during the two years prior to their appointment? For purposes of this question, please include individuals appointed between January 1 and December 31, 2023, and subject to the Ethics Pledge, as well as holdover appointees subject to the Pledge. ____ (if 0 skip to #53) **3**
 - b. How many of those appointees who were registered lobbyists and/or registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act during the two years prior to their appointment have an ethics agreement addressing their obligations under paragraph 3 of the Ethics Pledge? _____ **2**
 - c. For any of those appointees who do not have an ethics agreement, please provide their name and an explanation (e.g., Pledge paragraph 3 not reasonably expected to limit participation in any agency matters because appointee's duties sufficiently unrelated to prior lobbying activities). _____ [Question 52 Table 1](#)
53. Section 3 of Executive Order 13989 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 2023, the names of those individuals granted waivers in 2023, 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	6	Daniel Tsai Caroline Kennedy Summer Sylva Marilynn Malerba (2) Colleen J. Shogan
c. Paragraph 3	2	Rachel Patterson Bartholomew Sheard
d. Paragraph 4	0	
e. Paragraph 5	0	
f. Paragraph 6	0	
g. Paragraph 7	0	
h. Paragraph 8	0	
i. Paragraph 9	0	
j. Other (please explain)	0	

If other, please explain. _____

- 54. Number of violations, if any, of Executive Order 13989 in 2023. _____ 5
- 55. Number of enforcement actions, if any, taken in 2023 as a result of violations of the Executive Order 13989 (regardless of whether the violation itself took place in 2023 or earlier). _____ 1

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

[Part 11 Table 1](#)

PART 12. SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES (SGEs)

56. How many Special Government Employees (SGEs) did your agency have, in total, during calendar year 2023? _____ **38,913** (if zero, skip to Additional Comments for this Part)

57. Initial Ethics Training

a. How many SGEs who were expected to serve for 60 days or less on a board, commission, or committee were required to receive Initial Ethics Training (IET) by December 31, 2023 (5 C.F.R. § 2638.304(b)(2))?	26,011
i. How many of those SGEs received IET before or at the beginning of the first meeting?	25,627 (98.5%)
ii. How many of those SGEs received IET after the first meeting?	145 (0.6%)
iii. How many of those SGEs have not received IET as of today?	239 (0.9%)

If applicable, please explain why some SGEs received IET after the first meeting or have yet to receive IET. _____

Question 57 Table 1

58. Report the number of SGE public and confidential financial disclosure reports required to be filed by December 31, 2023, and the number of reports actually filed by December 31, 2023.

	Confidential Reports (OGE Form 450 or OGE- Approved Alternative Form)		Public Reports (OGE Form 278e)	
	Required	Filed	Required	Filed
a. Advisory Committee Members (FACA)	27,233	27,118 (99%)	18	18 (100%)
b. Advisory Committee Members (non-FACA)	411	376 (91%)	0	0
c. Experts/Consultants	702	654 (93%)	35	35 (100%)
d. Board Members	196	191 (97%)	21	21 (100%)
e. Commissioners	62	61 (98%)	13	12 (92%)
f. Other	1,934	1,934 (100%)	76	76 (100%)
TOTAL	30,538	30,334 (99%)	163	162 (99%)

Example for new entrant and termination reports: If an employee joined (or departed) the agency on December 15, 2023, and filed a new entrant (or 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 (or termination) report, do not count that report in your required numbers. Instead, include the report in your 2024 questionnaire response to be filed in 2025.

If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of reports required to be filed and the actual number of reports filed. _____

Question 58 Table 1

59. Note the number of SGE disclosure reports certified or otherwise closed by your agency during the calendar year. Of those reports, indicate how many were initially reviewed within 60 days and how many were certified within 60 days. “Initially reviewed within 60 days” means having completed a technical review and conflicts analysis. See 5 C.F.R. § 2634.605, section 4.02 of the Public Financial Disclosure Guide, and the Certification Requirements section of the Confidential Financial Disclosure Guide.

	Confidential Reports	Public Reports
a. How many reports did your agency certify or close in 2023?	29,903	198
b. Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were initially reviewed within 60 days?	29,604 (99%)	186 (94%)
c. Of those certified or closed in 2023, how many were certified or closed within 60 days?	29,286 (98%)	166 (84%)

If applicable, please explain why some reports were reviewed more than 60 days after submission. _____

Question 59 Table 1

If applicable, please explain why some reports were certified or closed more than 60 days after submission. Check all that apply.

- additional information was being sought **22**
- remedial action was being taken **6**
- other (specify) _____ **15**

Question 59 Table 2

60. Number of SGEs excluded from all or a portion of the confidential filing requirements per 5 C.F.R. § 2634.904(b): _____ **8,676**

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	34	5	1
b. Number of OGE Form 450 or OGE-Approved Alternative Forms	130		

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

[Part 12 Table 1](#)

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE COMMENTS:

[Overall Comments Table 1](#)

By submitting, the agency attests that, to the best of their knowledge and belief, all information in the above referenced data reported is accurate and complete.

Appendix

Question 7 Table 1

Ethics advice related to discrete questions put forward.
The ASBCA's GS employees are hired via the Army's civilian personnel system. Army provides prospective GS employees with required ethics notices.
OA provides ethics support as requested when we are between ethics officials.
On an as needed basis, DOI OIG provided consultative and direct employee ethics advice support.
Provides employment notices to new employees.
At the DeCA General Counsel's request, DoD Standards of Conduct personnel provided on-site supplemental ethics training in procurement ethics and standards of conduct for DeCA senior Staff. This training was requested to reinforce annual ethics training.
DoD Standards of Conduct Office and U.S. Army JAG School provided ethics training. Defense Health Agency and U.S. Transportation Command provided new civilian employee briefings. U.S. Army provided the e-filing system for the OGE Form 450 (FDM)
Hatch Act training offered to ethics counselors.
1. Provides FDM electronic filing system for Confidential Financial Disclosure reporting. 2. Provides DoD-wide ethics guidance and policies through DoD supplemental regulations at 5 C.F.R. Part 3601, the "Joint Ethics Regulation" (DoD Directive 5500.7), legal advisories, and regular coordinating group meetings of Department ethics officials.
Financial Disclosure Management (FDM) system for OGE 450
OSC: Hatch Act guidance and training to DOJ ethics officials. ODNI: Guidance and collaboration on 50 USC 3073a (FBI)
Use of Financial Disclosure Management System (FDM)
The Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation (FCSIC) is a very small federal corporation that shares many services with the FCA. As one of those services, the FCA Designated Agency Ethics Official (DAEO), with her team, provides ethics program management to FCSIC, and advice and counseling to FCSIC employees.
General ethics counseling, financial disclosure filing administration and review
Through September 2023, NCUA used Army's FDM e-filing system to manage the agency's confidential financial disclosure reports.

One DHS OIG employee was detailed to NEA's OGC office. This detail worked on Ethics related matters 50% of her time.
Ethics policy, post-government employment issues and public financial disclosure reporting support.
Question about serving on local boards - OGE Desk Officer referred us to White House Counsel
Provides ethics notices in offer letters to new hires.
Ethics Consultations
OA: provided platform for virtual ethics training (initial and annual) and provided ethics guidance to OSTP DAEO OSC: provided Hatch Act training OGE: provided ethics guidance to OSTP DAEO OMB: provided ethics guidance to OSTP DAEO
Provided online course for annual ethics training.
Ethics Compliance Tracking System
Initial Ethics Training. ONCD will begin conducting Initial Ethics Training by the end of the first quarter of 2024.
The White House Counsel's Office provides support and partnership on new employee initial ethics trainings and annual ethics trainings. White House Counsel's Office also provides support and partnership in developing ethics materials.
(1) We worked with Army to continue using their Financial Disclosure Management system (FDM) for our confidential financial disclosure report filers. (2) DoDEA provided us a detailee to assist us with our ethics program. The ethics detailee has reviewed and certified financial disclosure reports, provided ethics advice to employees, etc.
We use their FDM system and they provide help desk support if needed. They don't provide any additional services related to the review of reports.
HUD's Ethics and Appeals Division (EAD) administers USICH's ethics program. EAD provides program administration, including preparing and submitting the annual Questionnaire and responding to program reviews. EAD also drafts the policies and notices used to satisfy 5 C.F.R. § 2638.303 for the USICH DAEO approval. EAD reviews, certifies, and maintains the financial disclosure reports of USICH employees and provides ethics advice to USICH staff. EAD also provides both initial and annual ethics training to USICH employees.
IJC uses DOS ethics training modules

NARA uses a US Government shared services provider (through an IAA) for certain Human Capital services. For example, the provider prepares and sends offer letters and includes ethics information in those letters.

Question 8 Table 1

<p>The Army's Financial Disclosure Management (FDM) program provided financial disclosure report filing support to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Department of the Air Force and Navy, Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals, Defense Contract Audit Agency, Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency, Defense Commissary Agency, State Department, Defense Financial Accounting Service, Department of Homeland Security, Defense Intelligence Agency, Defense Information Systems Agency, Defense Logistics Agency, Department of Defense Inspector General, Defense Threat Reduction Agency, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, Office of Government Ethics, Special Inspector General of Afghan Reconstruction, United States National Guard, Uniformed Services University of the</p>	<p>The FDM System is the Office of Government Ethics (OGE) approved on-line filing system and database used for each and every DoD OGE 450 filed by all DoD regular employees and service members, and the filing employees of several civilian departments and agencies listed above, to comply with the Ethics in Government Act and implementing regulations governing filing, review, and compliance reporting for OGE 450 Confidential Financial Disclosure reports and annual ethics training. In addition to providing the basic filing system, the FDM system provides users assistance with user logon issues and other issues that impact the filing and review of OGE 450s. The system also provides a function that allows agencies to track annual ethics training.</p>
--	--

Health Sciences, Armed Forces Retirement Home, and the Department of Veterans Affairs.	
USADF Board of Directors received Ethics Training in October 2023.	Ethics Training was provided.
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC)	The Bureau’s Director serves on the Board of Directors for the FDIC. Prior to each FDIC Board meeting, the Ethics Office reviews all Board cases for potential ethics issues and provides ethics guidance to the Bureau Director in connection with his FDIC Board duties, as necessary.
Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC)	DLA provides advice, training, and financial disclosure reviews and certifications.
Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council	Financial disclosure review and program requirements, including applicable advisories
Joint Personnel Recovery Agency, DoD (Joint Strike Fighter Program), U.S. Army, U.S. Navy	Joint Personnel Recovery Agency - provided ethics advice pursuant to a memorandum of agreement. DoD (Joint Strike Fighter Program), U.S. Army, U.S. Navy - provided post-government employment and outside activities briefings, reviewed financial disclosure reports
National Assessment Governing Board and National Council on Disability	Services provided include all aspects of a mandated Executive Branch agency ethics program.
White House	Two employees completed 6-month details to the White House
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness	Describe the services or support provided: HUD’s agency ethics officials administer all portions of an ethics program for USICH. EAD provides program administration, including preparing and submitting the annual Questionnaire and responding to program reviews. EAD also drafts the policies and notices used to satisfy 5 C.F.R. Â§ 2638.303 for the USICH DAEO approval. EAD reviews, certifies, and maintains the financial disclosure reports of USICH employees and provides ethics advice to USICH staff. EAD also provides both initial and annual ethics training to USICH employees.

<p>The Upper Colorado River Commission (UCRC), an interstate water administrative agency established by action of five state legislatures and Congress.</p>	<p>Ethics services to the Chair of the UCRC, who was appointed by the President as a special Government employee (SGE).</p>
<p>Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation (FCSIC)</p>	<p>FCSIC is a very small federal corporation that shares many services with the Farm Credit Administration (FCA). As one of those shared services, the FCA Designated Agency Ethics Official (DAEO), with her team, provides ethics program management and services to FCSIC, including advice and counseling to FCSIC employees.</p>
<p>International Boundary Commission</p>	<p>IJC provides ethics services to the IBC</p>
<p>Public Buildings Reform Board</p>	<p>JUSFC's ADEAO provided guidance on how to access OGE's materials and experts, build an ethics program at a nano agency, and who to contact for Congressional/Hatch Act questions.</p>
<p>National Space Council Users' Advisory Group (UAG) for the White House, White House Office.</p>	<p>Provide the UAG FACA Committee with financial disclosure review, ethics advice and training, and ethics related administrative support.</p>
<p>Public Interest Declassification Board</p>	<p>NARA provides ethics support to the Public Interest Declassification Board, an independent board. The Information Security Oversight Office, which is part of NARA, serves as the Executive Secretariat for the PIDB and it can call on other NARA offices for support. NARA is authorized to expend its appropriations on PIDB activities, as PIDB does not receive any appropriations directly.</p>
<p>DoD Standards of Conduct Office</p>	<p>Data Call input and policy review</p>
<p>White House Counsel's Office and the Office of Administration</p>	<p>NSC has consulted White House Counsel's Office and the Office of Administration as necessary on topics such as financial</p>

	disclosure, outside engagements, new employee / political appointment hires, and gifts
Council of Economic Advisers	When they are between ethics officials OA provides ethics support.
National Space Council	Ethics training, advice, and counseling for employees, review of financial disclosure filings, and review of requests for participation in outside events.
Social Security Advisory Board, Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) Trust Fund, and the Disability Insurance Trust Fund.	Ethics review of financial reports, Annual Ethics Training, ethics advice for conflicts of interest.
Appalachian Regional Commission	The Appalachian Regional Commission's ethics officer assist the Southwest Border Regional Commission by providing an ethics training and answering questions regarding ethics procedures.
Secretary of Defense's USU Board of Regents	Legal and ethics support (financial disclosure, ethics training, ethics counseling)
International Broadcasting Advisory Board (IBAB)	6 Nominees assisted through the nomination and confirmation process.
Office of Pandemic Preparedness and Response Policy, Office of the Vice President, Office of the National Cyber Director, National Security Council, and Council of Economic Advisors.	Ethics guidance, advice and counseling, training financial disclosure reporting and review public disclosure of financial disclosure reports.

Question 9 Table 1

We are continuing to explore whether an automated system for tracking ethics program activities and storing ethics program records would be beneficial.
Budgetary.

1) A consistent resource for online initial and annual ethics training that automatically tracks course completion and can be monitored by ethics counselors to reduce the amount of manhours required to monitor compliance. 2) Recurring initial training on how to run an ethics program would be useful, including nuts and bolts training on the applicable law/regulations, slides/quick guides for training others and information to cover the regular issues that ethics counselors encounter. Should include advice about running an ethics program. Due to high turnover in our office, there is limited institutional memory and an ongoing need for initial training.

Budget, tracking and training

Budget

Budgetary (ATF)

Due to turnover, our ethics program went without a program manager starting in December 2022. However, we filled that vacancy in April 2023.

Funds for training, including travel to provide training to locations outside of the Washington, D.C. area.

Training. Human capital is vital for any healthy ethics program. Though the VA EST has a wealth of knowledge and expertise, we are a small group of attorneys and paraprofessionals (~20) who are solely dedicated to ethics practice within VA's OGC. Though our compliance teammates scattered throughout the enterprise assist with basic ethics questions, most stakeholders' questions are complex and thus require the processing and analysis of the VA EST Team of attorneys and paraprofessionals. EST is a small group to service nearly half a million federal employees, and the second largest federal agency. Training is thus vital to keep pace with changes in the law, to bring new employees up to speed, and to cement crucial relationships among ethics professionals within the federal government. The DAEO endeavors to increase opportunity and access to training for our team, as a force-multiplier for our relatively small practice.

Under the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act, EPA is implementing projects, creating grant funding opportunities and hiring new employees to meet these needs. From an ethics perspective, we must provide effective counseling to these new programs and the employees who are working in these innovative areas, including ensuring that the agency's grants reviewers are fully compliant with federal ethics laws. Given the amount of available grant money -- in the billions -- we are also working collaboratively with the competition advocate and agency appropriations lawyers as they consider their concerns. To meet these growing demands while continuing to meet the existing ethics programmatic requirements, we need additional FTE and funding.

We have designated one individual as an ethics counselor for the SSS to assist with ethics advice and training. We hope to add more ethics counselors.

Question 10 Table 1

Agency head is the ADAEO
Ethics staff will meet with Agency Head in 2024 to conduct a year in review of 2023. Additionally, ethics staff engage frequently with Agency Head on ethics including discussions which incorporates program feedback.
The Southwest Border Commission was created in 2023, staff had not been hired.

Question 11 Table 1

During CY2023, the Department of Defense conducted an Audit of DoD Senior Officials' Public Financial Disclosures.
In addition to the periodic audit by OGE this year, DoD Standards of Conduct Office did an external review of our 278 public financial disclosures. We have not yet received the results.
In July 2023, the DoD Office of the Inspector General (OIG) initiated an audit of financial disclosure reports filed by DoD seniors, including the DIA senior cadre.
My agency - 6 major commands reported that the Air Force Judge Advocate General's Office conducted inspections of the ethics programs of some of their installation legal offices. Entity outside agency - GAO audits our initial ethics training and annual ethics training.
The Army continued its program of reviewing subordinate office ethics programs. Also, the Department of Defense Inspector General's contracted Audit Team (KPMG) conducted an audit of the Army's Ethics Program, and the Department of Defense Inspector General started a review of all the Department of Defense OGE 278e filings.
KPMG annual internal controls audit
Each year, an independent auditor reviews DOL programs and operations, including the Ethics Program, that can have a material impact on the Department's financial statements. As part of this audit, KPMG conducted a walkthrough regarding DOL's main ethics guidance for employees and the method to ensure/track that individuals acknowledge it.
The Office of Ethics continuously monitors and evaluates the Ethics Program during weekly team meeting as well as management meetings. Additionally, EXIM IG conducted inquiry involving outside Employment Policy and Annual Financial Statement Audit done by KPMG

includes review of the Annual Ethics Training Plan and results of previous year's OGE Annual Questionnaire.
OIG, KPMG
In 2023, NSA OGC reviewed the ethics program and determined that it would benefit from direct oversight by an official leadership position with specific responsibility for the ethics program. NSA OGC also took great efforts to increase the number of attorneys assigned to the ethics program. The results of these efforts are set forth in Number 12 below. Also, NSA was part of a DoD-wide audit of Public Financial Disclosure programs initiated by the DoD OIG. The DoD OIG audit of NSA's Public Financial Disclosure program is still pending and NSA understands that it may be addressed separately from other DoD components.
OGE conducted an evaluation.
An outside auditor under contract to OPM conducted a review of OPM's public financial disclosure process.
As part of the Green Book audit the Ethics Law Division provided information on the new employee ethics training an annual ethics training to an outside audit firm.
An external organization, Ethisphere, was selected to perform an independent assessment of TVA's Ethics & Compliance program and processes. The assessment benchmarked TVA's program against established best practices for mature ethics and compliance programs. TVA received Compliance Leader Verification certification.
DoD IG, RFI from DoD Standards of Conduct Office

Question 12 Table 1

Q #12: The evaluation revealed lapses in 278-T reporting by a single new filer who had not internalized the time requirements for filing those reports. A recommendation was made to that filer to set reminders to check transactions on a monthly basis. This was not a policy or program change, but it did result in counseling and recommendations.
Manpower to assist with day-to-day administration of ethics program.
To date, there are no known results from the audit.
Changes to staffing and increased investment in technology resources.
Increased staffing in the ethics office.

The CSB has been implementing changes pursuant to its 2023 OGE Program Review recommendations. The FY 2024 IG report parroted OGE's recommendations and/or were moot.

After our internal review of agency policies and procedures, we worked with Office of Human Resources staff to provide the ethics team with improved notification of accessions, separations and promotions in order to provide appropriate ethics guidance. Additionally, the information contained on the ethics homepage of the agency's internal website was updated and has been more prominently displayed, allowing for greater visibility by agency staff.

The Office of Inspector General for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (OIG) announced an Evaluation of the Supervision, Enforcement, and Fair Lending Division's (SEFL) Approach to Assessing Independence and Mitigating Risks of Conflict of Interest on February 4th, 2021. As part of that assessment, the OIG reviewed various ethics training materials and policies relating to SEFL's ethics compliance obligations. OIG concluded its review in late 2023 and ultimately did not propose any formal recommendations for the Ethics Office.

In 2023, CEQ reevaluated and refined its financial disclosure process, developed several new collaborative tools to track workflow and manage compliance, and designated a new ADAEO and Deputy ADAEO.

An initial ethics training standard operating procedures document was created.

Initial Ethics Training for new employees remained a challenge. DeCA completed an OGE Program Review this past summer 2023. DeCA General Counsel and DeCA Human Resources are part of a broader working group planning a "refresh" of the DeCA internal webpage and creation of a mobile application to allow employees to access to training from mobile devices. The intent is to improve access to required training for those employees that do not have a dedicated computer or easy access.

DOD IG is conducting a review of OGE 278 filing across the DoD. The inspection has not completed so no results exist for us to take action on.

Final recommendations and findings have not been finalized or released.

We changed our OGE 278 and 278T reviews, so they are reviewed by 2 attorneys. On OGE 450 reviews we have provided and documented more official cautionary letters. DLA has determined that we need an SOP or some sort of instruction for conference attendance and speaking events. We are determining the best type of issuance for these policies. DLA is considering PEP accreditation for ethics practitioners. We are determining the best way to implement the requirement.

Based on the review of the ethics program, it was determined that the agency's written policy on the financial disclosure program needs to be updated to reflect changes to the program and OGE regulations.
The agency determined that the ethics program was effective and no change was needed.
Final report is still pending, but the ethics program has been undertaking implementation of enhancements for programmatic and policy updates and improvements.
Programmatic changes - TJAG inspections - 1) After the evaluation of one installation office, proper delegations of authority were executed as a result of the evaluator's findings. 2) Result of evaluation of a different installation - New training for airmen. Policy changes - TJAG inspections - Some installation legal offices changed their internal office policies to address personnel gaps and poor communication with servicing Civilian Personnel Offices (CPOs) re initial ethics training. Some TJAG inspections resulted in no changes because no problems were noted by TJAG's Office during the inspection of these installation ethics programs. GAO audit - No corrective plans were issued as a result of the GAO audit.
In addition to continuing to build upon the programmatic and policy changes described in last year's report, the Army established procedures regarding timely and interactive initial ethics training, revised its Post Government Employment Guides, and established accountability measures for timely initial and annual ethics training.
- Delegation of Ethics Counselor signature authority and plain language updates to PGE letters. - Improvements in tracking of ethics issues/opinions and products to help with the review process
The DAEO makes programmatic and policy changes as needed during bi-weekly DAEO meetings. An example of a programmatic change was the development of a newly designed agency Ethics webpage. The new webpage will include comments from the agency head on the importance of ethics and new Ethics in Brief handouts (one page handouts on various ethics topics.)
DoD IG audit of public financial disclosure reporting is still pending.
One component migrated public financial disclosure filers from a legacy system to Integrity, another component increased staffing levels, and a third component is considering additional internal operating procedures.
Audit resulted in no findings.

Programmatic changes- OIG Based on the review of outside employment, improvements were made to the Outside Employment Tracker Sharepoint, including working with the IT team to better avoid duplicates. OIG also took steps to ensure all questions reached legal staff. Policy changes- OIG Based on a review of all the Outside Employment requests, OIG determined that employees no longer needed to submit requests for all outside employment, only outside employment with the potential to produce a conflict.

Programmatic: The Department is implementing improvements as a result of a review of the overall ethics program in the Department. Policy: The Department is in the process of updating ethics policy. BOP: updating its fundraising policy and component standards of conduct. USTP: updating its guidance for employees with personal interests in bankruptcy cases. Recommendations under consideration: EOUSA - Year-end data and feedback are under consideration to determine if changes are needed.

No needed changes were identified.

The evaluation was a routine audit of financial disclosure.

As a result of the evaluation, the Departmental Ethics Office (DEO) updated standard operating procedures on financial disclosure and issued a new SOP governing the provision of post-government employment ethics guidance to departing employees. The DEO also issued a program advisory on financial disclosure and another on tracking procedures.

Some of our Operating Administrations (OAs) hired additional ethics officials.

The ADAEO evaluated all of the Treasury bureau ethics programs, including program administration financial disclosure training, and advice and counsel. Programs well-administered overall. Most feedback provided for financial disclosure review to meet regulatory and OGE technical review standards. The programmatic changes were varied among bureaus and include: updating ethics training presentations and reviewing additional methods of disseminating ethics information to employees developing and implementing a new process to better track and aggregate data related to the type of legal advice given regarding conflicts of interests improving consistency in providing cautionary guidance to financial disclosure filers more frequent outreach to employees on ethics issues, regular 278 reminders, improvements to financial disclosure review/notation procedures, improved guidance to HR and training personnel and increasing the number of ethics staff directly engaged in managing the intake and reviews of financial disclosures to increase attention to technical compliance. One bureau hopes to hire an FTE as the ethics program lead to improve its current structure of three FTEs performing duties in other program areas in addition to ethics. Policy changes: At one bureau, policy changes were made to reflect revisions to bureau designations of positions as confidential filers. Recommendations still being considered: At one bureau, implementation of possible programmatic changes are currently

under consideration by new leadership others are considering or have implemented suggestions/recommendations from the ADAEO program review.

Because the EPA ethics program is decentralized, the Ethics Office in the Office of General Counsel works continually to provide guidance and overall direction to the 100+ ethics officials. When we launched e450 filing in 2020, we also created an ethics dashboard to support the DEOs. But we have heard from them that they would appreciate even more information available to them "at a glance." In response, during this year, we made significant upgrades. The improved dashboard now provides extensive e450 and training tracking information so that DEOs have a real-time, comprehensive tool to track their ongoing ethics program duties. They can now identify their new employees by name along with their hire dates to track their initial ethics training completion. They can also view annual ethics training completion for both their confidential and public filers, and this information is updated hourly. To relieve DEOs from having to send out their own training reminders, we added a feature so that the system itself sends out periodic tailored training reminders to reminder filers to take their training. Significantly, we improved the DEOs' view of their e450 progress by creating easy-to-read charts and graphs to display filer submission status and review timeliness. We also enhanced the "ethics management" dashboard so that EPA Ethics can see the status of each DEO. During 2023, we used this dashboard to track DEO compliance in meeting the 60 day review/certification standard and in getting employees trained. In some cases, we sent out pointed reminders to DEOs and their supervisors about meeting the certification and training deadlines.

Chair approved new supplemental regulations concerning PAS bank holdings. Implemented Chair approved SOP on compliance checks on Board level transactions. OIG ethics duties delegation memo revised. Periodic reviews with minor revisions to policy letters and SOPs. OIG recommendations on changes to outside employment were found to be already in place.

As a result of review of advice logs and discussion with some supervisors, the Ethics Office determined that live training in 2023 was essential to afford employees an opportunity to connect with an ethics official in real time, and to get to know the agency's new Deputy Ethics Official. This was intended to improve employee comfort levels in contacting an ethics official, especially new employees, and to improve employee engagement with their own ethical obligations. Additionally, the agency assessed its program and will be adding new elements in 2024. Specifically, we will provide short 5 to 10 minute ethics briefings at staff meetings and endeavor to provide in-person training at regional offices. We have also teamed with the USDA and VA to produce a short video on ethical issues that arise when using social media that should be launched in the spring of 2024. Also in 2024, we plan to add an ethical obligation module to new supervisor training. With permission from the Director of the Office of Examination, we will require non-commissioned examiners, who are typically not required to complete annual ethics training, to complete annual ethics training in 2024 to ensure that employees with oversight activities understand their ethical obligations.

<p>The Ethics Office determined that live training in 2023 was essential to afford employees an opportunity to connect with an ethics official in real time, and to get to know the agency's new Deputy Ethics Official. This was intended to improve employee comfort levels in contacting an ethics official, especially new employees, and to improve employee engagement with their own ethical obligations. Additionally, the agency assessed its program and will be adding new elements in 2024. Specifically, we will provide short 5 to 10 minute ethics briefings at staff meetings and endeavor to provide in-person training at regional offices. We have also teamed with the USDA and VA to produce a short video on ethical issues that arise when using social media that should be launched in the spring of 2024. Also in 2024, we plan to add an ethical obligation module to new supervisor training.</p>
<p>Evaluation ongoing</p>
<p>Internal survey of deputy ethics counselors. Programmatic changes included adding additional deputy ethics counselors for specific offices/divisions and providing additional resources for deputy ethics counselors. Evaluated ways to provide additional ethics support to divisions/office within the Agency.</p>
<p>Updated procedures regarding HR notifying the Ethics Office of employee promotions. The Ethics Office continues to focus on making sure disclosure reports are reviewed and certified within 60 days.</p>
<p>In 2023, the DAEO evaluated the agency ethics program for its preparedness for a Presidential transition. The evaluation was reported to the agency head. There was no change because the agency had an adequate number of trained agency ethics officials.</p>
<p>Standard Operating procedures were developed and additional, specialized trainings were developed.</p>
<p>The FTC's Enterprise Risk Management Program audited the Ethics Team's confidential financial disclosure process and determined everything was designed well and operated effectively. No recommendations for changes or improvements were made.</p>
<p>No changes were required</p>
<p>We conduct an annual review of the program and make adjustments as needed. This year, there were no major changes needed so no changes resulted from the review.</p>
<p>OGC updated SGE guidance documents and updated the gift acceptance procedures and forms. We also updated our PSC training policy to require annual training similar to our employees.</p>
<p>Programmatic Changes - developing SGE training. Developed electronic events and WAG form to increase efficiency and consistency and improve record keeping.</p>

Adopted an online OGE 450 filing system for all OGE 450 filers.
NASA's ethics practice continually evaluates NASA's ethics program through monthly virtual meetings, other communications and client feedback. A programmatic change in 2023 was to successfully pilot multi-center live ethics training, where NASA employees from different duty locations are trained together.
Programmatic: (1) In September, NCUA transitioned to a new e-filing system provider for confidential financial disclosure reports. (2) The NCUA Office of Ethics Counsel (OEC) launched a completely redesigned SharePoint site for employees, including several new training resources. (3) OEC increased the number and sophistication of internal tracking logs. Policy: OEC has consistently implemented and expanded the process of performing preclearance reviews of new public financial disclosure filers' reports.
The entity deferred to our on-going OGE program review as the designated oversight entity.
The 18 USC 208 portion of Annual Training in 2023 was distributed over the course of five modules that focused on presenting practical information to help employees avoid violations. We also developed a new series of one-page ethics training tools which comply with Agency-wide initiative to make all training materials concise and relevant.
In 2023, NSA OGC decided to create an official leadership position to oversee the ethics program and manage the attorneys and staff supporting the program. The process of creating and hiring for the position started in December 2023 and will be completed in 2024. In addition, the ethics office added four new attorneys to the ethics team. Regarding the DoD OIG audit, NSA has not yet received final recommendations. However, NSA continues to make improvements to the Public Financial Disclosure (OGE 278) process including the allocation of additional resources to support timely OGE 278 reviews.
Put into writing the initial ethics training policy that had not been in writing previously.
Based on continual assessment, we are continuing our interactions with OGE on our supplemental regulation involving financial conflicts of interest.
As a result of the NRC's evaluation, a determination was made to apply the NRC's supplemental prohibited securities regulation only to those employees also required to file financial disclosure reports, subject to limited exceptions. Previously, NRC employees could be subject to one requirement, both, or neither, which contributed to employee confusion. The NRC now publishes one consolidated list of employees covered by financial disclosure requirements and the NRC's supplemental prohibited securities regulation. The NRC was also able to eliminate the need for newly covered employees to file a separate certification of compliance with the rule all newly covered employees will now file financial disclosure reports, which includes the certification of compliance. This eliminated redundant paperwork.

No policy changes resulted. However, in anticipation of new Board members and employees, we confirmed that the Board's new employee program clearly delineated ethics requirements.
Updates made to Code of Conduct to include anti-trafficking training provisions.
During the latter part of CY2023, OGE evaluated its internal process for tracking OGE Form 201 requests of OGE career public filers. No changes were made at that time. OGE intends to implement changes in this area in CY2024.
Continuous improvement. In 2023 that included increasing resources to the ethics team, enhancements to the Ethics Portal and special training for several offices with particular needs.
Modifications have been implemented in ONDCP's onboarding documents, annual ethics training, and initial ethics training to incorporate a link to the standards of conduct for employees.
No deficiencies found, so no changes recommended.
Provided updated ethics guidance, updated existing and created new Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), and provided additional ethics resources to staff. OSTP DAEO and OSTP leadership made updates and changes to the external events request review procedure including the level of legal team involvement and ethics review required as to some requests. Made minor revisions to the ethics best practices and guidance for discussion with newly onboarding staff members during their first week at OSTP as a part of the OSTP OGC's legal team meet & greet presentation to new staff.
Reviewed new employee onboarding process to incorporate the upcoming anti-trafficking training requirements. Met with HCO and our training office to discuss how to meet requirements.
1) ONCD instituted a clearance procedure and policy for outside activities, including speaking engagements, outside employment, and sponsored travel. 2) ONCD hired two new ethics attorneys, including the ADAEO. 3) ONCD implemented a new email for increased communication with employees and the general public 4) ONCD drafted a financial disclosure policy and standard operating procedures, which will be implemented imminently. The principal provisions of the policy are already in practice.
Ethics staff constantly evaluate the effectiveness of our program, particularly communications with agency staff, including advice and training. We refine our written and oral products to enhance understanding and utility.
We brought on an ethics detailee to assist us with our ethics program.

The review concluded that the ethics program was functioning smoothly.
We have added annual training as a topic for annual Board meetings, to ensure Board members complete their annual training.
Programmatic changes: Updated several ethics procedures, updated content for new employee ethics training Policy changes: Revised agency delegations of authority for agency designee and requirements to consult with ethics staff
Agency and OGE jointly proposed revisions to supplemental ethics regulation. Rulemaking is pending.
No changes were made because the Agency met all audit requirements.
Automated process for TVA's Standard Process and Procedures continuing to automate additional ethics functions for conflict of interest disclosures improved timeliness of financial disclosure filing requirements formalized cause analysis process refined postemployment guidance and review process established Ethics & Compliance focus groups and published Ethics & Compliance yearly report.
The evaluation did not raise any new concerns.
DAEO recommended changes to ethics notices in offers of employment. Established standard business processes for how the agency handles and tracks waivers under 5 CFR 2635.502. DoD IG audit of 278 program is still ongoing.
One FTE was added to the ethics program. Agency leadership approved request to purchase a new online OGE-450 filing system (FDonline). Considering alternate OGE-450 form for non-CO contracting staff and other ethics forms (e.g., 1353 travel).
The Office of General Counsel reviewed the ethics program based on the addition of new HR staff. The Office of General Counsel is working to ensure that new ethics filers are appropriately identified, managers receive appropriate training, and all new staff are trained on federal ethics.
The Postal Service's Ethics and Compliance team performs yearly self-assessments of the program and makes changes, as necessary. In 2023, we drafted internal guidance memoranda on certificates of divestiture, outside activities, the Ethics in Government Act, the Postal Service's Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct, and the criminal conflict of interest laws. These memoranda will provide guidance to team members and assist us in analyzing complex ethics issues.
Although 5 CFR 2638.105(a) requires the lead human resources official to notify the DAEO, the DAEO issued new written procedures, given the Commission's smaller size, to reflect that

the ADAEO would initiate and maintain contact with newly appointed individuals who are required to attend initial ethics training and are either a Public or Confidential Filer.
General policy updates
Further refined written policies.

Question 13 Table 1

As a small agency of 16 federal employees, the ADAEO works directly with the Associate Director for Administration to ensure compliance with 5 CFR Part 2638. In 2023, the ADAEO reviewed and provided input on draft written offers of employment and has personally provided initial ethics training to new employees. The ADAEO has met with and assisted each employee required to file a financial disclosure report. The ADAEO regularly provided ethics advice to agency officials with respect to attending events, meetings, outreach, and interactions with outside groups and organizations.
I will create a check list so that the one member will be aware of all ethical procedures.

Question 14 Table 1

The DAEO has an Ethics team in place for the event of a Presidential transition.
NOJMO: Not aware of an evaluation
Written confirmation not required because my agency has less than 1,000 employees.
Our agency does not have any political appointees so we are not affected by Presidential transitions.
A Presidential transition will not affect the Access Board's ethics program in 2024. The 13 Special Government Employees currently serving as public members all have terms that will continue through a Presidential transition, should one occur, in 2024. The Executive Director, who manages the day-to-day operations of the Board, is a career member of the Senior Executive Service.
The Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals has no Presidentially appointed officials therefore there was no need for such an evaluation.
CIGIE’s standing evaluation is that no additional ethics officials are required for Presidential transitions. CIGIE is not directly impacted by Presidential transition, as any Presidentially-appointed officials serving at CIGIE are employees of other agencies and, thus, are the responsibility of such agencies for purposes of financial disclosure reporting and initial ethics

training. Accordingly, while CIGIE frequently reviews its trained ethics official capacity, it is not necessary to undertake a detailed review specifically in advance of Presidential elections.
We only have one member so an evaluation was not needed.
Requirement was overlooked. However, our DAEO determined on 23 January 2024 that the Department of the Air Force has an adequate number of trained agency ethics officials to deliver effective support in the event of a Presidential transition. Also note that the Air Force DAEO's office does not review the financial disclosure reports of the PAS nominees. The DoD Standards of Conduct Office reviews the nominee reports for all DoD PAS nominees.
The Department evaluated this issue in January 2024 at the same time it launched its overall transition planning effort.
While an evaluation was not made prior to November 5, 2023, the DAEO has since conducted an evaluation and determined that the agency has an adequate number of trained ethics officials to deliver effective support in the event of a Presidential transition.
The agency experienced a transition in the ethics office. That loss of personnel impacted our ethics programming for the second half of 2023. We have determined that more staff is needed to make up for that loss.
The agency has only one position that would be impacted by a Presidential transition.
Ethics personnel remains the same
JUSFC is a nano sized agency of four employees. Of the four, the Agency Head is the DAEO and the Deputy Agency Head is the ADEAO. The agency has determined additional ethics officers are not required.
Appointment cycle of political appointees is independent of Presidential transitions.
NCPC is a small agency and the number of staff assigned for the volume of ethics work generated is sufficient.
N/A
DAEO's date of appointment was November 1, 2023 but subsequently DAEO has completed the evaluation.
Not affected by the Presidential transition. We don't need more ethics officials, only have 18 employees.
TVA does not have any political appointees except for its part-time 9-member Board of Directors and the Inspector General. The terms of these individuals do not change as a result of presidential transition. Accordingly, TVA does not have significant transition work as exists at other agencies.

Our agency has only one PAS so we believe we are adequately staffed.
The DAEO completed his evaluation on November 13, 2023. The ability to support a Presidential transition for USICH was considered as part of HUD's election readiness evaluation, which was completed prior to November 5, 2023.
The Postal Service is not affected by the Presidential transition and as such is not required to conduct this evaluation.
The appointments of the Commission's Federal member Presidential appointees, whether Federal Members or Private Citizens (see 41 U.S.C. Â§ 8502(b)), are not tied to Presidential transitions, and the Commission does not otherwise have any political appointees.
Agency ethics paralegal left in March 2023- is taking measures to fill that position.

Part 4 Table 1

Q4: An ADAEO was in place for at least half of the reporting year.
Question 2 - Number is classified Question 5 - The Employees identified as working "less than 1 hour per week" are the attorneys and paralegals who support the financial disclosure program for a limited time during the filing season.
#2.Number does not include part-time employees.
Q2. This number does not include detailees, interns, fellows, contractors, and other workers.
Ethics Program Manager participated in a training block on presidential transition and determined that DFAS will not suffer any direct effects.
Question 2: The number of DIA employees listed in this report reflects the unclassified number of DIA employees worldwide. Question 11: On July 10, 2023, the DoD Office of the Inspector General announced an Audit of DoD Senior Officials Public Financial Disclosures(Project No. D2023-D000RG-0133.00). The primary purpose of this audit is to determine whether public financial disclosure reports of senior DoD officials were submitted and reviewed in a timely manner. The DoD OIG is also assessing whether DoD ethics officials took appropriate actions to identify and address potential conflicts of interest in public financial disclosure forms. The DoD Standards of Conduct Office (SOCO), military departments, and defense agencies that have Designated Agency Ethics Officials (DAEO) fall under the purview of this audit. DIA is a defense agency with a DAEO.

Q6. Many Air Force ethics offices have no contractor support. Q13. All of these comments pertain to question 13. 1) The Air Force Personnel Center provides written offers of employment to prospective civilian employees that contain notice of ethical obligations including training requirements. 2) Several of the base legal offices requested a more user-friendly system for notifying financial disclosure report filers of their obligation to complete Annual Ethics Training as well as a system to track their training completion. 3) One installation office has been working with the local personnel office to create effective remedial measures to ensure compliance for all new supervisors in accordance with 5 CFR 2638.306.

In question 5, it appears that personnel performing ethics duties for only a portion of their workweek are counted as FTEs in the same manner as those who work ethics on a full-time basis. For example, we list 117 employees who work ethics matters for "11-20 hours per week (up to .5 FTE)" which should amount to no more than 56.5 FTEs, but is listed as 117 FTEs. This creates the appearance that the Department of Army is adequately staffed with ethics personnel, which is not the case since most of our ethics officials do not work ethics matters full-time.

10. The GC/DAEO meets with the agency head on a weekly basis. Ethics issues are discussed during these meetings. 11. Our agency underwent an annual financial statement audit performed by an Independent Public Accounting (IPA) firm. IPA firms are contracted by, act on behalf of, at the direction of, and in the name of Department IGs. Accordingly, IPA firms are performing audits pursuant to the statutory authority (Inspector General Act of 1978) of the Department IG that hired them. In this situation, IPA firms are not outside entities, they are performing Department IG internal oversight. During these audits the IPA firms may test the audited entity's compliance with ethics standards (5 C.F.R. Chapter XVI, Subchapter B., "Government Ethics").

Q1 Significant increase from last year is due to consolidation of military treatment facilities under the Defense Health Agency. Q6 Only two organizations utilized contractor support for substantive ethics work. Q11 DoD SOCO conducts Program Assist Visits/Reviews with each DDAEO agency/command every 3-4 years.

Q5. The US Trustee Program significantly increased its reporting of the number of ethics officials to include financial disclosure reviewers, including those outside the DC Metro area who have had those ethics responsibilities for several years but had not previously been included. Q9. Multiple components request additional IT resources such as the use of Integrity or a similar user-friendly filing system for confidential financial disclosure. Several components request additional personnel for financial disclosure review.

Q6: N/A for most bureaus. Q9: A couple of bureaus expressed the need for more Human Capital resources, one expressed additional need for IT, and one indicated it is preparing hiring justification for an additional ethics specialist. Q11: For DO/HQ, individual program reviews of Treasury bureaus conducted in 2023. Most bureaus conducted a program evaluation. As a part of one bureau's annual internal controls audit, a private auditing firm evaluated certain aspects of that bureau's ethics program.

For #4. There is an appointment memo for the ADAEO currently with SECVA's office for signature.

#14 -- Prior to 2020, EPA Ethics had only one person experienced in dealing with nominee and PAS reports. Entering into the P46 administration, we determined to increase our knowledge base. We now have four people with established experience with PAS and nominee reports and with providing counseling to PAS and other senior leadership officials. But saying that we have an adequate number of staff to support a presidential transition does not mean that we believe we have enough overall staff to support our other existing and growing program requirements and demands.

#5 Additional up to .25 FTE is an OIG attorney who was delegated certain duties for OIG employees at the request of Senior OIG Counsel to "further their independence of operations."

Question 11: A team from the FDIC's Office of the Chief Information Security Officer performed Security and Privacy Control Assessment testing for the FOnline system for calendar year 2023 in accordance with FDIC and Federal (NIST and FISMA) guidance. FDIC finalized and tested its FOnline disaster recovery contingency plan.

Q 13: Financial disclosure filings handled by Dept. of Commerce Ethics division pursuant to MOU with RESTORE Council.

Ethics staffing levels, including adequacy of trained agency ethics officials to support a presidential transition, are continually monitored by the General Counsel/DAEO, and Alternate DAEO, who served as acting DAEO in 2023 prior to the appointment of a new NASA General Counsel who serves as NASA's DAEO in June 2023.

#10: OGC regularly consults with NEH's Agency Head regarding ethics issues and changes in ethics regulations.

#2 - Data is not included/is classified. #13 - As a finding during collection of the requested OGE materials, the Ethics Office identified the recommended DoD language to new supervisors was removed in August 2022 during a re-vamping of supervisor training materials on our internal /classified employee website. Our ethics office is working with the Human Resources office to re-insert the notice in the internal new supervisor materials as well as send refresher notice to all supervisors.

Question 2 - In addition to 1532 full-time employees, NSF had 260 full-time IPAs on board as of December 31, 2023.
3.f. The number of reporting levels between the DAEO and Agency Head is marked "0" due to the overall reporting structure within the NSC. At the NSC, the agency head is the Deputy Assistant to the President, Chief of Staff, and Executive Secretary. The DAEO is Deputy Counsel to the President and Legal Advisor to the NSC, and he reports to the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, to whom the agency head is also subordinate. As a result, while the DAEO does not report to the agency head and is not himself the agency head, he is equivalent in rank to the NSC's agency head and has the same rank within the organization. 8. The Office of Administration is responsible for, and provided, the required notices of ethical obligations in written offers of employment (5 C.F.R. 2638.303), and issuance of ethics notices to new supervisors (5 C.F.R. 2638.306).
14. Our agency conducted a general assessment of staffing. As an independent agency, we are not impacted by a Presidential transition in the same way as other federal agencies.
Question 10: The DAEO had such meetings with the agency head and regularly had such meetings with the chief of staff. In 2023, there was one meeting with the chief of staff and the full ethics staff, and it was related to external events. Question 14: Throughout Fall 2023, the new DAEO regularly assessed resource level, including as to transition year, and discussed in weekly checkins with chief of staff.
Question 10: The Office of General Counsel that includes the DAEO and ADAEO meet biweekly with the Special Counsel (currently Acting Special Counsel) and ethics is one of the items discussed.
Question #2: Total number of employees is classified.
12) The new ethics attorney onboarded in mid-February.
Q2: The number of OVP employees is defined to include staff of the Executive Office of the President, Senate employees, as well as detailees and assignees from other departments and agencies. The Vice President also chairs the National Space Council and OVP provides ethics support, so for the purposes of this questionnaire, their staff have been counted as well. Q13: Procedures that were not in place at the end of 2022 were implemented over the course of the 2023.
5. The individual who performed ethics program duties in 2023 for 31 - 40 hours per week was our ethics detailee, and she was only assigned to the Peace Corps for 3 months in 2023.
14. The DAEO read 2638.210(a) and came to the conclusion that SIGAR has an adequate number of trained ethics employees to support any that come with the upcoming Presidential election.

Question 14: USU does not have any political appointees to be affected by the presidential transition. Question 2: Total agency FTE count includes federal civilian, active duty military staff and students. FTE civilians are 744.

We have only two staff for the entire agency and no funds available to hire additional staff. We participate in OMB, GSA, Partnership for Public Service, etc. meetings and do our best to stay on top of ethics requirements.

Question 5: The Department of Housing and Urban Development's Ethics and Appeals Division (EAD) administers USICH's ethics program. Of the employees listed for this section, two USICH employees worked 1-10 hours per week on ethics duties. The remaining 12 employees are HUD employees.

Q8: WHCO has provided some ethics support for the Office of Pandemic Preparedness and Response Policy, Office of the Vice President, Office of the National Cyber Director, National Security Council, and Council of Economic Advisors during 2023, although all of these components have their own ethics programs.

Question 15 Table 1

The Director, Departmental Ethics Office (DEO), provides the required written confirmation to the DAEO. Most offices have provided the written confirmation to the DEO Director. DEO is following up with the remaining offices for DAEO written confirmation.

NOJMO: Does not send these notices. LARC: All centers' HR offices and NSSC are under the supervision of the DAEO rather than an outside entity. JSC: This is an NSSC function for the agency. Why are centers asked about this?

Transition in HR personnel created confusion in providing written confirmation. The Office of General Counsel worked with Human Resources to correct this error.

HR is responsible for providing ethics notice to prospective employees. Ethics was made aware of such notices being provided.

Question 16 Table 1

Standard of Conduct include the information 5 CFR2638303, have been provided to the Office of Finance and Administration to provide in all written offers. However, the newly appointed DAEO was unable to confirm if all written offers included the required information.

<p>Following the CSB’s recent OGE inspection, the CSB instituted a new policy whereby the CSB HR office and the CSB's IAA partner/HR shared services provider are working together to develop additional coding for the creation of job offer letters. When a new hire’s job offer letter is created, this coding will automatically add certain new provisions, including ethics provisions, which advise the new hire of their responsibilities as a filer. Currently, this new procedure is implemented in a manual fashion. The CSB anticipates the process will become automated in about a month.</p>
<p>Procedures were implemented during the course of 2023.</p>
<p>The initial hires were non-federal employees. We are now requiring all Southeast Crescent Regional Commission employees to adhere to ethics regulatory and training requirements.</p>
<p>Only two employees. Last hire was September 2020 and at that time GSA CABS provided no ethics info in the hiring materials. This issue has been raised with OGE multiple times. GSA CABS provides the HRM support for ALL federal Commissions and Boards - so all will have this issue until GSA CABS includes the ethics info in their hiring onboarding. DAEO provides ethics training to new political appointees as SGEs are not supported via the GSA CABS agreement.</p>
<p>During a Program Review in 2023, OGE identified that the Commission’s offer letters to new employees and supervisors contained most, but not all, of the required information. The DAEO issued revised written procedures and approved a revised letter template compliant with 5 CFR 2638.303 and 306. However, in November 2023, the Commission's OIG sent a tentative offer letter to a prospective employee that was not on the approved template and did not comply with the information content requirements in 2638.303 and 306. To ensure future compliance by all components within the AbilityOne Commission, and including the Commission's external HR support providers, see 41 U.S.C. 8502(i), the DAEO will transmit/distribute the written procedures and offer letter template.</p>

Question 17 Table 1

<p>During CY 2023, one EPA nominee was confirmed who required the 2638.305(a) briefing. Because of his scheduled leave directly after confirmation, this briefing was necessarily delayed. Please note, however, that this appointee had joined EPA in 2022 as non-career SES and had already received initial ethics training, signed the Biden Ethics Pledge, and executed a recusal statement. His 2638.305(a) training was completed expeditiously upon his return to the office.</p>
<p>Due to an extended travel schedule, one appointee was granted a 15 day extension of time within which to complete their initial ethics briefing. The briefing was completed on time and within the extension period.</p>
<p>Scheduling conflicts on the ethics team resulted in one individual not receiving initial ethics training. The ethics team is coordinating with the employee to ensure the training is completed.</p>

Question 18 Table 1

<p>HR did not confirm whether two of the employees were FTEs to the DAEO. When the information was disclosed, the Initial Ethics Training was provided to the employees.</p>
<p>One employee had difficulty accessing their agency email and gained access just prior to the deadline. This employee completed the initial ethics training six (6) days after the deadline.</p>
<p>During the 2023 calendar year, the agency implemented a new onboarding process for new employees. During a review of accessions and separations, CFTC Ethics discovered 6 new agency hires did not receive IET. However, all 6 employees did attend agency annual ethics training, which covers essentially the same topics as those discussed in IET. There were four employees who were hired in December of 2022, that did not receive IET by January 1, 2023. Those four employees timely received IET and are included on this report. Lastly, there were two employees who were hired on December 31, 2023, who had not yet received IET. Those employees will be counted on our 2025 Questionnaire.</p>
<p>Most employees indicated work commitments that prevented them from completing IET within 90 days. Those employees' supervisors were apprised of their employees IET status and took action to ensure they completed the training.</p>
<p>Two employees were trained beyond the 3-month requirement due to an administrative oversight. However, both employees received IET in 2023.</p>
<p>One employee who had multiple scheduling conflicts received IET 8 days late.</p>
<p>3 of 7 Employees: Training received new hire onboarding notification from OHR 2 months after new hire date. The employee was enrolled in the next available Ethics session. 2 of 7 Employees: Employees (permanently remote) were unavailable for on-site Ethics session and a virtual option was not available. Employees were enrolled in next available virtual session. 2 of 7 Employees: Employee missed scheduled Ethics training, and the makeup date was after the deadline.</p>
<p>Initial Ethics Training for new employees remained a challenge due to very limited access to DeCA IT systems and large turnover. DeCA completed an OGE Program Review this past summer 2023 and this area was identified as a recommendation. DeCA General Counsel and DeCA Human Resources are part of an active, broader working group planning a “refresh” of the DeCA internal webpage and creation of a mobile application to allow employees to access to training from mobile devices. The intent is to improve access to required training for those employees that do not have a dedicated computer or easy access.</p>

During the Pandemic DISA switched to an entirely virtual onboarding process using pre-recorded presentations. While adequate for the COVID period, the process pushed monitoring of completion status down from the previously centralized newcomers orientation process to individual supervisor monitoring of completion of training and permitted new individuals to begin work prior to completing all training modules. This resulted in a number of personnel not completing required training. As a result of this problem, in November 2023 DISA reinstating the in-person onboarding training requirement for ethics and other required training. The return to this method (which has been highly successful in the past) should fix this deficiency.

The individuals that have not taken the training on-boarded into the agency, but quickly departed for trainings or deployments. They will complete it upon return.

Despite regular reminders and follow up notices, approximately 8.6% of employees required to complete Initial Ethics Training (IET) did so outside the 3-month window and an additional 6.8% did not complete the training. On the other hand, 84.5% of new entrants did receive Initial Ethics Training within their first three months and 93.1% received the training in their first year. We will continue to follow up with those who did not complete the training.

The following are responses from different Air Force installation legal offices: 1) Legal offices had personnel gaps that led to a lack of oversight on the timeliness of IET. One legal office has persistent challenges with its servicing Civilian Personnel Office (CPO) in obtaining accurate information about the number of new employees who completed interactive computer-based initial ethics training, which accounts for the vast majority of its personnel who had not yet received IET. These issues have been raised to leadership at the higher headquarters and are being addressed in 2024. 2) Late identification of filing and training requirements. All have now received training. 3) Records related to the newly onboarded employees were not promptly provided to legal office throughout 2023. When the ethics officials followed up with these individuals, they discovered that some individuals had left the agency and some had already take IET. The CPO at another installation notified the ethics office of new employees in timely manner. A couple of filers missed the deadline only because the IET on the MyLearning module was unavailable for a period of time. 4) Unusually high employee turnover created delays in training at one wing. Another wing conducted only Annual Ethics Training but conducted it twice a year. Problem was corrected by offering IET quarterly and/or as needed and is being more closely monitored by higher level legal office. 5) The CPO did not timely notify employees of requirement. 6) Due to turnover in the CPO, there was a failure to notify the legal office of the new hire civilian employees who are required to receive IET. 7) Ethics office provides IET at new employee orientation, but does not track attendance. 8) There were communication issues with HR and responsiveness issues with both new employees and their supervisors. New employees did not attend mandatory HR new employee orientation where ethics training is given. 9) The installation's CPO does not track IET completion, even though links to the agency's ethics training online are provided to new employees. The numbers by this installation are based on a reconciliation of in-person training records maintained by the ethics office with new employee entrance logs. It is likely that more employees completed the ethics training provided by the personnel office, but those completions are not tracked. 10) Some employees were told that they did not need to complete IET because the ethics office was told that they were not government employees. Once their personnel status was clarified, they completed IET.

Some employees discontinued their Federal employment within 90 days of appointment without completing initial ethics training. Some of the initial ethics training was entered as annual ethics training in the training database. Some HR offices continued to be challenged with providing timely HR notification of new employees to the relevant ethics offices. Reorganizations, deployment to locations where ethics training was not available, HR and ethics personnel turn-over, and ethics counselor unfamiliarity with IET provisions also played a part. In one instance, the HR office discontinued in September to require new employees to complete IET, which the servicing ethics office didn't discover until asking about it in November. The Army is in process of providing IET to these personnel.

Commands are aware of the delinquencies and are working on ensuring the new employees complete their training. Some employees were traveling for work or unable to access the training system due to work conditions. Others were not identified as new employees until after the 3-month deadline had passed.

18.a.iii. - This includes two groups: 1) 60 personnel - these were reported by component agencies/commands as not having received IET. The primary reasons cited were deployments, technical issues, and ethics staff turnover/shortages. 2) 142 personnel - One agency reported that they were unable to confirm/verify that these individuals received the training due to a learning management system technical failure. However, some or all of these individuals likely received the training.

The Department utilizes an online platform to administer initial ethics training for all employees, as defined in 5 C.F.R. 2638.304(a). The online platform sends each employee multiple automatic notifications at prespecified intervals to complete initial ethics training during the employee's first 75 days. The Department sends additional reminder emails to the employees who have not completed initial ethics training by the employee's 76th day and continues to follow up with the employee and management, as necessary. From June 1 - July 22, 2023, this online platform was down and new employees were unable to access their initial ethics training. Once the system was operating it took several months for accurate lists of completed training to be available. These training system problems resulted in a number of employees who completed their initial ethics training late. All employees who were impacted by this outage have completed their initial ethics training. With the exception of this timeframe, The Department followed these protocols for each employee who received initial ethics training beyond the requirement and for those employees that have not received initial ethics training as of today.

Primary reasons include technological problems accessing the HHS Learning Management System extended leave and deployment confusion between IET and AET requirements administrative oversight turnover/shortages of ethics staff and employee noncompliance. Another reason is employees misunderstanding the IET requirement and thinking that the presentation during new employee orientation was sufficient. One component did not get notified timely of new employees by its HR team.

Several components experienced delays in IET completion due to OCHCO on-boarding process changes and unexpected significant delays in deployment of a new online Learning Management System. The agency has since created work arounds to meet compliance.

Two SES employees were listed on the orientation roster sent to EAD by OCHCO however, the two employees did not attend the orientation. Although the list of orientation attendees was provided to EAD, there was a delay in determining the two employees had not attended the orientation. Corrective action was put in place to achieve earlier identification of employees

on the orientation roster who do not appear on the attendance roster in order to set up one-on-one briefings as necessary.

Scheduling difficulties and conflicts, official travel, litigation schedules, administrative error/oversight, employee leave including parental/military/medical.

There were a combination of technical issues and employee error caused delays in the completion.

We continued to work with the human resource bureau and the Foreign Service Institute (the Department's training facility) to devise a computerized system to notify new employees of the requirement to take IET. In the interim, we continued to manually notify employees of the requirement to take IET. The new system was activated mid-December 2023. We are optimistic that the new system will reach those who were not receiving notifications in the past and will increase the number of employees who will take IET in 2024.

Employees who received and completed IET beyond the 3-month requirement did so due to inadvertent oversights in tracking or because the employees were on unpaid leave, furlough, or suspension. In addition, most employees who have not received and completed IET as of today did not do so because they terminated employment before completing IET. This group was primarily composed of seasonal or temporary employees.

The 1 employee who has not received IET yet was called up to military duty and has been on military leave. For the 85 employees who received IET beyond the 3-month requirement, some were on military leave or extended sick leave some were interns who left before the due date and then returned to the agency and some were not trained within 60 days due to a lack of manager follow up. One of our OAs previously relied on managers to follow up with new employees and ensure they completed IET that issue has been fixed and now the OA ethics office sends out reminders to the employee throughout the initial 60-day period to ensure that employees timely complete IET.

Most employees completed the required training in 100 days and many received at least a copy of the Treasury Ethics Handbook, but a variety of issues contributed to the delay, including: technology malfunctions with training assignments and computer access employees not taking training despite repeated reminders conflicts with mandatory off-site federal law enforcement training administrative errors and misunderstanding/miscommunication with the office responsible for assigning training. For the 80 employees who did not receive IET, 77 were from one bureau and over half of which were employees that departed during CY2023 prior to completing IET. Nearly all employees have now taken the training, and these issues have been addressed and processes improved at the respective bureaus.

Annual ethics training is assigned electronically in VA's Talent Management System (TMS). EST does not track individuals, rather supervisors monitor their employees and the system reports completion. EST's annual financial disclosure report filing communications are used as an opportunity to amplify and remind filers of their training requirements. The remaining difference in these numbers, are accounted for as follows: there is a large cohort of employees that required training, and are not yet trained, but also not yet over 90 days. Essentially, those employees were hired between October 1 and December 31. VA hired large numbers of employees this year with additional funding derived from the enactment of the PACT Act.

The EPA initial ethics training module is part of the online suite of mandatory training courses for all new employees. In 2023, we improved the ethics dashboard so that DEOs can see "at a glance" all of their new employees by name and entry-on-board, and their initial ethics training completion status. This new feature has been instrumental in leading to a marked decrease in the percentage of new employees who did not complete their training within three months. In 2022, we reported that 81% of new entrants completed IET while in 2023 (despite onboarding more than twice as many new employees), we are reporting that 91% of new employees completed IET timely. For the 8% who did not do so, we have identified the following reasons: the individual departed EPA within the first three months, was called up for military service, or has a medical or other situation. In the rare case of employees who have still not completed IET, EPA Ethics is reminding the affected DEOs about this compliance requirement.

The ethics staff did not receive timely notice from the personnel office that 50 employees did not complete IET within 90 days. After ethics staff informed the affected employees that they needed to complete IET, most completed IET shortly after being notified. Approximately 12 had to be sent a second notice, and of those, six received a third notice. All 50 completed IET on or before December 31, 2023.

One center ethics office did not learn that new employees' learning plans were not automatically updated to include interactive initial ethics training prior to September 1, 2023, so these employees were not being notified of this training requirement or being sent follow up reminders to complete this training. This center ethics office will be following up on this training and sending reminders to make sure that it is completed.

Three employees separated from NARA prior to completing the training. We are following up on the remaining employees identified as not having completed the training.

Notification of overdue IET requirements have been sent to the individuals and their supervisors and will be pursued until IET is completed. One employee who did not complete IET completed their annual ethics training for 2023.

<p>One employee thought she had completed it but had completed another required training. The other was confused about the timing.</p>
<p>Some OMB employees were unable to attend IET within 90 days of arrival due to work conflicts as IET was only offered live virtually once per month in 2023. All three OMB employees that did not take IET in 2023 joined OMB in the last quarter of the year and are scheduled to take IET in February.</p>
<p>One employee received their IET beyond the 3-month requirement because the person was on extensive medical leave. As soon as the person was back in the office, OSTP OGC ensured the employee completed the IET.</p>
<p>Employee tracking error.</p>
<p>One employee was a prior employee of the agency who departed in December 2022 and was rehired in September 2023. Due to an oversight, new employee training was not assigned when the employee was rehired because the employee's gap in service to the agency was less than one year and other training records were still current. The employee was assigned the training in January 2024 when the oversight was discovered and the policy for assigning new employee training was clarified.</p>
<p>System issues, Extended leave (death of family)</p>
<p>Employees are enrolled in new employee ethics training within the first three weeks of onboarding. They have 60 days to take the video on demand and review accompanying materials. However, a small portion of employees do not take the training timely despite receiving several automated notices. The Ethics Law Division then reaches out to the employee's supervisor to ensure employees complete the training. Sometimes, their subsequent completion falls outside the 90-day window. Of the four employees who have not received IET as of today, three are on extended medical leave, and one is working in a different executive branch office.</p>
<p>7 employees were employed less than 90 days. 1 employee is a temporary hire who is a high school student in TVA's CADNet program who is not assigned training. 1 employee is an intern who returned to school early due to commitments with their university. This ending came before the due date for the ethics training. The intern has been locked out of the TVA system since August and will not be able to gain access until he completes ethics training. The 2 past due employees were immediately locked out of the system once the 90th day passed and were unable to regain access until ethics training was conducted, both of which were taken within 8 days of being locked out.</p>
<p>One employee was under the mistaken impression that completing the assigned annual ethics training fulfilled the initial ethics training requirement. That employee has now completed both initial ethics training and annual ethics training.</p>

Due to administrative oversight, the DAEO did not receive prompt notifications regarding two individuals who joined the Commission during spring 2023. Those two new employees did not receive initial ethics training within the 90-day requirement in 5 CFR 2638.304, however, both employees were already Federal employees who joined the Commission from other agencies, and both were historically OGE 450 Confidential Filers at their former agencies. Once the oversight was discovered the individuals promptly received initial ethics training, and the DAEO issued written procedures regarding how the DAEO/ADAEO initiate contact with new employees.

Six employees were unable to attend an initial ethics training during the initial three-month period, but all were subsequently trained in 2023.

Question 19 Table 1

The Director, Departmental Ethics Office (DEO), provides the required written confirmation to the DAEO. Most offices have provided the written confirmation to the DEO Director. DEO is following up with the remaining offices for DAEO written confirmation.

Transition in HR personnel created confusion in providing written confirmation. The Office of General Counsel worked with Human Resources to correct this error.

Question 20 Table 1

The head of the agency completed 2023 Annual Ethics Training (AET) on January 8, 2024. He had schedule conflicts on December 5, 2023, when the AET live training was given to the agency and also on December 13, 2023, when the make-up live AET training was given.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 424(b)(2)(B), the Chairperson of CIGIE is elected from among the Inspector General members of CIGIE and, accordingly, receives his or her initial ethics training from his or her employing agency.

Agency head is the DAEO.

Due to the press of government business including official travel at the end of the year as well as unanticipated IT issues, the Chairwoman was unable to complete the training by year's end. She has now done so.

Due to an information system error the ethics office did not discover until after the end of the year, NASA Presidential appointees with Senate confirmation (PAS) did not receive annual ethics training reminder messages from NASA's EPTS system and were not included in tracking information used to monitor annual ethics training. Consequently, the three NASA PAS appointees who remain with NASA, including the NASA Administrator, did not complete annual ethics training in 2023. Upon discovery of this oversight, the NASA Administrator and

the other two incumbent PAS appointees promptly scheduled and completed live ethics training for 2023 in January 2024.

Question 21 Table 1

b. One (1) member retired during calendar year c. Two (2) members separated from the agency and 1 is on Administrative Leave

Officers who did not complete the AET in a timely manner generally are those who are on an extended leave of absence or in operational environments where they are unable to complete in a timely manner or retired or separated prior to 31 December 2023.

One OGE450 filer was on extended leave during the aforementioned agency AET live training dates (December 5 and 13, 2023) and has hitherto been unable to complete interactive training. Upon return from leave on February 7, 2024, the filer will be reminded of the necessity to complete the interactive training.

The Agency provided live training to all employees who were in working duty status. However, one CFTC employee is on an extended medical absence. The Agency sent that employee ethics training materials but was unable to provide live training because that employee was not in duty status.

One public financial disclosure filer (OGE Form 278e) had not completed training by the end of the calendar year. That employee was in a long term leave status during the training period and will complete training when they return to duty. Fifteen confidential financial disclosure filers (OGE Form 450) had not completed training by the end of the calendar year. Thirteen of those filers have been and continue to be on parental or other long term health-related leave. Two filers are on detail to other federal agencies. Four employees who are not designated as financial disclosure filers had not completed training by the end of the calendar year. Three of those filers have been and remain on parental or other long term health-related leave. One filer is on detail to another federal agency.

Two employees failed to attend any scheduled AET sessions despite reminders. Both employees have been given an oral counseling about the seriousness of this requirement.

278 Filers: One left the agency and the remaining five failed to complete the training by the end of the year. 450 Filers: Seven left the agency and the remaining two failed to complete the training by the end of the year.

The difference between DCAA employees on board as of 31 December 2023 (4003) and the number of employees who received Annual Ethics Training is 124. These employees are comprised by employees who are on various forms Leave (Administrative, Military, Long-Term Medical, Without Pay). In addition, approximately 25 employees will retire from Federal service on or about December 31. The employees who are OGE 450 Filers would cease to be

Filers before the end of the Calendar Year. In addition, DCAA specific ethics training policies pursuant to 5 CFR 2638.309 excludes employees who are on long-term Leave or who will retire before the end of Calendar Year. They are exempt.

Due to hiring actions and departures from service we have a larger number of employees who receive annual Ethics training than we have full time employees due to some positions being being double counted due to departing employees and their replacements during the course of the year. Some people depart the agency before completing annual Ethics training and some (

The Ethics Program offered over half a dozen live training sessions for OGE Form 450 filers and sent multiple email reminders to 450 filers, their supervisors, and staff directors to complete training throughout the CY. We also included reminders regarding training requirements through FDM notifications and in the Agency-wide announcements. Those who have not completed training will be expected to complete their 2023 and 2024 training during calendar year 2024.

We granted 7 exceptions to training for people that were on extended medical leave, reservists on military orders, or deployments.

Despite regular reminders and follow up notices, a small percentage (~1.5%) of employees did not complete the training. We will continue to follow up with those who did not complete the training. We would note that 98.5% of employees did receive the required annual ethics training.

Discrepancies in the data include due to staffing and organizational changes, there were lapses in administrative oversight which are being addressed. A portion of personnel are on extended leave or deployment. This office is following up with the supervisory chain for employees with an outstanding requirement.

The following are responses from different Air Force installation legal offices: 1) Two confidential filers left the DAF prior to the due date for AET and were not removed from the requirement until after 1 January 2024. The others have been contacted along with their supervisors and remain unresponsive. 2) Two base legal offices had severe personnel shortages/turnover, resulting in a lapse in oversight of the ethics program and accurate accounting of the number of confidential filers who actually received AET in 2023. Both of those offices are currently contacting each of their confidential filers to ensure all were either trained in 2023 or are trained ASAP. 3) Filer on extended convalescent leave and has not been able to complete. 4) Filer is deployed and ethics office has not been able to contact him. 5) OGE 450 filers were not notified of the annual training requirement. Hard copy of Annual Ethics Training provided to the filers for review prior to filing 2024 reports.

Extended medical and military leaves, overseas deployments, and inaccurate accounting cover some of these discrepancies.
Some employees were unable to complete training due to work tempo or inability to access a training system.
One public filer went on terminal leave prior to completion. Remaining were primarily due to extended leave, deployments, and technical issues/errors.
2 employees on medical leave and 2 employees took the training after December 31, 2023.
12 employees are either on military leave, medical, or administrative leave.
Most employees who have not yet completed training are on extended leave and will complete training on return. Some are deployed or on detail. SGEs who have not completed AET are not permitted to perform any work for the Department.
Several of these employees are on extended medical leave, suspended from duty, or on military leave. Others have been referred to management for consideration of appropriate action to remedy non-compliance.
Employees either failed to complete the training, completed the training after the 12/31/2023 deadline, or completed the training but did not self-certify training completion by the deadline. In an effort to obtain compliance, multiple reminders of the requirement to take Annual Ethics Training were sent to employees. This included reminders from EAD staff, Regional Counsel, and the DAEO. Several times during the year, reminders were placed on HUD's internal webpage (HUD@work). The Ethics Office also contacted the supervisors of non-compliant employees to obtain their assistance in obtaining the compliance of their employees. The Ethics Office also called public financial disclosure filers who had not certified. Continued in additional comments for Part 5
Extended leave including parental, sick, military, LMS access problems, litigation schedules, administrative record-keeping errors.
The discrepancies are attributable to the following reasons: filers were absent from duty for an extended period of time for varying reasons, filers were detailed to another agency, filers departed the agency, filers neglected to complete training after dissemination of multiple reminders.
The Ethics Office and management officials remind filers to take Annual Ethics Training several times over the course of the year. The Foreign Service Institute hosts the online annual training course. We are aware that some filers experienced technical difficulties registering and launching the course in 2023. Others wait until the end of the year, and then are unable to complete the course. We are adopting new approaches to encourage filers take AET earlier in the year and to expand the monitoring and notice regarding AET compliance.

<p>We are also looking into potential technological solutions to make access to the online course easier for employees.</p>
<p>Discrepancies between the number of employees who were required to receive training and the number of employees who actually received training are attributable to a variety of factors, including inadvertent oversights in tracking, employees on extended administrative leave, FMLA leave, military deployment, or placement in leave without pay status.</p>
<p>Many employees were on extended leave (parental, sick, military, or administrative leave) and will receive training when they return to work.</p>
<p>At DO/HQ and several bureaus, extended illness/leave or family leave deployed some did not complete training despite reminders follow-up pursued. At one bureau, due to ongoing internal reorganization and shifting of employee responsibilities, many who did not complete training appear to have changed responsibilities, and the bureau is working with management to confirm filing status. At another bureau, technical issues prevented receipt of training completion reports for several weeks in December, hindering the ability to follow up with employees.</p>
<p>All but one of VA's 644 Public filers received the required annual ethics training for a total of 99.8% completion. Senior leadership addressed the delinquency, and the filer received the required training on January 23, 2023. All other VA employees are required to take annual ethics training in VA's Talent Management System (TMS) system and 96.75% completed the training. The supervisors monitor the individual employee's compliance with this agency wide requirement.</p>
<p>All public filers completed annual ethics training while 99% of all confidential filers did. This percentage is an improvement over last year's rate, which was a still impressive 97% of filers completing training. Reasons that employees did not complete training include: departure from the Agency, extended medical leave, or military deployment.</p>
<p>Regarding the 278 filers, due to scheduling conflicts in December 2023, four PAS employees, one SES PAS-staff member, and one Schedule C PAS-staff member did not receive training in 2023. All six received in-person ethics training in January 2024. Of the three 450 filers who did not receive ethics training in 2023, two are on extended sick leave. The remaining 450 filer received several reminders during 2023 and completed training on January 18, 2024.</p>
<p>The majority of employees that missed training were on approved extended absences, such as medical/parental leave or detail to another agency. Supervisors were notified of all excused employees.</p>
<p>One public financial disclosure filer failed to complete training and the six SGE's that served a portion of 2023 did not complete training</p>

<p>Five employees were on admin leave. Fourteen employees were on leave without pay. Ten employees were on medical leave. Two employees were on military leave.</p>
<p>One employee did not receive training due to bereavement leave.</p>
<p>Some SES employees left the Commission before training. With regard to 450 filers, those who did not take the training were either on extended sick leave, military leave, maternity leave, retired, detailed to another agency and deceased.</p>
<p>Two employees are on extended leave. Two employees did not complete their training by the 12/31/23 deadline but are still being advised to complete it their manager has been notified.</p>
<p>One public financial disclosure filer left the Agency before completing annual training. Seven confidential financial disclosure filers left the agency before completing training, three filers never received the training in our electronic system because there were technical difficulties within the system, and three filers did not complete due to extended leave circumstances. The agency has remedied those who were not assigned to the training due to technical difficulties.</p>
<p>Two employees were on parental leave during the online annual ethics training season. They returned to the office and completed the training in January 2024. One person was on parental leave during the online annual ethics training season and has not yet returned to the office. One person was on extended leave during online annual ethics training season and has not yet returned to the office.</p>
<p>As of December 31, 2023, 1 employee was on military leave and 4 employees were on extended sick leave.</p>
<p>We had one filer who is on extended leave and was granted an extension until her return this calendar year 2024.</p>
<p>11 employees did not take annual training by Dec. 31, 2023. The training was launched in December and those employees were not able to take the training due to being on leave due to use or lose.</p>
<p>Some employees did not complete the training by the set deadline (October 25, 2023), the Ethics Office actively engaged with HR to reconcile which employees did not or were unable to complete the training requirements in the automated training system, employees will receive notification.</p>
<p>Some employees have been out due to illness on long-term medical leave. An elevated number of separations at the end of 2023 resulted in a higher number of employees not completing annual ethics training before separating. One employee did not receive ethics training due to not receiving notifications or being able to access the training while on orbit. Local ethics offices are working to ensure employees who remain with NASA complete their</p>

training. As noted in item 20, presidential appointees did not receive training notifications and were not included in the database used to monitor ethics training due to an information systems anomaly. All three PAS appointees remaining with NASA promptly scheduled and completed live training for 2023 in January 2024 after this oversight was discovered.

Two confidential filers were on leave throughout the training period. One confidential filer joined at the very end of the year and one alternate filer was not informed of the filing requirement. One public filer was on leave at time of training, but has since completed the training requirement.

The vast majority of NEA employees attended the live training (via Zoom) on December 11, 2023. Those employees who were not able to attend live were given a quiz to complete after the fact to ensure that their participation was interactive. Each employee is required to get 9/10 answers correct, and works with an ethics official interactively to explain incorrect answers. As of the close of the reporting period (December 31st), some employees had not yet completed their quiz, and those are reflected in the above total. As of the date of this filing, all agency employees have completed the quiz and are considered to have finished IET.

Two employees who are required to complete the annual training program did not receive the second part of the training. This is because one was on parental leave and the other was on detail with another agency before part two was distributed.

OIG manages their 450 program but the NSF Ethics Office is responsible for training. Two OIG employees were promoted into filing positions, and OIG did not inform our office. If our office does not know about new filers, we do not know to assign or track their training. While gathering 450 information for the annual report, the issue came to light. OIG has added to its procedures to inform our office of promotions that require a new entrant 450.

The numbers reported above are percentages. Actual numbers are made available to cleared OGE personnel when required. For the filers who do not complete annual ethics training, the ethics office is reviewing the individual circumstances and reaching out to filers and their supervisors to ensure the training is completed where required.

One employee was out on extended leave and did not complete the training during CY23. However, she completed the training immediately upon returning to duty in early CY24. The NTSB requires all agency employees to receive live annual ethics training. Nine employees were unable to attend live training. Seven of those received interactive training during CY23. The two remaining received the interactive training in early January 2024 (one of which is an OGE 450 filer (see note above in this answer)).

Some discrepancy is due to employees being on annual or medical leave. Outstanding training requirements are being pursued through notifications to the individuals and their supervisors.

One employee was out on leave and was not able to attend training until January 2024.
Two employees currently on extended leave. Will complete training upon return.
As to 21.c and 21.d, for the employees onboard as of the end of the CY, our records specifically show that all timely completed training except for three: one employee was on extended medical leave, and two employees only completed the training in the first few days of January 2024. The understanding is that 21.d here refers to permanent regular employees (who are 450 filers), and 21.c refers to other employees (who are 45 filers) including SGEs, IPAs and detailees. As to the overall totals, note these are approximate numbers as of the end of the CY. Also, note some detailees come only for short periods during the year and so they are not employees as of the end of the CY.
Eight employees received waivers from ADAEO as they were on extended admin, military, or medical leave through the end of the year.
b. We were advised by agency counsel to no longer contact the outstanding public filer regarding their ethics requirements. The outstanding filer was on administrative leave and therefore not performing the duties associated with their position for the majority of 2023. Other employees who have assumed the role and its responsibilities have filed a new entrant OGE Form 278e.
Two confidential filers were on leave in 2023 and completed their 2023 annual ethics training in January 2024.
Three employees were on extended leave and unable to complete the training and eight employees were unable to complete training in 2023 due to administrative error. The eight employees not currently on extended leave have now completed the training.
one employee is on extended medical leave and has not completed the training. The other employees were simply late and completed the training first week of January 2024.
For the one Public filer, the employee left TVA employee prior to his due date for annual ethics training. For the Confidential filers, 22 left TVA employment before taking the training. 2 employees went from individual contributors to manager and the learning management system automatically changed their ethics training due date for 90 days after their new position effective dates. One of the new due date is January and the other is in March. If the employees do not take the training by the due date in the system, they will be blocked from network access until training is completed.
The remaining confidential financial disclosure employee requiring training completed their training requirement in January 2024. As of the filing of this report, all 334 personnel requiring training have received annual training.

<p>Some overseas ethics officials did not adequately track ethics training attendance. Procedures are being reconsidered to ensure compliance with the ethics training attendance certification requirement.</p>
<p>Annual training for PAS employees was being updated and ethics officials were unable to provide the annual training prior to the close of the calendar year.</p>
<p>One confidential filer has been on an extended period of absence for the last 12 months or more, so excused. Three confidential filers completed their annual ethics training in January 2024.</p>
<p>The Postal Service's Ethics and Compliance team sent several reminder emails to OGE filers to complete annual ethics training. The Postal Service's Ethics and Compliance team also informed senior leadership of OGE Form 450 filer's failure to complete annual ethics training. Despite both measures, 64 OGE Form 450 filers failed to complete annual ethics training in 2023. The Postmaster General was provided with a list of these employees who failed to take annual ethics training. We are currently evaluating various solutions for ensuring that all filers attend and record annual ethics training.</p>
<p>One employee is on extended leave so did not see the request to take the annual ethics training. All other employees received requests to take one of the seven annual ethics trainings offered in 2023. For any employees who did not initially take the trainings, Ethics reached out to their supervisors to alert them of the requirement that the employees took the training. As a last-ditch effort Ethics sent out a recording of the presentation to those employees who did not take the annual ethics training at any point.</p>
<p>Three filers had scheduling complications (i.e. long-term leave, etc.) and are scheduled to complete the required annual training upon availability.</p>

Question 22 Table 1

<p>DLA requires employees to attend leader-led training.</p>
<p>The Army continued its DAEO-mandated ethics counselor continued education program, requiring an hour of additional ethics training for all ethics counselors. Many ethics counselors used OGE-developed online training to fulfill this requirement. Also, inspectors general, financial, and acquisition professionals performed annual ethics training. Additional accountability measures were established for annual and initial ethics training shortfalls.</p>
<p>Some component agencies/commands require all personnel to receive training. Various component agencies/commands also provided specialized training to senior leader staff and supervisors. DoD has established a policy preference for live, leader led training to the</p>

maximum extent practicable and requires that PAS officials receive a live initial ethics briefing within 7 days of appointment.

New Deputy Ethics Counselors (DECs) and Ethics Coordinators (ECs) are required to complete an orientation training with Ethics Division attorneys. The Ethics Division holds three quarterly trainings an annual workshop for ethics officials, which DECs and ECs are required to attend. Many components require all employees to complete annual ethics training. At the time the data was compiled, 39,617 non-covered employees completed AET. The Ethics Division provides many optional trainings throughout the year including a training series for new ethics officials, financial disclosure reviewer trainings, topical trainings open to all HHS employees, and, on request, topical trainings to individual components. Additionally, ethics officials in many components offer mandatory or voluntary trainings to their employees. Many components include ethics information in regular emails to employees or in component newsletters.

Attorneys at DOJ must complete annual Professionalism Training which includes one hour of ethics training. Purchase card holders receive annual ethics training. Many components require annual ethics training for all employees regardless of their financial disclosure status. Many components provide ethics training to departing employees focused on post government employment restrictions. Administrative Officers/Executive Officers received focused ethics training in 23 regardless of their financial disclosure status. CRM: employees with overseas duty stations receive additional ethics training focused on international issues and off-duty conduct. DEA: core employees and supervisors receive annual training with an ethics case study and must pass a test on the Standards of Conduct.

In 2023, the DEO provided additional mandatory training for employees performing ethics duties, including a four day in-person Summit to deliver training, highlight resources, and share best practices. The DEO also delivered multi-part courses on the criminal conflict of interest laws, impartiality, and key ethics and travel authorities. Prior to the start of confidential and public financial disclosure filing season each filing year, the DEO provides reviewer and administrator training to all ethics officials with financial disclosure responsibilities. In addition, under the authority established by 5 CFR 2638.307(a)(4), certain DOI employees were designated as covered employees and required to complete annual ethics training. In addition, any employees required to complete IET and AET were also required to complete training on the Department's supplemental regulations. Further, ethics officials also provided training on a number of targeted ethics topics, including post-government ethics restrictions for certain offboarding employees. Training on the Hatch Act for employees and additionally focused on agency communications professionals on official communications. An Ethics Toolkit for Scientists and Researchers targeted at ethics issues relevant to that audience. Training on gift issues (including travel-related expenses) and training focused on identifying and screening for recusals. Ethics officials also provided

<p>training to targeted audiences on relevant topics, including new Senior Executives, new supervisors, executive assistants, representatives, and interns.</p>
<p>EST created our Ethics Advisor Program composed of Integrity & Compliance Officers throughout VHA. This program involves over five hours of initial ethics training and multiple follow-up sessions on particular topics yearly. Individuals who complete the program are set up with a liaison in EST. Integrity & Compliance Officers provide the ability to identify and coordinate on ethics issues throughout the field given their established positions at VA Medical Centers. VA requires all employees to receive annual ethics training. It is assigned and provided electronically. Our records show an overall government ethics training completion rate of 96.75%. This does not include SESs, who receive live training every year. Some employees who do not have computer access, such as cemetery workers, may not show as having received the training. In a focused effort to bring awareness to ethics, we developed an extensive training session and designation for Deputy Designated Agency Ethics Official (DDAEOs) across VA's major pillars, including VHA, VBA, NCA and OIT. These senior leaders receive several hours of one-on-one ethics training highlighting core topics along with particular matters of interest for their pillar. Following certification by the DAEO, they meet quarterly with VA's ethics team and have an identified liaison for ethics questions. There is continual ethics training both in-person and virtual, plus coordinated trainings throughout VA.</p>
<p>Employees who are not required to file 450s or 278s receive annual ethics training along with required filers at the agency. The DAEO requires that our Advisory Council certify annually that they understand and are abiding by the applicable ethics rules. Additionally, the DAEO requires that members of the Advisory Council who could not attend the live Annual Ethics Training certify that they have reviewed the IAF SGE Ethics guidance.</p>
<p>NEH provides annual ethics training to all agency employees, including those not otherwise required by regulation to receive training.</p>
<p>Yes. The agency prepared new training on human trafficking awareness, and provided it to all staff.</p>
<p>All PCLOB employees undertake annual ethics training, regardless of duties.</p>
<p>All attorneys in the Office of the General Counsel were required to take annual ethics training.</p>
<p>The Members appointed by the Biden Administration after the transition were not provided with onboarding materials by the White House. The DAEO took the training materials originally created for the transition with links to YouTube videos and provided interactive training materials to all Members as part of the onboarding and annual ethics training.</p>
<p>Annual ethics training is required for all employees, including non-covered employees.</p>

DeCA established additional training requirements for other groups of employees beyond those described in 5 C.F.R. §§ 2638.303-308 (notices to new employees and supervisors, initial ethics training, ethics briefings, annual ethics training) and tailored ethics content to different audiences. DeCA provides routine training required to be completed by store management personnel. This includes an ethics training for all DeCA Area and Zone Managers at DeCA Headquarters. The customized training is interactive and conducted in person by the General Counsel and staff. Training covers required ethics topics as well as an emphasis on ethics issues routinely encountered by employees at the store level.

The Army continued its DAEO-mandated ethics counselor continued education program, requiring an hour of additional ethics training for all ethics counselors. Many ethics counselors used OGE-developed online training to fulfill this requirement. Also, inspectors general, financial, and acquisition professionals performed annual ethics training. Additional accountability measures were established for annual and initial ethics training shortfalls.

The DAEO has delegated certain duties to certified ethics counselors. In order to be certified as an ethics counselor, the DON attorney must complete a minimum of eight hours of training in the core ethics/standards of conduct subject areas (e.g., conflict of interest, financial disclosure, post-Government employment, gifts, use of Government resources, misuse of position, and relations with non-Federal entities). Additionally, certified ethics counselors must complete one hour of annual refresher training.

The DAEO established ethics counselor training requirements for all ethics officials at the Department of Energy. Each ethics official must complete four hours of ethics training each calendar year, whether it is through the Institute for Ethics in Government or another source that offers training relevant to providing ethics advice and counseling. Political initial ethics training.

New Deputy Ethics Counselors (DECs) and Ethics Coordinators (ECs) are required to complete an orientation training with Ethics Division attorneys. The Ethics Division holds three quarterly trainings an annual workshop for ethics officials, which DECs and ECs are required to attend. Many components require all employees to complete annual ethics training. At the time the data was compiled, 39,617 non-covered employees completed AET. The Ethics Division provides many optional trainings throughout the year including a training series for new ethics officials, financial disclosure reviewer trainings, topical trainings open to all HHS employees, and, on request, topical trainings to individual components. Additionally, ethics officials in many components offer mandatory or voluntary trainings to their employees. Many components include ethics information in regular emails to employees or in component newsletters.

a. At one bureau, Ethics Officials are requested to take OGE offered courses during the year.
b. For DO/HQ, we required new entrant public filers who onboarded before August 1, 2023 and confidential filers who onboarded before June 1 to attend annual ethics training. All new supervisors must complete an interactive ethics training module. At one bureau, ethics briefing for employees traveling on official duty outside the United States. Six bureaus require ethics training for all employees.

EST created our Ethics Advisor Program composed of Integrity & Compliance Officers throughout VHA. This program involves over five hours of initial ethics training and multiple follow-up sessions on particular topics yearly. Individuals who complete the program are set up with a liaison in EST. Integrity & Compliance Officers provide the ability to identify and coordinate on ethics issues throughout the field given their established positions at VA Medical Centers. VA requires all employees to receive annual ethics training. It is assigned and provided electronically. Our records show an overall government ethics training completion rate of 96.75%. This does not include SESs, who receive live training every year. Some employees who do not have computer access, such as cemetery workers, may not show as having received the training. In a focused effort to bring awareness to ethics, we developed an extensive training session and designation for Deputy Designated Agency Ethics Official (DDAEOs) across VA's major pillars, including VHA, VBA, NCA and OIT. These senior leaders receive several hours of one-on-one ethics training highlighting core topics along with particular matters of interest for their pillar. Following certification by the DAEO, they meet quarterly with VA's ethics team and have an identified liaison for ethics questions. There is continual ethics training both in-person and virtual, plus coordinated trainings throughout VA.

Certain groups must receive annual ethics training regardless of their GS-levels and responsibilities (e.g., all staff who work in Commissioner offices). Managers throughout the FTC have also designated certain persons for mandatory annual ethics training based on the nature of their responsibilities, degree of independence, etc.

The ethics staff designated a support person (Irma Estrada) to complete the ACE Program (OGE sponsored Accelerated Ethics Program).

Yes. The agency prepared new training on human trafficking awareness, and provided it to all staff.

All TVA employees are required to take annual ethics training. Staff augmented and managed task contractors are not required but are strongly encouraged to take the training. In addition, TVA Supervisors/Managers and Officers/Executive-level employees are required to take an additional module as part of the annual online ethics training.

In our ethics training, in addition to public service is a public trust, conflicts of interest, impartiality, misuse of position, time, property, gifts between employees, gifts from outside sources, outside activities, seeking and post-employment, we also covered community service activities, endorsements, anti-nepotism, and the Hatch Act.
All contractors are provided annual Ethics Training material as well as Partners abroad, involved substantially, in agency operations. Certification procedures exist.
Contracting Officer's Representatives (CORs) receive ethics briefings as part of their periodic COR training. In addition, ethics staff send supplemental guidance and meet individually with departing senior employees subject to 18 U.S.C. 207(c) to explain post-employment ethics restrictions.
All OGC Attorneys
The Bureau Director requires all Bureau employees to attend annual ethics training without regard to their status as an OGE Form 278e or 450 filer.
Our agency requires initial and annual ethics training for all of its employees, irrespective of financial disclosure filing status. Also, the agency has established an ethics component as part of the training for all agency officials who have (or have been delegated) statutory gift acceptance authority.
CEQ provides live interactive initial, annual, and Hatch Act training to all employees, including detailees.
The Director, DCAA requested that all DCAA employees who are full-time employees to receive the Annual Ethics Training received by OGE 450 Filers. Employees who are on long-term Leave or who will retire before the end of Calendar Year are exempt.
My agency established mandatory annual in person ethics training for all gs-15 directors and SES support staff (Chiefs of Staff, administrative assistants and executive assistants).
All employees are required to take annual ethics training by computer with a written test. In addition, supervisors are required to take specialized supervisor's ethics training (emphasizing the importance of ethical leadership and financial disclosure) on a biannual basis.
The DAEO required all agency employees to attend live annual ethics training.
The Army continued its DAEO-mandated ethics counselor continued education program, requiring an hour of additional ethics training for all ethics counselors. Many ethics counselors used OGE-developed online training to fulfill this requirement. Also, inspectors general, financial, and acquisition professionals performed annual ethics training. Additional accountability measures were established for annual and initial ethics training shortfalls.

Because of the DoD OIG oversight responsibilities, the Agency Head, with advice and counsel of the DAEO/GC, has determined it critical that all OIG employees receive annual ethics training.

Some component agencies/commands require all personnel to receive training. Various component agencies/commands also provided specialized training to senior leader staff and supervisors. DoD has established a policy preference for live, leader led training to the maximum extent practicable and requires that PAS officials receive a live initial ethics briefing within 7 days of appointment.

The DAEO established ethics counselor training requirements for all ethics officials at the Department of Energy. Each ethics official must complete four hours of ethics training each calendar year, whether it is through the Institute for Ethics in Government or another source that offers training relevant to providing ethics advice and counseling. Political initial ethics training.

New Deputy Ethics Counselors (DECs) and Ethics Coordinators (ECs) are required to complete an orientation training with Ethics Division attorneys. The Ethics Division holds three quarterly trainings and an annual workshop for ethics officials, which DECs and ECs are required to attend. Many components require all employees to complete annual ethics training. At the time the data was compiled, 39,617 non-covered employees completed AET. The Ethics Division provides many optional trainings throughout the year including a training series for new ethics officials, financial disclosure reviewer trainings, topical trainings open to all HHS employees, and, on request, topical trainings to individual components. Additionally, ethics officials in many components offer mandatory or voluntary trainings to their employees. Many components include ethics information in regular emails to employees or in component newsletters.

The Secretary determined annual ethics training was mandatory for all HUD employees, not just financial disclosure filers.

Attorneys at DOJ must complete annual Professionalism Training which includes one hour of ethics training. Purchase card holders receive annual ethics training. Many components require annual ethics training for all employees regardless of their financial disclosure status. Many components provide ethics training to departing employees focused on post government employment restrictions. Administrative Officers/Executive Officers received focused ethics training in 2023 regardless of their financial disclosure status. CRM: employees with overseas duty stations receive additional ethics training focused on international issues and off-duty conduct. DEA: core employees and supervisors receive annual training with an ethics case study and must pass a test on the Standards of Conduct.

In 2023, the DEO provided additional mandatory training for employees performing ethics duties, including a four day in-person Summit to deliver training, highlight resources, and share best practices. The DEO also delivered multi-part courses on the criminal conflict of interest laws, impartiality, and key ethics and travel authorities. Prior to the start of confidential and public financial disclosure filing season each filing year, the DEO provides reviewer and administrator training to all ethics officials with financial disclosure responsibilities. In addition, under the authority established by 5 CFR 2638.307(a)(4), certain DOI employees were designated as covered employees and required to complete annual ethics training. In addition, any employees required to complete IET and AET were also required to complete training on the Department's supplemental regulations. Further, ethics officials also provided training on a number of targeted ethics topics, including post-government ethics restrictions for certain offboarding employees. Training on the Hatch Act for employees and additionally focused on agency communications professionals on official communications. An Ethics Toolkit for Scientists and Researchers targeted at ethics issues relevant to that audience. Training on gift issues (including travel-related expenses) and training focused on identifying and screening for recusals. Ethics officials also provided training to targeted audiences on relevant topics, including new Senior Executives, new supervisors, executive assistants, representatives, and interns.

- a. At one bureau, Ethics Officials are requested to take OGE offered courses during the year.
- b. For DO/HQ, we required new entrant public filers who onboarded before August 1, 2023 and confidential filers who onboarded before June 1 to attend annual ethics training. All new supervisors must complete an interactive ethics training module. At one bureau, ethics briefing for employees traveling on official duty outside the United States. Six bureaus require ethics training for all employees.

EST created our Ethics Advisor Program composed of Integrity & Compliance Officers throughout VHA. This program involves over five hours of initial ethics training and multiple follow-up sessions on particular topics yearly. Individuals who complete the program are set up with a liaison in EST. Integrity & Compliance Officers provide the ability to identify and coordinate on ethics issues throughout the field given their established positions at VA Medical Centers. VA requires all employees to receive annual ethics training. It is assigned and provided electronically. Our records show an overall government ethics training completion rate of 96.75%. This does not include SESs, who receive live training every year. Some employees who do not have computer access, such as cemetery workers, may not show as having received the training. In a focused effort to bring awareness to ethics, we developed an extensive training session and designation for Deputy Designated Agency Ethics Official (DDAEOs) across VA's major pillars, including VHA, VBA, NCA and OIT. These senior leaders receive several hours of one-on-one ethics training highlighting core topics along with particular matters of interest for their pillar. Following certification by the DAEO, they meet quarterly with VA's ethics team and have an identified liaison for ethics questions. There is

<p>continual ethics training both in-person and virtual, plus coordinated trainings throughout VA.</p>
<p>At the beginning of every weekly Administrator's senior staff meeting, the ADAEO provides an "ethics minute." In 2023, the White House Liaison invited the ADAEO to write an "ethics corner" for the weekly newsletter sent to all EPA political and administratively determined appointees. EPA Ethics also regularly provides ethics training to EPA's LEGIS fellows and also to the Brookings Institute for all of the federal agencies' LEGIS fellows. We also provide training to the EPA Designated Federal Officers in charge of FACA committees and also, upon request, to the FACA committees. We also provide training to interns and law clerks, whether paid or unpaid, and as needed or requested by offices and employees on all aspects of the federal ethics laws and regulations and the Hatch Act.</p>
<p>Agency Policy letter requires all EXIM employees to attend initial and annual ethics training.</p>
<p>In coordination with the Office of Secondary Market Oversight, the Ethics Office offers additional ethics training specific to employees providing oversight of Farmer Mac to ensure that they are aware of the heightened ethical appearance concerns and that they are conflict free before engaging in Farmer Mac oversight activities. The training is online and accompanied by a form that employees sign and certify that they understand the ethics rules. This training is repeated annually for employees assigned to Farmer Mac oversight activities.</p>
<p>All employees were assigned annual training</p>
<p>All Commission employees not just financial disclosure filers are required to take the Annual Ethics Training.</p>
<p>FHFA requires all employees to complete annual ethics training (with the exception of employees who attended new employee ethics orientation in 2023).</p>
<p>All GSA employees were required to complete annual ethics training. We also sent an annual reminder to managers and supervisors about their ethics responsibilities.</p>
<p>Employees who are not required to file 450s or 278s receive annual ethics training along with required filers at the agency. The DAEO requires that our Advisory Council certify annually that they understand and are abiding by the applicable ethics rules. Additionally, the DAEO requires that members of the Advisory Council who could not attend the live Annual Ethics Training certify that they have reviewed the IAF SGE Ethics guidance.</p>
<p>Our agency Ethics Program literature covers notices to new employees and supervisors, initial ethics training, ethics briefings, and annual ethics training.</p>
<p>All employees who serve as evaluators for procurements are required to complete a training. In addition, starting in CY 2020 all agency employees were required to complete an annual refresher training course in a number of subjects critical to NARA's mission, including an</p>

ethics component. Finally, the Archivist's Management Team receives quarterly ethics briefings.
Annual ethics training is provided to all NCPC employees.
Annual ethics training was mandatory for all NCUA employees in CY2023, regardless of financial disclosure filer status.
No agency training procedures were established during the reporting period. Our agency requires all employees to receive training, but these procedures were not developed during the reporting period.
It is our practice to send reminders that cover topics that are included in our required Annual Ethics Training for Filers to all Agency employees. This approach ensures continuity in our messaging concerning the Standards of Conduct and Criminal Conflict of Interest Statutes. The agency also requires that all supervisors and managers, not just financial disclosure filers, complete Annual Ethics Training. We also give a customized ethics briefing to Senior Executive Service employees who were not promoted from within the NLRB, all participants of the Agency's Summer Intern Program, and all attorneys hired under the Honors Attorney program. We provide a comprehensive ethics training to members of a Presidential appointee's front office staff and to the employees in the Office of Congressional and Public Affairs (OCPA) to ensure that these employees understand the additional limitations that are placed on appointees under the Biden Ethics Pledge. Lastly, because we had a number of employees promoted to the positions of Regional Director, Officer in Charge or Administrative Law Judge this year, we provided a comprehensive ethics briefing to each of these employees so that we could review relevant ethics requirements with them and emphasize the importance of their role within to the Agency's ethical culture.
Contracting officers as well as IT professionals who work/supervise contractors are required to complete specialized training, "The Government-Contractor Relationship at NSF". In addition to completing IET, new program officers are required to attend a merit review basics course where they receive an additional hour of ethics training geared towards managing their COIs and merit review panel COIs. All financial disclosure filers and all new filers were required to complete a sponsored travel course. "Top Ten Tips for Managers" is provided during Executive Leadership Training.
All OGE staff are required to receive annual ethics training.
OMB required new interns attend ethics training.
This year, ONDCP mandated that all personnel, including detailees, IPA's, and contractors, complete the annual ethics training.

Yes. The agency prepared new training on human trafficking awareness, and provided it to all staff.
USTR provides initial and annual ethics training for all agency employees, detailees, consultants, and contractors.
Overseas staff attending Overseas Staff Training (OST) are required to receive training focused on ethics issues they may encounter in an overseas environment. These OSTs are held bi-annually. Also, new personal services contractor (PSC) staff at overseas Peace Corps Posts were required in 2023, as they have been for several years now, to review ethics materials upon entering on duty. The Peace Corps Ethics Team worked with the agency's Office of Staff Learning and Development to have new PSC staff in 2023 fulfill this requirement via an online, interactive training course.
DAEO requires that all Commission employees (even non-filers) receive live in-person ethics training (performed live via Teams in 2023).
The SEC required mandatory ethics training in 2023 for ALL SEC employees onboard as of December 31, 2022. Employees who file a Form 278 received one version of the training and all other SEC employees (including Form 450 filers) received another version of the training. The training was completed during the summer and fall of 2023 and included training on our supplemental regulations. (Employees onboarded on January 1, 2023 or after received mandatory initial ethics training.)
All SSS employees required to receive annual training (278 and 450 filers) also received mandatory anti-human trafficking training.
SCRC has drafted and included ethics training requirements in its employee manual as well as offer letters for all employees, both federal and non-federal.
SIGAR requires all employees to attend live training for annual and initial ethics training.
All Employee must complete 60 minutes of live ethics training each year regardless of filer status
My agency provided initial ethics training to unpaid interns as well as provided annual ethics training to all agency employees regardless of pay-grade, position, or job responsibilities.
In our ethics training, in addition to public service is a public trust, conflicts of interest, impartiality, misuse of position, time, property, gifts between employees, gifts from outside sources, outside activities, seeking and post-employment, we also covered community service activities, endorsements, anti-nepotism, and the Hatch Act.
DFC Ethics training policy sets forth that all employees will be asked to attend annual ethics training gin the year(s) after onboarding. Other than employees who require live training

every year, all employees are offered live training and interactive training in alternating years.
Initial ethics training and annual ethics training for detailees.

Question 23 Table 1

The General Counsel is also the agency's DAEO and provides all of the ethics advice to members, and most of the ethics advice to staff (reviews all of it). He is therefore aware of issues that tend to come up and adjusts accordingly.
Met with AFRH Risk Manager and Performance Improvement Officer to discuss needs
Ethics Attorneys coordinate with DCAA Auditing Policy Personnel to evaluate how Ethics may be enhanced by the application of GAGAS Independence standards applicable to all DCAA auditors in the GS-0511 series.
Our agency decided to switch from group briefings of SES/GOFOS to individual briefings. A large majority of the SESs appreciated the more relaxed atmosphere and asked individual questions about various aspects of Ethics rules ranging from gift to post-government employment and including financial disclosure requirements. While the group briefing is more efficient for the presenter and allows for group discussions, our Agency plans to alternate briefing styles every other year to allow for both types of training for SESs to occur.
Monitored organization calendar while taking into consideration the restriction of minimum manning days (restriction on members of National Guard Bureau) and holidays to schedule ethics training. Used agency ethics annual training module, but did not go back and inquire about effectiveness. Checked the module to see if someone failed multiple times and inquired about help for them and additional training needs.
The Army continued to assess the content of ethics training instruction during ethics staff assistance visits, instruct on ethics topics at the incoming quarterly SES trainings and assesses the content of this training at the session, and conduct quarterly Army ethics telecons with topics based on surveys of Army ethics counselors.
The GC/DAEO meets weekly with agency head. Current ethics issues are addressed during this meeting. The DAEO holds a bi-weekly meeting with the Ethics Program team to address programmatic and policy issues, to include ethics education and communications.
Reviewed advice for common issues.
One component conducts a quarterly risk assessment. An ethics official in another component serves on the component's risk management committee. A third component

<p>established heightened screening procedures for certain higher-risk matters. A fourth component focused on risks related to personal social media.</p>
<p>DEO hosts meetings open to all Department ethics officials twice each month where ethics issues of note are discussed which helps inform training content and enhance communications. Some components' ethics officials regularly attend component staff meetings and/or meet with senior staff to engage about ethics issues, which helps inform training content and enhance communications.</p>
<p>One bureau reviewed training modules and increased focus on conflicts of interest/impartiality to address issues raised in that area, with a particular emphasis on moving between private sector and government.</p>
<p>EST conducted post-training surveys to capture comments and recommendations from VA employees.</p>
<p>The Ethics Office takes advantage of election cycles and seasonal events to issue guidance reminding employees of various ethics rules and the Hatch Act.</p>
<p>Ethics officials assessed risks to help inform the content of ethics education and communications.</p>
<p>Ethics staff meet regularly to discuss significant developments, trends and issues that should be added to our annual ethics training, in addition to sending periodic ethics announcements.</p>
<p>DAEO independently assessed areas of risk associated with the work of agency employees based on personal knowledge and ensured that training addressed those areas, as applicable. Training for SGEs was targeted differently than training for career employees.</p>
<p>One NASA location reported taking into account the accelerated schedule for advancing the new Space Launch System (SLS) progress, Human Landing Systems (HLS) programs for lunar exploration, and other acquisitions in ethics work.</p>
<p>We provide ethics training directed specifically to Acquisition staff and the CIO's office, who work the most on high-dollar IT acquisitions. This training includes relatively more training on acquisition-specific topics like the Procurement Integrity Act than regular annual training. We also provide targeted trainings for other units, including all the Administrative Officers, to address issues specific to those offices and organizations.</p>
<p>Discussed what would be appropriate among ethics team staff.</p>
<p>Provided targeted training on request.</p>
<p>Discussed with Chiefs of Staff what issues they commonly face in their respective offices.</p>

Conducted self-assessments to ensure that required employees are receiving the training administered post-training evaluations to assess participants' perceptions of the training reviewed advice logs for increased activity after training presentations and communications held discussions with agency leaders and employees to evaluate whether the training and communications they received have supported them in managing ethics tasks.

The DAEO has incorporated additional info into Member ethics materials related to the Hatch Act and Social Media Guidance.

Question 24 Table 1

New 278 filers receive one-on-one orientations during which an ethics official explains the public financial disclosure filing requirements, assists the filer with logging into Integrity for the first time, and walks the filer through the use of Integrity. Additionally, the ethics office released an updated interactive training module for non-filers, which is distributed every 3rd year. While completing the training module is optional, it is highly encouraged and widely publicized.

Received written feed back from DCAA Managers and Supervisors about the effectiveness of all Ethics Training.

Published information pertaining to latest developments in ethics issues and requested feedback.

Some on-line annual ethics training was audio-compliant.

Reviewed training surveys provided by organizations responsible for training events in which the Ethics Program team participated.

Reviewed incoming requests for ethics advice.

Used questions asked during trainings and questions received from employees to inform decisions on future training topics.

HQ started review and revision of DHS forms to ensure 508 compliance

DEO: employees taking online interactive ethics training must pass a test which immediately assesses their understanding of the rules and the effectiveness of the training. Training specialists in components provide feedback on ethics training.

Similar to 2022, in DO/HQ, after globally emailing two ethics newsletters (Spring and Holiday editions) and electronic guidance on Hatch Act and on holiday gifts, DO/HQ had an influx of questions, showing that people read this guidance and it is effective. One bureau conducted a focus group and online survey to better inform our thinking on training and communication

needs via its intranet ethics website. Another bureau continues to informally canvas training participants on their perceptions of the training.
EST sends an annual “client satisfaction survey” to stakeholders across the agency to garner feedback in many areas, including education. EST sends post-virtual training surveys to participants to monitor and adjust the delivery of ethics advice on a continual basis throughout the year. Finally, EST has improved our training frequency to include monthly offerings to the agency on financial disclosure, as well as increased frequency for Hatch Act and Post-government Employment (PGE).
Although we do not currently have a formalized evaluation process, we do gather responses anecdotally from our learners and our clients. The 2023 annual ethics training on Outside Activities, though launched later than we anticipated, was extremely well received and addressed a top area of concern expressed by DEOs. As part of our collection of information for the annual questionnaire, we offer DEOs an opportunity to comment freely. This year's comments were uniformly complimentary of the responsiveness, knowledge and customer service provided by the EPA Ethics Office.
We consider whether a particular pattern of ethics issues have emerged among employees that was addressed or should have been addressed by annual ethics training.
Received questions for ethics advice following the training in direct response to topics that were covered. Also, before conducting the training, solicited input from supervisors and employees regarding potential topics of interest to ensure that training topics were relevant and addressed any ethics concerns.
All employees completed an ethics training program on their computers.
ONCD did not provide formal evaluation of ethics education to employees. However, the DAEO received a number of unsolicited positive feedback from employees. Additionally, the number of follow-up ethics questions increased in the immediate days following each training.
Ethics staff reviews all post-training comments.
The Commission rolled out FDOonline in 2022 and has been learning throughout the rollout in the first year, the full implementation in the second year, as well as with off-boarding and on-boarding Members throughout.

Part 5 Table 1

Q 18: All new employees received IET within 1 week of commencing employment. Q 21: One confidential filer received a promotion that resulted in a mid-year change to public filer status. At the end of the reporting year, there were no confidential filers onboard.
--

Regarding questions 15 and 19: The DAEO is also the person that initiates all personnel hiring actions, so he is always aware of all new hires. Regardless, the human resources contractor for the agency (BSEE within Interior) has included the required language in all offer letters.

Questions 17, 18, 21 - Numbers are classified unless included

#18: Detailees are not included in this response unless they meet the definition of "employee" pursuant to 5 CFR 2638.603. #21(c): Pursuant to OGE Legal Advisory LA-23-10, the number of employees listed as requiring annual training includes only CIGIE employees. The number does not include detailees assigned to CIGIE, regardless of whether they file a confidential financial disclosure with CIGIE.

23. We partnered with our Public Affairs office to put monthly news articles on ethics issues onto the Agency's internal webpage. We publicize our dedicated ethics email address for the workforce to ask us questions in confidence. Part of our reviews of speaker engagements and conference attendance focuses on ethics issues such as the appearance of endorsement or the appearance of preferential access to senior leaders for clients of particular companies, as well as efficient use of government resources.

Question 23: We provided tailored ethics trainings to multiple DIA offices, such as, the Directorate for Mission Support, the Joint Military Training Center, the Defense Attache Service, the Chief Information Office, the Equal Employment Opportunity Office and the Office of Counterintelligence throughout the year.

Q18. A few legal offices in the field do not track this requirement. Q23 & Q24 The principal ethics attorney at one installation is new to managing an ethics program at a major command. That ethics office has asked The Judge Advocate General's office to provide a review/staff assistance visit of their ethics program, send a subject matter expert to perform an outside evaluation, and make recommendations for improvements generally. The ethics office has also asked The Judge Advocate General's office to assist with refining the ethics office's approach to correcting deficiencies that have already been identified. This review will occur in February 2024. Q21 continued. 6) The 2023 training effort for confidential filers was adversely affected by the loss of key ethics personnel during the peak training season, which limited the ability of the ethics office to effectively target filers with repeated training reminders. It also appears the initial use of FDM to send bulk reminder messages to untrained personnel may have been less effective, especially among supervisors, due to the use of email filters screening FDM messages. A later message sent directly to delinquent filers improved the office's training rate, but multiple personnel had already begun holiday leave and were unable to complete their training in 2023. Lastly, several filers had issues with the agency online training option and experienced challenges in producing and/or preserving documentation of their completion. A few returned from vacation in 2024 unable to find their training documentation. 7) One 450 filer did not complete AET because he was placed under investigation and had his computer access revoked. Another two 450 filers did not respond to repeated requests to fulfill this requirement. Supervisors were notified. A 278 filer did not respond to repeated requests to comply with this requirement. His supervisor has been advised. 8) Some confidential filers did not complete the AET earlier in the year and were on leave at the end of the year when additional reminders were sent out. Some confidential filers did not complete AET due to deployments. 9) Some confidential filers retired or left Air Force employment prior to the end of year and before completing AET, but they are included in the numbers for employees required to receive training. 10) Confidential filer was on maternity leave. 11) General and Flag officers detailed to joint assignments with other DoD DAEO agencies file their OGE Form 278 with the Military Department DAEO Agency but are trained at their duty location. Therefore, these individuals are not included in Military Department DAEO Agency Training numbers.

Question 22: The Department of the Navy DAEO has delegated certain duties to certified ethics counselors. In order to be certified as an ethics counselor, the Department of the Navy attorney must have completed a minimum of eight hours of training in the core ethics/standards of conduct subject areas (e.g., conflicts of interest, financial disclosure, post-Government employment, gifts, use of Government resources, misuse of position, and relations with non-Federal entities). Additionally, certified ethics counselors are required to complete annual recertification training.

General Comment. In the post pandemic environment of flexible work schedules, ethics presentations are provided primarily through video and audio communication platforms which permit attendees to ask and answer questions through microphone and written

<p>comment functions for interactive participation. Initial ethics training is performed live for new employees during their Entry on Duty orientation. Live annual ethics training was provided for senior executives and senior leaders (GS-15) employees during the 4th Quarter Senior Leader Training.</p>
<p>OIG- There are 2 employees who did not complete the annual ethics training for 2023 by December 31, 2023. One employee is on military leave until February 1, 2024. The other employee was on maternity leave but completed the training immediately upon return on January 4, 2024. The employee on military leave agreed to complete the training when he returns.</p>
<p>Q18iv. EOUSA/US Attorneys Offices hired 1,254 employees in 2023. Training for new employees, including their IET, is tracked in the component by the Office of Legal Education (OLE) who notifies supervisors if new employees are delinquent in meeting their training requirements.</p>
<p>Additional comments for Question #19: In 2023, IET was provided under the DAEO's supervision for all DOI Bureaus and Offices with the exception of the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC). OIG and NIGC ethics officials are not under the supervision of the DAEO. However, both OIG and NIGC have less than 1,000 employees each and also provided the DAEO with a written assessment containing information on the procedures which have been implemented for the provision of initial ethics training.</p>
<p>Q16: Our answer is "All" offers of employment included...The system shows the question without any responses to it.</p>
<p>Item 18(a) - number does not include interns at the agency.</p>
<p>As an example of supplementary ethics training provided by NASA, one NASA location provided focused/supplementary ethics training including Pathways Interns Ethics Training, Hatch Act training with emphasis on social media, telework, social justice Senior Leadership Training on Working with Contractors, Impartiality Training and Covered Relationships When Hiring Contractors, and Ethics for Administrative Officers.</p>
<p>17(a)(i): Only one new agency leader joined NEH in 2023.</p>
<p>#17 & #18 - Data is not included/is classified.</p>
<p>Question 18: Please note that the data is for employees onboarding at NSA-Washington, which is the majority of the workforce. In 2023, the ethics office identified that new employees hired in certain NSA locations outside NSA-Washington were not receiving initial ethics orientation as a matter of process. This was reported to OGE during OGE's 2023 inspection of NSA's ethics program and was identified as an OGE recommendation as part of</p>

that inspection. NSA is actively working to correct the process so that ethics orientation is provided to all employees required to receive it.
#22, OA requires every OA employee to take ethics training.
Q.21. Provided live, targeted ethics training by request to approximately 25 Federal Executive Board employees in July 2023.
Question 20: The current Acting Special Counsel completed the required annual training. The former Special Counsel was not required to complete the annual training because his term ended before the requirement was due.
18) ONCD trains all new employees and detailees that join the agency, regardless of grade or hiring status. Therefore, we do not track the number of employees trained pursuant to 5 C.F.R. 2638.304.
Ethics officials publish “Ethics Dispatches” to highlight ethics issues that may be of interest to agency employees and are timed to occur during the year when certain ethics issues might arise (e.g., gift rules during the holiday season, Hatch Act during elections seasons, etc.). New issues are circulated to the entire agency on a quarterly basis.
Question 21. The Commission's four (4) Public Filers includes one (1) SGE Public Filer who worked more than 60 days in 2023. 5 U.S.C. 13103(h). The Commission's 25 Confidential Filers includes three (3) SGE Confidential Filers. However, in 2023, the DAEO determined that interactive training for the three (3) SGE Confidential Filers who work less than 60 days was not practical and issued the appropriate written materials to those SGE Commissioners in accordance with 5 CFR 2638.307(d)(2).
Q21.: This number includes non-appointees and individuals who left the agency after training before December 31, 2023. It also includes WHO public and confidential financial disclosure report filers.

Question 27 Table 1

Our agency sought a 208(b)(1) waiver for an employee with an outside position and received OGE’s concurrence. However, as the ethics office was drafting the waiver for agency head signature, the employee notified us that he had terminated the outside employment.
One component sends waivers to OGE on a quarterly basis, thus the number of waivers sent in FY23 includes those from Q4 of FY22 and Q1 – Q3 of 2023.
One waiver was granted in 2023 and its finalized copy was sent to OGE in January, 2024.

Part 6 Table 1

Q25. The frequency of ethics questions asked on these topics does not necessarily reflect the relative seriousness or complexity of ethics questions that employees ask.
Q25: Many of the inquiries for financial disclosure cover conflicts of interest.
Responding to #25 - SCRC is working internally to establish additional procedures for conflict of interests that may evolve.

Question 28 Table 1

ACUS is a micro-agency that contracts out most HR functions. The DAEO makes the determination about whether financial disclosure filings are necessary once a hiring decision has been made by the agency (or when a staff departure is planned). Generally, SES and PAS positions require public reports, while GS-15 positions usually require confidential reports.
The DAEO is also the person that initiates all agency personnel actions (including hiring, terminations, retirements), in close coordination with the human resources contractor in Interior. He is always aware of all appointments well before they happen.
During my tenure as DAEO, I am unaware of any appointments to public and confidential financial disclosure filing positions.
We have only 4 public filers and it is evident to the DAEO when they are appointed (or terminated) notification by HR is not necessary.
No new appointments.
No appointments of employees to positions requiring public filing occurred during the reporting period.
In 2023 the USARC did not have any appointments of new public filers.
Due to the structure, independence, and small size of the ASBCA, the DAEO and ADAEO are the first to know about relevant appointments.
No new appointments.
The CSB's DAEO was appointed on 10/12/2023. Notwithstanding the referenced CFR section (which appears to have been conceived with Cabinet agencies in mind), the CSB is a microagency. Most of the positions requiring the filing of a financial disclosure form are already filled. Any other positions that require such a filing would normally involve the office owning the position, working in conjunction with the HR and ethics offices, and the DAEO would thereby be notified.

<p>The Office of the General Counsel, not human resources, make the determination of public and confidential filing positions.</p>
<p>450 filing is performed at the supervisor's initiative in our agency, so the HR personnel do not always know who will be filers within 15 days.</p>
<p>No new appointments to notify.</p>
<p>Several ethics offices stated that their civilian personnel office notified them of the appointments in all or most cases. Several other ethics offices stated that their CPO never notified them or that this question was not applicable to their office. Selecting “in some cases” was the best compromise answer. The following are explanations from different Air Force ethics offices. See Additional Comments Section for information from offices that answered "not applicable." 1) The CPO does not notify unit ethics officials of appointments, but the supervisor of the filer notifies the ethics office. The ethics counselor will often reach out to CPO for updates on new filers. In the case of public financial disclosure filers, the Air Force Ethics Office notifies the major command ethics office of new and departing filers. 2) One major command ethics offices tracks the public filers for the units within the command. CPO does not notify the ethics office, but the numbers are small and the appointments of public filers are announced publicly. 3) Ethics office created a system to better track new entrants including establishing POCs that the ethics office contacts monthly to remain informed of personnel changes. 4) After a breakdown early in 2023 in the process for identifying new confidential filers, the ethics office began tracking and sending emails to supervisors asking them to identify new filers. 5) Several ethics offices stated that the supervisor rather than CPO notified the ethics office of new 450 filers. 6) The ethics office is working with CPO to receive notice of new employees hired into designated 450 filing positions, but a substantial number of the installation's new filers consist of existing employees within large tenant units who are transferred or detailed internally and who are then assigned acquisitions duties requiring them to become confidential filers. Continued in Additional Comments.</p>
<p>The public financial disclosure filers did not change in calendar year 2023.</p>
<p>We did not have anyone appointed during this year.</p>
<p>We did not have any appointments that met the requirement.</p>
<p>JUSFC is a nano agency with four FTEs and contracts with GSA for HR services. JUSFC directly initiates any hiring processes and the DAEO is directly aware of every new hire.</p>
<p>No appointments.</p>
<p>DAEO is aware of all hires/promotions that would impact financial disclosure reporting requirements/changes.</p>

<p>NCPC is a very small agency and the DAEO is aware of new employees coming on board, their GS level, and whether they qualify as a public filer.</p>
<p>DAEO makes this determination and notifies new employees of responsibility to file public or confidential disclosure filing positions.</p>
<p>DAEO is the HRO for the Agency</p>
<p>Ethics staff and OCHCO staff have identified challenges with timely notification of employee rotations and details into public financial disclosure filing positions. Ethics staff and OCHCO staff are working to update guidance and procedures to ensure timely notification of these rotations and details.</p>
<p>No one appointed to a public financial disclosure filing position in 2023.</p>
<p>OGE had no new hires to public filing positions in CY2023.</p>
<p>No new hires in 2023.</p>
<p>During CY 2023, there were no appointments at IPEC to public financial disclosure filing positions. And, IPEC does not have a separate HR office.</p>
<p>Human Resources does not manage the public filers list. The Ethics Law Division receives notice of new employees on a monthly basis and determines whether the new employees are public filers.</p>
<p>No addition appointments were made during the reporting period.</p>
<p>No positions meeting the C.F.R. Â§ 2638.105(a)(1)) requirement were hired.</p>
<p>USAID's career CHCO remained vacant during this calendar year with significant turnover in HR leadership positions. This, in addition to an increased workload in USAID's Office of Human Capital and Talent Management with a reduced staff resulted in HCTM processes being disrupted and inconsistent. HCTM is currently working with the DAEO and the Bureau for Management to improve the identification and notification of all financial disclosure filers in a manner consistent with 5 CFR 2638.105.</p>
<p>GSA CABS does not make any recommendation or notification of ethics related issues or need/requirement to file the 450 or 278. GSA CABS does not provide any training or intro to ethics aspart of their onboarding. There were no new hires in 2023.</p>
<p>Transition in HR personnel created confusion in providing written confirmation. The Office of General Counsel worked with Human Resources to correct this error.</p>
<p>There were no appointments to filing positions in 2023.</p>

The Ethics and Compliance team obtains a report from Human Resources database on a weekly basis. The Postal Service broadly announces the appointment of new officers.
The Commission did not onboard any new Public Filer employees in CY2023.
HR only notified DAEO of appointments to confidential financial disclosure filing positions in some cases. This was a determination made between HR and the supervisors of the new employees, in conjunction with Ethics when requested. Some supervisors did not alert HR when a new employee needed to file, so HR did not tell the DAEO.

Question 28 Table 2

See answer to 28a. above.
The DAEO is also the person that initiates all agency personnel actions (including hiring, terminations, retirements), in close coordination with the human resources contractor in Interior. He is always aware of all appointments well before they happen.
During my tenure as DAEO, I am unaware of any appointments to confidential financial disclosure filing positions.
We have only 5 confidential filers and it is evident to the DAEO when they are appointed notification by HR is not necessary.
No new appointments.
The Access Board is a micro-agency with fewer than 30 full-time employees. The DAEO and other ethics officials are aware of any new hires to positions requiring the filing of confidential financial disclosure reports without notification from human resources.
In 2023 the USARC did not have any appointments of new confidential disclosure filers.
Due to the structure and small size of the ASBCA, the DAEO and ADAEO are the first to know about relevant appointments.
No confidential filers.
The CSB's DAEO was only appointed on 10/12/2023. Notwithstanding the referenced CFR section (which appears to have been conceived with Cabinet agencies in mind), the CSB is a microagency. Most of the positions requiring the filing of a financial disclosure form are already filled. Any other positions that require such a filing would normally involve the office owning the position, working in conjunction with the HR and ethics offices, and the DAEO would thereby be notified.

The Office of the General Counsel, not human resources, make the determination of public and confidential filing positions.

The DFAS Human Resources System does not have the technical capacity to track new employees who are assigned to or hired into positions requiring the filing of an OGE 450. An attempt was made to provide the ethics office with a monthly list of all OGE 450 filers in hopes that this would include new entrants but this proved to be too cumbersome. Further, DFAS has a number of OGE 450 filers, Contracting Officer's Representatives, for whom the duties that require filing are collateral assignments and are not inherent in the position. The ethics office works with the organizations in which have filers to ensure that we receive timely notice of new entrant OGE 450 filers.

We receive monthly reports containing the names and billet information of DIA employees assigned to confidential filing positions from the DIA Office of Human Resources (OHR). The ethics program works closely with OHR to update and validate these records.

No new appointments to notify.

The explanations provided for the public filers apply to the confidential filers. Several ethics offices stated that their civilian personnel office notified them of the appointments in all or most cases. Several other ethics offices stated that their CPO never notified them or that this question was not applicable to their office. Selecting "in some cases" was the best compromise answer. See the response to Q28a and the continuation of the response in Additional Comments for the response to this question.

Inconsistent coordination with human resources (HR) offices, HR office personnel turnover, and lack of HR procedural mandates affect Confidential Filer notifications of appointments to filing positions. But many Army ethics offices received excellent cooperation regarding Confidential Filer notifications. The Army continues to work on improving this communication with its HR offices.

Confidential financial disclosure is decentralized at DOJ. HR is not necessarily the primary source of information to ethics officials about confidential filers. HR does not track or implement confidential financial disclosure, or collect reports. Ethics officials are generally notified about new confidential filers by other means.

EPA Ethics and DEOs had not previously been receiving information about new hires. We continue to struggle with trying to integrate new hire information with ethics tracking because of the systemic problem of DEOs not always being directly involved in designating e450. We continue to try to address this issue with human resources but we understand that EPA is not unique in having this problem.

<p>During the first three quarters of calendar year 2023, Human Resources did not provide the ethics staff with a list of new employees on a regular basis. This adversely affected timely IET and 450 new entrant filing.</p>
<p>The confidential financial disclosure filers did not change in calendar year 2023.</p>
<p>No confidential filers</p>
<p>We do not have any confidential filers</p>
<p>We do not have any confidential filers.</p>
<p>JUSFC is a nano agency with four FTEs and contracts with GSA for HR services. JUSFC directly initiates any hiring processes and the DAEO is directly aware of every new hire.</p>
<p>DAEO is aware of all hires/promotions that would impact financial disclosure reporting requirements/changes.</p>
<p>NCPC is a very small agency and the DAEO is aware of new employees coming on board, their GS level, and whether they qualify as a confidential filer.</p>
<p>DAEO makes this determination and notifies new employees of responsibility to file public or confidential disclosure filing positions.</p>
<p>HD does not notify OGC Ethics of confidential filer appointments, the first line supervisor notifies our team.</p>
<p>No confidential filers</p>
<p>No one appointed to a confidential financial disclosure filing position in 2023.</p>
<p>OGE had no new hires to confidential filing positions in CY2023.</p>
<p>No new hires in 2023.</p>
<p>During CY 2023, there were no appointments at IPEC to confidential financial disclosure filing positions. And, IPEC does not have a separate HR office.</p>
<p>The Peace Corps Ethics Team was notified with lists of new employees and monthly staffing reports but not always within the 15-day deadline for staff moving internally into filing positions.</p>
<p>No new confidential filers hired in 2023.</p>
<p>Human Resources does not manage the confidential filers list. The Ethics Law Division receives notice of new employees on a monthly basis and determines whether the new employees are confidential filers.</p>

No addition appointments were made during the reporting period.
No positions meeting the C.F.R. Â§ 2638.105(a)(1) requirement were hired.
USAID's career CHCO remained vacant during this calendar year with significant turnover in HR leadership positions. This, in addition to an increased workload in USAID's Office of Human Capital and Talent Management with a reduced staff resulted in HCTM processes being disrupted and inconsistent. HCTM is currently working with the DAEO and the Bureau for Management to improve the identification and notification of all financial disclosure filers in a manner consistent with 5 CFR 2638.105.
GSA CABS does not make any recommendation or notification of ethics related issues or need/requirement to file the 450 or 278. GSA CABS does not provide any training or intro to ethics aspart of their onboarding. There were no new hires in 2023.
Transition in HR personnel created confusion in providing written confirmation. The Office of General Counsel worked with Human Resources to correct this error.
There were no appointments to filing positions in 2023.
The Ethics and Compliance team obtains a report from Human Resources database on a weekly basis. The Postal Service broadly announces the appointment of new executives.
Given the Commission's relatively small size, the DAEO issued written procedures clarifying that the ADAEO would initiate and maintain contact with new employees.
HR only notified DAEO of appointments to confidential financial disclosure filing positions in some cases. This was a determination made between HR and the supervisors of the new employees, in conjunction with Ethics when requested. Some supervisors did not alert HR when a new employee needed to file, so HR did not tell the DAEO.

Question 29 Table 1

See answer to 28a. above.
The DAEO is also the person that initiates all agency personnel actions (including hiring, terminations, retirements), in close coordination with the human resources contractor in Interior. He is always aware of all terminations well before they happen.
No termination from public financial disclosure filing positions.
See comment to # 28.a, above.

<p>There were no terminations of public filers during the reporting period. Also, the Access Board is a micro-agency with fewer than 30 full-time employees so, agency ethics officials would be aware of a public filer's termination without notification from human resources.</p>
<p>In 2023 the USARC did not have any terminations of public filers.</p>
<p>Due to the structure and small size of the ASBCA, the DAEO and ADAEO are the first to know about relevant terminations.</p>
<p>No terminations.</p>
<p>The CSB's DAEO was appointed on 10/12/2023. There were no terminations from public financial disclosure filing positions after that date. Even so, at a microagency such as the CSB, news travels fast and the DAEO would likely know of any such terminations and/or imminent terminations concurrently with the CSB HR office.</p>
<p>No terminations of public filer positions</p>
<p>No positions were terminated.</p>
<p>Several ethics offices stated that their civilian personnel office notified them of the terminations in all or most cases. Several other ethics offices stated that their CPO never notified them or that this question was not applicable to their office. Selecting "in some cases" was the best compromise answer. The following are explanations from different Air Force ethics offices. See Additional Comments Section for information from offices that answered "not applicable." 1) One major command ethics office - Although the local CPO does not inform the ethics office of terminations and separations, all public filers have a direct working relationship with their servicing ethics counselors and provide the counselors with timely notice of their intent to retire or separate from federal service. 2) The Air Force Ethics Office rather than the local CPO has notified the major command senior ethics counselors of upcoming retirements and separations. 3) The installation's public filers work in tenant units that almost never provide our office notice of their reassignment, retirement, or separation in a timely manner. 4) Notifications of terminations are normally available from other sources or are self-reported. 5) The local CPOs of one major command were either unaware of the requirement or delayed notification. The respective CPO and ethics offices are taking corrective action.</p>
<p>No public financial disclosure filers separated from FCSIC in 2023.</p>
<p>No terminations</p>
<p>We did not have any terminations during this time.</p>
<p>In 2023 the Acting General Counsel/DAEO stepped down in that position and returned to her Associate General Counsel position when the new General Counsel/DAEO started. Therefore</p>

the ADAEO and OGC staff were made aware along with the head of human resources (COO) at the same time.
Terminations of the positions did not occur in 2023.
JUSFC is a nano agency with four FTEs and contracts with GSA for HR services. The DAEO is directly aware of every termination or separation from service.
No terminations.
DAEO is aware of all changes to employment that would impact financial disclosure reporting requirements/changes.
NOJMO: No terminations.;MSFC: At MSFC we are not notified by OHC of confidential filer position determinations. This information is available to Ethics POC in reports in the Ethics Program Tracking System.
There have been no resignations of public filers in years. Even if there were, since there are only two in the agency, the DAEO would know.
See answer to #28; Our agency is small, and all public filers are senior leaders known to everyone in the agency. One such filer departed in 2023, and this employee's departure was made known personally to the DAEO and ADAEO with more than 15 days notice. Formal notice from Human Resources would have been duplicative.
No terminations during this period
Ethics staff and OCHCO staff have identified challenges with timely notification of the termination of employee rotations and details into public financial disclosure filing positions. Ethics staff and OCHCO staff are working to update guidance and procedures to ensure timely notification of these rotations and details.
No public filers departed.
No terminations from public financial disclosure filing positions in 2023.
No terminations in 2023.
During CY 2023, there were no terminations from a public financial disclosure filing position. And, IPEC does not have a separate HR office.
The ADAEO tracked the termination disclosures of covered departing employees.
no terminations in 2023
There were no terminations.

Human Resources notifies the Ethics Law Division 15 days or earlier of a departing SES employee. For non-SES filers (ALJs and AAJs), the filer informs the Ethics Law Division that the filer is leaving the Agency. The Ethics Law Division also receives monthly lists of departing employees.
No terminations were made during the reporting period.
No positions meeting the C.F.R. Â§ 2638.105(a)(2)) requirement were terminated.
USAID's career CHCO remained vacant during this calendar year with significant turnover in HR leadership positions. This, in addition to an increased workload in USAID's Office of Human Capital and Talent Management with a reduced staff resulted in HCTM processes being disrupted and inconsistent. HCTM is currently working with the DAEO and the Bureau for Management to improve the identification and notification of all financial disclosure filers in a manner consistent with 5 CFR 2638.105.
GSA CABS does not know anything about who at our Agency is a non-filer, 450 filer, or a 278 filer. The DAEO would track this independently of the HRM office (GSA CABS).
Transition in HR personnel created confusion in providing written notification. The Office of General Counsel worked with Human Resources to correct this error.
There were no terminations from public filing positions in 2023.
The Ethics and Compliance team obtains a report from the Human Resources database on a weekly basis. The Postal Service broadly announces the appointment of new officers.
None of the Commission's OGE-278 Public Filers were required to file a termination report.

Question 32 - 33 Table 1

Financial Disclosure Management System (FDM)
Financial Disclosure Management (FDM)
Electronic 450 ("E450") system developed by internal IT staff
CIA's e-filing system.
The CSB uses FDonline for OGE 450 filing.
FDonline
Ethics Management and Tracking (EMAT) System.
FDonline

FDonline
FDonline
Financial Disclosure Management System.
Financial Disclosure Management (FDM) managed by Department of the Army.
The U.S. Army's Financial Disclosure Management (FDM) system.
DoD Financial Disclosure Management (FDM)
The DoD Financial Disclosure Management system.
Financial Disclosure Management (FDM) hosted by the U.S. Army (https://www.fdm.army.mil).
DLA uses Integrity for OGE 278 filings, but uses Financial Disclosure Management for OGE 450 filings.
Financial Disclosure Management (FDM) System
FDonline
FDonline
Army's Financial Disclosure Management System
FDM
Financial Disclosure Management System (FDM)
Financial Disclosure Management (FDM)
FDM
Public financial disclosure filers use Integrity Confidential financial disclosure filers use FDonline
FDonline.
1. HHS Electronic Financial Disclosure System (EFDS) 2. NIH: NIH Enterprise Ethics System (NEES) 3. CDC: Ethics Program Activity Tracking System (EPATS) and 4. CMS: CMS Administrative Technology Solutions (CATS)
U.S. Army FM, FDonline, CBP HRBE (in-house developed program)
FDonline

Internal USMS e-filing system for Confidential Financial Disclosure, SharePoint (ATF), and FDOonline (BOP and DEO)
Financial Disclosure Management System (FDM)
FDOonline for confidential financial disclosure reports (OGE Form 450)
FDonline
DO/HQ: OGE 450 e-filing in Sharepoint linked to ethics DB Other bureaus: Sharepoint site an internally developed Salesforce application named "Disclosure" that enables the uploading, review and storage of signed PDF versions of the OGE Form 450 Ethics Management System (EMS) Bureau-developed OGE Form 450 filing system.
Financial Disclosure Management System (FDM).
One public filer has been approved to file on paper instead of using INTEGRITY. That individual filed a paper annual/termination report in 2023. All other public filers used INTEGRITY.
FDonline
Confidential Financial Disclosure Reports, OGE Form 450, and Confidential Conflict of Interest Certifications, FCA Form 449, are electronically processed in a secure SharePoint system. SharePoint houses the form and is used to collect the information, record e-signatures, and electronically route the form from the filer to the ethics office. The Ethics Office collects FCA Form 449 from applicable filers every three years, with 2023 being a collection year.
FCSIC does not have any Confidential Financial Disclosure Filers, OGE Form 450. However, three FCSIC employees file the Confidential Conflict of Interest Certification, FCA Form 449, electronically in a SharePoint system. SharePoint houses the form and is used to collect the information, record e-signatures, and electronically route the form from the filer to the ethics office. The Ethics Office collects FCA Form 449 from applicable filers every three years, with 2023 being a collection year.
FDOonline
FDonline
FDonline Intelliworx Electronic filing system
FD Online
Filers either mail or email their Forms 450 to the Office of the DAEO, which saves those Forms on the agency's internal computer systems.
PowerApp platform.

The FTC uses FDonline to e-file most Confidential Financial Disclosure (OGE Form 450) Reports. Occasionally, OGE's PDF version of the OGE Form 450 report is used instead.
e-OGE Form 450 filing system.
FDonline
We use Integrity for all OGE-278e & OGE-278T reports. In the last quarter of calendar year 2023, we began using FD Online for OGE-450 reports.
Ethics Program Tracking System (EPTS)
FDonline (current), FDM (historical)
FDonline
FDM
FDonline
NSF eFile system
In addition to Integrity, NSA uses its internal Financial Disclosure Reporting System (FDRS).
FD Online
Ethics Gateway
450 Portal based on the OMB Portal.
Army's FDM
OMB Ethics Portal Confidential Financial Disclosure (OGE Form 450) application.
Ethics Portal - DocuTrack
Ethics Compliance Tracking System
FDM
FDonline (HRWorx)
Confidential Financial Disclosure System (CFDS)
FDonline
FDonline
ARMY Financial Disclosure Management System (FDM).
FDonline

Financial Disclosure Management System (FDM) www.fdm.army.mil
DocuSign (which automates the transmittal of the OGE-450 to filer, intermediate reviewer, certifying official, and secured electronic storage) but does not allow reports to be returned to earlier signers (filer or intermediate reviewer).
We use Integrity for the 278 and FD Online for the 450 filers.
Financial Disclosure System (FDS)
Sharepoint
FDOnline/Intelliworx

Question 34 Table 1

Management of systems is overseen by federal employees.
The Commission uses FDonline for our confidential and public filers. The amount paid to the vendor for both groups of filers is \$814.25
The Bureau's Ethics Office does not specifically track the labor costs associated with operating/utilizing either the Integrity or FDonline platforms. Use of those systems is a routine part of Bureau Ethics staffs' core duties.
We had a total of 4 ethics officials who utilized the FDonline system to review OGE 450 confidential disclosure forms. We do not track the associated FTE/overhead costs.
DeCA utilizes the Army Financial Disclosure Management System and OGE Integrity. To our knowledge, DeCA has not been charged for use of the systems.
DCAA receives support from OGE Integrity and Department of the Army Financial Disclosure Management. The agency is not billed and does not have information about the budget internal to the Departments managing the systems.
See "Additional Comments for Part 7" below.
Our personnel use Integrity for 278 filing and FDM for 450s. FDM is an Army program run on DISA systems for all of DoD, but we don't know the program costs.
We use Integrity and FDM which is run by the Army. They do not charge for our use.
DTRA uses Integrity for filing financial disclosure reports and OGE does not charge the Agency fees. We use DoD/Army's FDM system for confidential financial disclosure reports. DTRA does not pay a fee for using DoD's FDM system.

All USDA Office of Ethics employees are involved with the use of our e-filing systems to a certain extent but we do not track the percentage of time spent on such responsibilities.
Expenses for the Army's Financial Disclosure Management System are tracked and reported by the Army.
The U.S. Army, Office of General Counsel, is the executive agent for the FDM system. The U.S. OGE is the executive agent for Integrity. Both provide the service free of charge. Accordingly, there are no reportable costs associated with the use of either system.
The Army is the DoD Executive Agent for the FDM filing system and as such, all funding for DoD users comes from Army appropriations.
Our components who use legacy filing systems do not break out costs for various system components (i.e. public or confidential financial disclosure reports) nor by where the costs are going. Thus, all costs are reported as a lump sum paid to a non-federal vendor.
Q34c. The internal systems used for confidential financial disclosure are part of the general IT costs of those components and are not separately tracked.
For the OGE 450 electronic filing system, the Army created and maintains FDM. The Department does not provide information on the Army's operating costs from non-federal vendors--those costs are accounted for in the Department's payment to the Army.
DOT does not track internal costs associated with operating and using FDonline.
We only use Integrity for public filers, but program will not allow us to leave blank. We do not track these costs for confidential.
VA doesn't break out personnel costs in administering its financial disclosure program. VA uses the US Army's FDM system for confidential financial disclosure.
All of the technology components that the FCA uses for the SharePoint site that host the OGE 450 fillable form and the Confidential Conflict of Interest Certification Form, are also used to support other applications. The FCA does not separately track costs that are specifically attributable to the ethics forms.
All of the technology components that the FCA uses for the SharePoint site that hosts the Confidential Conflict of Interest Certification Form, are also used to support other applications. The FCA does not separately track costs that are specifically attributable to the ethics forms.
We do not track internal/overhead costs associated with operating an e-filing system.
This information may be proprietary. We don't know whether it may be publicly released, and we need to consult with the vendor prior to making a public disclosure.

FHFA didn't use any additional service/product for FD Online however, time/salary of FHFA reviewers (including training one new employee) was dedicated to the system.
The FTC does not track the internal FTE costs of operating the e-filing system for filing confidential financial disclosure reports.
We do not track this information.
We do not track internal costs associated with the operating of the e-filing systems.
NASA does not separate the operating costs between confidential (450) and public (278) reports. The amount entered for confidential reports is the amount for operating EPTS for both confidential and public filers.
The total internal costs associated with operating the NSF eFile system is \$39,328. It is not possible to break down the costs by report.
The funding for FDRS (NSA's internal financial disclosure reporting system) is not controlled or managed by the Office of the General Counsel. Of note, costs are not the impetus for NSA's use of this system. Rather, it is the protection of information regarding Agency personnel.
OMB does not track this information.
The information is classified.
The Confidential Financial Disclosure System (CFDS) is one application that is part of a larger web-based platform used by the agency. The costs associated with maintaining each application housed on the larger platform are not individually tracked.
The total cost for FDOonline for both public and confidential filers in 2023 was \$165,840. FDOonline does not break down costs between public and confidential filings. The Agency does not track internal costs for the financial disclosure system.
Please refer to ARMY's separate response.
The contract does not separate expenses for confidential and public filers. DFC paid a total of \$8,895 to one vendor for filing services

Part 7 Table 1

The system did not let me fill out #35, perhaps because I answered "No" to #30. In 2023 3 of our 4 public filers filed electronically through Integrity, while the other filed his combined report by email our confidential filers submit fillable .pdf reports to the DAEO by email.
--

<p>Questions 28 and 29. The ADAEO handles the processing of new employees and is aware of who is being hired and needs to complete confidential and public financial disclosures. The GSA Commissions and Boards Office (CABS) provides HR support and the ADAEO submits the new employee paperwork to CABS.</p>
<p>35b. Five (5) confidential disclosure filers had technical issues using FDM and ultimately used the PDF form</p>
<p>Q. 30 comment: We received 2 paper OGE forms from employees who did not have access to the internal E450 system.</p>
<p>Our General Counsel is the DAEO and has delegated authority for the program administration to the ADAEO, who is the Chief of OGC's Ethics Law Division. All responses in this questionnaire directed to the DAEO have been answered by the ADAEO Question 28a - The answer is "in most cases" for public filers because there is the rare occurrence where senior officers receive the appointment outside the typical promotion process, our office has worked with HR to secure more timely notification of these officers' appointments Question 28b - For confidential filers the DAEO is notified by offices other than HR. Question 29 - The ADAEO receives a report of anticipated separations every 2 weeks Question 35 - Numbers are classified.</p>
<p>Question 31b: As the Department of Defense (DoD) Executive Agent for the FDM filing system, the Department of the Army fully funds FDM for all DoD agencies from Army appropriations.</p>
<p>Question 30 - All but one 278 was filed in Integrity. One SES filed her termination report in .pdf because she had turned in her CAC card and could no longer access Integrity.</p>
<p>We are working with our human resources personnel to explore ways of improving our current supervisor centered notifications of new 450 filers into our workforce.</p>
<p>Question 30: All OGE 278 reports were filed electronically using Integrity. Three OGE 450 filers are Special Government Employees (SGE) and do not have access to file electronically. Those three are not included in the confidential filers number due to them not filing electronically in FY 2023.</p>
<p>35a. - All public financial disclosure filers are in Integrity.</p>

Q28a and 28b continued. If “never” or “in some cases,” please explain further: 7) CPO provides the ethics office with periodic lists of inbound and outbound personnel. The office requests these lists monthly. Depending on CPO's responsiveness, the ethics office sometimes does not receive notification until after the 15-day deadline. 8) Due to the size of the base population, filers are predominantly identified by the unit's POC, who also has the ability to add them to the OGE 450 Filer list. Q28a and 28b. If not applicable, specify why: 1) Several offices did not have any new public or confidential filers in CY 2023. 2) Other offices had new military public filers only, and CPO does not handle military personnel. 3) One organization has units throughout the world but does not have a consolidated CPO office to notify the ethics office of appointments. The filers usually notify the ethics office of their appointments. Q29 If not applicable, specify why: 1) Several ethics offices do not have any public filers. 2) Several ethics offices did not have any public filers who retired or separated in CY 2023. 3) One ethics office stated that their CPO plays no role. Information about retirement or separation comes from the individual filer, owning unit, or public announcement. 4) One organization has units throughout the world but does not have a consolidated CPO office to notify the ethics office of retirements or separations. The filers usually notify the ethics office of their retirements or separations as part of their outprocessing. Q30 and Q31: The Department of the Air Force used e-filing for almost all of the 278s and 450s. There are a couple of exceptions. In January 2024 the Air Force Ethics Office accepted a 278-T (disclosing December 2023 transactions) from a filer who filed the excel version of a 278-T. The filer was overseas on official business, was approaching the deadline for filing the report, and did not want to login to the Integrity system from his overseas location. The Air Force Ethics Office accepted the excel version and will maintain a paper version of the report in a file cabinet in a secure location. In addition, the SGEs who are members of a FACA and who are experts/consultants must file paper 450s because they do not have CAC cards and cannot access the FDM e-filing system. The Air Force Ethics Office also has occasionally provided the instruction page from the pdf version of the 278-T to public filers to help explain the filing requirement. Although the office provides its own explanation of the filing requirement in email reminders, the office has found that it is also helpful to provide the OGE instructions to the filers. Q35: Integrity.gov is the only e-filing system the Department of the Air Force uses for its public financial disclosure filers.

Q.28 - The coordination with the Army senior official HR offices is good the only shortfall is notification of personnel detailed into acting SES positions.

Q28-29 Most agencies/commands reported that they receive in all or most instances. For those few reporting never or NA, the ethics office tracked or utilized another system/office to track. Q31 DoD uses the 450 PDF for SGEs who do not have access to electronic filing system. The OGE 278e & 278-T Excel spreadsheets are used either as worksheets in certain circumstances, such as for individuals awaiting onboarding or system access. Excel upload spreadsheets for 278e Parts 2, 5, and 6 are used frequently, as is the 278-T upload

spreadsheet. A Part 7 upload spreadsheet capability would be extremely helpful to assist filers in uploading transactions that were not required to be reported in a 278-T.
Question 30 Special Government employees serving on DOE advisory committees filed an alternative OGE 450 in .pdf format in CY 2023.
Q35: Most OGE Form 450 filer numbers are reported for the filing year, not fiscal year, based on how the confidential financial disclosure filing system is set up.
Q34a.This figure is the cost to BOP and DEO of FDOonline for confidential financial disclosure.
For Q28 & 29: Most bureaus responded In All Cases. However, since one or two responded Most, and one smaller bureau responded Never, we selected Most for the response. Questions 30-35: The Salesforce Disclosure application discussed above does not enable confidential filers to enter information into the system electronically. Confidential filers must complete and sign PDF versions of their OGE Form 450s outside the Disclosure system. Confidential filers subsequently upload their completed PDF forms into the Disclosure system so that the forms can be tracked, reviewed and stored using the Disclosure system.
#28 and #29 -- EPA Ethics is notified, typically before the start date, of appointments to political, administratively determined, ALJ, career SES and SL/ST positions. We also receive a biweekly report of all executive staffing personnel actions that took occurred in the preceding 14 days. The only notifications for public filers that may lag behind the 15 day clock are details into and from career SES, SL/ST positions. When DEOs designate employees as confidential filers, they can use the dashboard to track the assignment of the reports and completion. We are continuing to work with the Office of Mission Support (which undertook a massive reorganization late last year) to find a way to flag in the BAP when a new employee is hired into a position that had been identified by the DEO as a confidential filer. To aid in that effort, last year, we created within the BAP a brand new profile tab for ethics that DEOs can use to readily see ethics-related information about their employees, including disclosure report filing status. Prior to this innovation, ethics officials had no automatic way to track this information other than their own manual lists.
#35: Sixty-seven employees filed the Confidential Financial Disclosure Report, OGE Form 450, electronically in 2023. An additional 157 employees filed the Confidential Conflict of Interest Certification, FCA Form 449, electronically in 2023. The FCA Form 449 is collected every three years with 2023 being a collection year.
#31 We had one filer that filed this year by PDF since they was on extended leave during the filing season and unable to use our electronic system.
The IAF uses an OGE approved alternative 450 pdf form for our confidential filers.

NASA requests that all financial disclosure reports be filed electronically. For occasional exceptions, such as if a report originally filed with another federal agency is accepted, an electronic record of the report is maintained in EPTS.
Note that NCUA operates on a calendar year fiscal year, so FY2023 numbers correspond to CY2023. NCUA paid the Department of the Army for use of FDM in the fall of 2022 for use of the system through September 2023 however, those funds were considered NCUA FY2022 funds and were reported on the prior year's annual ethics questionnaire. No additional funds were paid in 2023 because NCUA has transitioned away from the system for confidential financial disclosure filing. The amount reported for non-federal vendors includes one-time implementation fees.
34(a): This is the amount we pay FDonline for both public and confidential filers.
#35 - Data is not included/is classified and excludes SGEs.
Question 35: The numbers reported are percentages. Actual numbers are made available to cleared OGE personnel when required.
OA files by calendar year. Please refer to that question.
The vast majority of OMB employees file their financial disclosure forms either through Integrity or the OMB Ethics Portal Confidential Financial Disclosure (OGE Form 450) application. If financial disclosure filers submitted financial disclosure reports at another agency, they sometimes provide PDFs of those forms which are maintained by OMB.
We reported the number of filers for CY 2023, not FY 2023, as that is how we track the filing cycle.
Q30: Due to technical difficulties, one filer was unable to complete her 2022 annual report in Integrity and completed it in PDF.
34.b. This is the amount (rounded to the nearest dollar) that the agency obligated to spend on FDM in fiscal year 2023.
30/31. We had one 278 filer who filed a termination report via a 278 pdf. All other reports were filed electronically.
The fee to FDonline was paid in 2022 for two years so there was no actual costs paid to FDonline for CY23.
There is still resistance to using the FD Online system by some Commission Members, specifically those that are wealthier and have too many holdings to enter manually. For those Members we upload the paper 450 as an attachment.

Question 36 Table 1

<p>c. A termination report could not be completed in Integrity due to technical issues after the filer separated. A paper form was used.</p>
<p>The filer who has not yet submitted their 278 (a. New Entrant/Schedule C) has filled out most of the electronic form, but has not submitted it to the Commission's ethics office. Commission ethics officials sent follow-up emails on 9/13/2023, 9/14/2023,11/28/2023,12/20/2023,& 1/9/2024.</p>
<p>Six employees who were required to file their new entrant report during CY2022, did not do so until CY2023, due to a delay in notification from Human Resources staff. Also, one filer who was granted a 30-day extension to January 4, 2024, filed their report on December 19, 2023. Lastly, three filers whose termination reports were due in January of 2024, filed their reports in December of 2023.</p>
<p>Based on review of the system information, there appear to be former employees whom HR did not timely identify, and this office is trying to track down for termination reports, filers who left and were not removed from the system, or reports assigned to individuals who had transferred to other agencies.</p>
<p>1) One filer was not told that he had to file his new entrant 278 in an e-filing system. Instead, he filled out a paper 278 that he submitted his CPO. That paper 278 was never reviewed by an ethics official. Once the filer's ethics office learned about him, the office assigned a new entrant 278 in the e-filing system, and the filer is working on the report. 2) Two termination filers were not told of requirement to file termination 278. Ethics offices are working with the filers to collect reports.</p>
<p>One Army general officer did not file an annual report under a combat zone extension. Army general officers detailed or assigned to non-Army DoD agencies file their reports under the Department of Army in Integrity. These officers are placed in Integrity org groups for which Army ethics counselors do not serve as ethics officials or certifiers. These individuals are not included in the Army agency OGE 278e numbers in Q 36 but are as follows: Not listed= 2 career new entrant reports required and filed 7 other new entrant reports required and 6 filed (combat zone exemption) 3 career annual reports required and filed and 100 other annual reports of which 96 are filed 3 other combination reports required and filed and 1 career termination report required and filed and 7 other termination reports required and filed.</p>
<p>Two new entrant reports are still within the filing deadline, the remaining reports involve service members and we are working with them to complete.</p>
<p>One filer unable to complete due to caring for critically ill family member. Ethics officials continuing to monitor and follow up.</p>

DOE continues to follow up on report not yet received in accordance with public financial disclosure report procedures.
Missing annual report due to administrative oversight with employee transferring from another 278 filing position. Missing new entrant report due to employee's failure to file. The employee has since filed the report and will be assessed a late filing fee.
Three individuals who were on detail in a covered position failed to timely file their reports. These individuals received numerous reminders to file from the Integrity system. All three were charged a late filing fee. Two have since filed their report and a third is attempting to file but having technical issues.
Administrative error, filer compliance. DEO is investigating missing reports.
One public filer neglected to file despite repeated reminder attempts.
We are addressing the two annual delinquent filers with disciplinary action, and we anticipate these reports will be filed shortly. One of the termination reports was filed in January 2024. We have notified the two remaining termination delinquent filers by email and letter as appropriate. The Department of State's Ethics Office continues to follow up about these reports and will refer as necessary.
One termination report was not filed in 2023 because an employee was in extended leave status during the calendar year and one new entrant report was not filed due to an inadvertent oversight in tracking a new entrant assuming a public filing position. Both reports are currently assigned and ethics officials are actively working with the filers to submit the required reports.
VA has a large number of confidential filers spread throughout the agency, working in various divisions and branches. Senior leadership in VHA, VHA, and NCA coordinated directly with supervisors as to delinquent filers.
One Schedule C filer did not submit the New Entrant report that was due in December 2023. The filer has been reminded of the need to file and pay the late filing fee.
A Schedule C employee was hired on October 8, 2023. However, Human Resources did not notify the employee of the need to file a new entrant 278e until January 12, 2024. The employee submitted their new entrant 278e on January 19, 2024.

One new entrant and one annual public financial disclosure report, OGE 278e, was not timely filed in 2023 because of a processing error. The FCA Human Resources Office (HR) completes personnel action reports (PAR) when employees are promoted. The resulting PAR report is automatically emailed to the ethics office. However, for two employees, HR inadvertently failed to initiate a PAR, which resulted in an oversight to notify the ethics office of the employees promotion into OGE 278e filing positions. The error was identified when the ethics office reviewed the employee's Confidential Financial Disclosure Report, OGE 450, filed in January 2024, which disclosed the new pay grade. This prompted the ethics office to have HR run a report to identify whether any other employees were missed, and one additional employee was identified. Both employees will be filing a new entrant report followed by applicable annual reports to correct the error.

Employee terminated his employment and could not be reached until recently

One employee left the agency in November and still hasn't filed his termination report. We are still trying to track it down. *I'm not sure what the one outstanding New Entrant report represents. The numbers above are pulled from Integrity's Annual Data Extract, however when I run a report for New Entrant reports due to the agency for 2023, nothing comes up.

Reasons for discrepancies vary, including misunderstanding of filing requirements when employees were converted from GS to agency specific appointment authority, and personal matters. Some reports due in 2023 were filed in January 2024 following outreach by ethics officials.

The numbers reported above are percentages. Actual numbers are made available to cleared OGE personnel when required. For the filers who have not submitted their reports, the ethics office is reviewing the individual circumstances and reaching out to filers and their supervisors to ensure the reports are submitted where required.

There were 11 OGE 278 filers

For one career SES form, the ethics team did not receive timely notification of the termination therefore the form was not assigned until January 2024 shortly after OGC ethics learned of the filer's change in position.

The New Entrant report has since be filed.

One Termination report was due at the end of 2023 but because of the holidays was submitted the first business day of 2024.

36.a. We assigned our Director (a PAS) a New Entrant 278e after she became the Director in late December of 2022, and she filed her New Entrant 278e in 2023. 36.b. The Career SES filer (also referred to in our comment to question 21.b. above) that shows up in this report as having not filed their Annual 278e filed a PDF version, which has been attached to their assigned report in Integrity. We are unable to close out the report and will work with Integrity to resolve this. 36.c. One of our Other filers departed the agency at the end of 2023 and filed her Termination 278e timely in January 2024. Therefore, the numbers generated by Integrity for these boxes are incorrect. "3" Other filers were required to file a Termination 278e in 2023, and "3" did so.

One filer left the agency before determining if she was transferring to a covered position. After discussion with the filer's new agency, ethics officials are in the process of collecting the filer's termination report.

One annual filer has been on medical leave since May 2023. The two termination filers completed their report in January 2024.

There was a termination late in the calendar year and another employee was totally unable to access integrity despite numerous attempts.

One filer submitted their report in January 2024 and the report was reviewed and certified within 60 days of submission. One filer has not yet been able to submit their report due to personal circumstances.

Question 37 Table 1

IT issues were a problem. The Integrity system was not notifying reviewing officials that a report required review. In other cases, reviewers required more information from the filer.

The delay in reviewing of some reports was due to the large number of filers at the agency, along with the complexity of some reports. CFTC Ethics staff conducted an after action meeting where discussions were held on ways to improve our review and certification times.

1 REPORT WAS REVIEWED AFTER 60 DAYS ON ACCOUNT OF ETHICS COUNSEL NOT HAVING SUFFICIENT TIME DUE TO PERSONAL LEAVE TO COMPLETE REVIEW WITHIN THE 60 DAY PERIOD.

One PAS report was reviewed after the 60-day mark due to confusion regarding filer roles in Integrity. For the annual reports, the delay occurred because we either needed more information from the filer or an amendment to the report before we could review or certify. Obtaining a final response from the filer required additional time. Two reports requiring amendments from the filers remain. Our office continues to contact the filers and remind them of this requirement. Regarding the termination report, certification of this report was delayed because the filer failed to complete their report prior to separating from government service and was unresponsive after departing the agency.

In one report a new filer required extensive revisions within his report. While there was an initial review well before the 60 days, it was not documented within Integrity. There were email and telephone communications and counseling between the filer and the ethics counselor during the initial 60 day period. However, it was not certified until after the 60 days to ensure accuracy.

More information was being sought and incomplete lines on the report.

As noted below, USDA's Office of Ethics is, proportionally, one of least resourced and smallest Ethics Office of any Cabinet-level Department. At current staffing levels, each OGE 278 financial disclosure reviewer in the Office of Ethics is responsible for reviewing an average of nearly 100 OGE-278e reports each year (not counting an even larger number of separate OGE-450 reviews), in addition to providing ethics advice and training to their clients (OE advisors perform all three functions.) This large report volume combined with a large client population (4,761 employees per one ethics advisor) and a significantly under-resourced Ethics Program makes 100% timely review of reports very challenging. With a ratio of only 1 Ethics Officer for every 4,761 USDA employees, USDA's Office of Ethics has suffered from years of under-investment and is one of the least resourced Ethics Offices of any Executive Branch Department.

1) Supervisor absences/unawareness of need to review and sign report in Integrity.gov within 60 days delayed initial review by the Ethics Official. Three subordinate ethics offices had personnel shortages and failed to notify the Certifying Official that their ethics officials were not available to conduct the initial review. Those shortcomings are being addressed in 2024. Significant health issues by two ethics officials and the sudden death of the spouse of one senior ethics official (resulting in a prolonged absence) caused a delay in review at three offices. Because all offices were already undermanned, the lack of timely review was not recognized by leadership in a timely manner. Major command ethics office is implementing safeguards in 2024 with additional reviewers to address these shortfalls. Continued in Additional Comments.

Army GOs detailed/assigned to non-Army DoD agencies submit under the Army in Integrity. They are not included in Q 36 but listed as follows: 2 career NE reports IRed and certified within 60 days, 6 other NE reports IRed and certified within 60 days 2 career annual reports

IRed and certified within 60 days, 1 of which was IRed within 60 days but certified outside of the 60-day window 96 other annual reports, 48 certified within 60 day 1 career termination report IRed and certified within 60 days 8 other termination reports, 7 IRed and certified within 60 days and one IRed but not certified within 60 days 3 combination reports filed, one IRed and certified within 60 days, 2 IRed within 60 days.

Question 36: The DoD requires that supervisors review reports in addition to the command ethics counselor and DAEO or designee. In some cases, the multiple levels of review delays the ethics counselor's initial review. Furthermore, it is likely that some ethics counselors completed their initial review within the 60-day review period but did not document their review on the general information page. While the Office of the Assistant General Counsel (Ethics) has issued program guidance on when and how to end initial review, the fact that a command's ethics counselor may change from year to year, impacts the corporate knowledge on proper use of the filing system.

Primary reasons cited were delays in supervisor reviews, staffing shortages/turnover, and system/technical issues.

Reports initially reviewed more than 60 days after submission because ethics staff were working on other priority items, including the review and certification of other financial disclosure reports.

In many cases, reviewers were seeking additional information and working with filers to remedy potential conflicts. Some components experienced ethics staff turnover that caused delays as new employees learned how to review reports.

Reports were pending filer confirmation to requested information.

In components with large numbers of reports, heavy workload of reviewers and certifying officials caused delays. In numerous components, a shortage of reviewing officials and reviewer/certifier turnover caused delays. EOIR: significant increase in the number of filing positions, with no increase in the number of reviewers caused delay. EOUSA: significantly large number of reports with consistent increase in their number and their general complexity caused delays, as well as staffing turnover. USMS: exceptionally heavy workload of reviewers.

Due to turnover, our ethics program went without a program manager who is the primary initial reviewer starting in December 2022. However, we filled that vacancy in April 2023.

Many of the reports required additional information and several required multiple exchanges with the filers.

<p>Ethics officials experienced technical issues accessing the submitted report in the Integrity system, which led to a single report being reviewed more than 60 days after it was submitted.</p>
<p>Additional information was being sought from the filer. In some cases, there were technical issues with reviewers accessing the e-filing system.</p>
<p>Most reports had their initial reviews completed within 60 days. However, competing workload priorities and staffing, especially for employees who do not perform ethics duties full-time, caused delay at some bureaus. In other cases, contacting filers for additional information and awaiting responses and not adequately documenting contacts with filers in Integrity regarding initial reviews and follow-up.</p>
<p>Each PFD reviewer is tasked with over 60 reports and is also tasked with over 800 CFDs. This caseload, coupled with their other ethics responsibilities, contributed to the delay in certification.</p>
<p>Only one report was reviewed after the 60 day mark, though please note that it was reviewed and certified on day 61.</p>
<p>Reports not certified within 60 days were certified on days 61, 62, 62, and 63, respectively. Two reports were filed by field office directors and one was filed by a field office regional attorney. In all three instances, additional time was required to gather and review information in order to access whether the filer had been involved in a matter in which they had a financial interest. The fourth report, filed by a HQ employee, included assets requiring additional time to research.</p>
<p>Both reports had filers on extended absences (PAS - travel schedule & other - personal leave) who needed additional information from accounts/tax preparers. Agency made conservative judgment call on when agency had sufficient info to justify initial review completed.</p>
<p>Usually delays are caused by the need for additional information from filers. Additionally, our agency has a disproportionately high number of public financial disclosure filers for an agency of our size. We hired an employee in June 2023 to assist with this process and are making a concerted effort to meet the 60 day deadline consistently.</p>
<p>additional information was being sought</p>
<p>additional information was being sought</p>
<p>We were delayed in submitting the 278-T form, the late filing fee was paid.</p>
<p>Staff shortages due to pending vacancies during the review period impacted several locations. Pending litigation was also a factor. Requests for additional information were not always documented.</p>

Reviewer sought additional information in order to complete initial review.
In each case, additional information was being sought.
The numbers reported above are percentages. Actual numbers are made available to cleared OGE personnel when required. The certification of Public Financial Disclosure Reports (OGE 278) within 60 days was identified as a recommendation in OGE's 2023 inspection report for NSA's ethics program. Notably, the number of annual reports certified within 60 days improved from NSA's reported data in 2022, which is the result of an increase in resources supporting the review of annual reports. The Office of the General Counsel has allocated additional resources for OGE 278 review for the 2024 filing year, and the ethics office continues to explore additional ways to improve these figures.
Reports were certified after 60 days due to needing more information from filers. Staffing issues.
Due to workload some forms were not completed within the 60 day timeframe.
The one report reviewed beyond the 60-day limit underwent review by another agency before the employee began working at ONDCP.
Several new Organizational Ethics Officials needed to be trained mid-cycle.
Some reports required follow-up and the employees were facing medical issues which caused delays.
Due to a transition in the review process, a small number of reports were not identified for review until more than 60 days after submission.
We have a human capital deficit. Until we brought on an ethics detailee to assist us in the fall of 2023, only one attorney was reviewing public financial disclosure reports, and this attorney has significant additional duties outside of their ethics responsibilities. We are working to better prioritize a timely review of these reports going forward, and the ethics detailee is assisting us at the beginning of the 2024 filing season.
Short staffed - Ethics specialist was on sick leave and DAEO was on jury duty -
Inadvertent delay in assigning forms to attorneys and/or workload conflicts for assigned attorneys.
Two termination reports were initially reviewed after 60 days by accident. All annual reports were reviewed timely. There is a discrepancy in NE reports because one was assigned in 2023, but not due until 2024. Therefore, it can't be considered 'closed' until 2024.
Additional information was being sought.

In general, several required additional information, remedial actions were sought, and some were reviewed prior to the 60 days but the certification didn't take in the Integrity system until day 61 or 62. All 8 of the reports certified over 60 days were certified under 70 days. All but one of those 8 were certified under 65 days. The oldest one was certified at 67 days and required an ethics agreement. In appropriate cases, recusals and ethics agreements were implemented.

Staff shortage, new staff learning the 278 procedures, and additional information being sought. To help remedy filers submitting incomplete/incorrectly filled forms, USAID plans to hold training sessions for OGE-278 filers early in the year in hopes to pre-empt mistakes before submission.

Internal office turnover within the ethics office and high volume of filings and continued increase in ethics inquiries placed demands on limited office resources.

Part 8 Table 1

Q #41: The agency received on FOIA request for public financial disclosure reports. The requester was referred to OGE's database of public filers.

37. A new DAEO was hired in July 2023 and departed in October 2023 so that person filed a new entrant report and a termination report. 41. One person did file a FOIA request for our agency's public financial disclosures for CY2022. We notified that person that they would need to submit an OGE Form 201 but they never submitted one.

#42 This is a rough estimate. Agency does not track specific number of forms released in a given calendar year.

Questions 36, 37-Numbers are classified unless included

Question #35: Due to exigent circumstances, one termination filing was submitted in paper format, instead of through the Integrity system. Question #38: Late filing waivers granted were a result of delay in filing notification by Human Resources staff. CFTC Ethics continues to work with Human Resources staff to resolve notification issues.

Question 36 - Please note that one Noncareer SES left the agency effective 12/30/2023. He did not file a termination report because he assumed a 278-filing position at another agency, with no break in service. Also, for Question 36 - one Schedule C filer was converted to a Noncareer SES on 2/12/23. However, we did not amend the filer's status in Integrity. Therefore, the filer is reported on the 2023 Annual Data Extract as a Schedule C. We've now made the amendment, so the filer will appear as a Noncareer SES for next year's 2024 Questionnaire. The same rationale applies for the Noncareer and Schedule C numbers shown in Question 37b. Question 39b - One filer was assessed 3 late filing fees for three Periodic Transaction Reports submitted on June 28, 2023, reporting transactions that occurred between March 2022 and May 2023. Another filer was assessed 1 late fee for a Periodic Transaction Report filed on May 25, 2023, reporting one transaction that occurred on August 26, 2022.

Question 41 - Received one FOIA request for 278s. Responded with guidance on how to use the OGE Form 201 and never heard back.

We did receive requests under the FOIA from a news organization, but the FOIA response was not finalized in 2023.

Q37 Continued: 2) One ethics office had only one report that was not initially reviewed within 60 days, but ethics office had simply miscalculated the days. The report was certified on the 61st day. 3) Deadline missed due to misunderstanding about how to use Integrity e-filing system. 4) Integrity system failed to send timely email notices to reviewer. 5) Reviewer tardiness due to other mission requirements. 6) One major command legal office had a complete turnover of staff responsible for the Ethics portfolio, which caused a delay in initial reviews. Q39: In CY 2023 the Air Force received requests for the waiver of the late filing fee for both 278e and 278-T reports. We have not completed processing them due to workload requirements but will continue processing them in 2024. Q39b: 2 of the late filing fees were assessed for the late reporting of transactions on the annual 278e. The third fee was assessed for the late filing of an OGE Form 278-T. Q37: The Air Force certified more 278s in 2023 than in 2022 because the ethics offices closed out reports that were due and filed in 2021 and 2022 but that had not been certified in those years.

Q40 - One individual was referred to DoJ for willful failure to include required information on their OGE 278 reports.

#42 - We had Fewer 201 submitted but more reports were requested on each form.

For DO/HQ, for Q39, the late fee waivers granted are incorrect in Integrity because some reviewers categorized the late fee under the OGE 278e rather than as a 278-T waiver. Moreover, Integrity does not capture multiple 278-T waivers granted to a filer for more than one required 278-T report. One other bureau also notes that all late fee waivers for 278e reports were for transactions listed on the 278e reports that were not timely reported on a

278-T, not because the 278e itself was filed late. Q42: For DO/HQ, approximately 75 OGE 278es and 278-Ts released in 2023. We do not track.
36(a) and 37(a): One new entrant was improperly coded into the Career-SES filer category when filing their report. This employee should have been in the Other filer category and was changed following report submission.
The number of requests for public financial disclosure reports and documents released, provided in response to questions 41 and 42, relate to candidate reports filed with the FEC pursuant to its role under the Ethics in Government Act as the point of entry for personal financial disclosures made by candidates for President and Vice-President.
FLRA received a request under FOIA for public financial disclosure reports, which was denied. Requester has not submitted an OGE Form 201.
We received a FOIA request for our 278 filer. At the advice of OIP, I referred the requester to the OGE website for information on how to properly request the form. I have not yet heard back.
41. The request was a FOIA request submitted through FOIA.gov, not a OGE Form 201.
Question 41. I did receive a FOIA request for all public disclosure forms filed with the agency. In response, I sent him the public disclosure forms filed by the Executive Director (SES) and the DAEO.
36 and #37 Data is not included/is classified
Q41 and Q42. Numbers reported are for those requests relating only to OGE employees. In CY2023, OGE also received a total of 4,371 requests for public reports and released 10,340 documents under EIGA relating to all executive branch employees.
#42 - Don't Track
OSTP OGC referred the requester to the OGE website.
37.a. We assigned our Director (a PAS) a New Entrant 278e after she became the Director in late December of 2022, and she filed her New Entrant 278e. Because this is greyed out in the chart above, we cannot input this data point. 41. We received one FOIA request for public financial disclosure reports. 42. No documents have been released to date, and the request is still pending.
We received a FOIA request for all OGE form 278s we responded to requestor directing to OGE form 201, and have not yet received any response.
received one request for a public financial disclosure however the person for whom the financial disclosure was requested for is actually a confidential filer (SGE under 60 days)

One Form 201 request was filed for records concerning an individual who was not a public filer, no records were responsive. The second request was filed under FOIA and did not meet the regulatory requirements of 5 C.F.R. Â§ 2634.603(f), requester was notified that he could re-file the request using Form 201, but we did not receive a compliant request.

One of the two requests for financial disclosure reports was still being processed as of 12/31/23.

Q41. and 42.: These numbers are approximations as there are some requests and responses that were not tracked. In addition to WHO, these figures also reflect some requests for public financial disclosures reports of employees in the Office of the Vice President, the Council of Economic Advisors, and the National Security Council.

Question 43 Table 1

HR did not inform me that that two employees started in August 2024. After confirmation with HR, I sent the two employees, the OGE 450 form to complete in November 2023. One of them submitted it in November 2023 and the other in January 2024.

CIA requires officers to file the Form 450, if they participate in contracting/procurements activities, or have Agency certifications to do so. Some officers were on extended leave or had limited access to the system.

Three OGE Form 450 filers were on long term health-related leave status during 2023.

There were instances of positions being described in the system as requiring filing OGE 450s but the individual in the position no longer performed duties requiring filing and the supervisor failed to notify the organizational 450 liaison to remove the requirement. In other instances individuals left the organization after the due date but had not filed their annual report.

There are currently 2 2023 OGE 450 New Entrant Reports pending completion.

These numbers reflect a successful filing rate of 99.7%. However, some employees failed to file due to transfers to other agencies, leaving government, or long term leave. A small number of employees simply failed to submit their reports despite being on duty and receiving more than 20 past due filing notices from the USDA Office of Ethics.

The following are the responses provided by several ethics offices. 1) Discrepancy in number is due to new entrant and annual filers moving to new bases and from departure from Government service and the corresponding changes not being made in FDM. 2) Filer either left prior to reporting period and not removed from FDM, or filer did not file and both filer and supervisor were unresponsive. 3) The FDM metrics fail to account for reassignments, which are not identified to Ethics Advisors. In some cases, a filer is not responsive to requests for additional information from a supervisor or a certifier. 4) Several new filers were added near the end of CY 2023, but their 450s were due before 31 Dec. Some have not completed their reports. Ethics office is working with the filers to get these completed. 5) Filers failed to e-sign draft reports. Reminders to filers were sent via the FDM portal. 6) Some filers were assigned to the system late due to a failure to notify the legal office of new entrants. 7) Discrepancy involving 2 filers was not apparent in the FDM management reports. Both individuals have non-standard email addresses (i.e. not af.mil emails), and it is possible FDM did not send notices to the appropriate email addresses. One of the two is an employee of another agency and may have filed with that agency. The ethics office has reached out to both individuals with discrepancies to investigate and will ensure their filing in 2024. 8) Filer had medical and technical issues and is now working on the report.

Filing affected by HR office challenges with accurately or timely notifying the servicing ethics office of incoming financial disclosure report filers, combat zone extensions, inaccuracies in FDM filer list maintenance (such as employees assigned reports but departing the agency prior to filing and not being removed from the system).

Due to late assignments or follow-ups for information to identify filers, some reports were not filed properly.

One agency nearly tripled in size during CY2023, gaining nearly 80,000 personnel from other DoD components, and were not able to confirm 2023 ethics compliance data for all transitioning personnel.

1 on military leave and 1 on extended sick leave.

Four on military leave, one on extended leave of absence, and follow up is being conducted on one.

Administrative oversights and entry errors in electronic filing systems. Filers have been notified to file, 28 employees have since filed, and one has left the Department.

2 FACA members did not submit an OGE 450.

The Ethics Office is in the process of working with their Administrative Officer to determine whether these 5 employees are in actual filing positions.

Administrative delays and communication errors in identifying new entrant filers. Some filers left before filing their report, and/or are on extended leave including parental, military, and sick leave. USMS: Due to significant technological system problems, an interim filing system was used in 2023. USMS is also re-analyzing who should be filing the OGE Form 450, which may have resulted in reports assigned but not collected. A new internal USMS e-filing system is coming online in 2024 which will enhance tracking and document compliance in the component. DEO: An e-filing system (FDOnline) was purchased for confidential financial disclosure in 2023 and went live for use in May. Its procurement and implementation has resulted in re-analysis of filer data sets in numerous offices. In December 2023, a Program Manager was hired for confidential financial disclosure to provide oversight of OGE Form 450 collection, which will greatly enhance tracking and compliance. EOUSA: line Assistant United States Attorneys (AUSAs) are required to file the OGE-approved alternative GCO-1 form for each matter/case assigned. Actual number of forms is not tracked as they are retained in each case file. The reported data reflects the number of AUSAs who complied with the confidential financial disclosure reporting requirements.

Discrepancies due to employees departing the agency, passing away, and administrative errors.

All of the unfiled reports were assigned near the end of the year. All but one of these reports were filed in January 2024. The Department of State's Ethics Office will continue to follow up on the remaining report (due 12/31/2023) to address the filer's technical difficulties in logging in to FDM.

The discrepancy between the number of employees who were required to file confidential financial disclosure reports and the number of employees who actually filed are attributable to a single filer who was absent due to extended leave.

Some filers are on extended leave.

Filers on extended or other leave. At one bureau, after a change of responsibilities in HR, ethics counsel was not notified of promotions to positions requiring 450s. Seventeen were missed and have since been notified of the need to file.

98.1% of VA's confidential filers completed their reports. The outstanding reports are the result of employees on extended leave (sick, military, maternity, and paternity) and other filers who are simply noncompliant. EST, in collaboration with the leadership of its sub-organizations, has formulated new processes for addressing noncompliant filers. EST has also met with the leadership of VA's sub-organizations and have educated them on their responsibilities for their employees' timely filing of financial disclosures and the filing penalties available to them under 5 C.F.R. Â§2634.701.

<p>The four employees who did not file 450s as of December 31, 2023, were required to file new entrant reports. These reports were due before December 31, 2023. The reports are still outstanding. We have notified the employees on several occasions, and continue to notify them, that the reports are overdue. One employee has experienced continuing health issues which has caused a delay in filing.</p>
<p>2 employees were on medical leave. 1 employee was on military leave. 1 employee was removed the Agency prior to filing.</p>
<p>Inadvertent error in follow-up procedure, now corrected and report filed.</p>
<p>Employees left the Commission, or maternity leave, military leave, sick leave, or deceased.</p>
<p>1 mil. 4 on extended leave.</p>
<p>1 New Entrant Report granted filing extension beyond December 2023. The New Entrant report is pending completion and therefore not included in the number of reports actually filed.</p>
<p>Some employees were on extended medical leave due to illness, or an extended leave without pay status. One location observed that some employees were not added as filers due to a rollover error.</p>
<p>The numbers reported above are percentages. Actual numbers are made available to cleared OGE personnel when required. For the small number of filers who have not submitted the ethics office is reviewing the individual circumstances and reaching out to filers and their supervisors to ensure the reports are submitted where required.</p>
<p>there are no discrepancies</p>
<p>Several employees joined OMB in 2022 and submitted their report in 2023. One employee was on extended medical leave from before the date on which 450 reports were due through the remainder of the year. Another employee was on extended military leave. This employee didn't file a financial disclosure report while on leave and left OMB without returning to OMB work or filing a financial disclosure report.</p>
<p>OSTP OGC sent reminder emails and requested that the delinquent filers submit their OGE Form 450. As of January 2024, OSTP OGC has received the late Form 450s.</p>
<p>Two 450 filers had salaries above the filing threshold but were belatedly identified. One left OVP prior to the discovery of this omission. The other has since submitted a 450. New procedures have been developed to ensure 450 filers are timely identified going forward.</p>
<p>One employee was promoted into a covered filing position earlier in 2023 and the 450 program managers only became aware of that in early 2024. With regard to the other two</p>

employees, the Office of the Ethics Counsel was provided with inaccurate information about their grades, resulting in delayed identification of those required filers.
Reports were due in December but are not yet received. Filers have been reminded of their obligation to file.
FTEs obligated to file missed the February 15th deadline to file or otherwise did not file. Currently USAGM has no policy in place to enforce filing.
Of the 16 reports that were not filed by December 31, 2023, 15 reports were received in early January 2024 and all were reviewed and certified within 60 days of filing. One report was not received from a filer who departed after the due date and prior to filing the report.

Question 44 Table 1

The first two weeks of February 2023 filers who had not yet filed their 450 were unable to do so because of new computer security improvements that did not recognize FOnline and rejected FOnline's emails to CSB users. In an abundance of caution, those filers were given a 60-day extension on 2/15/2023. Fortunately, the security glitch was fixed on that date and some filers were able to file their reports on time. Because of work priorities, however, the reviewer reviewed most of the reports one day after the 60-day extension expired.
We had a large influx of new employees to the agency in the calendar year, many of which were appointed to positions requiring the filing of a financial disclosure report. This resulted in agency ethics officials not being able to review and/or certify reports within 60 days.
Three confidential reports submitted in 2023 were initially reviewed by a previous ethics counsel but records associated with the review and the reports themselves became unavailable to CEA. Each of the three reports has been re-reviewed and certified in 2024 and the filers have been advised of their ethical obligations.
Due to staffing changes in the ethics office, a tracking oversight occurred.
Three reports took a few days longer than 60 days to certify. Two reports required to be filed in 2023 were filed late and certified within 60 days in January 2024.
Supervisor did not review timely.
DCAA reorganizes Supervisors, and DOD Supplement 5 CFR 3601 requires all Financial Disclosure Reports to be reviewed by Supervisors before being reviewed by Ethics Attorney. Therefore, delayed Supervisor review may cause delay to the 60 day Ethics Attorney review. In several cases, the data on the OGE 450 was also used to decide Threats to Independence under Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS). OGE 450 is used at DCAA as a tool for Threats to Independence as well as Conflicts of Interest. Therefore,

supervisors were coincidentally addressing potential Threats to Independence during their reviews.

We initially failed to allocate sufficient personnel resources to review and certify the reports. As we reviewed the status of our program during the year this became clear to us and we provided training to additional personnel to assist us in clearing the backlog. Providing additional training to our less experienced personnel and utilizing them to clear simpler 450s and then as they gained more experience increasing their responsibilities allowed us to bring our program back into balance.

Some reports were reviewed more than 60 days after submission because the filer did not provide additional information or amendments requested, or because the filer's supervisor did not complete their review and e-sign the reports within the 60-day period.

There is a system error in FDM which makes some reports unable to be seen in the initial review screen. Because of this error our ethics counselors are not easily able to see some reports that need review. Also, some were seeking additional information.

One OGE 450 report was certified at 64 days because the filer was not initially aware that he was required to submit a disqualification statement when he submitted his report. As soon as the recusal was received, the supervisor signed the report and the Ethics Counselor certified the report.

At current staffing levels, each financial disclosure reviewer in the Office of Ethics is responsible for reviewing an average of nearly nine hundred (900) OGE-450 reports each year, in addition to providing ethics advice and training to their clients (OE advisors perform all three functions.) This very large report volume combined with a very large client population (4,761 employees per advisor) makes 100% timely review of reports very challenging. With a ratio of only 1 Ethics Officer for every 4,761 USDA employees, USDA's Office of Ethics is one of the least resourced Ethics Offices of any Executive Branch Department. Despite those challenges 85% of 450 reports submitted in 2023 were reviewed within 60 days.

Discrepancies result from new staff and organizational oversight changes, e.g., new reviewers did not record initial reviews within the e-filing platform, reports are within 60-days of submission as of Dec. 31, and implementation of new oversight procedures to improve quality of reviews and related guidance.

The following are the responses provided by several ethics offices. 1) Several ethics offices reported that the reports were not initially reviewed within 60 days because the 450s were pending supervisor review in FDM. Despite repeated calls and emails to supervisors, those supervisors did not review and sign in a timely manner. 2) One deployed organization had a personnel gap due to redeployment of the assigned Ethics Official, causing 7 of its 450s to be initially reviewed outside the 60-day period. 3) Several ethics offices experienced ethics counselor turnover, resulting in a delay of certification of the 450 reports. Senior ethics counselor at major command is working to reduce delay in review and certification through improving coordination with subordinate offices and working with supervisors of filers to get reports signed, amended as necessary, and reviewed on time. 4) Local ethics counselor had a large increase in filers due to expanded support of its geographically separated unit in Texas. Due to the increased workload and frequent reorganization of units which resulted in supervisor changes, some reports were reviewed and certified outside the required window. 5) A two-person legal office lost the senior attorney 4 months early without a replacement. This contributed to the delay in reviewing and certifying 2 of reports. Both reports were reviewed and certified 62 days after final employee signature. 6) Other mission requirements took precedence over review of 450 reports. 7) Most reviewers and certifiers are part-time employees (Air Force Reserve) and were not able to meet the review requirement deadline between tours. 8) Filers and supervisors experienced technical issues accessing FDM. 9) Supervisors retired or transferred. Ethics office is not notified by CPO of these changes. As a result, FDM was not updated with a new supervisor. 10) There were exigent operational demands (e.g., natural disaster in Turkey), manpower constraints, and delayed review by supervisors. Enhanced tracking in FDM in the future and additional trained Judge Advocate reviewers will mitigate these delays in the future.

DoD's requirement of supervisory review, mandated by the Joint Ethics Regulations, necessarily adds to total review time. Also, requests for additional information or clarification, extremely large volume of reports, difficulty of keeping track of individual New Entrant report filers after the annual report season, late supervisory reviews, inconsistent oversight, ethics personnel shortfalls, and combat zone extensions contribute to slow processing.

Question 44: The Department of Defense requires that supervisors review reports in addition to the OGE450 certifier. In some cases, the dual level of review delays the OGE 450 certifier's initial review. Furthermore, it is likely that some of the OGE 450 certifiers completed their initial review within the 60-daytime period, but forgot to end initial review in FDM. While the Office of the Assistant General Counsel has issued program guidance on when and how to end initial review, the fact that a command's OGE 450 certifier may change from year to year, impacts the corporate knowledge on proper use of Financial Disclosure filing systems.

Primary reasons cited were delays in supervisor reviews, staffing shortages/turnover, and system/technical issues.

Additional information was being sought.
Reports reviewed more than 60 days after submission due to competing priorities of reviewers.
In many cases, reviewers were seeking additional information and working with filers to remedy potential conflicts. Two employees in one component are stationed abroad and there were mailing delays with their paper reports. One reviewer misunderstood the 60-day timeline to begin on February 15, rather than the date of filing. The reviewer in one component was on extended medical leave. Some components experienced increased numbers of filers or staffing shortages that caused delays.
Due to significant staff turnover, some reports were initially reviewed more than 60 days after submission.
HUD: Three reports were reviewed late because reviews did not realized they needed to change the search date to 2023 in the system to see New Entrant reports. OIG- For the annual reports, OLC reviewed and certified 99% within 60 days after submission. The majority of reports reviewed and certified more than 60 days after submission were new entrant reports, which were affected by factors such as delays at the L1 Supervisor review level, or issues with system notifications. OLC is taking steps to reduce these delays.
New e-filing systems requiring user training, heavy workload and scheduling difficulties of reviewers and certifiers.
Filings were certified or closed more than 60 days after submission due to our ethics program went without a program manager starting in December 2022. However, we filled that vacancy in April 2023. Additionally administrative error contributed to late reviewers.
Many of the reports required additional information and several required multiple exchanges with the filers.
Certain reports were reviewed more than 60 days after submission because of inadvertent oversights in tracking the 60-day review timeframe for submitted reports.
In most cases, additional information was being sought from the filer. In some cases, there were short-term employee resource constraints that have been resolved. Some reports involved complicated conflicts questions that took additional time to resolve. Some reviewers experienced short-term technical issues accessing the e-filing system.
In DO/HQ, overall, filers' supervisors change/supervisors leave (or in one case, go on a long-term detail) between the time of report submission and report review we are not always made aware of the changes and need to manually route the report to the correct supervisor, once that person is made known to us. New supervisors often have inquiries about identifying and resolving conflicts issues. In one case, we had a complex family trust with

assets that could not be sold, and it took time to resolve the conflict issues with a new supervisor who inherited the form for review. In another case, we could not remediate the conflicts, and the filer was unwilling to divest and was eventually reassigned to a different office. In other cases, technical difficulties with e-filing program may also result in delayed reviews supervisors don't always alert us timely if they encounter technical issues, and their review may have been close to the 60-day mark at that time. At other bureaus, obtaining additional information from filers competing priorities with staffing/workload and filers on extended leave contributed to delays.

Reviewer caseload is substantial as each attorney is tasked with reviewing at least 836 CFDs.

Under EPA's decentralized ethics program, more than 100 DEOs oversee the confidential financial disclosure system. This year, those DEOs had to deal with an overall increase of more than 930 additional e450 filers. They nevertheless reviewed 98.75% of e450s within 60 days (a slight decrease from the previous year at 98.9%) but improved the certification rate within 60 days from 88.6% to 98.5%. Typical reasons for not meeting the deadlines include: (a) new or changing ethics officials who are inexperienced and do not know how to proceed, (b) delay in getting electronic forms re-routed, and (c) filers do not respond assiduously to questions seeking clarification and/or reviewers do not follow up timely.

Most reports not certified within 60 days involved filers who owned assets or reported spouses' employers which presented potential financial conflicts. Additional time was needed for field offices to review files to determine whether a filer participated in a matter in which they had a financial interest. Some filers did not comprehensively report assets. Additional time was needed to obtain missing information, or clarify information that was reported. Note: The number of reports filed (289) is greater than the number of reports certified (282) because 7 reports were new entrant reports filed after December 1, 2023, the review and certification of which could not be completed by the end of the year.

One report experienced technical difficulties routing through the SharePoint system. The report was reviewed, but could not be signed. When the issue could not be resolved, the form was deleted out of the system and resubmitted by the filer. It was then successfully routed and certified.

While we were successful in reviewing 96% of the reports filed within 60 days of filing, we were unable to review 4% of the reports within 60 days due to intermittent and temporary staffing issues that have since been resolved. We note that every filer within this small percentage of reports had already gone through a thorough financial conflict vetting process with the FCC Ethics Team prior to submission of their OGE 450 reports.

Reports with initial reviews completed more than 60 days after submission were due to workload-related delays and tracking inaccuracies when reviewers inconsistently record

timely initial review completion, resulting in timely initial reviews that appear late based on the final certification date.
Additional information was being sought for some.
Additional information was required from one filer who was on extended leave.
Hundreds of reports are reviewed and certified by supervisory managers in offices and divisions throughout the FTC. Despite repeated reminders from the Ethics Team, inevitably a small number of managers fail to timely review and certify reports.
additional information was being sought.
Staff shortages due to pending vacancies during the review period impacted several locations. Pending litigation was also a factor. Requests for additional information were not always documented. For locations employing intermediate supervisory review, the proper supervisor was not always identified in EPTS.
One report was not reviewed within the 60 day window as the 60th day fell on a weekend. The form was reviewed and certified on the next business day after the 60th day.
In the cases where review was not possible, technical review and conflicts analysis could not be completed because the filers had not provided sufficient information, but were endeavoring in good faith to provide that information.
additional information was being sought
The numbers reported above are percentages. Actual numbers are made available to cleared OGE personnel when required. In 2023 the Office of the General Counsel allocated additional resources to reviewing annual Confidential Financial Disclosure Reports (OGE 450), and additional resources have again been allocated in 2024. The ethics office continues to make improvements in how reports are assigned and in managing the progress of reviews with the goal of significantly improving the above figures.
Initial review with 60 days. Needed additional information from filer.
Due to workload some forms were not completed within the 60 day timeframe.
More information was needed.
OMB OGC was working with some 450 filers on their report but did not list that interaction as a first review until more than 60 days had elapsed. Excessive workload during report review season also delayed some reviews beyond 60 days.
The review of one form within the 60-day timeframe was mistakenly overlooked.
Similar to 2022, OSTP continued to have a high volume of onboarding staff members in 2023 with a very limited legal team to help support the agency. Additionally, OSTP legal team had

frequent management turnover, including two General Counsel changes within this year. In addition, there were delays in obtaining information from some filers, and there were some complexities in certain 450s that were filed. Moreover, OSTP had high number of detailees and they provided copies of their certified 450s. These reports would not have been certified by OSTP OGC given they were already reviewed and certified by their home agencies. OSTP OGC reviewed but did not certify the 450s that the detailees had on file with their home agencies and which the detailees provided to OSTP OGC.

Only one report was reviewed one day late.

ONCD had a change in personnel in the Ethics Office which coincided with start of the OGE-450 review season. The position was briefly vacant, which caused a delay in reviewing the files.

As noted above, we have a human capital issue. Until we brought on an ethics detailee to assist us in the fall of 2023, there was only one attorney reviewing these reports, and they have significant additional duties outside of their ethics responsibilities. We are working to better prioritize a timely review of these reports going forward, and the ethics detailee is assisting us during the 2024 filing season.

More than half of the filings that were reviewed more than 60 days after submission were reviewed just 1 or 2 days late. In several of these cases, the intermediate review took more than 40 days, which provided the final reviewer/certifier with less time to review and certify within the 60-day timeframe.

Additional information required, extended leave, workload.

Inadvertent delay in assigning forms to attorneys and/or workload conflicts for assigned attorneys.

Due to competing priorities and workload challenges, the reports were reviewed more than 60 days after submission.

One report required more than 60 days due to filer needing to make substantial changes to report (90 securities ultimately needed to be added) one review was delayed due to delays in the supervisor review, and one review was one day late (the first business day after a holiday). All reports reviewed/closed within 75 days.

Some supervisors were derelict in their obligation to perform an intermediate review and some ethics officials did not adequately follow up with supervisors for action after 30 days when the filer submitted their report as is procedure.

As noted by the Commission during the 2023 Program Review. The Commission accepts OGE's recommendation as well as OGE's interpretation that "date of filing" in 5 CFR 2634.605(a) means the date the Commission's DAEO/ADAEO receives the Filer's OGE 450.

Confidential Financial Disclosure Guide: OGE Form 450, Â§ 3, p.44 (December 2018). The Commission respectfully notes, however, that “date of filing” or “filing date” is not a defined term at 5 CFR 2634.105. The Commission universally used the annual regulatory filing deadline of February 15 to start the 60-day review/certification clock as a measure to preserve and economize agency time and staffing resources. Because the regulation at 2634.605(a) does not expressly state “date of receipt” as explained in OGE’s Guide, the Commission did not feel this was an unreasonable interpretation of 2634.605(a) when read together with 2634.903(a). Although some Filers submitted their CY 2022 OGE 450 report prior to February 15, 2023, per 2634.903(a), no incumbent OGE 450 Reports are due prior to February 15 in any calendar year. The Commission believes it important to note that although the Commission was not compliant in CY 2023 with OGE’s Guide, had OGE concurred with the Commission’s interpretation, all the Commission’s OGE 450 Reports for CY 2022 were reviewed within 60 days of February 15, 2023. Nevertheless, moving forward, the Commission will review and certify all OGE 450 Reports within 60 days of receipt, unless otherwise extended as permitted by 5 CFR 2634.903(d).

The Deputy General was responsible for reviewing and certifying all 450s. A significant number of 450s were sent back after initial review, and were subsequently certified within 60 days of resubmission, but we do not track the numbers for that.

Internal office turnover within the ethics office and high volume of filings and continued increase in ethics inquiries placed demands on limited office resources.

Part 9 Table 1

Questions 43, 44-Numbers are classified

Questions 43 & 44 - There were 434 reports filed in 2023, and 439 reports certified in 2023. The additional 5 reports are new entrant reports that were filed in late 2022, thus, certification was not due until early 2023.

Question 45: In most cases, filing extensions were granted to New Entrant filers because the filer received late notice to file his or her OGE Form 450. The filers received late notice because the agency could not add them as filers to the FDM electronic filing system until they received a Common Access Card (CAC) and had a functioning DCSA email address, which often occurred several days or weeks after the employees' appointment date and prior to the employees assuming their duties.

The Department of Defense requires that supervisors review reports in addition to the OGE 450 certifying official. In some cases, the dual level of review impacts the OGE 450 certifying official's final certification.

In December 2023, a Program Manager was hired in DEO for confidential financial disclosure to manage the new FDOOnline system, to assist with finalizing filer data sets, and provide oversight of and assistance with confidential financial disclosure throughout the Department.
Item 43: Of the 230 reports, 32 were new entrant and 198 were annual reports.
44. Hundreds of reports are reviewed and certified by supervisory managers in offices and divisions throughout the FTC. Despite repeated reminders from the Ethics Team, inevitably a small number of managers fail to timely review and certify reports.
#45 - military service
#43 - #45 Data is not included/is classified
45. This is the number of individual 450 filers that were granted filing extensions in 2023.
Question 45. In 2023, to ensure the individual had sufficient time and support, the Commission granted a 15-day filing extension to a newly hired attorney, who also happens to be a person who is blind.
Q44. Four reports were filed prior to December 31, 2023 and timely reviewed and certified in early 2024.

Question 49 Table 1

Our agency notified OGE of all referrals and final dispositions known as of 31 December 2023, some dispositions are still pending. Our agency will notify OGE when the dispositions are finalized.
Of the three matters identified, only one concerned a DOL employee who was still with the agency. That matter is still open.
The Department's referrals to DOJ were for failure to file financial disclosure reports. Referrals for failure to file financial disclosure reports is not a covered referral under 5 C.F.R. section 2638.206(a).
Form completed in 2024.

Part 10 Table 1

48(b): None of the referral status options is applicable. DOJ reviewed the referral, determined that it would not conduct an intake on the referral, but did not formally decline prosecution. 49: OGE Form 202 notification for 2023 referral sent in 2024.
--

Q46: 8 persons received disciplinary action. One person received disciplinary action for violations of Subpart C, G, and H. Because of the manner in which the question was asked, the Department of the Air Force reported 10 disciplinary actions. Q48: One case that DOJ declined to prosecute is back with the IG for the Department of the Air Force for investigation and potential disciplinary action, depending upon the results of the IG investigation.

Q46- DoD has a number of personnel employed in retail clerk type positions and the vast majority of violations listed pertain to those positions.

Q46: One employee received one disciplinary action based in part on violations of Subpart G, Subpart H, and the Department's supplemental standards of conduct.

Q48 and Q49 One matter was opened in 2022 and closed in 2023, and two matters were opened in 2023 and closed in 2024.

Our office referred 3 cases to the Human Resources Bureau (GTM) for possible disciplinary action based on the late filing of Annual OGE 278 Reports. GTM will adjudicate those referrals in 2024 (Question #47).

Q46: One bureau noted: There were six actions but one of them had charges that fell under two different sections.

A signature development for the Agency's ethics program for this year, is the coordination and implementation of a system within VA's HR Alert Human Resources system, that allows data to be captured for employees disciplined for ethics matters. The system mirror's OGE's reporting requirements, and allowed EST to pull this information directly from the VA's massive footprint for the first time, from one singular system. There are process improvements identified this cycle (as expected with any new system) and developers are working to optimize the system for this year. Continued training on what is, and what is not government ethics issues for VA's HR representatives is also being coordinated.

Q. 46 and Q. 47: At the FCC, disciplinary actions involving employees are generally led by offices outside of the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) (the FCC's ethics practice is housed within OGC). OGC/Ethics has not been made aware of any disciplinary actions taken by any other office or bureau within the agency in 2023 that are based wholly or in part upon violations of the federal ethics regulations (including the FCC's supplemental regulations) and statutes.

Question 51 Table 1

One Schedule C employee resigned after only a few days, and did not sign the Pledge before leaving.

Question 51 Table 2

<p>Three employees were initially thought to be exempt in non-policymaking positions but CEQ later identified these as pledge signers.</p>
<p>Note: The PAS was actually appointed in December 2022. Although not required to sign the Pledge because appointed without break in service after serving in another position for which the Ethics Pledge was already signed, the DAEO advised him to sign the Pledge from the New Administration. He signed a new Pledge and forwarded it with his Certification of Ethics Agreement Compliance in February 2023.</p>
<p>See above.</p>
<p>A Schedule C employee was hired on October 8, 2023. However, Human Resources did not timely notify the employee of the need to sign the ethics pledge. The employee signed the pledge on January 8, 2024.</p>
<p>The Schedule C employee who signed the Pledge in 2024 was appointed on December 4, 2023. The employee was provided with the ethics pledge form on December 15, 2023, and received her initial ethics briefing on December 21, 2023. While the Pledge was not signed in 2023, the employee was aware of the ethics pledge requirements soon after her appointment.</p>
<p>0</p>
<p>As to 51.a.ii, a few of these came from other federal agencies where they presumably had already signed the ethics pledge while in their prior appointee positions.</p>
<p>v. appointee transferred to SBA from the State Department without a break in service. We obtained a copy of the signed pledge from State for our records.</p>

Question 52 Table 1

<p>Information not tracked</p>
<p>Bart Sheard. He was granted a limited waiver of the requirements in Section 1, Paragraph 3, (b) and (c) of the Ethics Pledge, which will allow him to serve as a Senior Advisor in the Office of the Secretary and effectively carry out his duties in that position. The waiver does not include any other provisions or subsections of the Ethics Pledge or relate to any other matters in which he is otherwise recused from participation under the Ethics Pledge, and he remains restricted from participating in any particular matter involving specific parties that is directly and substantially related to his former employer or former clients for a period of two years following the date of his appointment.</p>

Part 11 Table 1

DCAA has no full time employees who are subject to the Ethics Pledge.
Q52 OSD has over 150 political appointees. Neither the Ethics Pledge Form nor the OGE 278 provides a location for this specific information to be disclosed. HR requires all political appointees to sign the Ethics Pledge Form provided by OGE and the White House. While that Pledge form does not elicit disclosure of prior lobbying or FARA registration status, individual guidance is provided to appointees based upon information concerning prior employment and compensation contained in the OGE 278. Additionally, Ethics Pledge restrictions are addressed during interactive training sessions provided to new political appointees.
Q54 & 55: One appointee committed four pledge violations, all of which were discovered at the same time. They resulted in one enforcement action in the form of formal counseling after notifying the White House.

Question 57 Table 1

Per our annual appropriations act, our commissioners serve for up to 75 billable days except the chair who serves up to 125 billable days and therefore these individuals don't fall within the requirement of 5 C.F.R. 2638.304(b)(2) and thus may have up to 3 months to complete their IET. Notwithstanding the foregoing, 3 of 4 SGEs completed their IET prior to the first meeting. One failed to complete the IET prior to the first meeting, but completed the IET a few days after the 3 month deadline.
One SGE has been on extended leave and not responded to emails. The Agency sent a follow-up email in January of 2024.
The Human Resources appointment process for USDA FACA and non-FACA SGEs made it extremely difficult for the Office of Ethics to receive timely information needed to notify filers of the training requirement and track completion thereof. We have revised the onboarding process for new SGEs, which will improve training numbers in 2024.
SGEs were unable to complete training due to lack of contact with ethics counselor.
One agency experienced a process error, which they have corrected going forward.
One SGE believed she had completed IET before the first meeting but later discovered that she hadn't.
They were not present at first meeting but participated in training after first meeting.

Some SGE members were not able to be in attendance at the first meeting of CY 23, and received training later. The additional individuals who did not receive training were due to an administrative error on the part of the agency in scheduling the correct time for training in 2023 and a misunderstanding of the requirements of 5 C.F.R. Â§ 2638.304(b)(2).
Certain SGEs completed IET after the first meeting because of a breakdown in coordination resulting in training being delivered after the first meeting.
The Ethics Office was not informed of the first meeting date of one DOT Advisory Committee that included three SGEs. Once the Ethics Office learned that the meeting had already occurred, an initial ethics training was scheduled and held within 24 hours of learning about the meeting. All three SGEs had already completed their financial disclosure reports prior to their appointment, and all three reports were certified within 30 days of submission and before the first committee meeting.
We were unsuccessful in re-assigning initial ethics training to six SGEs who were on the tail end of terms that had begun in the previous two years. These SGEs had received the required training in prior years in their terms. This error in capturing these SGE's continued service in 2023 was due to temporary staffing issues that have since been addressed and resolved.
Three SGEs, members of the PCAH FACA Committee, have not yet attended a meeting or participated in any Committee activities.
All new SGEs are required to receive IET before their first meeting.
The ethics office was informed of the appointment of two SGEs after the first meeting. As of the date of this response, both SGEs have received IET.

Question 58 Table 1

One of the SGE's submitted their initial 278 and ethics officials sent the form back to the SGE for edits. Ethics officials emailed the SGE on 8/8/2023, 9/5/2023, 11/28/2023, 12/20/2023, regarding the request for edits to the form.
Two SGEs were granted extensions of time to file their OGE-450, and one SGE has been on extended leave and not responded to emails. The agency sent a follow-up email to that filer in January of 2024.
One of the Bureau's advisory committee members participated in her first meeting on December 1, 2023 and did not file her 450 until the first week of January 2024. The committee did not meet again prior to the member filing her 450. __
Despite repeated filing notices and follow ups from Office of Ethics leadership, some SGEs failed to complete their OGE 450 reports as required.

<p>Thirteen experts/consultants were erroneously appointed when they actually performed no duties. All appointment have now been rescinded. The Army DAEO exempted thirteen FACA members from filing requirements given their lack of involvement in assets or issues that would affect the material interests of the non-Federal parties with whom they may be affiliated.</p>
<p>Still waiting on submission because member was unavailable to complete OGE 450.</p>
<p>Two agencies/commands experienced process errors, which they have corrected going forward.</p>
<p>1 non FACA Board member was not compliant</p>
<p>Two FACA SGEs participated in a meeting prior to filing financial disclosure reports. No other FACA SGEs were allowed to participate in meetings without filing a financial disclosure report.</p>
<p>2 did not file report.</p>
<p>One SGE committee had a filer who did not timely file a report despite requests, and who then departed the position. For the other SGE committees leadership transitions and misunderstanding on the application of 5 C.F.R. Â§ 2638.904, led to the oversight in filing for CY 23. That agency has ensured all members have completed filings for CY 24 before the first meeting of CY 24.</p>
<p>A few Fulbright Board members appointed in prior years have not filed their report and have been unresponsive despite numerous reminders of their obligation to file each year. These members' terms ended but are still expected to serve until their replacement has been appointed.</p>
<p>One of our Operating Administrations had a delay in submission of three SGE reports due to ethics staff departing the agency after the reports were assigned to the SGEs. Additional staff have been assigned to perform the ethics duties in that OA and the SGEs have now filed their reports.</p>
<p>The key issue for this calendar year's report, centered around The Advisory Committee on Tribal and Indian Affairs. This FACA had a new Designated Federal Officer, without the benefit of prior experience, and was learning the requirements inherent in the various processes.</p>
<p>Despite repeated requests by the DEO, one SGE did not comply with filing a required confidential report. That individual is no longer an SGE.</p>
<p>We were unsuccessful in assigning and collecting confidential financial disclosure reports from six SGEs who were on the tail-end of terms that had begun in the previous two years. This error in capturing these SGE's continued service in 2023 was due to temporary staffing issues that have since been addressed and resolved. In a further effort to avoid such errors in the future, we have made changes to our online financial disclosure protocol to ensure that</p>

SGE financial disclosure reports can be assigned, tracked, reviewed and certified in the same online system that is in use for all other FCC confidential financial disclosure filers.
Designated Federal Officials (DFO's) for all NASA FACA advisory committees have been advised that SGE advisory committee members whose 2023 reports have not been filed not participate in a FACA committee meeting in 2024 until their 2023 forms have been filed, reviewed, and certified. Some SGE's at one location who are not FACA committee members may not have been informed of OGE 450 filing requirements.
In CY 24, the ethics office was informed of appointments of 2 SGEs in CY 23.
NCA Members are required to file OGE Approved Alternative Form prior to each meeting of NCA Members who meet 3 times annually. However, NCA Members are not required to file the form if not attending the meeting. One NCA member did not attend the June 2023 meeting and thus was no required and did not file the form.
One Advisory Committee whose DFO retired in 2023 could not find two reports filed by current members.
NSA's Advisory Board was reestablished in 2022 with many new members who are new to the financial disclosure requirement. Since that time, the ethics office has worked with Advisory Board leadership on compliance with ethics requirements. We are continuing to work on improvements in process and this area was the subject of an OGE recommendation in its 2023 inspection of NSA's ethics program.
One SGE filed a few days late in early 2024 because he was unable to access the SEC network and CFDS to timely complete his 450 due on December 31, 2023.
One Member was appointed in November 2023. We've given him an extension to file his new entrant report. He will file a new entrant / annual report covering 2023 in February 2024.

Question 59 Table 1

additional information was being sought
The agency experienced a transition in the ethics office. That loss of personnel impacted our ethics programing for the second half of 2023.
Timeliness of intermediate review by a committee designated federal official implicated some reports. Staff shortages due to pending vacancies during the review period impacted several locations.
Two CY23 reports were certified in early 2024. Initial review of the two forms was completed within sixty days, but certification was delayed due to administrative oversight.

One report is not certified or closed since pending additional information to be supplied to ethics official.

NSA's Advisory Board was reestablished in 2022. The ethics office continues to work on improving the Agency's compliance with ethics requirements specifically for the Advisory Board. This area was the subject of an OGE recommendation in its 2023 inspection of NSA's ethics program. Notably, the Advisory Board on which these SGEs serve is intentionally structured in such a manner as to avoid having members participate in particular matters. Further, members sign an agreement stating that they will not participate in official matters that may affect an entity with which they have an affiliation or financial interest. Thus, regardless of any interests disclosed on a report, it would not affect the manner in which they performed their SGE duties.

Due to workload some forms were not completed within the 60 day timeframe.

One filer received a 45-day extension, and review was completed within 30 days of the end of the extension. A second filer failed to file on time, and paid a late fee.

The one 450 report was certified more than 60 days after submission because the intermediate reviewer returned the 450 to the filer for additional information and clarification.

In 2023, 19 annual reports and two new entrant reports were filed. Additionally, eleven (11) New Entrant reports submitted in 2022 were also certified in 2023. All were "technically" certified in 2023. However, as this is a new system to the Commission - all were reviewed but final certification was delayed due to a technical issue. They were reviewed and approved but "technically" not certified in FD Online until beyond the 60 days of initial submission.

For the 2022 calendar year OGE 450 filing requirement (due February 15, 2023), a Private Citizen SGE Commissioner returned his OGE 450 to the Commission on or about February 12, 2023, meeting the timeline set forth in the ethics regulation. However, this Commissioner is a person who is blind and although the OGE 450 form is designated as accessible, he was not successful using Adobe Acrobat to digitally sign his PDF OGE 450. To resolve this situation, the Commission acquired DocuSign, a digital document processing tool. The Commission acquired the tool, staff members attended requisite training, and the Commissioner's OGE 450 was re-sent for his signature on May 27, 2023. The Commissioner successfully used DocuSign to digitally sign his OGE 450 and returned it to the Commission on May 22, 2023. Two other SGE Private Citizen Commissioners, including one Commissioner who happens to be blind, mismarked their OGE 450s, but each SGE Commissioner timely submitted their OGE 450. One SGE selected "Annual" versus "New Entrant" and the other SGE did not mark SGE on their signed OGE 450. Due to lag in correspondence with the SGE Commissioners, including IT issues with one SGE's Government-furnished laptop, the DAEO/ADAEO were not able to

correct/certify those two reports within 60 days. One report was certified at 63 days, and the other was certified at 79 days once the IT issues were remediated.

Internal office turnover within the ethics office and high volume of filings and continued increase in ethics inquiries placed demands on limited office resources.

Question 59 Table 2

Two of the SGE disclosure reports that were certified outside of the 60 days were waiting for edits from the filer. For one of the filers, ethics officials erroneously requested edits.

Personnel shortages/significant health issues by the senior ethics official caused a delay in review and certification of 278s. Because all offices were already undermanned, the lack of timely review was not recognized by leadership in a timely manner. The ethics office that experienced this issue is implementing safeguards in 2024 at the MAJCOM level by adding reviewers to address these shortfalls.

See above.

Staffing shortages

More financial disclosure reviewers are needed in EOIR.

SGE committees misunderstanding on the application of 5 C.F.R. Â§ 2638.904, led to the oversight in certifications for CY 23. That agency has ensured all members have completed filings for CY 24 before the first meeting of CY 24, and have new processes in place to certify timeline in CY 24.

Due to significant Designated Federal Officer (DFO) turnover, the timely collection of financial disclosure reports, notification, and subsequent review faced challenges. EST actively met with DFOs, conducted training, and stressed the importance of timely submissions. Some FAC members who submit reports in paper format is an ongoing challenge as well. The relocation of the Ethics Offices during OGC space renovation impacted the collection, organization, and scanning of reports. Loss of several ethics paralegals over the CY added to the challenges.

DEO was delayed in signing off/certifying due to competing priorities (but the report was reviewed within 60 days).

The agency experienced a transition in the ethics office. That loss of personnel impacted our ethics programing for the second half of 2023. We have determined that more staff is needed to make up for that loss.

Timeliness of intermediate review by a committee designated federal official implicated some reports. Staff shortages due to pending vacancies also implicated review time. Requests for additional information were not always documented.
Eight advisory committee reports were not certified within 60 days because of administrative error.
See the explanation immediately above regarding reports that were reviewed more than 60 days after submission.
One filer received a 45-day extension, and review was completed within 30 days of the end of the extension. A second filer failed to file on time, and paid a late fee.
All were "technically" certified in 2023. However, as this is a new system to the Commission - all were reviewed but final certification was delayed due to a technical issue. They were reviewed and approved but "technically" not certified in FD Online until beyond the 60 days of initial submission. There is also a question of how reports show up in FD Online. Currently, we are unable to see all CFDs submitted in one year and we have to search multiple years to capture all reports that need to be reviewed/certified.
Internal office turnover within the ethics office and high volume of new and complex filings which required additional guidance, review, and follow-up.

Part 12 Table 1

Q 58-60: ACUS SGEs are not required to file any annual financial disclosure form due to the very remote chance of conflicts, and because all members (including SGEs) have an affirmative duty (under ACUS's bylaws to report conflicts in real time.
DCAA has no Special Government Employees.
Question 57: SGEs currently supporting DIA do not serve on boards, commissions or committees, and are not required to receive annual ethics training.
Q56 This year's response reports more SGEs than last year's response. The Department of the Air Force hired additional consultants to support the SecAF and the Chief Scientist. Q57 The SGEs who are experts/consultants (58) and those who are public filers (42) received either annual or initial ethics training in CY 2023.
Q60 Most excluded SGEs are those on boards advising on internal personnel matters, such as sexual assault prevention and military family/personnel issues or are providing part time skilled services such as teaching or language interpretation.
Q60: Exempt SGEs are primarily employed through the National Disaster Medical System (NDMS) to respond to major disasters or provide per diem nursing services at the NIH Clinical

Center. Others are FDA SGEs who did not serve on any FACA committees in 2023 and were thus not required to file.

Additional comments for Question #56, #57, and #58. For Question #56, DOI reported 134 SGEs because 134 individuals were appointed to serve as SGEs in prior years to multi-year or open-ended terms of appointment and were expected to continue serving in calendar year 2023. For Question #57, the difference between 134 SGEs expected to serve and the 126 response reflects only individuals who actually served as SGEs in 2023 and does not include eight individuals who did not actually perform any SGE duties in 2023, including attending meetings and, as a result, they were not required to receive IET. Finally, for Question #58, the difference between 126 SGEs trained and the 112 response reflects that fourteen SGEs received training, but terminated service as an SGE prior to the deadline to submit a confidential report and are removed from the total response.

Q57: For DO/HQ, one SGE public filer is a member of the IRS Oversight Board who received annual training in a session with with our other public filers. The member is a term appointee who is not reappointed each year and files the OGE 278e without regard to the number of days served by virtue of the appointment under 26 U.S.C. 7802. The Board has not conducted business in many years because this filer is currently the sole member and continues to file until termination of appointment. Q61: For DO/HQ, one SGE public filer, for whom it was determined OGE 278-Ts are required, was granted a waiver of the late filing fee for a 278-T.

A majority of VA's FACA committee members do not have VA email addresses and/or PIV cards and, therefore, cannot access the Financial Disclosure Management (FDM) system which VA uses to collect and review the OGE 450 forms. The lack of access to FDM has resulted in delays in collecting and reviewing their OGE 450s. In August 2023, VA signed a contract with Intelliworx for use of FDOonline, a system which can be accessed via username and password. VA IT is currently working on the security issues associated with implementing this program and it is anticipated that the FACA filers will be added into FDOonline within the next sixty days.

Question 60: All SGEs were student interns during the summer months. The summer interns are subject to substantial supervision and review, and do not exercise significant judgment regarding agency actions. They are not at the pay band level that would qualify them as financial disclosure filers under agency policy.

The NEA employs a large number of SGEs on FACA committees to fulfil its grantmaking functions. This year, there were 682 SGEs appointed serving on the Arts Advisory Committee (AAC). Each of these employees serves one day a year and is not permitted to participate without undergoing IET and completing an OGE-approved 450 alternative form. The National Council on the Arts (NCA) is a FACA committee consisting of PAS SGEs. These employees fill out 450s during their nomination, and an OGE-approved alternative form before each formal NCA meeting they attend. This year, there were 18 total NCA members. One such member was new, but filed and completed his nominee report the previous year, and thus was only required to the OGE-approved alternative form this year. One meeting was only attended by 17 council members. (Continued in "Additional Questionnaire Comments")

#53, 55 and 58: Two SGE Advisory Board members will complete new entrant reports in 2024. They have done a "meet and greet" with other board members and received IET.

Questions 56, 58, 59: NWTRB had a total of 10 Board members during 2023. One Board member filed both an OGE 450 and later in the year an OGE Form 278. This results in a total of 11 reports.

For question 59, OSTP indicated that of our 17 SGEs, we reviewed and certified 450s for 10 of those individuals in a timely manner. The remaining 7 SGEs were either assigned 450s to complete but never submitted them or had submitted drafts of 450s and, when asked follow up questions regarding what they reported, failed to respond and, as such, their 450s were unable to be certified within the appropriate time period. As of January 2024, OGC have received 450s from all SGEs still working at OSTP.

Comment related to question 60 - The DAEO determined that 2023 student honors interns, who are considered SGEs, will be excluded from the Form 450 reporting requirement under 5 C.F.R. 2634.204(b). The DAEO exercised her authority under 5 C.F.R. 2634.904(b) and made a categorical determination that the student interns' duties raise only a remote possibility that the interns would be involved in a real or apparent conflict of interest. Moreover, these interns are highly unlikely to have a substantial role in the formulation of agency policy or serve on a Federal Advisory Committee and their work is heavily supervised.

Q57 No SGEs were serving on a board or commission in 2023. All SGEs received Initial Ethics Training. Q58 The service of two SGEs spanned portions of 2022 and 2023. Both SGEs filed timely confidential financial disclosure reports in late 2022 which were reviewed and certified within 60 days.

Overall Comments Table 1

Our agency does not have a CHCO.

We were unable to provide the answer in the form for Question #16 Answer for #16: All of the written offers included the required information

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 12 - Continued: Hence, Q56 reflects all 700 SGEs (682+18), and Q58 and 59 reflect the total number of reports required to be filed by all SGEs (682 AAC reports + 18 NCA [first meeting] + 17 NCA [second meeting] + 18 NCA [third meeting])