

**SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION**  
**FISCAL YEAR 2021 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET JUSTIFICATION**

**Status of Open Government Accountability Office and  
Office of the Inspector General Recommendations**

**Overview**

Pursuant to Public Law 115-414, *Good Accounting Obligation in Government Act*, this technical material supports the Social Security Administration's (SSA) Fiscal Year 2021 Congressional Budget Justification, and provides requisite details for Government Accountability Office (GAO) and Office of the Inspector General (OIG) public audit recommendations over 1 year old. As required, the information includes anticipated timelines for implementation and justifications for any recommendations we do not plan to implement.

We take seriously the recommendations of GAO and OIG and make every effort to implement their suggested corrective actions as promptly as possible; however, we must use a risk-based approach to balance this work with our many competing responsibilities. For example, many of the open recommendations included in this report require information technology (IT) changes. Because we are involved in a major IT modernization project that will span the next several years, we will implement these recommendations as a part of that project rather than incorporating them into our old systems.

We appreciate the work of OIG and GAO. We will continue our efforts to implement their insightful recommendations.

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

**Government Accountability Office (GAO) Open Recommendations**

Audit Number (SSA number) Report Title	Rec. Date	Recommendation	GAO Status (Excerpted)	SSA Implementation Status <sup>1</sup>
<b>GAO-16-511 (12015021) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY : Agencies Need to Improve Their Application Inventories to Achieve Additional Savings</b>	9/29/16	Recommendation 1: To improve federal agencies' efforts to rationalize their portfolio of applications, the heads of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Education, Energy, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, the Interior, Labor, State, Transportation, the Treasury, and Veterans Affairs; and heads of the Environmental Protection Agency; National Aeronautics and Space Administration; National Science Foundation; Nuclear Regulatory Commission; Office of Personnel Management; Small Business Administration; Social Security Administration; and U.S. Agency for International Development should direct their Chief Information Officers (CIOs) and other responsible officials to improve their	<b>Open.</b> Social Security Administration (SSA) officials reported that they continue to make progress in implementing the efforts to address the recommendation. We will continue to monitor SSA's efforts to develop a complete application inventory.	<b>Open.</b> We continue work to finalize our inventory of non-Systems applications developed by headquarter components that are not part of Systems applications. We completed the Final Boundary Scope Memos with all applications designated as in-scope for the 2018 assessment. We are reviewing the submitted data and working on modeling the new applications, as appropriate, into the Enterprise Architecture (EA) repository. As each new system boundary is completed, we add related applications to the Enterprise Application Inventory on a flow basis. We currently have no timeline for completion of this recommendation.

<sup>1</sup> All statuses are current through November 30, 2019.

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		inventories by taking steps to fully address the practices we identified as being partially met or not met.		
<p><b>GAO-16-786 (12015025)</b> <b>SOCIAL SECURITY: Improvements to Claims Process Could Help People Make Better Informed Decisions about Retirement Benefits</b></p>	<p>9/14/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: To ensure that key information provided by claims specialists to potential claimants of Social Security retirement benefits is clear and consistent with Program Operations Manual System (POMS), the Commissioner of the SSA should take steps to ensure claims specialists understand that they should avoid the use of breakeven analysis to compare benefits at different claiming ages.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> To close this recommendation, GAO would like to see SSA 1) update POMS to instruct technicians to inform claimants that benefits withheld due to earnings above the limits will be returned through higher benefits starting at full retirement age (FRA) and 2) re-send the administrative message (AM) to technicians periodically to remind them of this guidance (AM 18011 does not mention the earnings test).</p>	<p><b>Closed on November 29, 2016.</b> On October 19, 2016, we issued an AM to remind claims specialists to inform claimants filing for Retirement Insurance Benefits (RIB) of their options and applicable policy that may inform their decision on when to start receiving RIB.</p> <p>Toward the end of every calendar year, we update POMS with the new Annual and Monthly Earnings Test amounts. In conjunction with this yearly update, we will re-issue the AM reminding technicians to: (1) inform claimants that delaying receipt of retirement benefits results in permanently higher benefits; and (2) provide estimated benefits at different claiming ages. In addition to publishing the AM annually, we will cover the AM during transmittal training that occurs in conjunction with the publication. Technicians and management usually view the transmittal training together, which will enable further discussion that could include best practices.</p> <p>We released AM-16068 Reminders for Interviewing Claimants for Retirement Insurance Benefits in 2016 and re-issued it in 2017 and 2018. This message reminds technicians not to discuss breakeven points with claimants. In addition, newly hired technicians are not taught the breakeven analysis during training. In FY</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				<p>2019, we reviewed Month of Election (MOEL) training to emphasize the importance of providing options with accompanying benefits amounts.</p> <p>In response to GAO's comments, we issued a new AM to remind employees that the breakeven analysis is obsolete and the Month of Entitlement explanation should not include this information. On February 1, 2019, we issued AM-19004 entitled, "Policy reminder for discussing MOEL options and other policies that may affect claimant's decision on when to start benefits." The AM specifically states the following: "Do not discuss breakeven points with the claimant or recommend specific benefit decisions." We also released a Video-on-Demand on March 19, 2019 entitled "Month of Election Training" that covered MOEL information. We will send GAO a CD copy of the video training we provided to staff.</p>
<p><b>GAO-16-786 (12015025) SOCIAL SECURITY: Improvements to Claims Process Could Help People Make Better Informed Decisions about Retirement Benefits</b></p>	9/14/16	<p>Recommendation 4: To ensure potential claimants are consistently provided with key information during the claiming process to help them make informed decisions about when to claim benefits, SSA should take steps to ensure that when appropriate, claims specialists clearly explain the retirement earnings test and inform claimants that any benefits withheld because of earnings above the earnings limit will</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> To close this recommendation, GAO would like to see SSA 1) update POMS to instruct technicians to inform claimants that benefits withheld due to earnings above the limits will be returned through higher benefits starting at FRA and 2) re-send the AM to technicians periodically to remind them of this guidance (AM 18011 does not mention the earnings test).</p>	<p>Closed on November 29, 2016. On October 19, 2016, we issued an AM to remind claims specialists to inform claimants filing for RIB of their options and applicable policy that may inform their decision on when to start receiving RIB.</p> <p>Toward the end of every calendar year, we update the POMS with the new Annual and Monthly Earnings Test amounts. In conjunction with this yearly update, we will re-issue the AM reminding technicians to: (1) inform claimants that delaying receipt of retirement benefits results in permanently higher benefits and (2) provide</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		<p>result in higher monthly benefits starting at FRA.</p>		<p>estimated benefits at different claiming ages. In addition to publishing the AM annually, we will cover the AM during transmittal training that occurs in conjunction with the publication. Technicians and management usually view the transmittal training together, which will enable further discussion that could include best practices.</p> <p>Additionally, we recently updated RS 02501.025 Determining Annual and Monthly Exempt Amounts with the yearly amounts. Further, we re-issued AM-16068 Reminders for Interviewing Claimants for Retirement Insurance Benefits in 2017 and 2018. Also, on March 16, 2018, we released AM-18011 Policy Reminder for Discussing the Month of Election (MOEL) Options, which instructs technicians to provide benefits estimates at different ages and directs them to other relevant policy sections explaining delayed retirement credits. Both AMs were covered during the transmittal training at the time of issue and re-issue</p> <p>On May 20, 2019, we again updated RS 02501.021 and RS 02501.025 to include the recommended explanation about benefits withheld. We included language about the earnings test in the new AM and Video on Demand (VOD) mentioned in recommendation 2 for this same report. The policy included a subsection letter C to RS 02501.021 entitled “Crediting Months and Adjustment of Reduction Factor (ARF).” The addition of subsection C was</p>
--	--	---	--	--

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				<p>to remind Claims Specialists to clearly explain the retirement earnings test and inform claimants that any benefits withheld because of earnings above the earnings limit will result in higher monthly benefits starting at FRA. We will publish this AM on a periodic basis to serve as a reminder of this policy.</p> <p>We receive the updated figures on the annual exempt amounts from our Office of the Chief Actuary every year around mid-October, which are released in conjunction with the Cost-of-Living Adjustment. The updated figures are normally published in RS 02501.025 no later than early November.</p>
<p><b>GAO-16-674 (12015017) SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME: SSA Provides Benefits to Multiple Recipient Households but Needs System Changes to Improve Claims Management</b></p>	<p>8/17/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: To ensure the agency has sufficient information about risks to Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program integrity when making decisions about efforts to address them, the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should conduct a risk assessment of the current manual process for connecting and adjusting claim records of SSI recipients who live in households with other SSI recipients, and, as appropriate, take steps to make cost-effective improvements to SSA's claims management</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> As of May 2018, SSA indicated that they continue to disagree with this recommendation stating that current SSI program rules do not support connecting records of unrelated individuals living in multiple recipient households. SSA also noted that it does not have evidence from its payment accuracy reviews that manual processing of married couple multiple recipient household claims leads to payment errors. As such, the agency stated that it could not commit resources to address this recommendation at this time, but noted if a legislative proposal is put forth that affects unrelated multiple SSI recipient</p>	<p><b>Closed September 15, 2016.</b> SSI is an individual needs based program. Current program rules do not support connecting the records of individuals in unrelated multiple recipient households. Given that the report did not discover any fraud or improper payments, we cannot commit our constrained resources to perform a risk assessment. If a legislative proposal is put forth that affects unrelated multiple SSI recipient households, we will, as part of our evaluation and planning, assess program policy and systems risks and develop cost estimates on any proposal's impact on our resources.</p> <p>We re-evaluated GAO's comments for this recommendation in May 2019. We continue to disagree with the recommendation, as current program rules do not support connecting the records of individuals in unrelated multiple</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		<p>system to address identified risks.</p>	<p>households, SSA will assess program policy and systems risks as part of its evaluation and planning. . However, we continue to believe that the manual processing currently used to connect and adjust claim records of SSI recipients who live in households with other SSI recipients leaves the agency at risk. SSA has acknowledged that it has not assessed the extent to which manual processing leads to payment errors, and the data they provided us on FY 2014 improper payments to married couple recipients does not address the full scope of the issues we identified. Specifically, field office (FO) staff reported several instances in which manual processing is used to connect and adjust claims records for multiple recipient households due to system limitations, and indicated that these manual adjustments increase the likelihood of erroneous payments. These manually processed claims are for households with multiple related recipients whose SSI benefits are currently inter-related under program rules, such as multiple child recipients who are siblings or individual recipients who marry</p>	<p>recipient households. There are two legislative proposals in the FY 2021 President’s Budget. The first is to eliminate In-Kind Support and Maintenance and replace it with a flat 10 percent reduction of the Federal Benefit Rate (FBR) for any adult living with another adult no matter if they received SSI payments or not. The second is to establish a lower FBR for SSI eligible children under 18 who are not married and live with either another SSI eligible sibling or an SSI eligible parent. This latter proposal only affects family members whose records are already connected in the system. If legislation is enacted that affects unrelated multiple SSI recipient households, we will, as part of our evaluation and planning, assess program policy and systems risks and develop cost estimates on the impact of any proposals on our resources.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

			another recipient. Without an assessment of the risks associated with the manual processing of these claims, SSA is unable to determine if additional adjustments to its system would be a cost-effective use of its resources.	
<b>GAO-16-494 (12015018) IT Dashboard: Agencies Need to Fully Consider Risks When Rating Their Major Investments</b>	6/2/16	Recommendation 2: To better ensure that the Dashboard ratings more accurately reflect risk, the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Education, Energy, Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, State, Transportation, the Treasury, Veterans Affairs; the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; and the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should direct their Chief Information Officers (CIO) to ensure that their CIO ratings reflect the level of risk facing an investment relative to that investment's ability to accomplish its goals.	<b>Open.</b> SSA partially agreed with our recommendation and, in a written response, stated that its CIO rating criteria includes a review of the level of risk facing an investment relative to that investment's ability to accomplish its goals. The written statement also noted that the CIO receives regular updates from key stakeholders on investment risks and mitigation plans. While the agency has submitted documentation showing the incorporation of risk management issues into the rating process, SSA has yet to demonstrate how risk exposure scores are factored into its ratings. Factoring risk exposure scores is critical because these scores explicitly show the severity of the risks facing an investment. As such, we cannot yet close this recommendation. We will continue to monitor SSA's progress.	<b>Closed August 3, 2016.</b> Our CIO rates each major Information Technology (IT) investment using his or her best judgment and a set of pre-established criteria, which includes the level of risk facing an investment relative to that investment's ability to accomplish its goals. Our CIO receives regular updates from project management staff, executive management, and other key stakeholders on the current risks and mitigation plans for each Major IT investment. The CIO assesses whether these risks are being effectively mitigated, thus reducing the probability and impact of these events occurring before deciding on an overall rating. This assessment is consistent with the requirements of the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act (FITARA), and in the May 2016 FITARA 2.0 scorecard, the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee increased our Risk Assessment Transparency score. In June 2018, we provided GAO with further documentation of our CIO Ratings Procedures.  We released Policy 8020.10, "Chief Information Officer Ratings", ( <a href="https://www.ssa.gov/digitalstrategy/policyarchive/CIOResponsibilities.htm">https://www.ssa.gov/digitalstrategy/policyarchive/CIOResponsibilities.htm</a> ) in March 2019, to



Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				document formally how the CIO rates investments according to risk. The risk exposure scores are based on quantitative and qualitative risk assessment of the factors outlined in the IT Capital Planning Guidance, as well as incremental development. The risk exposure scores are updated on the Federal IT Dashboard for each budget submission, after a TechStat, and anytime at the discretion of the CIO. We believe that with the implementation of Policy 8020.10, we have fulfilled this recommendation.
<b>GAO-16-331 (12015004) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Needs to Better Track Efforts and Evaluate Options to Recover Debt and Deter Potential Fraud</b>	4/13/16	Recommendation 1: To ensure effective and appropriate recovery of Disability Insurance (DI) overpayments and administration of penalties and sanctions, the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should clarify its policy for assessing the reasonableness of expenses used in determining beneficiaries' repayment amounts to help ensure that withholding plans are consistently established across the agency and accurately reflect individuals' ability to pay.	<b>Open.</b> We will close this recommendation once SSA clarifies its policies on the reasonableness of expenses.	<b>Closed on August 16, 2017.</b> We updated our overpayment instructions GN 02201.010, SSA-3105 Processing Instruction, as of July 20, 2017. We included additional processing instructions to ensure consistency when our technicians process various requests from an overpaid individual (e.g., appeal, waiver, partial withholding, etc.).  We are taking action to provide additional clarification on how staff should consider whether expenses reported by overpaid individuals are reasonable when approving a withholding plan. We anticipate completing the specific instruction by the end of FY 2020
<b>GAO-16-331 (12015004) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Needs to</b>	4/13/16	Recommendation 2: To ensure effective and appropriate recovery of DI overpayments and administration of penalties and sanctions, the Acting	<b>Open.</b> Although SSA has taken several steps to reinforce policies for processing of repayment plans and document retention, and to review its quality assurance	<b>Closed on November 26, 2019.</b> We updated the Performance Quality Review (PQR) process to implement controls to review withholding agreement processing and appropriate retention of documentation. Effective October 2019, new

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Better Track Efforts and Evaluate Options to Recover Debt and Deter Potential Fraud</b></p>		<p>Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should improve oversight of DI benefit withholding agreements to ensure that they are completed appropriately. This could include requiring supervisory review of repayment plans or sampling plans as part of a quality control process, and requiring that supporting documentation for all withholding plans be retained to enable the agency to perform such oversight.</p>	<p>process, SSA had not indicated how these steps will ensure policies are implemented appropriately. We will close this recommendation once SSA provides support that it is taking steps to oversee the extent to which its policies are carried out correctly.</p>	<p>Title II and Title XVI PQR waiver review sheets with appropriate language were released for FO customer service representatives and processing center (PC) technicians, which include specific language and policy for review of appropriate actions to collect, protest/stop, or change the rate of withholding for an installment agreement and document retention.</p> <p>In 2019, we revised prior overpayment PQR review sheets to provide consistent guidance across all reviews and to update policy links in the review sheets. All review sheets require the reviewer to indicate whether documentation is stored appropriately according to our policy.</p> <p>Additionally, PQR-PC, which is a quality review process for PC technicians, was released in October 2019. Cases reviewed under PQR-PC are reviewed under “whole case processing” to ensure policy was followed for all actions taken on the case. Technicians must correct all errors identified during the review.</p>
<p><b>GAO-16-331 (12015004) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Needs to Better Track Efforts and Evaluate Options to Recover Debt and Deter Potential Fraud</b></p>	<p>4/13/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: To ensure effective and appropriate recovery of DI overpayments and administration of penalties and sanctions, the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should explore the feasibility of using additional methods to independently verify financial information provided by</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We will consider closing this recommendation once SSA provides additional information on its rationale for not using additional methods to independently verify financial information.</p>	<p><b>Closed on October 17, 2017.</b> We explored the feasibility of using additional methods to independently verify financial information provided by beneficiaries for use in determining appropriate overpayment repayment agreement amounts. We determined the study would not be cost effective. In order to do a probe, it would require special authorization from the overpaid individuals to access the National Directory of New Hires (NDNH), The Work Number, and Access to Financial Institutions. In addition, the</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		beneficiaries to ensure that complete and reliable information is used when determining repayment amounts. These additional tools could include those already being used by the agency for other purposes.		<p>NDNH query only provides quarterly reports of earnings information. Consequently, this information could change during the time an overpaid individual requests a repayment agreement.</p> <p>In our response to GAO’s June 2018 assessment, we noted all of the factors that we used to determine the feasibility and that, as resources permit, we may consider updating or creating new computer matching agreements and authorizations to verify an overpaid individual's financial allegations beyond the information and proofs provided for repayment agreements that extend beyond 36 months.</p>
<b>GAO-16-331 (12015004) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Needs to Better Track Efforts and Evaluate Options to Recover Debt and Deter Potential Fraud</b>	4/13/16	Recommendation 4: To ensure effective and appropriate recovery of DI overpayments and administration of penalties and sanctions, the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should adjust the minimum withholding rate to 10 percent of monthly DI benefits to allow quicker recovery of debt.	<b>Open.</b> We will close this recommendation once SSA achieves resolution from Congress on its legislative proposal or from its own regulatory efforts.	<b>Closed on July 25, 2018.</b> We submitted a legislative proposal in the last five years (2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021) for the President's Budget to add new language to Section 204 of the Social Security Act that requires a minimum withholding rate of 10 percent of the monthly benefit for Title II benefit overpayments. In addition to the President's Budget, we included the proposal in the 2019 Spring Unified Agendas as we can also make the change through a regulatory update.
<b>GAO-16-331 (12015004) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Needs to Better Track</b>	4/13/16	Recommendation 5: To ensure effective and appropriate recovery of DI overpayments and administration of penalties and sanctions, the Acting Commissioner of the Social	<b>Open.</b> We will consider closing this recommendation if SSA conducts a fuller analysis or provides us with additional information on the costs associated	<b>Closed on April 13, 2016.</b> We do not believe that this recommendation will have a significant impact on recovering debt, particularly in comparison to the proposal to adjust the minimum withholding rate to 10 percent of the monthly benefit for TII benefit overpayments. We do not

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Efforts and Evaluate Options to Recover Debt and Deter Potential Fraud</b></p>		<p>Security Administration should consider adjusting monthly withholding amounts according to cost of living adjustments or charging interest on debts being collected by withholding benefits. Should SSA determine that it is necessary to do so, it could pursue legislative authority to use recovery tools that it is currently unable to use.</p>	<p>with making these changes in withholding amounts.</p>	<p>consider debt delinquent when recovering via benefit withholding. For delinquent debts, our debt collection strategy is to implement collection tools that yield the most collections (i.e. Tax Refund Offset, Administrative Offset, and Administrative Wage Garnishment). We have researched the changes necessary to implement charging interest, which are extensive since the impact is on multiple systems that affect our overpayment business processes. We would also have to implement procedural changes, which will require extensive training for our employees.</p> <p>In June 2019, we re-evaluated our position in response to GAO's concerns. We currently have the authority to charge interest and penalties on our delinquent debts. As part of the Debt Management Product (DMP), our new debt management system that we expect to implement in FY 2022-2023, we are building the capability to calculate, store, and bill this information. Even though we are working on these efforts to put us in a position where we can charge interest and penalties</p>
<p><b>GAO-16-331 (12015004) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Needs to Better Track Efforts and Evaluate Options to Recover Debt</b></p>	<p>4/13/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 6: Pursue additional debt collection tools for collecting delinquent penalties. This includes taking steps to implement tools within its existing authority and exploring the use of those not within its authority, and seeking legislative authority if necessary.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> As of August 2018, the agency determined that its current debt management system lacks the ability to apply new tools to civil monetary penalties (CMP) and put these efforts on hold until its new DMP is near completion, which SSA expects to be in 2023.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> Our current systems do not have the ability to handle the necessary tracking, application of interest, fees and penalties, and reporting of this activity for CMPs. We are currently developing the DMP with an expected completion date of 2022-2023. We will revisit this recommendation when development of DMP is complete.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

and Deter Potential Fraud				
<p><b>GAO-16-250 (12015005) SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY: SSA Could Increase Savings by Refining Its Selection of Cases for Disability Review</b></p>	<p>2/11/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: The Acting Commissioner of Social Security should direct the Deputy Commissioner of Operations to further consider cost savings as part of its prioritization of full medical reviews. Such options could include considering the feasibility of prioritizing different types of beneficiaries on the basis of their estimated average savings and, as appropriate, integrating case-specific indicators of potential cost savings, such as beneficiary age and benefit amount, into its modeling or prioritization process.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> SSA previously agreed that it could look for ways to improve its return on conducting continuing disability reviews (CDR), but also stated that its statistical models and prioritization process already do much of what we recommend. For example, SSA stated that age is already a strong variable in its statistical models. However, these models predict medical improvement and are not designed to take expected cost savings into account. We continue to believe that to maximize expected cost savings SSA could refine its prioritization process by factoring in additional actuarial considerations. In August 2018, SSA stated that the Office of Analytics and Improvements is evaluating the current models and exploring alternatives that more explicitly incorporate projected savings. It plans to include the results of this evaluation in a future CDR report to Congress.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> Our current Continuing Disability Review (CDR) predictive models already accomplish much of what GAO has recommended. The CDR statistical models operate at the individual case level, and there is no accepted methodology or available information to accurately predict outcomes on expected future benefit payments at the individual beneficiary level.</p> <p>We have developed a methodology to calculate prospective program savings from full medical CDRs, at the individual beneficiary level. We are using the current Office of Chief Actuary methodology for the calculation of net program savings from previously performed CDRs for use in the ranking of individuals who are due for CDRs. When these calculations (which are still in development) of individual net program savings from a CDR cessation are complete, they will be combined with the predictive CDR model scores to provide an estimated net program savings from a full medical CDR. We will perform an assessment of this methodology by comparing the expected outcomes on the FY 2017 CDR cohort from ranking cases using this net program savings value to those from our current CDR predictive model ranking. We anticipate the assessment will be completed at the end of January 2020. When this assessment is completed, we will share the results and documentation of both the methodology and the projected outcomes.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-16-250 (12015005) SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY: SSA Could Increase Savings by Refining Its Selection of Cases for Disability Review</b></p>	<p>2/11/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: The Acting Commissioner of Social Security should direct the Deputy Commissioner of Budget, Finance, Quality, and Management to monitor the characteristics of CDR errors to identify potential root causes and report results to the Disability Determination Services (DDS). For example, SSA could analyze CDRs with and without errors to identify trends by impairment, beneficiary type, or other characteristics.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> SSA agreed with this recommendation and stated that it reports all errors to the relevant DDS for corrective action. SSA further stated that its identification of root causes is limited by the relatively few reviewed CDRs that have errors. However, in FY 2014 as an example, SSA identified over 600 CDRs with errors. Although these CDRs made up a small percentage of the CDRs reviewed by SSA that year, the agency could analyze the characteristics of CDRs with errors by comparing relevant percentages without modeling. In addition, SSA could combine data from multiple years if it determined that considering more CDRs with errors would be helpful. There is no change in the status of this recommendation for 2018.</p>	<p><b>Closed on July 25, 2017.</b> We do identify and analyze each and every error found through our CDR quality assurance process and report all of these errors to the relevant DDS for corrective action. For identifying root causes, we are limited by the data available due to the low number of errors (2-3 percent) annually. We do not plan to analyze CDR errors because of the low volume.</p>
<p><b>GAO-16-250 (12015005) SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY : SSA Could Increase Savings by Refining Its Selection of Cases for Disability Review</b></p>	<p>2/11/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: The Acting Commissioner of Social Security should direct the Deputy Commissioner of Budget, Finance, Quality, and Management to regularly track the number and rate of date errors, which can affect benefit payments (e.g., incorrect cessation dates), and consider</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> SSA disagreed with this recommendation and stated that, per SSA regulation, the agency does not consider date errors when calculating accuracy rates because date errors do not affect the decision to cease or continue benefits. SSA also stated its stewardship reviews examine the non-medical quality of benefit payment decisions. However,</p>	<p><b>Closed on May 5, 2016.</b> We disagreed with this recommendation. Our CDR quality reviews examine the medical determination. Our stewardship reviews provides non-medical payment accuracy performance measures for Title II and Title XVI payments. We model the accuracy rate data for CDRs after our initial Quality Assurance (QA) data. Title 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations, sections 404.1640 - 404.1642, mandate the performance standards for the initial QA accuracy rates. According to the</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		including those errors in its reported CDR accuracy rates.	these reviews are not focused on CDRs, and SSA does not report results from them for CDRs specifically. SSA also explained that it does not track the number and rate of date errors because they are infrequent. However, SSA's regulations do not prevent the agency from tracking date errors, and until it does, SSA cannot definitively determine the frequency of these errors. In addition, we found that considering date errors substantially reduced some states' estimated CDR accuracy rates. Without tracking these errors, SSA cannot assess their effect and consider whether including them in its reported CDR accuracy rates has merit. There is no change in the status of this recommendation for 2018.	regulations, the definition of performance accuracy includes the measurement of factors that have a potential for affecting a decision, as well as the correctness of the decision. We do not include onset and cessation date errors because the medical decision in these cases is correct. In addition, we do not track the number and rate of date errors because of their infrequency, especially at the State level. It is not cost beneficial to track and report date errors on a regular basis. As we previously shared with the auditors, we can produce this data; however, we will not create and maintain a report that will likely be unused. We do not plan to record CDR date errors.
<b>GAO-16-250 (12015005) SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY: SSA Could Increase Savings by Refining Its Selection of Cases for Disability Review</b>	2/11/16	Recommendation 5: Acting Commissioner of Social Security should direct the Deputy Commissioner of Budget, Finance, Quality, and Management to adjust its approach to sampling CDRs to efficiently produce reliable accuracy rate estimates for continuances and cessations separately in each state.	<b>Open.</b> SSA disagreed with this recommendation and stated that some states do not generate enough CDR decisions, particularly cessations, to generate statistically valid samples. However, for states with CDR samples that are consistently too small to produce reliable results, SSA could, for example, pool decisions from more months than	<b>Closed on May 5, 2016.</b> We disagreed with this recommendation. States with smaller volumes of cases do not provide enough cases in the universe, especially cessations, for us to be able to select a statistically valid sample. We would have to conduct a 100 percent review of the cases, which does not constitute statistical sampling. A 100 percent review is a highly resource intensive undertaking and would provide limited additional value to our CDR QA accuracy reporting.

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

			it currently does to generate statistically valid samples by state. Conversely, for states with CDR samples that are consistently larger than necessary to efficiently achieve reliable results, SSA could, for example, reduce sample sizes. Because CDR accuracy rates vary by state and cessations are consistently less accurate than continuances, we maintain that SSA should adjust its approach to sampling CDRs. There is no change in the status of this recommendation for 2018.	
<b>GAO-16-250 (12015005) SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY: SSA Could Increase Savings by Refining Its Selection of Cases for Disability Review</b>	2/11/16	Recommendation 7: The Acting Commissioner of Social Security should direct the Chief Actuary to better document the methods including data sources, assumptions, and limitations that factor into its estimates of CDR cost savings.	<b>Open.</b> In June 2019, SSA reported that it documented its estimation methodology for Title II CDRs, and expects to complete the equivalent for Title XVI by the end of December 2019.	<b>Open.</b> We have begun detailing our documentation processes, methods, and assumptions. We have written documentation on the estimation methodology and data sources used for estimating the effects of Title II medical CDRs. As time permits, we continue to make progress on preparing the documentation for title XVI medical CDRs. We expect to have a rough set of documentation in place by the end of the second quarter of FY 2020.
<b>GAO-16-34 (12014035) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Could Do More to Prevent Overpayments or Incorrect</b>	10/29/15	Recommendation 1: To improve transparency in reporting processing errors, SSA should provide additional information on the margins of error or confidence intervals, and clearly identify any limitations in its findings on	<b>Open.</b> We believe that SSA still needs to demonstrate that it is reporting limitations, such as small sample sizes, that would affect the reliability of its estimates of DI improper payments due to specific types and causes of errors and will	<b>Closed on November 5, 2015.</b> We agreed to provide clarifying language concerning the margins of error or confidence intervals in our reviews, and to clearly identify any limitations in our findings on overpayment information provided to Congress and the public. We have communicated the limitations of Stewardship and Work CDR sample sizes on substrata of errors.



Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Waivers to Beneficiaries</b></p>		<p>overpayment information provided to Congress and the public.</p>	<p>consider closing the recommendation at that time.</p>	<p>We have also done that for the FY 2014 Work CDR report. We will add similar language to all reports explaining the limitations on our findings to ensure transparency and, where possible, we will provide confidence interval data.</p> <p>We included the requested additional language in both our FY 2015 Payment Accuracy Report (Stewardship) that was released in June 2016 and our FY 2015 Work CDR Quality Review Report that was released in October 2016. We provided GAO with the published reports. For the Stewardship report, the additional language is in the Executive Summary on page i and in the Deficiency Analysis section on pages 5 and 6. For the FY 2015 Work CDR report, the additional language is in the Findings section on page 6. We also added language to the Annual Financial Report noting that year-to-year differences in the annual average improper payment dollars for the individual categories of error are not statistically significant.</p>
<p><b>GAO-16-34 (12014035) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Could Do More to Prevent Overpayments or Incorrect Waivers to Beneficiaries</b></p>	<p>10/29/15</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: To minimize the potential effect of vulnerabilities in the work reporting process, SSA should take steps to help ensure that work information is entered directly into eWork, the system of record for work information, and issue required receipts. Such steps could include: (a) Improving and issuing guidance and training to field and 800-</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> As of August 2018, SSA had taken a number of steps to implement this recommendation but SSA needs to clarify how recent efforts ensure work information for concurrent beneficiaries is monitored to ensure overpayments from non-electronic wage reporting do not occur. The agency has not reported how it will monitor alerts that are generated from non-</p>	<p><b>Closed on January 22, 2019.</b> A systems enhancement was released on June 2, 2018 that allows SSI and concurrent (SSI and DI) wage reporting by SSI recipients, deemors, and representative payees and provides an automated receipt that the reporter can view, print, and/or save. MSS-18054 OTH was released on June 1, 2018 for all sites advising of the enhancements in myWageReport (myWR). We also issued an emergency message (EM), EM-18052 "Use of the Employer Identification Number (EIN) in MSSICS and eWork with myWageReport</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		<p>number staff to help ensure they log information into eWork and issue required receipts. (b) Establishing policies to monitor alerts to help ensure that work information for concurrent beneficiaries is reflected in SSI and DI systems, and take steps to monitor and make enhancements to systems or guidance, as needed.</p>	<p>electronic wage reporting to ensure that this information is reflected in the SSI and DI systems. Failing to ensure that work information is reflected in both systems could lead SSA to erroneously assess overpayments for concurrent beneficiaries who properly report work.</p>	<p>Workaround" on November 2, 2018. The EM reminds technicians about the importance of keying the EIN in the claim system and eWork when processing wages and work reports. It also provides technicians with interim work-around instructions for posting EIN information in eWork. The EM prepares technicians for the implementation of Section 824 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (BBA) and is critical to the success of the online wage reporting application myWR. Both initiatives will help reduce processing time for wage reports.</p> <p>We ensure work information is in our SSI records by continuing the use of our diary system that interfaces with both the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and various outside wage/income sources (e.g., State wage reporting) to inform both our technicians and management of unreported income. We continue to monitor income, among other issues, through the normal Redetermination diary process. For DI, we use the eWork program that interfaces with our Summary Earnings Query and our Detailed Earning Query to compare what the claimant reports.</p>
<p><b>GAO-16-34 (12014035) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Could Do More to Prevent Overpayments or Incorrect</b></p>	<p>10/29/15</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: To further ensure the effective screening of work reports, SSA should monitor its process for handling work reports to determine whether staff are taking action on work reports in accordance with proper procedures, and</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> SSA disagreed with this recommendation and, as of May 2018, reported that existing processes address it. Under its current process, SSA accepts a beneficiary's return to work allegation (work report), but does not verify the information when the wages are reported, instead</p>	<p><b>Closed on October 29, 2015.</b> We disagreed with this recommendation. We accept a beneficiary's return to work allegation (work report), but do not verify the information at the point of contact. The outcome of a work CDR is not dependent on the accuracy of the work report, as we are required to fully develop and verify the work activity and apply appropriate work incentives. We use our</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Waivers to Beneficiaries</b></p>		<p>provide feedback to staff as needed.</p>	<p>verifying it during its CDR process. However, SSA accepts some work reports without a CDR; therefore, absent an oversight process to ensure that work reports are properly screened, GAO believes this approach may be missing opportunities to prevent overpayments for unreported work.</p>	<p>work CDR process to verify work activity, not the work report.</p> <p>We evaluated GAO's comments and continue to disagree. Although we encourage beneficiaries to report wages timely, a work report does not always result in a CDR. Technicians carefully review work reports and make independent determinations on the need for one. When we do not conduct reviews timely, we may complete a review using data obtained through our Continuing Disability Review Enforcement Operation process using IRS data and our Quarterly Earnings Project using Office of Child Support Enforcement data. We also analyze electronic wage reports to identify potential cases that may require a CDR.</p>
<p><b>GAO-16-34 (12014035) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Could Do More to Prevent Overpayments or Incorrect Waivers to Beneficiaries</b></p>	<p>10/29/15</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: To enhance the ease and integrity of the work reporting process, SSA should study the costs and benefits of automated reporting options, including options similar to those currently available for SSI recipients, but that do not go as far as automating the CDR process.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> As of August 2018, SSA had taken steps to study the costs and benefits of automated reporting options as we recommended, although some efforts are still under way. While these efforts partially address the recommendation, SSA has not provided information on the costs and benefits of a telephone reporting option for DI beneficiaries, which is currently available to SSI beneficiaries and would provide an automated option for those who lack access to smart phones or the Internet.</p>	<p><b>Closed on November 8, 2018.</b> The myWR application went into production in September 2017. Since then, the application has provided DI beneficiaries the ability to report earnings electronically. Although DI beneficiaries may report wages via myWR using a mobile phone, we do not have plans to evaluate landline telephone reporting based on accessibility issues, parity issues between SSI and DI, and lack of system resources. In June 2018, we expanded the myWR application to allow SSI recipients, their representative payees, or their deemors (e.g., an ineligible spouse or parent living with a recipient) also to report earnings electronically. This application provides SSI recipients another channel for wage reporting (in addition to the telephone and mobile channels).</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				<p>We negotiated an agreement with a payroll provider (PDP) and awarded a contract on September 30, 2019. The contract with the PDP will allow us to establish an information exchange with the PDP to receive wage data on a monthly basis. This will help us determine when a work CDR is needed. The process will allow us to perform Work CDRs closer to when earnings are actually earned, ultimately reducing overpayments. Development of the exchange is currently in the early stages, and full implementation of the project is expected to take several years. Further, we developed a system called Work Smart to identify cases for a CDR based on data collected through an information exchange.</p>
<p><b>GAO-16-34 (12014035) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Could Do More to Prevent Overpayments or Incorrect Waivers to Beneficiaries</b></p>	<p>10/29/15</p>	<p>Recommendation 5: To enhance beneficiary understanding of work reporting requirements, SSA should: (a) Clarify work reporting requirements provided to beneficiaries. (b) Explore options for increasing the frequency of reporting reminders to DI beneficiaries, similar to those currently available to SSI recipients.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> In November 2018, SSA reported taking several actions to address GAO's October 2015 recommendation, including sending information on wage reporting responsibilities to beneficiaries and advocacy groups in conjunction with specific changes related to electronic wage reporting. SSA also reported it plans to complete this assessment and begin taking additional action, if needed, by the end of January 2019. Without clearly and frequently reminding DI beneficiaries of the work reporting requirements, beneficiaries may</p>	<p><b>Closed on January 22, 2019.</b> In September 2017, we deployed a new wage reporting application on the my Social Security online portal that allows DI beneficiaries to report their earnings electronically, similar to what was already available outside of my Social Security for SSI recipients.</p> <p>In June 2018, we added new capabilities to my Social Security accounts. The portal now accepts wage reports electronically from SSI recipients and deemors, DI beneficiaries, concurrent beneficiaries, and representative payees. More information about this feature is posted on our external facing website,</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

			fail to comply with SSA's complex program rules, and receive overpayments.	<p><a href="https://choosework.ssa.gov/blog/2018-07-09-update-social-security-online-wage-reporting-service">https://choosework.ssa.gov/blog/2018-07-09-update-social-security-online-wage-reporting-service</a>.</p> <p>While there are no additional formalized communications being distributed to DI beneficiaries, we are confident Operations Front Line employees remind beneficiaries of work reporting requirements and the tools available to report work activity when handling online, phone, or in person contacts.</p>
<p><b>GAO-16-34 (12014035) Disability Insurance: SSA Could Do More to Prevent Overpayments or Incorrect Waivers to Beneficiaries</b></p>	10/29/15	<p>Recommendation 6: To improve compliance with waiver policies, SSA should develop a timetable for implementing updates to its Debt Management System to:</p> <p>(a) Align system controls with SSA policy, so that waivers over \$1,000 cannot be administratively waived. (b) Ensure that evidence supporting waiver decisions is sufficiently maintained to allow for subsequent monitoring and oversight.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> Although SSA implemented the second part of the recommendation, continuing limitations in SSA's Debt Management System could allow staff to administratively approve waivers greater than \$1,000 without review or detection by managers in violation of SSA policy. In January 2019, SSA reported that it is building a new debt management system, which will include controls to prevent administrative waivers over \$1,000. SSA anticipates these controls, which are tied to broader changes to SSA's debt management system, will be in place in FY 2020. However, until the controls are implemented, SSA will not have assurance that staff are appropriately processing such waivers. In the interim, SSA should consider alternative</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We continue to work on this multi-year project. We are modernizing the debt management system and due to product roadmap re-prioritization, the planned release for the Intranet waiver application is now FY 2022. The control in the application will ensure technicians cannot administratively waive overpayments over \$1,000.</p> <p>Title II and Title XVI Waiver Review sheets are part of the Performance Quality Review (PQR) process. In the course of PQR questions, technicians can annotate the dollar range of the overpayment being reviewed (\$0 - \$1000.00; \$1000.01- \$2000.00; \$2,000.01- 20,000.00; \$20,000.00-\$100,000.00; and \$100,000.01 –up) and affirm appropriate action was taken.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

			approaches for preventing inappropriate waivers, such as conducting regular, targeted reviews of administrative waivers over \$1,000 dollars to ensure that they are being processed correctly.	
<b>GAO-16-34 (12014035) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Could Do More to Prevent Overpayments or Incorrect Waivers to Beneficiaries</b>	10/29/15	Recommendation 7: To improve compliance with waiver policies, SSA should take steps to regularly assess the accuracy of DI waiver decisions, particularly for administrative waivers and for some waivers under \$2,000. This could include periodically reviewing approved and denied DI waivers through its continuous quality initiative.	<b>Open.</b> In May 2018, SSA reported that it continues to believe that its actions resolve this recommendation. However, in the absence of regular, targeted reviews, SSA lacks assurance that waivers of DI overpayment debts-especially low-dollar amounts that lack supervisory review-are being processed correctly.	<b>Closed on March 24, 2016.</b> We continue to clarify waiver and debt management processing instructions. We replaced the Continuous Quality process with our Performance Quality Review (PQR) process. We updated our review sheets for FY 2020 to ensure consistent terminology across all reviews and updated the policy sections referenced. Additionally our process is the same for Title XVI and TII waivers. There is not a specific review sheet for waivers under \$2,000. However, the new review sheets do incorporate the question for the amount of the review (0-\$1000.00; \$1000.01-\$2000.00; \$2000.01-\$19,999.99; 20,000.00-\$99,999.99; \$100,000.00-up) for both Title II and Title XVI overpayments.
<b>GAO-15-531 (12014032) DISABILITY INSURANCE: Actions Needed to Help Prevent Potential Overpayments to Individuals Receiving</b>	7/8/15	Recommendation 3: To improve SSA's ability to detect, prevent, and recover potential DI benefit overpayments due to the concurrent receipt of FECA benefits, the Commissioner of Social Security should, in accordance with Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance, compare the	<b>Open.</b> GAO will continue to monitor SSA's work in this area. It will be important for SSA to follow through with these plans in order to help the agency identify and prevent potential DI overpayments.	<b>Open.</b> We continue to work with DOL to establish the computer matching agreement to support the FECA data exchange.

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Concurrent Federal Workers' Compensation</b></p>		<p>costs and benefits of alternatives to SSA's current approach for reducing the potential for overpayments that result from the concurrent receipt of FECA benefits, which relies on beneficiaries to self-report any FECA benefits they receive. These alternatives could include, among others, routinely matching Department of Labor's (DOL) FECA program data with DI program data to detect potential DI overpayments.</p>		
<p><b>GAO-15-531 (12014032) DISABILITY INSURANCE: Actions Needed to Help Prevent Potential Overpayments to Individuals Receiving Concurrent Federal Workers' Compensation</b></p>	<p>7/8/15</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: To improve SSA's ability to detect, prevent, and recover potential DI benefit overpayments due to the concurrent receipt of FECA benefits, the Commissioner of Social Security should strengthen internal controls designed to prevent DI overpayments due to the concurrent receipt of FECA benefits by implementing the alternative that provides the greatest net benefits.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> GAO will continue to monitor SSA's work in this area. It will be important for SSA to follow through with these plans in order to help the agency identify and prevent potential DI overpayments.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We continue to work with DOL to establish the computer matching agreement to support the FECA data exchange.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-15-73 (12013025) 401(K) PLANS: Greater Protections Needed for Forced Transfers and Inactive Accounts</b></p>	<p>11/21/14</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: To ensure that 401(k) plan participants have timely and adequate information to keep track of all their workplace retirement accounts, the Social Security Administration's Acting Commissioner should make information on potential vested plan benefits more accessible to individuals before retirement. For example, the agency could consolidate information on potential vested benefits, currently sent in the Potential Private Retirement Benefit Information notice, with the information provided in the Social Security earnings and benefits statement.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We welcome SSA's efforts to raise awareness about the role of private retirement savings in ensuring financial security and to notify individuals of potential benefits. However, these efforts do not supplant the need for individuals to have early and ongoing access to complete information on their potential plan benefits. In February 2018, bipartisan members of Congress introduced legislation that would make this possible. The Retirement Savings Lost and Found Act of 2018 (S. 2474) would house SSA's data on potential private retirement benefits in a secure database, which would be searchable online by participants and beneficiaries prior to retirement. Whether the legislation is enacted or not, we continue to believe that SSA should work to make its valuable data on potential vested plan benefits more accessible to individuals before retirement.</p>	<p><b>Closed on February 24, 2015.</b> As required by the Social Security Act, we disclose IRS's pension information automatically upon an individual applying for certain benefits or upon an individual making a specific request for the information. Even if we can provide information on potential vested benefits, including unverified, external third-party retirement income information in our Social Security Statement or in an individual's personal <i>my</i> Social Security account, as GAO suggests, doing so may place SSA in a position of responding to questions about Employment Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) policy from the public. The ERISA notice directs the recipient to contact U.S. Department of Labor's Employee Benefits Security Administration. SSA cannot respond to recipients' ERISA inquiries because we have no firsthand knowledge of the private pension information involved. This is outside the scope of our mission, and it would increase workloads, including additional written correspondence and undeliverable mail. In August 2016, we provided GAO an update on our position. Our Office of the General Counsel determined that it would be permissible to include a general statement in our benefit statement encouraging potential beneficiaries to pursue any external pension benefits as long as it includes information required by law and the information is accurate. However, we continue to believe including such information would place us in a position to respond to issues or questions that we do not have the expertise to answer. We believe our statement adequately covers the fact that</p>
--	-----------------	---	---	--



Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				<p>people need other savings, pensions, and investments. Furthermore, we send notices to people who we believe qualify for other pensions.</p> <p>GAO indicated that members of Congress introduced bipartisan legislation that would make it possible for us to implement GAO's recommendation. If legislation is enacted, we will take any steps that are required.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-06-599R (12005036) Managerial Cost Accounting Practices: Department of Health and Human Services and Social Security Administration</b></p>	<p>4/18/06</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: To better understand the relationship of costs and revenues related to fees SSA collects for administering state SSI supplementation programs, the Commissioner of SSA should direct appropriate officials to study those costs to determine the full cost, including the cost of services provided by other entities for the benefit of SSA.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> SSA completed the roll out of the Employee Office Sampler (EOS) to the DDS offices and once SSA receives additional funding it will roll out EOS to the remaining operational components. According to SSA, this tool removes the manual aspect of the District Office Work Sampling (DOWS) process. The offices involved are continuing to clean up their sampling categories along with the business offices that use the sampling data.</p>	<p><b>Closed on September 29, 2006.</b> We are moving forward with the Employee Office Sampler (EOS), a cost efficient, web-enabled sample capturing system in the format of the DOWS currently used in our field offices. This sampling method will allow us to continue to track the work performed in the State SSI supplementation programs as it is captured today using the DOWS. We completed the roll out of EOS to the DDSs for the start of the first quarter of FY 2018. We received funding approval to roll out EOS to the remaining operational components in five additional phases. In FY 2019, we received funding for the 21st Century Work Measurement project. The FY 2019 release provides a direct feed from the EOS to the Cost Analysis System. We are continuing our work to prepare the next office (Office of Earnings Operations) for the EOS rollout.</p>
<p><b>GAO-18-19 (12015026) WORKPLACE RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS: Better Guidance and Information Could Help Plan Participants at Home and Abroad Manage Their Retirement Savings</b></p>	<p>3/5/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: The Social Security Administration Commissioner should take steps to improve the likelihood that the Notice of Potential Private Pension Benefit Information corresponds to actual retirement benefits in the future, for example, by working with the IRS as necessary.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We will monitor the agency's progress in implementing this recommendation.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We continue to meet with the IRS regularly to discuss Form 8955-SSA, which provides the basis for the information shown in the "Potential Private Retirement Benefit Information" notice. The IRS has agreed to incorporate our suggestion to update Form 8955-SSA to explain that the filer should include the individual pension plan participant's full social security number (SSN) on the form. We are working with the IRS to clarify coding instructions for Form 8955-SSA and to institute a new edit to our paper processing to ensure accuracy. We are also having discussions regarding potential data exchanges with filers.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				We do not currently have a timeline for implementing this recommendation.
<b>GAO-18-37 (12016007) SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY: Additional Measures and Evaluation Needed to Enhance Accuracy and Consistency of Hearings Decisions</b>	1/8/18	Recommendation 1: The Commissioner of SSA should develop a set of public performance measures, to include accuracy and consistency, as well as timeliness, of administration law judges' disability decisions. SSA could consider whether existing quality review or monitoring efforts could provide suitable data for such measures.	<b>Open.</b> GAO will continue to monitor SSA's efforts.	<b>Open.</b> We developed a review of hearing decisions to assess decisional quality on a national level. We implemented the review throughout FY 2019 and will draft the report in FY 2020. As we review the results of our national sample and prepare our report, we will assess whether existing quality review measures provide suitable data concerning performance measures such as timeliness, consistency, and accuracy. We are working internally to evaluate current Office of Appellate Operations reviews. We do not currently have a timeline for implementing this recommendation.
<b>GAO-18-37 (12016007) SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY: Additional Measures and Evaluation Needed to Enhance Accuracy and Consistency of Hearings Decisions</b>	1/8/18	Recommendation 2: The Commissioner of SSA should systematically evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of its quality assurance reviews and take steps to reduce or better manage any unnecessary overlap among them to ensure strategic use of resources. Such steps could include enhancing collaboration where reviews overlap or only conducting the reviews that are most efficient and effective in achieving agency goals for improving accuracy and consistency of ALJ disability decisions.	<b>Open.</b> GAO will continue to monitor SSA's efforts.	<b>Open.</b> We developed a review of favorable and unfavorable hearing decisions to assess decisional quality on a national level. We implemented the review throughout FY 2019. We will review the results and draft a study report by the end of FY 2020.

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-17-228 (12016009) SSA DISABILITY BENEFITS: Comprehensive Strategic Approach Needed to Enhance Antifraud Activities</b></p>	<p>4/26/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Lead a comprehensive fraud risk assessment that is consistent with leading practices, and develop a plan for regularly updating the assessment.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> GAO requested and awaits additional documentation of SSA's fraud risk assessment of its disability programs to assess the extent to which it is consistent with leading practices.</p>	<p><b>Closed on October 4, 2019.</b> In FY 2018, we completed our first fraud risk assessment focused on the disability program, consistent with the leading practices outlined in the GAO Framework for Managing Fraud Risks in Federal Programs. We presented the results of the fraud risk assessment to the National Anti-Fraud Committee (NAFC), and it determined several risks required additional mitigation strategies to reduce the residual risk. On September 30, 2019, we finalized our Disability Fraud Risk Profile, which identifies additional control activities for those specific risks. The completion of the Disability Fraud Risk Profile documents our comprehensive approach to fraud risk management, by identifying fraud risks within SSA programs and determining the appropriate risk response. We provided GAO documentation on October 4, 2019.</p>
<p><b>GAO-17-228 (12016009) SSA DISABILITY BENEFITS: Comprehensive Strategic Approach Needed to Enhance Antifraud Activities</b></p>	<p>4/26/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Develop, document, and implement an antifraud strategy that is aligned to its assessed fraud risks.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> GAO requested and awaits additional documentation to assess the extent to which SSA's Disability Fraud Risk Mitigation Strategy is aligned to assessed fraud risks to SSA's disability programs.</p>	<p><b>Closed on June 5, 2019.</b> On March 20, 2019, the Acting Commissioner approved the Fiscal Year 2019-2021 Agency Anti-Fraud Strategic Plan. The plan focuses on three major goals: (1) enhance our fraud risk management culture; (2) strengthen our programs through assessment and monitoring; and (3) conduct outreach and ongoing communication of our anti-fraud efforts. We aligned the goals with GAO's Framework for Managing Fraud Risk in Federal Programs. We provided GAO additional documentation on June 13, 2019. We also completed the Disability Fraud Risk Profile and provided GAO with documentation on October 4, 2019.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-17-228 (12016009) SSA DISABILITY BENEFITS: Comprehensive Strategic Approach Needed to Enhance Antifraud Activities</b></p>	<p>4/26/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: Work with components responsible for implementing antifraud initiatives to develop outcome-oriented metrics, including baselines and goals, where appropriate for antifraud activities.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> GAO will continue to monitor SSA's efforts.</p>	<p><b>Closed on June 5, 2019.</b> On April 26 2019, we finalized our Enterprise Fraud Risk Management (EFRM) Strategy. The strategy was reviewed, and approved, by SSA's National Anti-Fraud Committee, comprised of the senior leadership for our major functional areas. The EFRM Strategy establishes a standardized process for conducting fraud risk assessments and establishing fraud risk mitigation strategies and profiles for our major programmatic areas. This strategy aligns with the principles and practices established in the GAO Framework for Managing Fraud Risk in Federal Programs. This process will help us evaluate our major fraud risks and our mitigation strategies as well as the data and metrics necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of our controls.</p>
<p><b>GAO-17-228 (12016009) SSA DISABILITY BENEFITS: Comprehensive Strategic Approach Needed to Enhance Antifraud Activities</b></p>	<p>4/26/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: Review progress toward meeting goals on a regular basis, and recommend that the NAFC make changes to control activities or take other corrective actions on any initiatives that are not meeting goals.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We will continue to monitor SSA's efforts.</p>	<p><b>Closed on October 4, 2019.</b> On April 26, 2019, we finalized our EFRM Strategy. The EFRM Strategy establishes a standardized process for conducting fraud risk assessments and establishing fraud risk profiles for our major programmatic areas. This strategy aligns with the principles and practices established in GAO's Framework for Managing Fraud Risk in Federal Programs. It also outlines a multi-year schedule to complete fraud risk assessments across our major program areas and conduct regular reassessments. Our NAFC reviewed and approved the strategy. This process will help the NAFC evaluate the control activities designed to help prevent and detect fraud and make risk-based decisions on those initiatives.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				<p>On September 30, 2019, we finalized our Disability Fraud Risk Profile. The profile identifies additional control activities for specific risks identified in the Disability Fraud Risk Assessment that NAFC determined required additional mitigation to reduce the residual risks. The completion of the Disability Fraud Risk Profile documents our comprehensive approach to fraud-risk management, by identifying fraud risks within our programs and determining the appropriate risk response. We will repeat this exercise for the other fraud risk areas identified in the EFRM Strategy.</p>
<p><b>GAO-17-352 (12016019) YOUTH WITH AUTISM: Federal Agencies Should Take Additional Action to Support Transition-Age Youth</b></p>	<p>5/4/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: To implement the goals and policy priorities of the 2020 Federal Youth Transition Plan, the Federal Partners in Transition (FPT) workgroup should develop a long-term implementation plan, including milestones and specific agency roles and assignments.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> SSA noted that the voluntary, ad-hoc nature of the FPT precludes definitive role assignments and implementation plans. We continue to maintain that being a voluntary initiative does not preclude the FPT from establishing long-term milestones and clarifying roles and responsibilities. Further, a long-term plan can be changed, and need not be definitive. Without a long-term implementation plan that includes milestones and specific agency roles and assignments, it is less likely that the priorities outlined in the 2020 Plan will be achieved.</p>	<p><b>Closed on July 27, 2018.</b> We have been meeting with the Departments of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services on a monthly basis in both the Federal Partners in Transition (FPT) steering committee and general meetings. These meetings have created a working, structured, collaborative effort to address the audit recommendation and meet the policy priorities outlined in the FPT 2020 plan.</p> <p>Departments are rotating the responsibility to present to FPT stakeholders on critical youth transition-related topics that will help inform FPT members of agencies' efforts. FPT members are utilizing the working group as a method to disseminate important information to our respective networks and leverage FPT members' expertise to help inform policy and processes. FPT is currently identifying members and resources that are missing from the working group, ways to coordinate with other interagency</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				<p>entities, and strategies to continue engaging the various stakeholders.</p> <p>As a key partner in the FPT workgroup, we agree that our continued work toward accomplishing the goals laid out in the 2020 Federal Youth Transition Plan is within our purview and authority. However, the voluntary, ad-hoc nature of the FPT allows FPT to be flexible and responsive to the partners' needs and believe changing its nature and purpose would turn FPT into an ineffective gathering. Other related groups to which our agency and related agencies are members, such as the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee and the Interagency Working Group on Youth Programs, are able to create more structured implementation plans for specific work.</p>
<p><b>GAO-17-485 (12016012) SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME: SSA Could Strengthen its Efforts to Encourage Employment for Transition-Age Youth</b></p>	5/17/17	<p>Recommendation 1: Analyze the Student Earned Income Exclusion (SEIE) data to determine why a large proportion of transition-age youth on SSI with reported earnings did not benefit from the SEIE and, if warranted, take actions to ensure that those eligible for the incentive benefit from it.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> GAO will close this recommendation when SSA analyzes SEIE data and, if warranted, takes actions needed to ensure those eligible for SEIE benefit from it; or when all students with earnings receive SEIE because SSA's legislative proposal was enacted.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We are still working to resolve the issues with Student Earned Income Exclusion (SEIE) analytical data that we reported during the audit. Once those issues are resolved, we intend to analyze the data to determine the volume of students with earnings who are not benefiting from the SEIE. However, we continue to submit a legislative proposal in our budget, most recently in FY 2021, to eliminate earnings reporting for youth, which would prevent similar concerns in the future. We do not have a timeline for completion of this recommendation.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-17-485 (12016012) SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME: SSA Could Strengthen its Efforts to Encourage Employment for Transition-Age Youth</b></p>	<p>5/17/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Analyze options to improve communication about SSA-administered work incentives and the implications of work on SSI benefits, with a goal of increasing understanding of SSI program rules and work incentives among transition-age youth and their families. This should include, but not necessarily be limited to, updating SSAs procedures for staff meeting with SSI applicants, recipients, and their families to regularly and consistently discuss – when applicable—how work incentives can prevent reductions in benefit levels and how work history is considered during eligibility redeterminations.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> As of June 2019, SSA continued to disagree with this recommendation, noting that the specific strategy suggested in the recommendation is too resource consuming given the current state of its operational workloads. We acknowledge that it may be challenging for SSA to ensure staff across its offices consistently and accurately explain complex program rules pertaining to work and work incentives. At the same time, FO staff are both obliged and best-positioned to explain these rules. Moreover, in response to an SSA request for Information, SSA received a range of feedback on how it might improve transition outcomes for youth on SSI through better communication, suggesting that SSA's current communication strategies may not be sufficiently effective. We will consider closing this recommendation when SSA has taken further steps to ensure field staff are providing consistent and accurate information.</p>	<p><b>Closed on July 5, 2017.</b> We disagree. We have analyzed and continuously monitor and solicit feedback on options to improve communications about our work incentives. We continuously explore ways that we can better communicate information about work incentives for all our beneficiaries, including transition-age youth and their families. We require staff to meet with SSI recipients regularly and instruct staff to discuss relevant work incentives. Most letters issued to recipients include information about the ChooseWork site. Our current brochure provides relevant information to fill knowledge gaps regarding the age-18 redetermination, SSA work incentives, and other resources. While not all youth take advantage of these work incentives or are interested in them, there is no indication that staff is not providing them with appropriate work incentive information.</p> <p>In addition to our efforts with staff, we prioritize services to youth in the Work Incentives Planning and Assistance (WIPA) referrals from the Ticket to Work Help Line (Help Line). The Help Line is the contact number for our youth brochure. The Help Line refers any youth between the ages of 14 and 25, or their representative, to a WIPA for services if the caller expresses an interest in receiving work incentives information, regardless of their employment status. WIPA projects must prioritize working with the youth once they receive the referral. Finally, early internal discussions are underway to formulate a viable youth Ticket demonstration project.</p>
---	----------------	--	---	---



Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				<p>We updated our transition-aged youth notice and brochure to include information on Medicaid and to point out the importance of keeping health insurance as well as having a primary care provider. The updated notice will provide information about SSI work incentives that primarily affect youth (such as the Student Earned Income Exclusion and Section 301) as well as information about common programs and services the family and youth may find helpful (such as vocational rehabilitation and the Department of Education’s Parent Centers). Beginning August 17, 2019, we will send the notice/brochure to approximately 357,785 (347,363 English notices and 10,422 Spanish notices) youth who are between the ages of 14 and 17 and who receive SSI. Below is a copy of the notice and links to our website to access the English and Spanish versions of the annual publication.</p> <p>English: <a href="https://www.ssa.gov/pubs/EN-05-11005.pdf">https://www.ssa.gov/pubs/EN-05-11005.pdf</a> Spanish: <a href="https://www.ssa.gov/pubs/ES-05-10915.pdf">https://www.ssa.gov/pubs/ES-05-10915.pdf</a></p> <p>In May 2019, we reported to GAO that each year we work with all parts of the agency to determine what should be included in our brochure that is sent to youth. We have also begun discussions about how to better utilize social media to reach youth.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-17-485 (12016012) SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME: SSA Could Strengthen its Efforts to Encourage Employment for Transition-Age Youth</b></p>	<p>5/17/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: Work with the Secretary of Education to determine the extent to which youth on SSI are not receiving transition services through schools that can connect them to Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) agencies and services.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> Unless SSA takes steps to overcome the legal and operational barriers it identified to sharing data on youth receiving SSI, or can monitor its success at connecting to VR services through implementation of our fourth recommendation, SSA cannot know whether youth on SSI are receiving or have access to services they may need to achieve employment and, potentially, self-sufficiency. We maintain that SSA should remain open to identifying opportunities to determining the extent of youth not connected to VR, and reviewing options with Education as Education's implementation of WIOA and data collection on youth in transition evolves.</p>	<p><b>Closed on July 27, 2018.</b> We had discussions with the Department of Education, but ultimately determined that the legal and operational barriers to sharing data on Supplemental Security Income (SSI) recipients with schools would prevent us from facilitating the connection between the youth, the school, and VR. Further, given recent requirements in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act requiring pre-employment transition services, research from prior and current data sources may be misleading.</p> <p>The Departments of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services run programs designed to help youth achieve employment and potentially self-sufficiency, and it is their responsibility to serve all eligible youth. While it is not SSA's responsibility to "ensure youth on SSI are receiving or have access to services", we continue to work with the Department of Education on the Federal Partners in Transition group and other relevant agencies to determine how we can support their missions. Finally, as part of our fiscal year 2021 Presidential Budget, we included a legislative proposal allowing us to directly refer youth to VR.</p>
<p><b>GAO-17-485 (12016012) SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME: SSA Could Strengthen its Efforts to Encourage</b></p>	<p>5/17/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: Explore various options for increasing connections to VR agencies and services, including their potential costs and benefits. One option, among others, could be to expand the Ticket to Work program to include youth.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> In August 2018, SSA officials reported that, after reviewing its interpretation of the Social Security Act, the agency continues to maintain that the law precludes it from directly or indirectly referring youth on SSI to vocational rehabilitation agencies.</p>	<p><b>Closed on July 27, 2018.</b> We have taken multiple steps to explore options to increase connections to VR agencies and services.</p> <p>To gather information from external stakeholders, we published a Request for Information (RFI) on Strategies to Improve Adult Outcomes for Youth Receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) in</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Employment for Transition-Age Youth</b></p>			<p>Therefore, SSA submitted a legislative proposal in the 2019 Presidential Budget that would allow the agency to refer youth to vocational rehabilitation agencies. SSA officials also reported that SSA started two demonstration projects to determine whether youth on SSI benefit from referrals to vocational rehabilitation agencies. According to information provided in July 2019, one of these projects analyzes an experimental intervention to improve the outcomes of children receiving SSI by providing personalized information to families about the likelihood that a child will not continue on SSI after age 18 redetermination, as well as resources to help these youth with the transition to employment. The resources offered will include: math tutoring, SAT/ACT test preparation, and help with applying for vocational rehabilitation services. SSA's second demonstration project, which has not yet begun, will involve testing direct referrals to VR in one state for 18 and 19 year olds who or may become SSI or Social Security Disability Insurance beneficiaries. This</p>	<p>the Federal Register (83 FR 411). This RFI explicitly asked about ways to connect youth receiving SSI with VR and about options for programs like a Ticket to Work for youth. We provided GAO with the RFI and our plans in July 2019.</p> <p>We also reviewed our interpretation of the Social Security Act and maintain that it precludes us from referring youth to VR outside of demonstration projects. We looked at indirect ways of referring youth to VR, such as referring them to other agencies. However, if the ultimate purpose is to refer to VR, then it is not allowed. As a result, we have submitted a legislative proposal as part of the fiscal year 2019 Presidential Budget that would renew our authority to refer youth to VR. We are also beginning two projects that test whether referrals to VR are beneficial to youth (in addition to our work on the Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI [PROMISE] project). We are developing an agreement with the State of Ohio that will allow us to test referring youth going through an age-18 redetermination or who apply for benefits at age 18 to VR. We are also working with researchers at the University of Chicago to test ways of connecting younger youths to VR. We provided GAO with information on the Ohio project in July 2019.</p> <p>We will begin recruitment for the Ohio Direct Referral Demonstration project in January of 2020. This project will involve testing direct</p>
---	--	--	---	--

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

			<p>demonstration project will involve data sharing between SSA and the state on individuals eligible to participate in the project. SSA's actions are positive steps and we will continue to monitor SSA's progress related to its Technical Expert Panel and demonstration projects.</p>	<p>referrals to VR resources in the state of Ohio for 19 year olds who are or may become Supplemental Security Income or Social Security Disability Insurance beneficiaries. Additionally, we have not conducted the proposed technical expert panel, but have instead commissioned two reports on youth services that will help us identify implementable polices related to youth.</p> <p>The costs and benefits of increasing access to VR are highly dependent on specific legislation. Since no legislation has been enacted, all actions taken so far have been minimal (e.g., changing the youth brochure). As such, they have had negligible costs or benefits. We do not plan to develop a cost benefit analysis for this proposal.</p>
<p><b>GAO-17-464 (12016017) Telecommunications: Agencies Need to Apply Transition Planning Practices to Reduce Potential Delays and Added Costs</b></p>	<p>9/21/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Verify the completeness of its inventory of current telecommunications assets and services and establish a process for ongoing maintenance of the inventory regarding services other than local and long-distance telecommunications.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> GAO will continue to monitor SSA's efforts to implement this recommendation.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> At the time of the final report, we disagreed with the recommendation. During the course of the review, we provided the requested documentation between our agency and the General Services Administration (GSA). We believed the documentation demonstrates our collaboration with GSA and supports our attestation that our inventory was valid and complete. We also included the complete inventory in our Agency Transition Plan, which we provided to GSA in the fall of 2016. In addition, in April 2017, we provided the supporting document, "Data Reconciliation Plan", which outlines our process for reconciling and maintaining all services procured through GSA contract vehicles.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				<p>In order to account for all services at all agency sites, we utilize our official repository of office information, the Detailed Office/Organization Resource System (DOORS). We provided three screenshots of the DOORS intranet site to demonstrate its authoritative purpose and functionality. We have two projects that account for all of the telecommunications services within our Enterprise Infrastructure Solutions (EIS) Transition Program--SSANet and Grand SLLAM (SSA's Local and Long distance Access Management). We provided evidence of the documented process for maintaining services for each project. The reconciliation processes with the DOORS database can be located throughout each document. In addition, we provided documentation to demonstrate authority from the Executive Sponsor.</p> <p>We have made significant progress over the past two years; however, we acknowledge that resolution as recommended will require significant changes to our inventory procedures and policy.</p> <p>To resolve the immediate and outstanding concern of a complete and managed telecommunications inventory, we will begin consolidating disparate telecommunications inventories into a unified asset management solution (ServiceNow) by 2021. We believe that with this approach, we can provide more accessible, searchable, and reliable telecommunications data for the purposes of promoting transparency, facilitating better</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				<p>decision-making, control spending, and improving operational efficiency. Once fully implemented, our approach will not only make it easier to understand how we spend taxpayer dollars, but also serve as a tool for better oversight, data-driven decision-making, and innovation. We believe that better data leads to better decisions and ultimately a better government.</p> <p>We intend to transition our network and telecommunications environment to EIS. We will award three contracts under the EIS vehicle. We understand that our EIS award will move forward without the extensive inventory analysis, as recommended. Consequently, this EIS procurement activity, while financially noteworthy is limited in scope, informed by third-party analysis to the advantage of our organization, conducted in extensive consultation with GSA and OMB, and provides an immediate and direct benefit to the public. As we strengthen our inventory program, we will consider additional opportunities through EIS to achieve sustainable benefit aligned to agency, administrative, and congressional priorities.</p>
<p><b>GAO-17-464 (12016017) Telecommunications: Agencies Need to Apply Transition Planning Practices to Reduce Potential</b></p>	9/21/17	<p>Recommendation 2: Complete identification of the agency's future telecommunications needs and aligns its approach with the agency's enterprise architecture.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> GAO will continue to monitor SSA's efforts to implement this recommendation.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> EIS is a key part of the multi-channel customer service model that enables the public to interact with us in many different ways. Our Next Generation Telephone Project provides us the immediate ability to meet telephone demand in the near term while providing the flexibility to shift our approach should customers migrate to more digital interactions and self-service.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<b>Delays and Added Costs</b>				<p>We will not dismiss the fact that we have existing inventory that we need to maintain during our transition. Our main priority for the EIS program is to transition our services on a like-for-like basis. We feel this strategy will enable us to transition our services before the expiration dates of the existing contracts, and provide us with immediate cost savings. Immediately following the awards of both solicitations within our program, we will perform an analysis of the winning bids and the alignment of future telecommunications needs with our enterprise architecture. The analysis activities are within our Program Management Plan under tasks 66 and 67.</p> <p>To continue our work on this recommendation, we are forming a Chief Information Officer-level workgroup co-chaired by the Division of Integrated Telecommunications Management and Enterprise Architecture, to conduct analysis of agency future telecommunications needs. We anticipate completing the analysis and making recommendations in the first half of FY 2020.</p>
<b>GAO-17-464 (12016017) Telecommunications: Agencies Need to Apply Transition Planning Practices to Reduce Potential Delays and Added Costs</b>	9/21/17	Recommendation 3: Use configuration and change-management processes in its transition.	<b>Open.</b> GAO will continue to monitor SSA's efforts to implement this recommendation.	<b>Open.</b> We previously disagreed with this recommendation. However, we have since taken action and implemented change-management processes in our transition. The EIS Transition Program Management Office will use these new processes. In our draft report comments, we stated that we identified legal expertise early in the transition planning stage and they have assisted in early discussions and planning. During this review, to document our efforts, we provided the Agency Transition Plan that we released to

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				<p>GSA. The plan contains the roles and responsibilities of over 45 program team members, including an attorney from our Office of the General Counsel.</p> <p>In addition, we require project management disciplines for all projects from our internal Information Technology Investment Process. The Quantum Leap initiative requires the adherence to PRIDE (Project Resource Guide), which by definition contains the requirements for change management and configuration management. The Quantum Leap initiative is the first and largest part of our transition; therefore is the default authority requiring these practices. We provided all the authoritative sourcing and supporting documentation in January 2017.</p> <p>In September 2018, we provided GAO with additional documentation. We are continuing our efforts and will issue a directive requiring all telecommunication services acquired through EIS be managed via a Configuration Management Database (CMDB) within 1 year of acquisition. ServiceNow is our target technology for CMDB. We expect to implement the recommendation by October 2021.</p>
<p><b>GAO-17-464 (12016017) Telecommunications: Agencies Need to Apply Transition</b></p>	<p>9/21/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: Identify the resources needed for the full transition, document the costs and benefits of transition investments, identify staff resources needed for the</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> GAO will continue to monitor SSA’s efforts to implement this recommendation.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> Our transition management team performs similar duties in other projects and operational activities across other parts of our telecommunications division. Providing a cost benefit justification for these same resources for this program would prove extremely difficult.</p>



Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Planning Practices to Reduce Potential Delays and Added Costs</b></p>		<p>remainder of the transition, and analyze training needs for all staff working on the transition.</p>		<p>The cost savings for transition to EIS is difficult to calculate. A variable analysis must be used for assets, features, and consolidation activities of migration contracts particular to EIS. We are unable to conduct accurate analysis until the award, as the analysis is highly dependent on needs of the mission unit and the specific solutions offered.</p> <p>Most of our staff assigned to the transition, already have the required certifications and no further training is immediately necessary. Training evaluations are an ongoing activity and continue to ensure position descriptions include the essential training needed to perform EIS transition activities.</p> <p>To implement this recommendation, for each of the 14 EIS capabilities we will or propose to award, we will identify and document the resources needed by role for the full transition. In addition, we will document the costs and benefits for transition investments, identify additional staff resources, and analyze training needs for the staff working on the transition. Training requirements are dependent on the scope of our EIS transition. Our transition to EIS is limited to the move of existing network circuits from a prior contract (Networx) to EIS. We believe that the extent of personnel and training required for this transition is constrained to those personnel required to make sound judgments on functionality, cost, pricing, procurement, execution (Program Management) and field deployment for the transition. We expect to complete our transition by the end of FY 2021.</p>
---	--	---	--	--

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-17-464 (12016017) Telecommunications: Agencies Need to Apply Transition Planning Practices to Reduce Potential Delays and Added Costs</b></p>	<p>9/21/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 5: Identify measures of success for the transition, identify transition risks related to critical systems and continuity of operations, and identify mission-critical priorities in its transition timeline.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> GAO will continue to monitor SSA’s efforts to implement this recommendation.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We agree to use several critical milestones as a baseline to monitor, track, and report performance to produce measureable results. In addition, we have a detailed chart with over 530 preparation tasks for our EIS Transition Program. In our solicitations, we will require a transition plan detailing the tasks, resources, durations, etc., to transition every site throughout the program.</p> <p>Previously, we disagreed with the need to identify transition risks related to critical systems and continuity of operations. However, we have since taken action to identify continuity of operations in the risk register in our Risk Management Plan. Even though we added identifying risks, we planned for them as an avoidance strategy by requiring a dual-carrier approach and including them in our Agency Transition Plan.</p> <p>On September 20, 2018, we provided GAO with additional. In our continuing efforts on this recommendation, we will issue Chief Information Officer guidance. The guidance will identify measures of success for the elements we target to transition to EIS with a 10 percent variance, transition risks related to critical systems and continuity of operations, and mission-critical priorities in our transition timeline. We anticipate completing this task in the first half of FY 2020.</p>
---	----------------	--	--	---

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-17-597 (12016018) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRAT ION: Improvements Needed in Facilities Planning and Service Delivery Evaluation</b></p>	<p>8/21/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Develop a long-term facility plan that explicitly links to SSA’s strategic goals for service delivery, and includes a strategy for consolidating or downsizing FOs in light of increasing use of and geographic variation in remote service delivery.</p>	<p><b>Open:</b> To close this recommendation as implemented, SSA will need to demonstrate that it has developed a long-term facility plan--possibly building on its model FO pilot--that links to its strategic goals for service delivery and includes a plan for adjusting its FOs in light of increasing use of and geographic variation in remote service delivery.</p>	<p><b>Closed on March 20, 2018.</b> To ensure our facilities plan will align with our service delivery strategies, we initiated the Space Acquisition Review Board (SARB). SARB continues to meet periodically and focuses on efficiently using our resources to reduce our real estate footprint and operating costs, and proactively address organizational and operational changes. The goals, results, and plans of our real estate strategy for consolidating or downsizing field offices are documented in our annual Real Property Efficiency Plan. We provided GAO with a copy of our final FY 2019–FY 2023 plan on September 25, 2018.</p> <p>Moving forward, we continue to revise our space allocation standards and associated space computation worksheets to include reductions in both cubicle and office size, which will result in space savings and ultimately a reduction in our real estate portfolio.</p>
<p><b>GAO-17-597 (12016018) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRAT ION: Improvements Needed in Facilities Planning and Service Delivery Evaluation</b></p>	<p>8/21/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Reassess and, if needed, revise its FO space standards to ensure they provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate both unexpected growth in the demand for services and new service delivery technologies.</p>	<p><b>Open:</b> To close this recommendation as implemented, GAO will need to see evidence that the revised space allocation standards allow more flexibility for growth in demand and new service delivery methods, or at least that SSA considered incorporating such flexibility.</p>	<p><b>Closed on September 25, 2019.</b> We published the consolidated and revised agency Space Allocation Standards (SAS) and Space Computation Worksheets (SCW) in June of 2019. These documents incorporate many of the space optimization elements we have been implementing over the last year, including standardized offices and workstations, focus rooms, and employee personal storage space. We will continue to meet bi-monthly to review the SAS and SCW and research any changes or updates that we believe are important to amend for the future.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-17-597 (12016018) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRAT ION: Improvements Needed in Facilities Planning and Service Delivery Evaluation</b></p>	<p>8/21/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: Develop a cost-effective approach to identifying the most common issues with online benefit claims that require staff follow-up with applicants, and use this information to inform improvements to the online claims process.</p>	<p><b>Open:</b> For GAO to close this recommendation as implemented, SSA will need to demonstrate that it has incorporated enhancements to some iClaims applications that are targeted to reducing re-contacts with these applications.</p>	<p><b>Closed on October 4, 2019.</b> We identified the most common reasons for technician follow-up on iClaims and Based on these reasons, we developed a list of potential future enhancements to the iCaim. We prioritized the enhancements based on which ones would provide the most relief. We will determine if enhancements can be made to the iClaim application in order to reduce technician follow-up.</p>
<p><b>GAO-17-597 (12016018) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRAT ION: Improvements Needed in Facilities Planning and Service Delivery Evaluation</b></p>	<p>8/21/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 5: For its alternative customer services approaches, including desktop icons and video services in third-party sites, develop performance goals and collect performance data related to these goals.</p>	<p><b>Open:</b> For GAO to close this recommendation as implemented, SSA will need to demonstrate that it has moved beyond collecting usage data, and has implemented performance measures for the SSA Express Icons and other alternate service delivery methods and is collecting related data.</p>	<p><b>Open:</b> We are actively working on a dashboard for behavioral based management information (MI) data collection for the SSA Express Icon project. The Icon will allow us to collect better MI regarding customer usage. In addition, the dashboard will allow us to analyze the impact the Icon has on our customers and the third party sites. On October 17, 2019, we released the rebranded SSA Express pages, which will allow us to update our MI dashboard. Our performance goal is to increase the number of visits to the SSA Express icon by 15,000 and to increase the number of new partner sites by 50 each fiscal year.</p> <p>We currently have 72 third-party video service delivery (VSD) partner sites and met our goal of adding at least 4 new sites in the past calendar year. We base our video presence in third-party sites on business needs (geographical limitations for customers in rural areas and shared clientele like Veterans Affairs locations. In line with the</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				business needs, we plan to expand to an average of 3 to 4 partner sites each year.
<b>GAO-17-675 (12016023) SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTIN G: Actions Needed to Demonstrate and Better Review Compliance with Select Requirements for Small Business Advocates</b>	9/25/17	Recommendation 1: SSA should comply with sections 15(k)(2), (k)(3), (k)(6), (k)(8), (k)(11), and (k)(15) or report to Congress on why the agency has not complied, including seeking any statutory flexibilities or exceptions believed appropriate.	<b>Open:</b> When we confirm what actions the agency has taken in response to this recommendation, we will provide updated information.	<b>Closed on October 1, 2018.</b> As of October 1, 2018, the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (OSDBU) Director reports to the Deputy Commissioner for Budget, Facilities, and Management (DCBFM) who has management oversight over the Senior Procurement Executive.  On May 30, 2019, we updated the roles and responsibilities as outlined in OMB’s Circular A-76 to add the Director of OSDBU’s responsibility to review and advise the agency on any decision to convert an activity performed by a small business to an activity performed by a federal employee. We provided GAO with a copy of our Administrative Instructions Manual System Material Resource Management Guide, in which we highlighted the revisions.
<b>GAO-18-323 (12017004) RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD: Additional Controls and Oversight of Financial Interchange Transfers Needed</b>	5/21/18	Recommendation 1: Work with the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) to explore options for electronically sharing data and limiting the reliance of the financial interchange process on manual data entry.	<b>Open:</b> RRB and SSA continue to discuss options for exchanging information electronically.	<b>Open.</b> We are currently developing a Rough Order of Magnitude/Cost Estimate for electronically sharing data and limiting the reliance of the financial interchange process on manual data entry under our existing agreement. We currently have no timeline for completion of this recommendation.

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-18-323 (12017004) RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD: Additional Controls and Oversight of Financial Interchange Transfers Needed</b></p>	<p>5/21/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Take additional steps to provide oversight of financial interchange calculations at the individual-case level. This could include periodically reviewing a subset of these cases.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> GAO will close this recommendation once SSA provides additional information on the steps it will take to use the information it will receive from RRB to review financial interchange results at the individual-case level.</p>	<p><b>Open:</b> We are working with the Railroad Board (RRB) Financial Interchange Division to learn about the procedures used to calculate payment amounts and request RRB’s formal business process, results determined from RRB for each case, access to its system, and actual RRB cases. We continue to meet with RRB and are making progress on the Financial Interchange (FI) guide. The FI guide provides a high-level overview of the process, including case examples. We will provide written comments and suggestion when RRB provides us it revised draft. We met with the RRB on October 23, 2019, and discussed our comments and suggested revisions. Once the guide is complete, RRB will produce a technical guide that we can use to create a business process for undertaking a review of the individual cases used by RRB to compute the annual financial interchange transfer amounts. We currently have no timeline for completing this recommendation.</p>
<p><b>GAO-18-501 (12017011) Social Security Disability: Better Timeliness Metrics Needed to Assess Transfers of Appeals Work</b></p>	<p>7/25/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: The Deputy Commissioner for Hearing Operations should evaluate the costs versus the benefits of changing system limitations that hinder users’ ability to correctly and efficiently identify and transfer batches of cases.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> SSA agreed and in May 2019 stated that it is in the early stages of developing and rolling out a new case processing system that will replace its Case Processing and Management System. SSA expects the new system will eliminate the limitations that we cited.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> In 2017, we started developing a comprehensive plan to modernize our case processing systems, the Hearings and Appeals Case Processing System (HACPS), a modern and cohesive end-to-end disability claims processing infrastructure that supports the full life-cycle of a disability claim. HACPS will include hearings and appeals case processing functionality and will replace the Case Processing Management System. There were six releases of HACPS from November 2018 through September 2019). While HACPS is still in the initial phases of development and rollout, we continue to make progress in designing a system that will provide</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				users greater flexibility in correctly and accurately transferring cases to and from hearing sites process. We expect full implementation of HACPS in early FY 2021.
<b>GAO-18-93 (12016035) FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS: Critical Actions Needed to Address Shortcomings and Challenges in Implementing Responsibilities</b>	8/2/18	Recommendation 1: Ensure that the department's IT management policies address the role of the CIO for key responsibilities in the six areas it identified.	<b>Open:</b> When we confirm what actions the agency has taken in response to this recommendation, we will provide updated information.	<b>Closed on September 21, 2018.</b> We published the updated Chief Information Officer requirements and posted the information (SSA Chief Information Officer Authorities Directive) on our public-facing website on 8/29, 2018.

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

**GAO “Closed, Unimplemented” Recommendations**

Audit Number (SSA number) Report Title	Rec. Date	Recommendation	GAO Status (Excerpted)	SSA Implementation Status
<b>GAO-15-19 (12013026) SSA DISABILITY BENEFITS: Enhanced Policies and Management Focus Needed to Address Potential Physician- Assisted Fraud</b>	11/10/14	Recommendation 1: To improve the ability of the agency to detect and prevent potential physician-assisted fraud, and to address potential disincentives for staff to detect and prevent physician-assisted fraud, SSA should review the standards used to assess DDS performance; and develop and distribute promising practices to incentivize staff to better balance the goal of processing claims promptly with the equally important goal of identifying and reporting evidence of potential fraud.	<b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA did not fully implement this recommendation. As of June 2019, the agency had developed and disseminated a DDS Administrators Letter to inform DDS employees of best practices to detect and minimize physician-assisted fraud. The letter is intended to provide staff with an overview of fraud procedures, a reminder of staff responsibilities to policies regarding fraud, and links to training tools on fraud. SSA officials added that they try to stress to DDSs the importance of reporting fraud and recognizing or rewarding employees that do. However, SSA did not systematically determine whether existing standards used to assess DDS performance create disincentives for staff to report fraud.	<b>Closed on July 21, 2016.</b> We released a DDS Administrators Letter on July 7, 2016, which provided DDS employees with best practices for staff to detect and minimize physician-assisted fraud. Specifically, the letter provided: (1) overview of fraud or similar fault procedures; (2) reminder of fraud or similar fault responsibilities and policies; and (3) links to available fraud or similar fault training tools. In addition, the letter requires all staff to view an anti-fraud training VOD each year. The VOD offers reminders and examples of how fraud has been discovered. Finally, the letter addresses the implementation of section 812 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (BBA-812), which requires physicians to self-report their exclusion status. As required by BBA-812, we produce a quarterly report to identify evidence from excluded providers, which we share with DDSs.
<b>GAO-14-46 (12013006) SOCIAL SECURITY DEATH DATA: Additional</b>	11/27/13	Recommendation 3: In order to enhance the accuracy of and ensure appropriate agency access to SSA's death data, and to increase transparency among recipient agencies, the	<b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA reported that it has implemented improvements in its estimating procedures for future reimbursable agreements to ensure consistent estimates for all customers. As of	<b>Closed on November 27, 2013.</b> We partially agree. We comply with OMB Circular A-25, User Charges, and charge "full cost" for goods or services we provide. We ensure charges are sufficient to recover the full cost to provide goods, resources, or services, as defined by the Federal



Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Action Needed to Address Data Errors and Federal Agency Access</b></p>		<p>Social Security Administration's Acting Commissioner should direct the Deputy Commissioner of Operations to share a more detailed explanation of how it determines reimbursement amounts for providing agencies with death information.</p>	<p>August 2018, SSA shared with GAO evidence of information provided to an agency requesting the full death file. However, the information was limited to the reimbursement amount the agency would pay SSA, and officials confirmed they did not share documentation with the agency about the process they used to calculate the amount. While we recognize that there may be limitations on the type of cost details SSA can provide to recipient agencies, we continue to believe that more transparency in conveying the factors that lead to the estimated and final reimbursement amounts recipient agencies are charged could help them make more informed decisions. As of July 2019, SSA planned to take no further action on this recommendation.</p>	<p>Accounting Standards Advisory Board. We provide estimated cost information to our Federal partners as part of the reimbursable agreement. In FY 2013, we refined our process for death data cost estimates and established consistent standardized costs, which we will reflect in future reimbursable agreements. Using the OMB Circular A-25 framework, we review all reimbursable requests on a case-by-case basis to determine our full costs. Such costs include all direct and indirect expenses to any part of the Federal Government to provide goods, resources, or services. Our typical reimbursement cost estimates include categories such as salaries and other direct costs (including IT costs), office overhead, agency overhead, IT Special Project charges, and a contingency amount to cover unforeseen costs. As a government-wide business practice, Federal agencies do not share detailed costs for reimbursable agreements.</p>
<p><b>GAO-12-495 (12011024) Social Security Administration: Improved Planning and Performance Measures Are Needed to Help Ensure</b></p>	<p>5/9/12</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: To address the challenges facing SSA's IT modernization efforts, the Commissioner of Social Security should direct the Deputy Commissioner for Systems/Chief Information Officer to ensure that performance measures in each of OMB's four measurement</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA has not fully established IT investment performance measures that comply with the OMB capital planning guidance. Specifically, on September 6, 2016, we reviewed the performance measures associated with the agency's major IT investments that utilized operations and maintenance funding</p>	<p><b>Closed on July 19, 2012.</b> This recommendation refers to the OMB's requirements for the Exhibit 300, Information Technology Capital Asset Summary and Performance Measurement Report. We will continue to meet every requirement of guidance, including meaningful and objectively measureable performance measures for each category required within Exhibit 300's mission and business results, customer results, processes and activities, and technology.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Successful Technology Modernization</b></p>		<p>areas are defined for ongoing IT modernization initiatives and, as appropriate, (1) identify how each investment is to contribute to expected benefits; (2) measure the effectiveness in meeting the goals, requirements, and mission results; and (3) provide a means for measuring projects' progress in meeting modernization goals.</p>	<p>for both FY 2015 and FY 2016. Of the seven investments we reviewed, only one investment followed the capital planning guidance developed by OMB. As of September 27, 2016, the agency stated that it could not provide any additional information on how it plans to comply with the guidance. Thus, we are closing this recommendation as not implemented.</p>	
<p><b>GAO-12-495 (12011024) Social Security Administration: Improved Planning and Performance Measures Are Needed to Help Ensure Successful Technology Modernization</b></p>	<p>5/9/12</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: To address the challenges facing SSA's IT modernization efforts, the Commissioner of Social Security should direct the Deputy Commissioner for Systems/Chief Information Officer to establish an enterprise architecture plan that includes key components called for by federal guidelines and GAO's enterprise architecture management framework, to effectively guide modernization activities. The plan should include (1) development of a service-oriented architecture road map that guides modernization</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> While SSA has taken several actions toward implementing this recommendation, additional actions are needed to effectively respond to the recommendation. Specifically, in May 2015, SSA developed an enterprise road map to guide its modernization efforts that included EA performance targets. Further, in July 2016, SSA stated that it was in the process of updating the enterprise data model that would include the descriptions of relationships among the business processes. Nevertheless, in August 2016, the agency stated that it had not yet performed a comprehensive gap analysis to identify the</p>	<p><b>Closed November 6, 2012.</b> On August 30, 2012, we complied with the Federal Chief Architect and delivered an EA roadmap that met OMB standards. Rather than evaluating the entire enterprise from a central perspective all at once, we provide guidance to the organizational component that has responsibility for the business process to assess their current state, its objectives, and to identify gaps. We are continually evolving and improving our IT investment and management processes. We have already noted your recommendation regarding performance measures, and we will continue to improve in that area. The Strategic Information Technology Assessment and Review process requires the consistent use of pocket planners by the portfolio teams. These planners provide milestones for major proposed investments, which help the portfolio teams and our executives understand the</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		activities and helps ensure the agency achieves its stated service-oriented architecture goals, such as better business agility and reduced systems development and maintenance costs; (2) development of an enterprise gap analysis that identifies the differences between the current and target environment in all related architecture products; (3) performance targets for the future environment, including interim milestones; and (4) descriptions of relationships among the business processes in terms of information.	differences between the current and target environment in all related architecture products. Further, in September 2016, the agency stated that it could not provide any additional information on how it intends to fully establish its EA plan for guiding IT modernization activities. Accordingly, we are closing this recommendation as not implemented.	intended life cycle of each investment. We also require a multi-year strategic business plan for each portfolio. We included these business plans in the roadmap submission to OMB in August 2012. Descriptions of relationships among our business processes exist at many levels. We carefully and explicitly describe these relationships as we undertake every new development effort. The descriptions exist in documentation for security certification as well. While a high-level informational description might be appropriate for an enterprise-wide EA plan, we do not agree that detailed descriptions are appropriate for such a plan. As we have already stated, we intend to fully comply with OMB requirements for EA planning.
<b>GAO-11-678 (12011013) INCAPACITATED ADULTS: Oversight of Federal Fiduciaries and Court-Appointed Guardians Needs Improvement</b>	8/11/11	Recommendation 1: To help state courts fulfill their role in appointing guardians for incapacitated adults, the Commissioner of SSA should take whatever measures necessary to allow it to disclose certain information about SSA beneficiaries and fiduciaries to state courts, upon request, including proposing legislative changes needed to allow it to do so.	<b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> We continue to believe that it is in the best interest of incapacitated SSA beneficiaries for the agency to disclose certain information about beneficiaries and fiduciaries to state courts, upon request. Given SSA's position that the Privacy Act prevents the agency from undertaking this important activity, GAO recommends that it take whatever measures are necessary to allow it to do so, including proposing legislative changes. As of FY16, SSA continued to disagree, reiterating that the Privacy	<b>Closed April 11, 2012.</b> We disagreed with this recommendation. While this recommendation is different from the draft report recommendation, the positions stated in our response to the draft report remain valid. As we explained, the Privacy Act forbids disclosure of personal information about a living person without the written consent of the individual or someone who can consent on the individual's behalf. We also do not believe the data sharing measures GAO proposes are cost effective since court-appointed guardians serve as representative payees in only one percent of our cases.

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

			Act forbids disclosure of personal information about a living person without the written consent of the individual or someone who can consent on the individual's behalf; and the proposed data sharing would not be cost effective since court-appointed guardians serve as representative payees in only one percent of their cases.	
<b>GAO-11-724 (12010011) DISABILITY INSURANCE: SSA Can Improve Efforts to Detect, Prevent, and Recover Overpayments</b>	7/27/11	Recommendation 1: To enhance SSA's ability to recover debt and to improve the detection and, where possible, prevention of overpayments in the DI program, the Commissioner of Social Security should develop and adopt agency wide performance goals, for the recovery of DI overpayment debt, such as the percent of outstanding debt collected annually.	<b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA agreed to develop a performance-based recovery target to comply with the requirements of Executive Order 13520. Since SSA's payments are a subset of its overall total payments, the agency is unable to set a numeric target specifically for the recovery of improper payments. For the future, SSA is exploring other systems enhancements and policy improvements that will increase its debt recoveries. SSA's performance-based recovery target was included in its March 15, 2013 Accountable Official's Report. Since the publication of that report SSA has made additional progress on the project, notifying over 200,000 affected debtors. In FY13, SSA implemented the required systems enhancements to collect delinquent debt through the	<b>Closed June 29, 2012.</b> We agreed to develop a performance-based recovery target to comply with the requirements of Executive Order 13520. Since our improper payments are a subset of our total overpayments, we are unable to set a numeric target specifically for the recovery of improper payments. For the future, we are exploring other systems enhancements and policy improvements that will increase our debt recoveries. Our performance-based recovery target was included in our March 14, 2012 Accountable Official's Report as well as our Annual Performance Plan for FY 2012. For the future, we are exploring other systems enhancements and policy improvements that will increase its debt recoveries. Our performance-based recovery target was included in the March 15, 2013 Accountable Official's Report. Since the publication of that report, we have made additional progress on the project In FY 2013, we implemented the required system enhancements to collect delinquent debt through the TOP/State Reciprocal program; we began notifying our

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

			TOP/State Reciprocal program and reported that it began notifying debtors in early FY14 and collected \$2.8 million through the state reciprocal program. In FY14, SSA reported that in April 2014, SSA's Acting Commissioner decided to halt recovery of debts 10 years or more delinquent via the Treasury Offset Program pending a thorough review of the agency's policies and discretion under the law. As a result, SSA has not yet completed its notifications, and cannot provide a timeframe for resuming notification to affected debtors.	debtors in early FY 2014. We collected \$2.8 million via the state reciprocal program.
<b>GAO-11-146 (12009012) Employment Verification: Federal Agencies Have Taken Steps to Improve E-Verify, but Significant Challenges Remain</b>	1/18/11	Recommendation 2 (GAO recommendation 9): To ensure that SSA can accurately project costs associated with its E-Verify workload, as well as estimates for potential mandatory implementation of E-Verify, the Commissioner of SSA should assess the risk and uncertainty within SSA's E-Verify workload estimate as well as the limitations associated with the assumptions used to create it, in accordance with best practices, to ensure that SSA can provide the required level	<b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> As noted in our report, SSA did not agree with the recommendation. SSA stated that it routinely assesses the risk and uncertainty when developing assumptions for E-Verify workload estimates and administrative costs related to proposed legislation. SSA also stated that if E-Verify were to become mandatory, SSA would adapt its budget models and recalculate estimated costs based on the new projected workload volume. As discussed in the report, SSA does not conduct a risk and uncertainty analysis that uses statistical models to quantitatively	<b>Closed June 30, 2011.</b> We disagree with the implication that we do not assess the risk and uncertainty within our E-Verify workload estimates. We routinely assess the risk and uncertainty when developing assumptions for E-Verify workload estimates and administrative cost estimates related to proposed legislation. We understand that E-Verify workloads may grow and that they would grow substantially with mandatory implementation of E-Verify. If there were mandatory implementation of E-Verify, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services would provide us with revised estimated workloads. We would adapt our budget models quickly and recalculate estimated costs based on the new projected volume.

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		of support to USCIS and E-Verify operations.	determine the extent of variability around its cost estimate or identify the limitations associated with the assumptions used to create the estimate. We continue to believe that SSA should adopt this best practice for estimating risks to help it reduce the potential for experiencing cost overruns for E-Verify, but we are closing this recommendation because SSA did not plan to implement it.	
<b>GAO-09-398 (12008020) Social Security Disability: Additional Performance Measures and Better Cost Estimates Could Help Improve SSA's Efforts to Eliminate Its Hearings Backlog</b>	9/9/09	Recommendation 2: To help SSA monitor progress and evaluate individual Plan initiatives' effect on the hearings-level backlog, inform its decisions about resource allocations for eliminating this backlog, and minimize adverse effects of the Plan's implementation, the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should develop cost estimates for the initiatives SSA considers critical to eliminating the hearings-level backlog in addition to the time savings estimates already developed.	<b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA disagreed with GAO's assertion that the agency did not develop cost estimates for the backlog reduction plan, and noted that it conducted a full evaluation of the costs and savings associated with implementing all major aspects of the Plan. In July 2012, SSA stated - and reiterated in May 2013 - that the backlog plan was initiated in 2007 as a moral imperative from Commissioner Astrue to reduce the number of disability cases pending at the hearing level, along with the time it was taking to process them. Cost and risk factors were not incorporated at that time. The agency noted that many initiatives developed and implemented from	<b>Closed March 31, 2010.</b> We disagree with the assertion that we did not develop cost estimates for the backlog reduction plan. An essential part of our development and implementation planning process was a full evaluation of the costs and savings associated with implementing all major aspects of the plan. Our budget requests for FYs 2009 and 2010 incorporated the full costs and savings related to implementation of the plan. We used these estimates, and our normal ongoing analysis of performance, to form decisions about resource allocations. We updated our plan and budget estimates for FY 2010 and beyond to take into account workload changes driven by the economic downturn and other changes in performance based on ongoing monitoring of the implementation of our plan initiatives. We will continue to monitor workloads and performance, and, if further economy-driven changes are

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

			<p>the plan have now become a part of SSA's normal business process, and that decisions that cost and risk analysis would have informed have already been made, so such analysis at this point is not cost-effective. GAO, however, continues to believe that it is important to develop cost estimates for individual Plan initiatives over the entire course of the Plan through FY13 because it would allow SSA to determine which initiatives provide the best return on investment as it moves forward with Plan implementation. Such information is critical to making informed decisions regarding the most effective use of funds to eliminate the backlog.</p>	<p>necessary, we will update our plans and our budget accordingly.</p>
<p><b>GAO-09-24 (12007020)</b> <b>Social Security Administration: Service Delivery Plan Needed to Address Baby Boom Retirement Challenges</b></p>	<p>2/9/09</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: To pursue high-quality FO service, SSA should develop a service delivery plan that describes, in detail, how it will deliver quality customer service in the future while managing growing work demands with constrained resources. This plan should identify the extent that new business processes will allow SSA to accommodate growing demand or whether additional</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA did not agree with our recommendation to establish quantitative standards for FO customer wait times and phone service, stating that such standards would create problems by diverting staff already spread thin across FOs away from processing claims and post-entitlement work. SSA stated that it tracks waiting times and makes adjustments as necessary to improve service, and that many of the recently hired FO staff went to offices with the</p>	<p><b>Closed on June 30, 2010.</b> We disagree with setting a quantitative standard for field office customer waiting times and phone services. Without full funding and additional resources to achieve these goals, these standards would come at the cost of other SSA work, such as claims, redeterminations, and post-entitlement work.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		resources are needed to achieve its strategic goals. Further, this plan should establish standards for FO customer waiting times and phone service to help identify and improve offices with poor service.	highest waiting times. GAO recognizes the many pressures SSA faces, but continues to believe that clear standards that establish a minimum level of quality customer service are an essential first step for organizations to measure success. SSA provided no updates on this recommendation in FY10 and FY11. In FY12, SSA reported that it continues to disagree with this recommendation.	
<b>GAO-08-1020 (12008008) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY : SSA Has Taken Key Steps for Managing Its Investments, but Needs to Strengthen Oversight and Fully Define Policies and Procedures</b>	9/12/08	Recommendation 7: To strengthen SSA's investment management capability and address weaknesses and to ensure senior management involvement and full accountability for the agency's investments, the Commissioner of Social Security should direct the Chief Information Officer to develop and implement policies and procedures to manage IT acquisitions as investments and manage them using the investment management framework.	<b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA's May 2012 Capital Planning and Investment Control guide addresses IT acquisitions, including hardware, software, and services--referred to as special expense items. In addition, the Deputy Commissioner for Systems/CIO, who chairs SSA's Strategic Information Technology Assessment and Review Board, is responsible for approving these items. However, these items are not approved through the SITAR pre-select, select, control, and evaluate processes. Further, IT acquisitions are not mentioned in the SITAR Board charter. As we reported in 2008, until the agency manages acquisitions within its IT Investment Management framework, it will be unable to	<b>Closed on September 30, 2009.</b> We disagreed with this recommendation. Our existing information technology systems (ITS) budget development process already treats IT acquisitions as investments and maintains them under an investment management framework, though not one described by GAO's Information Technology Investment Management Framework. We agree, however, that the ITS budget development process can be further integrated with the Information Technology Investment Board centered investment management process.



Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

			consider its investments comprehensively, and ensure that the investments optimally address the organization's mission, strategic goals, and objectives.	
<b>GAO-08-40 (12007004) Social Security Disability: Better Planning, Management, and Evaluation Could Help Address Backlogs</b>	1/7/08	Recommendation 1: To ensure that current and future modifications to the disability determination process achieve the desired and optimal outcome, the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should establish a "target pending" for cases in the reconsideration stage as the agency does for the other stages, to allow identification and monitoring of backlogs.	<b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> In 2008, SSA agreed that tracking claims pending at this stage should be part of the agency's routine and comprehensive monitoring of all DDS workloads. However, SSA believed that instead of the number of reconsideration cases pending, cases over a certain age could be used as an alternative indicator of performance, a measure that is consistent with the agency's current direction of focusing on aged claims. A target number of reconsideration cases over a certain age could be used as an alternative to the total number of reconsideration cases pending. However, SSA has not established what would be an acceptable number of reconsideration cases over a certain age. In 2010, SSA reiterated that it did not believe establishing a target for reconsideration cases was warranted, therefore, it did not create a number or percentage of reconsideration cases over a certain number of days old as an indicator.	<b>Closed on September 30, 2009.</b> We agree that tracking pending reconsiderations should be a part of the agency's routine and comprehensive monitoring of all DDS workloads. However, we do not believe this should be an agency target/goal. As an alternative to a reconsideration-pending goal, we could use a number or percentage of reconsideration cases over a certain number of days old as an indicator of performance. This would be consistent with the agency's current direction of focusing on aged claims.

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

			<p>SSA has, however, stressed the importance of processing the budgeted number of reconsiderations and carefully track that number. For example, SSA processed 90.3% of its budgeted reconsiderations and are on track to process 100% of this budgeted workload by the end of FY10. GAO continues to believe that SSA should establish such a target for the reconsideration stage as it does for the other three stages - initial, hearings, and Appeals Council - of the disability process. This would help SSA determine when the number of reconsideration claims pending exceeds the optimal level that should be in the pipeline, indicating a backlog exists, so that the agency can better determine where to focus its attention. In 2011, SSA stated that the agency's position has not changed and SSA continued to disagree with this recommendation.</p>	
<p><b>GAO-08-40 (12007004) Social Security Disability: Better Planning, Management, and Evaluation</b></p>	<p>1/7/08</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: To ensure that current and future modifications to the disability determination process achieve the desired and optimal outcome, the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should conduct</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> In 2008, SSA partially agreed with this recommendation and noted that it would continue to collect data and monitor outcomes to evaluate DSI and was implementing parts of DSI it believed successful, such as Quick Disability Determination.</p>	<p><b>Closed on June 30, 2010.</b> Disability Service Improvement (DSI) was designed as an experiment to see if SSA could speed up disability determinations at all levels. DSI eliminated reconsideration and replaced it with review by a Federal reviewing official (FedRO). However, because of budgetary issues and long processing</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Could Help Address Backlogs</b></p>		<p>a thorough evaluation of the Disability Service Improvement (DSI) initiative before deciding which elements should be implemented nationwide and which should be discontinued.</p>	<p>SSA conducted only limited assessments of DSI. SSA has discontinued this initiative and is currently focusing on its Hearings Backlog Reduction Plan. The intent of our recommendation was to help ensure that SSA incorporates a strong evaluation component in the DSI initiative so that the agency could obtain reliable data that would help it improve the disability claims process by identifying which aspects of DSI should be continued, discontinued, or modified. Such an evaluation could also help inform future initiatives.</p>	<p>times, the FedRO adjudication was suspended in early 2008.</p>
<p><b>GAO-08-5 (12006020) SSA Disability Representatives: Fee Payment Changes Show Promise, but Eligibility Criteria and Representative Overpayments Require Further Monitoring</b></p>	<p>10/15/07</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: The Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should assess the extent to which representatives collect more than their authorized fee through a combination of state payments and fee withholding, and if necessary identify and implement cost-effective solutions to ensure that representatives either are not paid more than their authorized fee or return anything they receive in excess of their authorized fee.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA agreed with the recommendation and noted that, if fee withholding in SSI claims were made permanent, it would work with states to ensure that representatives do not receive fees in excess of that approved by SSA for services performed before SSA. In February 2010, Congress made permanent the extension of fee withholding to representatives of SSI claimants (Public Law 111-142). In April 2012, SSA stated that because the environment for representatives of SSI claimants changed since the issuance of our report, the agency no longer sees</p>	<p><b>Closed on June 30, 2008.</b> Withholding and direct payment of fees to representatives in Title XVI claims are scheduled to sunset in March 2010. If direct pay to representatives becomes permanent, we will work with the states to ensure that representatives do not receive fees in excess of that approved by SSA for services performed before SSA.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

			the need to implement this recommendation.	
<b>GAO-07-986 (12006013) Social Security Administration: Policies and Procedures Were in Place over MMA Spending, but Some Instances of Noncompliance Occurred</b>	10/1/07	Recommendation 2: To enhance SSA's (1) ability to track the costs of program activities including MMA administrative costs, (2) controls over its review and approval processes for purchase card payments, and (3) tracking of its accountable assets, the Commissioner of Social Security should establish additional detailed procedures for a purchase card supporting documentation review and approval process to help ensure that purchase card payments are properly	<b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA disagreed with this recommendation in commenting on our draft report and had not reported taking any corrective actions. In March 2016, a request for a status update on this recommendation was sent to SSA. The SSA audit liaison replied stating that SSA continued to disagree with the recommendation and has no plans to take any corrective action in response to the recommendation. Therefore, we are closing this recommendation as not implemented.	<b>Closed on March 31, 2008.</b> We disagreed with this recommendation. With respect to the policies and procedures directed to micro-purchasers and contracting officers (CO) (not requestors), we do not concur with this recommendation. COs are already aware of the file documentation required for their purchases, whether paid with the purchase card or otherwise. COs follow the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Social Security Administration's Acquisition Handbook file documentation policies. We believe that our current guidance, "Micro-purchasing in SSA," updated in December 2014, contains sufficient information for micro-purchasers and their approving officials regarding file documentation and retention. Micro-purchasers and approving officials must take this course prior to being appointed and, beginning in FY 2008, they were

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
 Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		<p>supported, allowable, and allocated.</p>		<p>required to take refresher training every three years. Additionally, we conduct acquisition management reviews (AMR) of micro-purchase activity. We also conduct onsite reviews of purchases made by micro-purchasers in headquarters, and "remote" AMRs of purchases made in the regions. We base onsite and remote AMRs on a review of one or more of the following: (1) purchase logs; (2) monthly purchase statements; (3) purchase activity data-mining by means of custom designed Citibank purchase reports; (4) input received from the Office of Travel and Administrative Payment Services staff and other analysts; and (5) micro-purchaser pre-award documentation. We conduct these reviews on an ongoing basis to identify questionable purchases. Regarding the issue of proper allocation of purchase and card transactions, we issued an Acquisition Alert to all purchase cardholders on August 23, 2007 and again on October 5, 2010. The alert included reminders on the need for purchase cardholders to ensure that all purchase requests receive management and budget approval before any purchase and that file documentation is maintained for all purchases.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-07-555 (12007007) Medicare Part D Low-Income Subsidy: Additional Efforts Would Help Social Security Improve Outreach and Measure Program Effects</b></p>	<p>6/22/07</p>	<p>Recommendation 1 (GAO recommendation 3): To improve SSA's outreach efforts and its ability to measure the effectiveness of the Medicare Part D low-income subsidy application processes, the Commissioner of Social Security should establish specific performance goals and measures for SSA's outreach activities to provide the agency with a means to assess their effectiveness in soliciting applications from additional individuals who qualify for the subsidy, but have not yet applied.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> In its response to our report, SSA stated that it believed that its National Strategic Communications Plan serves as a comprehensive plan for its outreach efforts agency-wide, but that it would not be able to implement specific goals and measures due to the lack of reliable data on the eligible population. While we agreed that SSA's National Strategic Communications Plan serves as a comprehensive plan for describing the agency's outreach efforts, we stated that we did not believe that data on the potentially eligible subsidy population, while useful, were needed for SSA to establish specific performance goals and measures to assess the effectiveness of its outreach efforts. Although SSA has taken a number of actions to make more people aware of the subsidy, such as mailing a notice to approximately 6 million low-income Medicare beneficiaries informing them about the subsidy, it has not established the performance goals and measures we recommended.</p>	<p><b>Closed on December 31, 2007.</b> The recommendation indicated SSA would have a basis for developing specific goals and measures for its outreach strategy. However, the conclusions on page 28, second paragraph of the report includes the following: "Also, it is unclear how much more outreach is needed, given the lack of reliable data on the eligible population. The extent of additional outreach efforts will also depend on SSAs ability to more precisely identify remaining individuals eligible for the subsidy". Therefore, we would not be able to implement specific goals and measures at this time due to the lack of reliable data on the eligible population. We will continue our outreach efforts to identify individuals potentially eligible for the subsidy and solicit applications from them. We are also continuing to mail approximately 100,000 applications each month to beneficiaries attaining initial Medicare eligibility after screening them to determine that their income is below 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Level. As in past years, SSA has incorporated its message on extra help in its Cost-Of-Living Adjustment letters sent each December to over 50 million beneficiaries. Since GAO met with us in March, we announced a new strategy in our continuing efforts to inform the public about extra help. The theme, Show Someone You Love How Much You Care, is designed to inform relatives and caregivers the sons, daughters, grandchildren and family friends about the extra help program. This new strategy was launched for Mother's Day. SSA employees across the country are visiting their local</p>
--	----------------	---	--	--

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

				community centers, grocery stores, flower shops, restaurants and places of worship in a focused effort to inform the public about extra help. We plan to publicize this effort in the local media. The outreach effort continued throughout the year, with a second series of targeted events scheduled for Father’s Day.
<b>GAO-07-213 (12006018) SOCIAL SECURITY REPORM : Greater Transparency Needed about Potential General Revenue Financing</b>	3/22/07	Recommendation 1: To improve public understanding of proposed changes to Social Security, the Commissioner of SSA should direct the Office of the Chief Actuary at SSA to include a summary presentation of its analysis in future scoring memoranda that will enable policymakers and the general public to quickly and easily compare Social Security reform proposals especially with respect to proposed use of general revenue and federal budget implications.	<b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> The agency took some steps to facilitate comparison of generic solvency provisions. In addition, in proposal scorings issued since GAO's report, the agency took some steps to facilitate comparison of solvency provisions. While GAO will continue to monitor the situation, we have determined that this recommendation should be closed as not implemented.	<b>Closed on September 28, 2007.</b> For over a year, we have been including an additional table which provides the specific implications for the OASDI unfunded obligation of different provisions in the overall proposal. In particular, a separate column in the table has been provided indicating the extent to which general review transfers that do not represent new income to the government affect the unfunded obligation of the program. We agree that general inclusion of a simple table showing the effects on the actuarial deficit of each provision would be helpful.

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-07-8 (12006001) SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY PROGRAMS: Clearer Guidance Could Help SSA Apply the Medical Improvement Standard More Consistently</b></p>	<p>10/3/06</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: To ensure that SSA is able to consistently assess whether DI and SSI beneficiaries have improved medically, the Commissioner of Social Security should clarify guidance for assessing medical improvement when conducting CDRs. More specifically, SSA should clarify guidance concerning (1) what degree of improvement is required to meet the standard and (2) when the use of exceptions to medical improvement is appropriate. SSA should also work with DDSs to ensure that CDRs are conducted on a neutral basis, without a presumption that beneficiaries continue to have a disability.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> The Deputy Commissioner of Operations, Office of Disability Determination and the Office of Disability Programs collaborated to provide guidance to the DDSs for adjudicating CDRs. Staff members prepared "Development of Medical Evidence for Continuing Disability Review Cases" to assist with adjudication guidance, which provides reminder items for CDR development. SSA reported in 2009 that CDRs are currently being adjudicated in the DDSs and that a pilot in Missouri to test 200 CDRs in the electronic environment (eCDR) is near completion. The next step is to rollout eCDR to the rest of the state. It is not clear to GAO, however, whether the adjudication guidance clarifies what degree of improvement is required to meet the standard or when the use of exceptions to medical improvement is appropriate. As of FY11, SSA had not demonstrated that it sufficiently implemented this recommendation.</p>	<p><b>Closed on September 28, 2007.</b> We rolled out eCDR to all states..</p>
---	----------------	---	---	--



Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-06-831 (12005027) Enterprise Architecture: Leadership Remains Key to Establishing and Leveraging Architectures for Organizational Transformation</b></p>	<p>8/14/06</p>	<p>Recommendation 1 (GAO recommendation 10): To assist the 27 major departments and agencies in addressing enterprise architecture challenges, managing their architecture programs, and realizing architecture benefits, the Social Security Administration should ensure that their respective enterprise architecture programs develop and implement plans for fully satisfying each of the conditions in our enterprise architecture management maturity framework.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> Since 2006, the Social Security Administration has not addressed the majority of core elements outlined in our EA management maturity framework that we previously reported as not satisfied. Specifically, while the agency is measuring IT investment compliance with its EA, it is not measuring and reporting return on its EA investment and has not defined a methodology for developing, maintaining, and validating its EA products. According to agency officials, the agency is awaiting further guidance from the OMB before it invests in further developing methods and mechanisms for measuring return on EA investment.</p>	<p><b>Closed on December 29, 2006.</b> We have formed an Enterprise Architecture Governance Committee and have dedicated EA staff to ensure continued development and maturity of our EA program in accordance with GAO’s Enterprise Architecture Management Maturity Framework and the Federal Enterprise Architecture Program Management Office EA assessment Framework 2.0 requirements. We have improved and documented our EA framework, models, documentation and implementation. As a result, the OMB scored our Framework 2.0 assessment as Green in all categories (Completion, Use, and Results) during their March 2006 review.</p>
--	----------------	---	---	--

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-06-196 (12005016) Social Security Administration: Additional Actions Needed to Prevent Improper Benefit Payments under Social Security Protection Act</b></p>	<p>5/30/06</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: To assure proper benefit eligibility determinations and appeals processes, the Commissioner of Social Security should provide enhanced training to staff to assist them in properly processing claims covered by Section 211.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> In March 2007, SSA stated that the agency drafted a regulation and was updating the claims processing procedures relating to Section 211 of the Social Security Protection Act (SSPA). Once these procedures are completed, SSA stated that it would include information on processing benefit claims under Section 211 in monthly interactive video training provided to SSA FOs. SSA stated that it expected to have these updates completed in FY 2007. In its August 2009 update, SSA stated that the Office of Regulations sent the regulation to the Commissioner for review to determine the release date, and expected to have the regulation published and the updates to the processing procedures for Section 211 of the SSPA completed in 2009. As of May 2010, the Commissioner had placed this regulation on an indefinite hold and the agency has no anticipated release date.</p>	<p><b>Closed on December 31, 2009.</b> We published claims processing procedures related to Section 211. We published subsequent updates to the claims processing procedures from September 2006 through April 2009.</p>
---	----------------	--	--	--

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-06-421 (12005023)</b> <b>Personal Information: Agency and Reseller Adherence to Key Privacy Principles</b></p>	<p>4/4/06</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: To improve accountability, ensure adequate public notice of agencies' use of personal information from commercial sources, and allay potential privacy concerns arising from agency use of information from such sources, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, and the Commissioner of SSA should develop specific policies for the collection, maintenance, and use of personal information obtained from resellers that reflect the Fair Information Practices, including oversight mechanisms such as the maintenance and review of audit logs detailing queries of information reseller databases--to improve accountability for agency use of such information.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA agreed to amend Privacy Act system of records notices (SORN) to reflect the use of information from commercial sources. Furthermore, the agency agreed to explore options for enhancing its policies and internal controls over information obtained from commercial resellers, including options for improved audit trail maintenance and review. However, SSA has not yet documented that the SORNs have been revised nor has SSA provided concrete plans for developing a policy addressing the collection, maintenance, and use of personal information from commercial resellers.</p>	<p><b>Closed on September 29, 2006.</b> We agree. To better address the Fair Information Practices concerning information we obtain from information resellers, we will amend our relevant Privacy Act systems of records notices to reflect the use of information resellers/commercial data sources. We will also explore options for enhancing our policies and internal controls over information we obtain from information resellers, including options for improved audit trail maintenance and review.</p>
--	---------------	--	---	--

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-05-735 (12004034) Social Security Administration: Additional Actions Needed in Ongoing Efforts to Improve 800- Number Service</b></p>	<p>8/18/05</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: To improve the quality of the 800-number telephone service, the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should establish procedures for documenting and assessing customer-reported complaints. In doing so, the agency should determine the types of information it needs to assess customers' concerns and to provide the agency a means to identify and address service issues.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA has not acted on this recommendation. SSA reported that it previously conducted pilots to gather and maintain information on customer complaints but abandoned these initiatives because they were too labor-intensive. SSA concluded that the resources required to implement this recommendation outweighed the benefits. In FY09, SSA reiterated that it had taken no action on this recommendation.</p>	<p><b>Closed on June 30, 2006.</b> We disagreed with this recommendation. We previously piloted a Talking and Listening to Customer initiative, which was designed to gather and maintain records on customer comments and complaints. This initiative was abandoned due to heavy resource requirements. Likewise, a pilot to mandate the input and maintenance of a system for Customer Comment Cards used in our field offices was also deemed too labor intensive. We believe requiring National 800 Number Network (N8NN) agents to register complaints received during N8NN calls would considerably lengthen the call. This would reduce the number of agents available and be counterproductive to our efforts in to improve access to callers desiring agent assistance. We believe that current and any additional resources that become available would be used more cost-effective in conducting increased service observations at the local answering site level. Not only would this provide more valid site-specific data and indicate persistent patterns/trends, it would also permit quicker feedback and corrective actions, such as additional focused training.</p>
<p><b>GAO-05-154 (12002040) Social Security: Better Coordination among Federal Agencies Could Reduce</b></p>	<p>3/7/05</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: The Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should require employers seeking verifications, via SSA's electronic batch process, to submit the workers' dates of birth, for matching against SSA's records.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA agreed to investigate this recommendation to determine its impact on SSA's operation and the employer community. After investigating this option, SSA determined that it does not believe it is prudent to make the date of birth field a mandatory field for</p>	<p><b>Closed on March 31, 2006.</b> We agreed to investigate this recommendation further to determine its impact on our operation and the employer community. The primary reason for completing these verifications is for more accurate wage reporting. The date of birth is not included on an employee's W-2 and, therefore, is not needed for wage reporting purposes. Currently, the date of birth field is available for the</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Unidentified Earnings Reports</b></p>			<p>wage reporting verification purposes. SSA based its conclusion on two aspects: 1) the ongoing lack of resources to make the necessary changes to make the date of birth field mandatory in light of higher priority improvements in wage reporting overall; and 2) the fact that requiring the date of birth would put additional burden on both the employers and SSA. The agency does not believe that making the date of birth field mandatory would improve wage reporting.</p>	<p>employers' optional input. Changing the date of birth field from optional to mandatory could have an impact and place a burden on the employer community by increasing the number of incorrect name and SSN mismatches as well requiring our field offices to investigate the mismatches and correct the information in our system of records if necessary. Programming changes will be needed to make the date of birth mandatory if we decide to take this course of action and will need to be considered as part of our prioritization process.</p> <p>After investigation of this proposal, we do not believe it is prudent to make the date of birth field a mandatory field for wage reporting verification purposes. We base this conclusion on two aspects: 1) the ongoing lack of resources to make the necessary changes to make the date of birth field mandatory in light of higher priority improvements in wage reporting overall and 2) the fact that requiring the date of birth would put additional burdens on both the employers and SSA. We do not believe making the date of birth field mandatory would improve wage reporting.</p>
<p><b>GAO-05-115 (12004014) Social Security Administration: Actions Needed to Strengthen Processes for Issuing Social Security</b></p>	<p>2/23/05</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: To strengthen the integrity of SSNs issued to children, the Commissioner of Social Security should establish a mechanism to better coordinate with external audit agencies that periodically conduct reviews of states' birth registration and certification</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA agreed that coordination and sharing of information is important and notes that it will encourage state auditing agencies to share report results so that SSA can monitor the findings and recommendations to mitigate risks to the enumeration process. Follow up with SSA in June 2007 did not</p>	<p><b>Closed on September 30, 2005.</b> While we believe that coordination and sharing of information is very important, it is not within SSA's scope of review to audit a State's birth registration process. We will encourage State auditing agencies to share report results so that we can monitor the findings and recommendations to mitigate risks to our enumeration process.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Numbers to Children</b></p>		<p>processes. Monitor the findings and recommendations of such reviews to mitigate risks to SSA's enumeration processes.</p>	<p>result in any new indications of coordinated efforts between SSA and states of states' audit report results. Additional follow up with SSA officials in April 2009 indicated that SSA had not taken any additional steps to coordinate with external audit agencies such as state or local auditors.</p>	
<p><b>GAO-04-929 (12003032) Disability Insurance: SSA Should Strengthen Its Efforts to Detect and Prevent Overpayments</b></p>	<p>10/19/04</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: To enhance SSA's ability to detect and prevent overpayments in the DI program, the Commissioner of Social Security should study the potential for creating an alert system similar to that used in the SSI program for alerting FOs about recipients at high risk for earnings-related overpayments. Such a system would allow SSA to notify FOs and program service centers about beneficiaries the agency identifies as most likely to incur large overpayments.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> When the Continuing Disability Review Enforcement Operation (CDREO) identifies disability beneficiaries with significant earnings, it signals to the Disability Control File (DCF) for work activity control purposes. If there is no current work activity development pending, the CDREO posts the pending action to the DCF and generates an alert to the relevant FO or program service center to process the CDR. The DCF then controls these issues to completion. However, this alert system does not identify individuals who may be most likely to incur a large overpayment. There is no prioritization or flagging of cases alerted to differentiate them. SSA does not create categories of cases by the size or the potential for a large overpayment.</p>	<p><b>Closed on March 31, 2005.</b> We currently have an agreement with the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) to conduct computer matches with the National Directory of New Hires for SSI recipients. We implemented query access to OCSE data (quarterly wages, new hire reports, and unemployment insurance data) for disability benefits and Ticket to Work purposes this spring. Online access was done in advance of the batch process because it was more cost effective and expeditious. We are using the OCSE data in making determinations about work and earnings for cost reimbursement claims from State Vocational Rehabilitation agencies. We are also using the OCSE data in Ticket to Work as supplemental work and earnings information in making determinations on Employment Network requests for payment. Another computer matching agreement that supports SSA's use of OCSE data in the disability program for the purposes of identifying possible overpayments has also been drafted.</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-04-929 (12003032) Disability Insurance: SSA Should Strengthen Its Efforts to Detect and Prevent Overpayments</b></p>	<p>10/19/04</p>	<p>Recommendation 5: To enhance SSA's ability to detect and prevent overpayments in the DI program, the Commissioner of Social Security, once the eWork system is fully implemented, should consider how it could be used to help the agency create performance goals for its work CDR workload.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA agrees that once eWork has been implemented on a national basis and sufficient time has elapsed to allow users to become proficient in its use, it should consider using the data in creating agency performance goals for its work CDR workloads.</p>	<p><b>Closed on March 31, 2005.</b> After eWork has been rolled out nationally and sufficient time has elapsed to allow users to become proficient in its use, we should consider utilizing the data contained therein to create performance goals for our work CDR workload.</p>
--	-----------------	--	---	---

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-04-655 (12003017) GUARDIANSHIP S: Collaboration Needed to Protect Incapacitated Elderly People</b></p>	<p>7/13/04</p>	<p>Recommendation 1 (GAO recommendation 3): To increase the ability of representative payee programs to protect federal benefit payments from misuse, SSA should convene an interagency study group that includes representatives from the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), federal agencies with representative payee programs, including Veterans Administration (VA) and Office of Personnel Management (OPM), and state courts that wish to participate in order to study the costs and benefits of options for improving interagency cooperation and federal-state cooperation in the protection of incapacitated elderly and non-elderly people. Options may include (1) prompt and systematic sharing among federal agencies' representative payee programs of information such as the identity of individuals who are incapacitated, the identity of those individuals' designated guardians and representative</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> Although VA, HHS, and OPM indicated their willingness to participate in such a study group, SSA disagreed with this recommendation. SSA stated that its responsibility focuses on protecting SSA benefits, cited concern about the difficulty of interagency data sharing and Privacy Act restrictions, and indicated that leadership of the study group would not be within its purview. As of September 2007, the agency's position has not changed. Coordination among federal agencies and between federal agencies and state courts remains essentially unchanged, according to agency and court officials. SSA continues to provide limited information to the VA in cases where issues arise, such as evidence of incapacity or misuse of benefits. However, to ensure that no overpayment of VA benefits occurs, SSA will provide appropriate VA officials requested information as to the amount of Social Security benefit savings reported by the representative payee.</p>	<p><b>Closed on December 31, 2004.</b> We disagreed with this recommendation. We do not believe the proposed effort is within our purview. We receive appropriations from Congress to ensure that the benefits paid to payees are used for the maintenance and welfare of incapacitated individuals. The effort GAO has proposed goes far beyond our statutory responsibilities. Moreover, we believe that it would be extremely difficult for agencies to develop a systematic way to share information when we consider the number of State and local courts that exist and the differing laws of the State and Federal agencies regarding capability. In addition, there are privacy implications that could preclude information sharing among the many different jurisdictions.</p>
--	----------------	---	---	--



Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		<p>payees, the identity of guardians and representative payees who fail to fulfill their duties, and the assignment of successor guardians and successor representative payees, and (2) prompt and systematic sharing of similar information among federal agencies and courts responsible for guardianships that choose to participate. Information-sharing initiatives should be designed in a manner that is cost-effective, respectful of privacy rights, and consistent with federal nondisclosure requirements concerning confidential information.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-04-49 (12003021) Information Technology Management: Governmentwide Strategic Planning, Performance Measurement, and Investment Management Can Be Further Improved</b></p>	<p>2/12/04</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: To improve the agency's IT investment management processes, the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should develop work processes and procedures for the agency's investment management board.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> SSA has developed guidelines that outline SSA's IT investment process and the operations of the Information Technology Advisory Board (ITAB). The guidelines that include SSA's Capital Planning and Investment Control Guide, dated September 2007 and its Information Technology Planning Training Package, date December 2007, specify the roles of key entities involved in the organization's investment management process, and explain procedures for assigning responsibility for investment decision making. However, SSA does not have a Charter or operating procedures for the ITAB.</p>	<p><b>Closed on September 30, 2004.</b> SSA's investment management board, the ITAB, follows established work processes and procedures as documented in SSA's Target IT Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) Process Guide. The Agency's Target IT CPIC Process Guide describes the Agency's defined process for meeting its Clinger/Cohen Act and OMB responsibilities as well as the role, responsibility and authority of the ITAB. The process guide is updated on a yearly basis to ensure continued compliance with legislation and OMB guidance. The level of detail reflected in the process guide provides the flexibility for the ITAB to meet its obligations efficiently.</p>
---	----------------	--	---	---

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-04-121 (12002039) Social Security Administration: Strategic Workforce Planning Needed to Address Human Capital Challenges Facing the Disability Determination Services</b></p>	<p>1/27/04</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: The Commissioner of SSA should issue regulations that establish uniform minimum qualifications for new disability examiners. The minimum qualifications should be based on an analysis of the position that identifies the examiner's responsibilities and the minimum knowledge, skills, and competencies necessary to adequately perform them. The minimum qualifications for the examiner's position should take into account any changes in the complexity of the tasks required for this position stemming from the Commissioner's new long-term strategy.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> The agency agreed with this recommendation. The Implementation Workgroup is working with SSA leadership to develop multi-year implementation strategies.</p>	<p><b>Closed on December 31, 2008.</b> In December 2007, the Recruitment and Retention Workgroup presented a final report regarding current and future recruitment and retention impediments for the DDSs. The workgroup identified 147 issues affecting recruitment and retention, which were then consolidated into nine topic categories. The overarching topics included items such as training, compensation initiatives, Disability Examiner certification, succession planning, executive marketing packages, etc. Implementation actions are currently underway to bring solutions to many of the 147 items.</p>
<p><b>GAO-03-863 (12003004) Small and Disadvantaged Businesses: Some Agencies' Advocates Do Not Report to the Required Management Level</b></p>	<p>10/14/03</p>	<p>Recommendation 1 (GAO recommendation 2): The Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should take steps as necessary to comply with the requirement in section 15(k)(3) of the Small Business Act that the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization director be responsible only to and report</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> As of June 8, 2005, the agency stated that it will not implement the recommendation and closed out the recommendation in 2004.</p>	<p><b>Closed on March 31, 2004.</b> On March 2, 1999, our General Counsel (GC) issued an opinion specifically related to the OSDBU Director position. In that opinion, the Associate General Counsel for General Law stated that each of SSA's Deputy Commissioners, including the Deputy Commissioner for Finance, Assessment and Management (DCFAM), as well as the GC and the Chief Actuary report directly to the Commissioner. The GC concluded that each of them (i.e., the Deputy Commissioners) could be considered to have the status of a "deputy" to the</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
 Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		<p>directly to the head or deputy head of the agency.</p>		<p>Commissioner, unless more is required by a specific statute or regulation. Based on that opinion and the current direct reporting relationship of our Deputy Commissioners, including the DCFAM, to the Commissioner, we continue to believe we are in compliance with Section 15(k)(3) of the SBA. Additionally, with respect to GAO's interpretation of the role of the Agency's "Deputy Commissioner" we offer the following: "While the Deputy Commissioner shares responsibility for providing executive leadership to the Social Security Administration, including acting for the Commissioner in her absence, each of the other Deputy Commissioners report directly to her." The DCFAM's functional statement in the SSA Organization Manual reads, "The Deputy Commissioner, Finance Assessment and Management is directly responsible to the Commissioner for carrying out the ODCFAM mission and providing general supervision to the major components of ODCFAM. The Deputy Commissioner also is the SSA Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and is directly responsible to the Commissioner for carrying out the CFO mission."</p>
--	--	---	--	---

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-03-920 (12002029) Social Security Numbers: Improved SSN Verification and Exchange of States' Driver Records Would Enhance Identity Verification</b></p>	<p>9/15/03</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Considering the significant increase in the number of on-line requests that SSA anticipates receiving from states, as well as the weaknesses that we identified in SSA's service that may increase states' vulnerability to identity fraud, the Commissioner of Social Security should develop a strategy for improving the non-match rate for SSA's verification service. This should include identifying additional information it can reasonably and legally disclose to state driver-licensing agencies as well as actions states can take to prevent non-matches.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> The agency has not taken any actions to date to work with the states to explore options for reducing the non-match rate.</p>	<p><b>Closed on March 31, 2004.</b> We believe the evaluation of our comment is misleading because the highlight at the beginning of the report, and the report itself, states that we agree with the recommendation to improve the non-match rate. Although our comments stated that we partially agree, we also noted that increasing the number of elements to match must be considered with caution. We do not believe that improving the non-match rate will necessarily result in improved identity authentication as anyone who presents a State's Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA) with all of the correct data used on the SSN application would produce a match via SSN verification, but still may not be the person to whom the SSN was assigned. It has been our experience that State and Federal governments are seeking better security, requiring "tighter" routines. Our processes merely confirms whether the forwarded information matches information in our computer records and that a match does not verify identity. In addition, we are very limited by law and policy in the types of information that can be disclosed and accessed by motor vehicle agencies. While we can increase the elements to match upon, that may decrease "improve the non-match rate" by yielding more matches, we caution that there is the potential for increased vulnerability to fraud by increasing the number of false positives.</p>
---	----------------	---	---	--

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-03-604 (12002011) Equal Employment Opportunity: SSA Region X's Changes to Its EEO Process Illustrate Need for Agencywide Procedures</b></p>	<p>7/16/03</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: The Commissioner of SSA should direct the Regional Commissioner of Region X to review the statistically significant differences we found in adverse actions and awards to determine why they occurred and what, if any, corrective action is needed.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> As of May 17, 2005, the agency considered the recommendation closed; however, no specific action had been taken.</p>	<p><b>Closed on December 31, 2003.</b> As part of our ongoing efforts to ensure equity to all employees, we will continue to monitor statistically significant differences in the processing of personnel actions in various categories including adverse actions and awards. However, it should be noted that the GAO data shows that of 142 adverse actions in a 5-year period, 65 (46 percent) were attributed to systems security sanctions cases. We would like to emphasize that these cases are identified largely from security reviews and that the proposing and deciding officials for sanctions cases are required to follow a uniform table of penalties that is applicable agency-wide. Additionally, to ensure consistency, the deciding official is the same person for all cases in each region. These factors should be taken into consideration when drawing any conclusions from the data.</p>
<p><b>GAO-02-831 (12001031) SSA Disability Decision- Making: Additional Measures Would Enhance Agency's Ability to Determine Whether Racial Bias Exists</b></p>	<p>9/9/02</p>	<p>Recommendation 5 (GAO recommendation 1): To more readily identify patterns of misconduct, including racial bias, in complaints against ALJs, SSA's Office of Hearing and Appeals should use internal, administrative data, where available, to identify and document the race or ethnicity of complainants.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> The agency's Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) Associate Commissioner has instructed all OHA components to complete a Bias Complaint Summary Form to capture key information on racial bias and misconduct when an ALJ bias or misconduct complaint is filed. In 2005, the agency also convened an agency workgroup tasked with developing recommendations on how to collect meaningful data on race and ethnicity to ensure the availability</p>	<p><b>Closed on December 31, 2004.</b> On October 22, 2004, a memorandum from Chief Administrative Law Judge David B. Washington was released to all regional offices and hearing offices announcing that the Office of the Chief Administrative Law Judge (OCALJ) would serve as the lead component for compiling all racial bias and misconduct complaint information for OHA. OHA's Associate Commissioner instructed that all OHA components complete a Bias Complaint Summary Form to capture key information on racial bias and misconduct when an ALJ bias or misconduct complaint is filed. In compliance with GAO-02-831, the Bias Complaint Summary Form summarizes key information on all ALJ bias</p>

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

			of information needed to analyze any adverse effects on program policies and rules. However, no further action has yet been taken since the conclusion of this workgroup.	misconduct complaints and allows OCALJ to address issues regarding OHA's ongoing quality assurance process. The Bias Complaint Summary Form also improves SSA's assessment of the ALJ decision-making process and readily identifies patterns of racial bias and misconduct.
<b>GAO-02-346 (12001025) Social Security Administration: Fugitive Felon Program Could Benefit from Better Use of Technology</b>	9/6/02	Recommendation 1: To improve the fugitive felon program's operational efficiency and ensure sustained, long-term success in identifying fugitive SSI beneficiaries, the Commissioner of Social Security should designate a program management office and program manager to direct, monitor, and control the program's activities and progress.	<b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> The agency disagreed and closed this recommendation in March 2003, stating that no actions would be taken.	<b>Closed on March 31, 2003.</b> We disagree that one Agency-wide program manager is necessary. The fugitive felon program is a joint effort between SSA's Office of Operations and OIG; within the two offices, there are managers who are responsible for the program. Communication and cooperation among all components within SSA have been excellent, and we see steady refinement in our processes and anticipate continued success as this program continues to mature. To ensure that all involved offices are aware of the overall process and individual office responsibilities, we released a detailed process description (EM 02046 - "Roles and Responsibilities for Fugitive Felon Case Processing") to involved offices in April 2002. We provided a copy of the message to GAO during this review. In addition, the Inspector General Act does not allow OIG to take direction from nor take part in administrative decisions that appropriately belong to SSA.

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-02-346 (12001025) Social Security Administration: Fugitive Felon Program Could Benefit from Better Use of Technology</b></p>	<p>9/6/02</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: The Commissioner of Social Security should direct the program management office and manager to conduct a detailed assessment of the fugitive felon program's current operations and performance, including a complete analysis of the organizations, processes, information flows, and time frames required to administer the program, a full accounting of the program's costs, estimated and actual program benefits, and current workload requirements.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> As of August 2002, the agency disagreed with this recommendation. On March 2003, the agency closed this recommendation stating that no actions would be taken.</p>	<p><b>Closed on March 31, 2003.</b> Monitoring and analysis of the program's operations is an ongoing process. Enhancements are made when deemed necessary and timeframes required to administer the program continue to decrease. Based on August 1996 legislation for the matching of fugitive felon information, we completed many of the tasks cited in the recommendation prior to starting the matching process in calendar year 1999. Also, beginning with the semi-annual report to Congress dated October 1, 1997 through March 31, 1998, OIG has regularly reported its performance in the fugitive felon program. In addition, we completed a Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) on the fugitive felon program in January 2001, which reflected a 4.8 to 1 return on investment. This CBA document was supplied to GAO during this review. In terms of determining current workload requirements, it is too early in the process for us to accurately project workloads; however, we do have estimates based on earlier OIG reports. We consider this an ongoing monitoring initiative.</p>
<p><b>GAO-02-346 (12001025) Social Security Administration: Fugitive Felon Program Could Benefit from Better Use of Technology</b></p>	<p>9/6/02</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: The Commissioner of Social Security should direct the program management office and manager to identify and prioritize, based on its assessment, those fugitive felon processes that need improvement and develop a strategy for resolving</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> The agency disagreed and closed this recommendation in March 2003, stating that no actions would be taken.</p>	<p><b>Closed on March 31, 2003.</b> We disagreed with this recommendation. We do not believe this is necessary as we already provide for these actions in our normal operations. SSA has a number of efforts underway to automate some of the fugitive felon processes. OIG and the Office of Operations are partnered in developing an Allegation Management System that will allow for the effective and efficient management of allegations of fraud that SSA encounters, both</p>



Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

		technological and administrative barriers preventing their efficient operation.		<p>programmatic and employee. This software will support fugitive felon processing as part of "programmatic fraud." Additionally, software is being designed to automate: OIG referral of fugitive felon cases to our field offices for suspension action; suspension action and release of the due process notice to the SSI recipient; update of the Supplemental Security Record (eliminating FO handling of most of the fugitive felon cases); and feedback to OIG. This software, designed to automate the backend processing, is expected to be operational by the end of calendar year 2002. This information was shared with GAO during this review. Also, OIG, in conjunction with the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Information Technology Center (ITC), has recently developed an electronic means for the ITC to return information obtained from law enforcement to OIG. This not only significantly cuts down on the amount of paper transferred between the ITC and OIG, but also reduces OIG field processing time. There is some manual processing within the fugitive felon process. When a file is received by SSA, it must be manually logged as received and reviewed to determine if the records are acceptable. This is a minor interruption in the fugitive felon file process; however, once past the logging and initial check, the file follows the same path as any of our other successful, high-volume SSA matching operations. However, we are examining a means for automating the receipt of files.</p>
<b>GAO-02-346 (12001025)</b>	9/6/02	Recommendation 4: The Commissioner of Social	<b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> The agency agreed with this	<b>Closed on March 31, 2003.</b> While this recommendation may have merit, we believe the

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>Social Security Administration: Fugitive Felon Program Could Benefit from Better Use of Technology</b></p>	<p>Security should direct the program management office and manager to continue to examine and propose options for using technology to automate the currently manual functions involved in exchanging fugitive warrant information with federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies and in completing the verifications and referral of this information, including assessing alternatives to using data-matching agreements to obtain fugitive warrant information, and determining whether on-line connections with state and local law enforcement agencies and/or direct telecommunications connections with the FBI's National Crime Information Center database could offer viable and more efficient means of sharing warrant information.</p>	<p>recommendation, in part, but indicated that action on this recommendation was beyond its purview. SSA closed this recommendation in March 2003, stating that no actions would be taken to address the recommendation.</p>	<p>better solution would be the creation of a single National Warrant Database. In November 2001, OIG expressed the need for a National Warrant Database and testified before Congress about the many benefits that would be derived if such a database were established. The database would be a mandatory deposit for all warrant information from law enforcement jurisdictions. We support OIG's recommendation for creation of such a database. We shared this information with GAO during the review. Since July 2000, we have been involved in negotiating fugitive felon matching agreements with the States. We secured agreements with 24 States and four local law enforcement jurisdictions. In States where participation was not 100 percent, agreements have been pursued to obtain reporting of warrant information directly to us. Additionally, this process accounts for GAO's mention of extended processing time for the fugitive felon cases, citing 165 days as the general processing time.</p>
--	--	--	---

Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Government Accountability Office as required by Public Law 115-414

<p><b>GAO-02-346 (12001025)</b> Social Security Administration: Fugitive Felon Program Could Benefit from Better Use of Technology</p>	<p>9/6/02</p>	<p>Recommendation 5: The Commissioner of Social Security should direct the program management office and manager to assess the anticipated technological impact on fugitive felon operations from the implementation of provisions prohibiting OASI and DI benefits payments to fugitives, including identifying the additional information systems support that would be needed to conduct and process leads resulting from computer matches of warrant information against these benefits recipients' files.</p>	<p><b>Closed, Unimplemented.</b> As of August 2002, the agency stated that it had already completed the task that we recommended. However, our review of documentation supporting the agency's position determined that SSA's analysis had assessed the workload impact resulting from the OASI and DI legislation, but that the agency needed to conduct additional assessment to determine whether and what information systems support would be required to meet the broader mission.</p>	<p><b>Closed on March 31, 2003.</b> We have already completed this task. In January 2001, a joint SSA/OIG in-depth analysis of the State and Federal warrant files received by SSA was started to determine what impact OASDI legislation would have on the program. It was determined there would not be any technological impact issues, as the cases would follow the same path as SSI, and this legislation would only impact manpower. Thus far, it has been determined the result would be approximately three times the current workload. This information was shared with external entities, including congressional staff and the FBI. This information was also shared with GAO during this review.</p>
--	---------------	--	--	---

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

**Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Open Recommendations**

<b>OIG Audit Number (SSA Audit Number) Report Title</b>	<b>Rec. Date</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>OIG Status</b>	<b>SSA Status<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>A-03-12-11204 (22012012) Access Controls for the Social Security Number Verification Service</b>	4/2/13	Recommendation 3: Develop consistent procedures for contacting employers who appear on the fraud detection reports to ensure the appropriate use of the Social Security Number Verification System (SSNVS).	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We are currently exploring ways to work internally and with the employer community to implement fraud detection measures while using SSNVS. We will strengthen authorization rules to aid in decreasing fraudulent use of SSNVS. We currently have no implementation date for this recommendation.
<b>A-15-12-11233 (22013012) Supplemental Security Income Telephone Wage Reporting</b>	2/6/14	Recommendation 1: Adopt a process to identify and report unique Supplemental Security Income Telephone Wage Reporting classifications (for example, wage reports, wage reporters, wage earners, users, usage, etc.) for a specified period.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> On September 23, 2017, we implemented the first release of myWageReport (myWR), in accordance with the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, section 826, (BBA 826). Management Information (MI) reports for Supplemental Security Income Mobile Wage Reporting (SSIMWR) and Supplemental Security Income Telephone Wage Reporting (SSITWR) will be incorporated into myWR. In fiscal years (FY) 2019 and 2020, we will pursue enhancements to provide MI at the national, regional, area, district, and field office (FO) levels for myWR, SSIMWR, and SSITWR. We will also pursue obtaining direct comparisons between the various wage-reporting tools as well as unique-level data.

<sup>1</sup> All statuses are current through November 30, 2019.

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>A-03-12-21269 (22013033) Improper Use of Children’s Social Security Numbers</b></p>	<p>4/1/14</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: Add a verification response code to SSNVS to notify employers when a child’s social security number (SSN) has been submitted for verification.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We are identifying potential improvements to SSNVS and considering whether we can create a stand-alone investment when resources become available.</p>
<p><b>A-03-13-13015 (22013030) Access Controls over the Business Services Online</b></p>	<p>6/5/14</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Modify or develop a new control at the authorization stage to ensure an applicant is authorized to use BSO services on a company's behalf to help prevent unauthorized use.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> The identified accounts were deactivated on August 4, 2015. We will complete enhancements to the Registration of Most Everyone (ROME) application in the second quarter of FY 2020 and implement the Enterprise Authorization for Everyone (EAZE) application in the third quarter of FY 2020. We will use these tools to begin replacing and retiring the Integrated Registration Service, which supports Business Services. These tools have business requirements in place that will add/delete/modify authorization for services based on a company’s direction to approve/deny services for the employee. Our target completion time frame is the second quarter FY 2021.</p>
<p><b>A-03-13-13015 (22013030) Access Controls over the Business Services Online</b></p>	<p>6/5/14</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: Review the age restriction control for applicants younger than age 18 to ensure the controls are working as intended to prevent unauthorized use of BSO services.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> The identified accounts were deactivated on August 4, 2015. We will complete enhancements to the ROME application in the second quarter of FY 2020 and implement the EAZE application in the third quarter of FY 2020. We will use these tools to begin replacing and retiring the Integrated Registration Service, which supports Business Services. Our target completion time frame is the second quarter of FY 2021.</p>
<p><b>A-03-13-13015 (22013030) Access Controls over the Business Services Online</b></p>	<p>6/5/14</p>	<p>Recommendation 5: Determine whether the maximum age check of 125 should be lowered to be effective in preventing unauthorized use of BSO services.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> The identified accounts were deactivated on August 4, 2015. We will complete enhancements to the ROME application in the second quarter of FY 2020 and implement the EAZE application in the third quarter of FY 2020. We will use these tools to begin replacing and retiring the Integrated Registration Service, which supports Business Services. Our target completion time frame is the second quarter FY 2021.</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>A-03-13-13015 (22013030) Access Controls over the Business Services Online</b></p>	<p>6/5/14</p>	<p>Recommendation 8: Develop procedures to ensure Agency and contractor employees who register for BSO have a valid business reason and their accounts are deactivated when the reason no longer exists.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> The identified accounts were deactivated on August 4, 2015. We will complete enhancements to the ROME application in the second quarter of FY 2020 and implement the EAZE application in the third quarter of FY 2020. We will use these tools to begin replacing and retiring the Integrated Registration Service, which supports Business Services. Our target completion time frame is the second quarter of FY 2021.</p>
<p><b>A-06-14-14047 (22014030) Follow-up: Collection of Civil Monetary Penalties</b></p>	<p>3/10/15</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Pursue alternative methods to collect section 1129 civil monetary penalty balances due from individuals who do not receive SSA payments or voluntarily remit restitution.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> This recommendation would require legislative or regulatory action. We currently have no implementation date for this recommendation.</p>
<p><b>A-08-13-13038 (22014012) Using Medicare Data to Identify Disabled Individuals Who Are Deceased</b></p>	<p>3/18/15</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Work with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to obtain an agreement to identify disabled beneficiaries who are not using Medicare and use this information to determine whether these beneficiaries are alive. SSA should focus on disabilities that generally require routine medical care to identify high-risk beneficiaries.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We are continuing our efforts to explore options to study anti-fraud uses of Medicare non-utilization data. We are continuing discussions with OIG regarding obtaining the recommended information from the Center for Medicare and Medicare Services via the Inspector General Empowerment Act. Anticipated implementation date 9/30/20.</p>
<p><b>A-15-15-25002 (22014049) Fraud Risk Performance Audit of the Social Security Administration's Disability Programs</b></p>	<p>4/29/15</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Track cases where a party pled guilty or was convicted of a criminal offense involving fraud and all identified cases where a beneficiary intentionally provides false information, omits or does not report information, or colludes to receive benefit payments. This will enable the Agency to perform such analyses as data mining and data analytics that</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We continue to collaborate with OIG to incorporate this data into our data analysis. We plan to create a specific OIG liaison within the Office of Anti-Fraud Programs to track fraud referrals and intentional false statements provided by beneficiaries. In addition, we will track the information for additional data mining and analytics. We anticipate implementation by 9/30/20.</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

		will allow SSA to not only detect, but also prevent fraud and identify new potential fraud schemes.		
<b>A-03-14-24027 (22014019) Reimbursement for Data Exchanges with Third Parties</b>	5/8/15	Recommendation 3: Continue the development and implementation of a comprehensive data exchange inventory, workload process, and MI system with available resources. Establish milestones that help ensure the system's implementation by 2017.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We completed the first minimum viable product to deliver the Data Exchange Gateway to allow us to receive travel data from the Department of Homeland Security in June 2019. We are currently developing functionality for electronic Consent Based SSN Verifications (eCBSV) to support the Banking Bill with a target delivery of June 2020. We are also working to deliver a second eCBSV rollout in late 2020, using a Commercial Off the Shelf software application for all aspects of eCBSV administration
<b>A-07-14-14065 (22014060) Cost-benefit Analysis of Processing Low- dollar Overpayments</b>	7/1/15	Recommendation 2: Re-evaluate the Social Security Administration's process for collecting overpayments where the value of the overpayment is less than what SSA spends to collect the overpayment to ensure it expends resources on activities that result in the greatest return on investment.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We continue to evaluate our process We expect to complete our evaluation on this recommendation by the end of the second quarter of FY 2020.
<b>A-07-15-35031 (22015009) Overpayment Waiver Requests Processed by Field Offices in Fiscal Years 2012 and 2013</b>	7/30/15	Recommendation 1: Regularly analyze waiver approval rates and review FOs that appear to be outliers to determine compliance with the Social Security Administration's policies on overpayment waivers.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We are developing a waiver report that contains overall waiver approval and denial rates for each regional and area office as well as specific field offices that fall into high or low approval categories. We plan to release the report at the regional level with a case sample for each identified office to review/analyze as well as supplemental materials to assist with training and awareness. We anticipate completing our actions by the end of March 2020.
<b>A-04-14-14078 (22014024) Oversight of the Benefit Offset National</b>	9/22/15	Recommendation 2: For future demonstration projects, require an independent executive, or executives, to evaluate and approve the project's planned costs, and throughout the	Open.	<b>Open.</b> As part of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018, Public Law No. 115-435, we are preparing an Evidence Submission as a part of our FY 2021 Budget Submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Per OMB

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<b>Demonstration Project</b>		project at established milestones, assess the results and determine whether the project merits continued expenditures.		Memo M-19-23 and OMB Circular A-11 Part 6, section 290, we appointed a Chief Data Officer, Statistical Officer, and Evaluation Officer. The Evaluation Officer will establish a multi-year learning agenda, which is due to OMB in September 2020.
<b>A-07-15-15030 (22015005) Supplemental Security Income Overpayments Pending a Collection Determination by Social Security Administration</b>	9/22/15	Recommendation 3: As resources allow, establish a plan to review remaining overpayments where no recent actions had been taken to collect overpayments from individuals no longer receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments, focusing on the highest dollar overpayments first.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We completed our evaluation of the population of SSI debts and developed a strategy to address the high-volume of complex cases. We released the cases to the regions for corrective action, and we expect completion of those actions by the end of February 2020.
<b>A-07-15-15030 (22015005) Supplemental Security Income Overpayments Pending a Collection Determination by Social Security Administration</b>	9/22/15	Recommendation 4: Rectify the issues, including the systems limitations and unresolved diaries found during this review, causing overpayments to be unresolved.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> Using the case reviews for recommendation 3 from this same report, we will determine how to trigger an automated change to the disposition code in order for collection of an overpayment to be sent to either billing or to the Treasury Offset Program. We will address the issue of system limitations as part of the new Debt Management Product (DMP). We expect implementation of DMP in FYs 2022-2023.
<b>A-02-15-22114 (22015041) Accuracy of Disability Benefit Payments Paid to Beneficiaries Who Receive Federal Employees Compensation Act Payments</b>	11/13/15	Recommendation 3: Establish appropriate automatic alerts for Federal Employees Compensation Act (FECA) cases to ensure cost of living adjustments or other payment changes are developed timely.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We completed and submitted an Information Technology Investment Process (ITIP) proposal to create an alert for Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA) workers' compensation cases. The request is part of the enhancements to the Payment Center Automation initiative. The ITIP presentation is for fiscal year 2020 funding. We anticipate two approaches: (1) short-term (6-12 months), create a new alert that will generate on a predetermined basis to a technician in the Processing Center (PC) as a way to control the FECA workload; and (2) long-term



**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				(18+ months), create and improve the data exchange with the Department of Labor (DOL).
<b>A-09-15-15041 (22015028) Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Benefits Withheld Pending a Windfall Offset Determination</b>	3/21/16	Recommendation 2: Evaluate the results of its actions for the 58 beneficiaries and take appropriate action to address the remaining population of 61,734 beneficiaries identified during the current audit.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> Of the 61,734 beneficiaries identified in the audit, over 50,000 beneficiaries have since had their offset determination processed and benefits paid. Approximately 11,000 cases are still outstanding and require action. Our plan is to release these cases in calendar year 2020 with an expected completion date of July 2020.
<b>A-09-15-15041 (22015028) Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Benefits Withheld Pending a Windfall Offset Determination</b>	3/21/16	Recommendation 3: Take appropriate action to address the population of 26,558 beneficiaries identified during our 2011 audit.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> Of the original 26,558 beneficiaries identified, 12,154 cases have been resolved. We released the cases to the Regions in July 2019 and will provide an update in May 2020.
<b>A-09-15-15041 (22015028) Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Benefits Withheld Pending a Windfall Offset Determination</b>	3/21/16	Recommendation 4: Periodically identify and select for review beneficiaries whose Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance (OASDI) benefits are being withheld pending a windfall offset determination.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We submitted an ITIP proposal that will improve automation of windfall offset determinations. This enhancement will allow employees to code additional Windfall Offset Data lines that will be used to control records pending a windfall offset determination. This is a long-term project associated with the Appointed Representative Fee Petition ITIP. We currently do not have a timeline for implementing this recommendation.
<b>A-09-15-15041 (22015028) Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Benefits Withheld Pending a Windfall Offset Determination</b>	3/21/16	Recommendation 5: Improve automated controls to ensure SSA employees establish a Windfall Offset Data line on the Master Beneficiary Record when they withhold OASDI benefits pending a windfall offset determination.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We submitted an ITIP proposal that will improve automation of windfall offset determinations. We will provide updated status in the second quarter of FY 2020.

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>A-09-14-34103 (22015050) Underpayments Payable to Widow(er)s Eligible for a Higher Monthly Benefit Amount</b></p>	<p>4/11/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: Determine whether it should develop a systems alert to detect when a [alternate widow's computation] should apply.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> This recommendation will be addressed as part of the IT modernization project. Given our competing IT priorities, we cannot predict an implementation date for this recommendation.</p>
<p><b>A-09-16-50093 (22015045) Concurrently Entitled Beneficiaries Receiving Representative Payee and Direct Payments</b></p>	<p>5/5/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Conduct timely Master Beneficiary Record (MBR) and Supplemental Security Record (SSR) matches to identify and correct discrepant payment information.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We are continuing our review of cases and plan to re-run cases with similar criteria to determine if recent improvement to the electronic Representative Payee System (eRPS) will prevent the need to create an MBR and SSR match. As such, we cannot provide an implementation date at this time.</p>
<p><b>A-12-15-50041 (22015032) Workload Oversight in the Miami Hearing Office</b></p>	<p>6/9/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 6: As part of the next contract with the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) union, work to modify the contract language to require ALJs requesting voluntary transfers to hearing offices to meet established goals and expectations.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> The final proposal to the Union included the following eligibility requirements: (a) a judge must not have failed to comply with a workload or policy compliance directive in the prior six months; and (b) a judge must not currently be on sick leave restriction or have been counseled for sick leave abuse or placed on sick leave restriction in the prior twelve months. We requested assistance from the Federal Service Impasses Panel and expect a decision in March 2020.</p>
<p><b>A-09-16-50109 (22016006) Beneficiaries Serving as Representative Payees Who Have a Representative Payee</b></p>	<p>8/10/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: Evaluate the results of its review for the sampled beneficiaries and take appropriate action to address the remaining populations of beneficiaries identified by our audit.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We released cases to the regions on February 5, 2019. All regions responded, but a few case corrections are still pending. We anticipate the remaining cases will be completed by the end of March 2020.</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>A-09-16-50088 (22016011) Benefits Payable to Child Beneficiaries Whose Benefits Had Been Withheld Pending the Selection of a Representative Payee</b></p>	<p>9/23/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Evaluate the results of its actions for the 55 beneficiaries and determine whether it should review the remaining 11,927 beneficiaries identified by our current audit.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We are identifying cases that have already been resolved. Once complete, we plan to release these cases to the PCs for correction.</p>
<p><b>A-09-16-50088 (22016011) Benefits Payable to Child Beneficiaries Whose Benefits Had Been Withheld Pending the Selection of a Representative Payee</b></p>	<p>9/23/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: Conduct analysis to determine which of the 4,233 beneficiaries identified by our prior audit need to receive an underpayment notification.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We completed the analysis of the 4,233 cases and identified 2,425 cases that have an underpayment that may be payable. Concurrent with our efforts for recommendation 2, we are filtering out resolved cases. We plan to provide an update by the end of March 2020, and we plan to release these cases to the PCs for correction.</p>
<p><b>A-08-16-50030 (22016007) Assessment of the Social Security Administration's Plan to Achieve Self Support Program</b></p>	<p>9/27/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Collect data on the Plan to Achieve Self-Support (PASS) program participation, costs, and outcomes.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We are still evaluating the results of a longitudinal study of PASS plans. We will use the results from the study to evaluate the costs and outcomes of approved PASS plans. In addition, we will explore cost-effective options to collect MI on PASS program participation. We expect our analysis to be available by the end of the second quarter of FY 2020.</p>
<p><b>A-08-16-50030 (22016007) Assessment of the Social Security Administration's Plan to Achieve Self Support Program</b></p>	<p>9/27/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Develop clear and measurable goals to evaluate the impact of PASS program participation on disability rolls.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We are still evaluating the results of a longitudinal study of PASS plans. We will use the results from the study to evaluate the costs and outcomes of approved PASS plans. In addition, we will explore cost-effective options to collect MI on PASS program participation. We expect our analysis to be available by the end of the second quarter of FY 2020.</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>A-08-16-50030 (22016007) Assessment of the Social Security Administration’s Plan to Achieve Self Support Program</b></p>	<p>9/27/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: Establish routine program monitoring and quality control reviews.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We continue to coordinate with stakeholders to assess cost-effective options to improve program monitoring and internal quality control reviews. We have identified the preferred functional requirements for enhancements to the PASS program Control and Information System application. The enhancements will streamline our current process and improve functionality. We are currently working on a governance document. We do not currently have an implementation date.</p>
<p><b>A-08-16-50030 (22016007) Assessment of the Social Security Administration’s Plan to Achieve Self Support Program</b></p>	<p>9/27/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: Strengthen internal controls, such as clarifying program guidelines, limiting PASS benefits, and taking steps to reduce overpayments caused by misuse of PASS benefits.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We are still evaluating the results of a longitudinal study of PASS plans. We will use the results from the study to evaluate the costs and outcomes of approved PASS plans. We updated several PASS policies while the longitudinal study was underway. We may have to delay some policy updates until the release of the study results. This may include changes in policies to help reduce potential overpayments. We expect implementation by the end of the second quarter of FY 2020.</p>
<p><b>A-13-16-23006 (22015029) Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Benefits Affected by Federal Pensions</b></p>	<p>9/29/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: Finalize changes to its administrative finality policy regarding whether the agency should continue to pay prospective benefits even where administrative finality currently prohibits reopening the determination.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> The Workgroup to Revise the Rules of Administrative Finality is seeking data to support the recommendation. This recommendation requires legislative or regulatory action.</p>
<p><b>A-14-15-15010 (22015036) Access to the Social Security Administration’s my Social Security Online Services</b></p>	<p>9/29/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Ensure the Federal tax information available through my Social Security is safeguarded in accordance with Federal laws and requirements established by the IRS.</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We implemented a pilot with a Credential Service Provider (CSP) called ID.me. We are currently evaluating the results to determine if the pilot should be expanded.</p> <p>ROME Enhancements is an Agile effort that, as part of our Digital Identity product line, will add new features to the existing ROME application to ensure that it is compliant with all federal laws and</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				<p>regulations, including Assurance Level 3. This effort started in FY 2019.</p> <p>Federation is another effort for FY 2019 that is part of the Digital Identity product line. This effort will expand the ID.me credential service provider pilot conducted in FY 2018. Using ID.me as a credential service provider is another method for ensuring we adhere to federal laws and regulations for authentication and authorization.</p> <p>Under the Digital Identity product we have included on the roadmap, the action to sunset the legacy authentication process and migrate users to the new process is scheduled to begin in FY 2020 and is a multi-year investment.</p>
<p><b>A-14-15-15010 (22015036) Access to the Social Security Administration’s my Social Security Online Services</b></p>	<p>9/29/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Identify and implement appropriate authentication and identity proofing technology to ensure my Social Security operates under Assurance Level 3 authentication requirements, as determined by the Agency’s 2016 risk assessment.</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We implemented a pilot with a CSP called ID.me. We are currently evaluating the results to determine if the pilot should be expanded.</p> <p>ROME Enhancements is an Agile effort that, as part of our Digital Identity product line, will add new features to the existing ROME application to ensure that it is compliant with all federal laws and regulations, including Assurance Level 3. This effort started in FY 2019.</p> <p>Federation is another effort for FY 2019 that is part of the Digital Identity product line. This effort will expand the ID.me credential service provider pilot conducted in FY 2018. Using ID.me as a credential service provider is another method for ensuring we adhere to federal laws and regulations for authentication and authorization.</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				When the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) published new guidelines in SP 800-63-3, it added assessment criteria/language for agencies to use, making OMB's M-04-04 publication obsolete. We are working to implement a new assessment process to encapsulate the new material and will reevaluate previous assessments. Once we determine the new risk levels, we will ensure these services are protected at the appropriate levels.
<b>A-12-15-50015 (22016015) Pre-effectuation Reviews of Favorable Hearing Decisions</b>	2/7/17	Recommendation 3: Create pre-effectuation review-related cost data to assist with any future savings calculations.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> In FY 2019, we identified and compiled data on every action the Division of Quality has directed back to the hearing level for further proceedings. We matched those actions with the subsequent hearing level decisions and ascertained the change in outcome, if any. Using available information on the average OASDI and SSI monthly awards and the lifetime award amount actuarial figure for OASDI benefits in 2011, we compiled approximate monthly and lifetime award amounts for OASDI, SSI, and concurrent cases. We then identified approximate dollar figures for cases where subsequent administrative law judge outcomes were less favorable and calculated figures for both total cost savings and per case cost savings. We are currently validating the assumptions in our calculations as well as the calculations themselves. We anticipate reporting further progress by the end of the second quarter of FY 2020.
<b>A-09-17-50200 (22016037) Beneficiaries Whose Payments Have Been Suspended for No Child in Care and Who Are Serving as</b>	2/27/17	Recommendation 4: Determine whether it should develop additional controls to ensure it does not improperly suspend mother/father and spousal beneficiaries who have a child in their care.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> A project proposal to add fields to the Dependent Child in Care screen in the claim path is being incorporated into the IT modernization project. Given our competing IT priorities, we cannot predict an implementation date for this recommendation.

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<b>Representative Payees for Children</b>				
<b>A-13-15-15029 (22015030) Cross-Program Recovery to Collect Overpayments</b>	4/28/17	Recommendation 1: Review the remaining 16,936 individuals we identified with OASDI and SSI overpayments to determine whether mandatory cross program recovery (CPR) should occur and begin recovery efforts for all applicable overpayments.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We have identified and updated the population of SSI debts from the original list of 16,936 cases to 12,361 that require action. We will release 7,131 cases to the PCs and 5,230 to FOs for review and action. We anticipate completing the cases by the end of March 2020.
<b>A-13-15-15029 (22015030) Cross-Program Recovery to Collect Overpayments</b>	4/28/17	Recommendation 2: Consider establishing automated alerts to notify staff to review certain overpayments when CPR should be used to collect overpayments.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> In August 2017, the Overpayment Redesign investment was approved by the ITIRB. In FY 2018, due to overlapping technical and business processes, the Overpayment Redesign and Remittance Modernization projects were combined into one investment, the DMP. With expected implementation in FY 2022-2023, this modernization effort is an agile investment using modern technology to create an enterprise authoritative source of debt management data.
<b>A-07-16-50082 (22016033) Overpayments Collected Through Long-term Repayment Plans</b>	5/3/17	Recommendation 1: Evaluate the Social Security Administration's existing program debt repayment policy to reduce long-term repayment arrangements	Open.	<b>Open.</b> The proposal was included in the President's FY 2021 Budget. We continue to examine our existing policies regarding overpayments collected through long-term repayment plans to determine opportunities to reduce long-term repayment agreements.
<b>A-07-17-50127 (22017009) Statutory Benefit Continuation During the Appeals Process for Medical Cessations</b>	5/11/17	Recommendation 3: Evaluate the results of the SSA actions for the individuals we identified and determine the feasibility of identifying the remaining individuals in our populations who should have additional overpayments posted.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We evaluated the population of cases and determined 29 cases need corrective action. We anticipate completion of the cases by the end of December 2020.
<b>A-04-16-50138 (22016036)</b>	5/16/17	Recommendation 1: SSA should develop a comprehensive process for	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We are working to standardize award data. We continue to work on contract language requiring a

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>Social Security Administration's Actual Information Technology Costs for the National Support Center</b></p>		<p>reconciling equipment orders, delivery receipts, quantities invoiced, and asset inventory lists.</p>		<p>vendor to provide an Advanced Ship Notice report to SSA within a certain number of hours of shipping equipment to us. The data would include contract number and serial numbers of each piece shipped, allowing us to connect assets to contracts.</p> <p>We have developed a Confirmation and Delivery tool where recipients confirm delivery of items and Contracting Officer Representatives can utilize the reporting function. We plan to pilot this tool with the printer deployment.</p> <p>Component Custodial Officers, in the regional and field offices, are using the Asset Manager Portal to monitor, track their equipment, and complete disposal actions. We provided training along with a documented user guide. We plan to roll the tool out to the Headquarters components by the end of FY 2020.</p>
<p><b>A-01-14-34091 (22016046) Supplemental Security Income Overpayments Resulting from the Goldberg-Kelly Procedures</b></p>	<p>6/12/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Evaluate the feasibility of having automated notices processed in less than 7 days when the current print contracts expire.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> The current contracts do not expire until July 2021; at that time, we will be able to change the turnaround time for the Notices of Planned Action from three workdays to two workdays. The change will also require a programming change to the claims processing system.</p>
<p><b>A-06-17-50225 (22016045) Manually Reduced Cross-program Recovery Overpayments</b></p>	<p>7/5/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Consider the cost-effectiveness of implementing controls to prevent systems from erroneously deleting SSI overpayments.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We are exploring options for possible systems updates and placing them in the FY 2020 IT modernization roadmap. Given our competing IT priorities, we cannot predict an implementation date for this recommendation.</p>
<p><b>A-06-17-50225 (22016045)</b></p>	<p>7/5/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 3: Consider the cost-effectiveness of identifying and re-establishing SSI overpayments</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We are reviewing cases to determine the best course of action. Some cases may have been corrected since the audit, and correction of some may</p>



**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<b>Manually Reduced Cross-program Recovery Overpayments</b>		erroneously deleted by Manual Adjustment Credit and Award Data Entry system adjustments.		be precluded due to administrative finality. We expect to release cases for correction by the end of March 2020.
<b>A-04-17-50267 (22017011) The Social Security Administration's Telework Pilot and Its Effect on Customer Service</b>	7/12/17	Recommendation 1: Determine whether additional customer service or production metrics would assist in measuring how telework affects FOs' ability to provide customer service and employee production.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We ended the telework pilot in field offices on November 22, 2019.
<b>A-04-17-50267 (22017011) The Social Security Administration's Telework Pilot and Its Effect on Customer Service</b>	7/12/17	Recommendation 2: Determine whether the amount of time FO staff spend to identify and prepare work to be performed while teleworking is reasonable, and if not, whether it can be reduced.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We ended the telework pilot in field offices on November 22, 2019.
<b>A-04-17-50267 (22017011) The Social Security Administration's Telework Pilot and Its Effect on Customer Service</b>	7/12/17	Recommendation 3: Determine the effect telework has on customer wait times when an FO experiences an unusually high number of visitors.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We ended the telework pilot in field offices on November 22, 2019.
<b>A-04-17-50267 (22017011) The Social Security Administration's Telework Pilot and Its Effect on Customer Service</b>	7/12/17	Recommendation 4: Determine the effect telework has on a hearing office's ability to provide support to an ALJ during a hearing.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We are modifying telework for staff positions that support ALJ hearings. Effective March 2, 2020, changes include either eliminating or reducing telework.
<b>A-06-13-23091 (22016047)</b>	7/17/17	Recommendation 1: We recommend that SSA determine the feasibility of taking appropriate action to review all	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We are still in the process of reviewing and analyzing a sample of cases to determine if improper payments are an issue and if corrective action is

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<b>Cross-referred Social Security Numbers</b>		cases where numberholders simultaneously receive benefit payments under cross-referred SSNs.		needed on the cross-referred SSNs. We expect to determine proper procedures and instructions for processing by the end of March 2020.
<b>A-06-13-23091 (22016047) Cross-referred Social Security Numbers</b>	7/17/17	Recommendation 2: We recommend that SSA determine the feasibility of taking appropriate action to resolve any cases where SSA identifies an individual who receives benefit payments under more than one of his or her own properly assigned SSNs.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> Once we identify individuals who receive benefit payments under more than one of his or her own properly assigned SSNs, we will review the cases and determine the proper procedures and processing instructions for field office staff. We expect to release cases for this recommendation in FY 2020.
<b>A-06-13-23091 (22016047) Cross-referred Social Security Numbers</b>	7/17/17	Recommendation 3: We recommend that SSA determine the feasibility of taking appropriate action to implement system controls to prevent simultaneous issuance of payments under cross-referred SSNs.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We plan to conduct analysis to determine the feasibility and appropriateness of controls as they relate to this recommendation. We have not established a completion date for this recommendation.
<b>A-06-13-23091 (22016047) Cross-referred Social Security Numbers</b>	7/17/17	Recommendation 4: We recommend that SSA determine the feasibility of taking appropriate action to review all cases where numberholders receive payments under SSNs that are cross-referred to SSNs that contain the numberholders' death information.		<b>Open.</b> We are still in the process of reviewing and analyzing a sample of cases to determine if improper payments are an issue and if corrective action is needed on the cross-referred SSNs. We expect to determine proper procedures and instructions for processing by the end of March 2020.
<b>A-06-13-23091 (22016047) Cross-referred Social Security Numbers</b>	7/17/17	Recommendation 5: We recommend that SSA determine the feasibility of taking appropriate action to implement system controls to ensure death information input on numberholders' Numident records is also input on all the numberholders' cross-referred SSN(s).	Open.	<b>Open.</b> This system enhancement will be discussed as part of IT modernization. We expect to have an idea of IT modernization plans for this recommendation by the end of February 2020.
<b>A-06-13-23091 (22016047)</b>	7/17/17	Recommendation 6: We recommend that SSA determine the feasibility of taking appropriate action to add death information to the Numident records	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We are still undergoing the necessary legal analysis. These cases involve complex death reporting and potential disclosure issues that require input and collaboration from multiple components to

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<b>Cross-referred Social Security Numbers</b>		of non-beneficiary numberholders whose SSNs are cross-referred to SSNs that contain the numberholders' death information.		resolve; however, we are simultaneously making significant progress regarding death data and in closing out other OIG recommendations through our IT modernization efforts. Through our FY 2018 and FY 2019 efforts, we have updated the Numident with over 10 million additional historical death records
<b>A-06-13-23091 (22016047) Cross-referred Social Security Numbers</b>	7/17/17	Recommendation 7: We recommend that SSA determine the feasibility of taking appropriate action to remove cross-references to SSNs in cases where cross-referred SSNs belong to more than one individual.		<b>Open.</b> The actions we are taking under recommendations 1 and 4 will address these records.
<b>A-08-16-50053 (22017023) The Social Security Administration's Manual Award Process for Initial Retirement and Survivor's Insurance Claims</b>	9/5/17	Recommendation 1: Determine the feasibility of enhancing SSA systems to reduce common Earnings Computation (EC) limitations.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We automated PSC actions related to the Earnings Computation limitation on May 19, 2018. These enhancements eliminate the need to send unnecessary diaries to the PSCs  We are also addressing this recommendation as part of the IT modernization initiative, which is currently in the product discovery phase to identify the capabilities for the new Consolidated Claims System. Given our competing IT priorities, we cannot predict an implementation date for this recommendation.
<b>A-04-17-50208 (22017005) Social Security Administration Employees Who Received Salary Increases While Working Under an Opportunity to Perform Successfully Plan</b>	9/14/17	Recommendation 3: Complete corrective actions and recover the overpayments from the nine employees who received within grade increases and one employee who received a promotion in FY 2016 while working under an Opportunity to Perform Successfully plan.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> We took action to alert the individuals of the overpayments and have completed actions on all cases but one. For the remaining case, the collection efforts are suspended pending an arbitration hearing, which the union has until April 11, 2020 to schedule. If the hearing is not scheduled by April 11, 2020, we will seek to have the Department of the Interior resume the collection of the debt.

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>A-02-17-14048 (22017003) The Cost-effectiveness of Vocational Rehabilitation Services</b></p>	<p>10/23/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Determine whether the Agency should revise how it determines whether vocational rehabilitation (VR) services led to Social Security Disability Insurance trust and/or the SSI general revenue fund savings before reimbursing VR costs.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> In FY 2018, we developed several recommendations that would ensure that no cost reimbursement payments exceed actual program savings. However, we determined the recommended changes would require legislative action.</p>
<p><b>A-02-17-14048 (22017003) The Cost-effectiveness of Vocational Rehabilitation Services</b></p>	<p>10/23/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Determine whether the Agency should develop a strategy to increase the cost-effectiveness of VR services.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> This recommendation would require legislative action.</p>
<p><b>A-13-17-34105 (22016051) Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Benefits to Individuals Removed from the United States</b></p>	<p>12/29/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Take action, if appropriate, on the remaining 1,746 beneficiaries we identified who were still receiving benefits.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We are consolidating a list of cases returned from the PSCs in which case development or action is still pending. We will provide a status update by the end of second quarter of FY 2020.</p>
<p><b>A-09-18-50559 (22017042) Higher Benefits for Dually Entitled Widow(er)s Had They Delayed Applying for Retirement Benefits</b></p>	<p>2/14/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: Determine whether it should develop additional controls to ensure it informs widow(er) beneficiaries of their option to delay their application for retirement benefits.</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We are currently in the development phase for the Beta release of the new Preliminary Claims System. We will add this capability to our product backlog and evaluate the current preliminary and initial claims processes to identify enhancements to assist technicians when informing beneficiaries of entitlements and eligibility options. We continually review our product roadmap to determine a potential implementation timeframe for this functionality. Our current roadmap for the IT modernization project</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				shows FY 2022 as a potential implementation timeframe.
<b>A-03-16-50056 (22017021) Using Nursing Home Data to Determine Suitability of Representative Payees</b>	3/21/18	Recommendation 1: Review and analyze The Department of Health and Human Services' Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services nursing home data to determine whether it can be a tool to assess the suitability of organizational payees that are nursing homes to ensure they are serving beneficiaries' best interests, especially those organizational payees that might not meet SSA's monitoring criteria.	Open.	<b>Open.</b> Our representative payee resources are currently dedicated to implementation of recent legislation. We are developing a revised plan for implementing this recommendation and expect completion by the end of September 2020.
<b>A-09-17-50259 (22017031) Deceased Beneficiaries Who Have Different Dates of Death on the Social Security Administration's Numident and Payment Records</b>	3/26/18	Recommendation 2: Evaluate the feasibility of resolving future date-of-death discrepancies between the Numident and Master Beneficiary or Supplemental Security Records.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We determined that the elimination of alternative death input sources to our payment records is feasible. The work is included as part of our IT modernization effort and roadmap slated to be addressed in FYs 2020 - 2022. Implementation will depend on available resources.
<b>A-07-18-50294 (22017050) Manual Adjustments to Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Overpayments</b>	4/9/18	Recommendation 2: Determine the cost-effectiveness of reviewing additional manually adjusted overpayments that may need correction, focusing on overpayments adjusted by greater than \$20,000 to target larger dollar errors.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We have reviewed a sample of the manually adjusted overpayments with adjusted balances greater than \$20,000; however, we determined that we need to sample the cases further to decide whether it is cost effective to take action on the larger population of cases. We currently have no timeline to complete this recommendation.
<b>A-07-18-50294 (22017050) Manual Adjustments to Old-</b>	4/9/18	Recommendation 3: Provide employees additional training on computing and verifying the validity of actions on overpayments that need	Open	<b>Open.</b> We are working with our PSC Quality Vision team to ensure the PSC refresher training captures the issues identified in this audit. We do not currently have a timeline for completion of this training effort.

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<b>Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Overpayments</b>		to be adjusted, including training on Manual Adjustment, Credit, and Award Data Entry (MACADE) inputs for overpayment adjustments and deletions.		
<b>A-07-18-50294 (22017050) Manual Adjustments to Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Overpayments</b>	4/9/18	Recommendation 4: Identify error-prone MACADE inputs for overpayment adjustments and consider the cost-effectiveness of establishing user messages to alert employees of common errors before they complete their inputs.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We continue to determine the most common errors in our review and how we can develop an alert that will be prompted in the most critical/error prone inputs. We are considering submitting an ITIP proposal. We do not currently have a timeline for completing this recommendation.
<b>A-06-17-50190 (22017061) Master Beneficiary Record Death Information that Did Not Appear on the Numident</b>	5/3/18	Recommendation 2: Develop system enhancements that ensure death information input on payment records is also recorded on the Numident.	Open	<b>Open.</b> Improvements to the death process between OASDI systems and the Numident are planned as part of our IT modernization investment over the next 3-5 years.
<b>A-07-17-50131 (22017043) Incorrect Payments to Disabled Beneficiaries Who Return to Work</b>	5/15/18	Recommendation 1: Consider taking steps to ensure beneficiaries are aware of their option to voluntarily suspend benefits when reported earnings are likely to result in an overpayment.	Open	<b>Open.</b> On May 2, 2019, we posted a blog on the Ticket to Work website explaining voluntary suspension. In January 2019, we added language on page 9 of the 2019 Red Book (Publication #64-030) that informs beneficiaries of their option to request a voluntarily suspension of benefits when reported earnings are likely to result in an overpayment. Beneficiaries can contact us at 1-800-772-1213 or visit their local office to learn more about how to request voluntary suspension of their benefits. We will also add language to the 2020 version of the agency publication: Working While Disabled: How We Can Help (EN-05-10095).
<b>A-06-17-50232 (22017059)</b>	5/24/18	Recommendation 1: Verify the current vital status of beneficiaries identified during the audit and take	Open	<b>Open.</b> We have released 82 cases that will need corrective action. We will provide a status update by the end of March 2020.

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<b>Follow-Up: Payments to Individuals Whose Numident Record Contained a Death Entry</b>		appropriate action to terminate benefit payments or remove erroneous death entries. If applicable, SSA should also recover improper payments and refer potential instances of fraud to our Office of Investigations.		
<b>A-04-18-50265 (22017054) Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Debtors Who Are Not Current on an Installment Agreement</b>	5/29/18	Recommendation 1: Review the 12,269 delinquent debtor records and take action, where appropriate, to begin benefit adjustment or recovery using its external collection tools.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We have taken action to prioritize the debts from the 12,269 debtor records. We have taken corrective action for 2,393 debts that were immediately recoverable (current pay records.) We are evaluating the work year estimates to determine the next course of action for the remaining cases that we determined are not immediately recoverable. We determined the categories with the highest collection potential are: Contingently Liable, Debtor in Current Pay, and Payee in Current Pay. We do not have a completion date for this recommendation.
<b>A-02-16-50066 (22018003) Controls over Supplemental Security Income Applicants/ Recipients' Transferring Ownership of Resources</b>	5/29/18	Recommendation 3: Determine the value of automating the transfer of ineligibility periods calculated on the Property/Cash Given or Sold screen to the Supplemental Security Record. If it adds value, make that change.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We received a work-year estimate for case processing that suggests it is beneficial to reduce manual inputs for this workload. We will work on an ITIP proposal and possibly incorporate it into the IT modernization project. Given our competing IT priorities, we cannot predict an implementation date for this recommendation.
<b>A-02-16-50066 (22018003) Controls over Supplemental Security Income Applicants/ Recipients' Transferring</b>	5/29/18	Recommendation 4: Determine the value of automating the transfer of ineligibility periods calculated on the Property/Cash Given or Sold screen to the Supplemental Security Record. If it adds value, make that change.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We received a work-year estimate for case processing that suggests it is beneficial to reduce manual inputs for this workload. We will work on an ITIP proposal and possibly incorporate it into the IT modernization project. Given our competing IT priorities, we cannot predict an implementation date for this recommendation.

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

Ownership of Resources				
<p><b>A-09-17-50202 (22017044) Beneficiaries in Suspended Payment Status Pending the Selection of a Representative Payee</b></p>	6/1/18	<p>Recommendation 1: Improve controls to ensure it does not improperly withhold payments to beneficiaries age 15 or older pending the selection of a representative payee.</p>	Open	<p><b>Open.</b> We are continuing to make enhancements to our tracking application, which alerts technicians of the need to develop for a new representative payee. The enhancements will include a field to show the claimant's date of birth and current age in years (updated daily). It will allow our FOs to immediately identify those beneficiaries who are at least 15 years of age. Additionally, when a specific case is selected, it will show the beneficiary's age. We will create supplemental reports from the S8 tracking site that will include MI data by age for the regions and area directors to easily identify groups of beneficiaries who could be eligible for direct payment. The report will count cases for three cohorts according to the claimant's age: 0 to 14, 15 to 17, and 18 and older. This should assist in identifying trends within age groups and better assist FOs in identifying beneficiaries who could be paid directly. We expect to complete this recommendation by the end of FY 2020.</p>
<p><b>A-09-17-50202 (22017044) Beneficiaries in Suspended Payment Status Pending the Selection of a Representative Payee</b></p>	6/1/18	<p>Recommendation 4: Include on its Tracking Application all beneficiaries whose payments it withheld pending the selection of a representative payee.</p>	Open	<p><b>Open.</b> Actions for this recommendation are on hold. Given our competing IT priorities, we cannot predict an implementation date for this recommendation.</p>
<p><b>A-07-18-50278 (22018008) Overpayments Not Collected Through Benefit Withholding</b></p>	7/17/18	<p>Recommendation 2: Determine whether, as part of its Debt Management modernization initiative, it could automate the manual actions currently required to ensure it initiates</p>	Open	<p><b>Open.</b> Progress continues on the Debt Management Product, which is planned for implementation in FY 2022-2023.</p>



**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

		benefit withholding at the appropriate time.		
<b>A-07-18-50278 (22018008) Overpayments Not Collected Through Benefit Withholding</b>	7/17/18	Recommendation 3: Emphasize to managers and employees, through training and reminders, the importance of addressing aged due-process requests and benefit withholding actions.	Open	<b>Open.</b> The PSCs are conducting a new national overpayment refresher training. We anticipate completion by the end of March 2020.
<b>A-07-17-50182 (22018012) Underpayments Paid on Supplemental Security Income Records with Outstanding Overpayments</b>	7/23/18	Recommendation 1: Determine whether, as part of its IT systems modernization, it could limit the number of manual actions required to ensure it withholds SSI prior month underpayments from SSI recipients to recover outstanding overpayments.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We are in the initial sprint for our first Consolidated Claims Experience release, which is for Medicare claims. We have not yet reached a point where these functions can be realized; however, they are being considered and catalogued. Given our competing IT priorities, we cannot predict an implementation date for this recommendation.
<b>A-08-18-50582 (22018020) Accuracy of Month of Entitlement Determination for Supplemental Security Income Recipients Awarded Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Benefits</b>	7/27/18	Recommendation 1: Evaluate, as part of IT modernization efforts, the feasibility of new systems controls to help ensure that SSA establishes the earliest OASDI month of entitlement (MOE) for SSI recipients.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We determined that month of entitlement on OASDI claims for SSI recipients is in scope under the IT modernization initiative. We will continue to work through the discovery, design, and development of the Benefit Domain products. We do not currently have an implementation date for the product.
<b>A-08-18-50582 (22018020) Accuracy of Month of Entitlement Determination for Supplemental Security Income</b>	7/27/18	Recommendation 2: Clarify policies and procedures to assist SSA technicians in establishing correct OASDI MOEs for SSI recipients.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We continue the creation of an entitlement guide to assist our technicians in establishing correct OASDI MOEs for SSI recipients. We anticipate implementing the guide in FY 2020. Finally, we are revising an SSI training guide for our technicians.

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<b>Recipients Awarded Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Benefits</b>				
<b>A-08-18-50582 (22018020) Accuracy of Month of Entitlement Determination for Supplemental Security Income Recipients Awarded Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Benefits</b>	7/27/18	Recommendation 3: Provide training to assist SSA technicians in establishing correct OASDI MOEs for SSI recipients.	Open	<b>Open.</b> Our workgroup of regional, policy, and business process experts continue to draft a nationwide MOE guide. Once the guide is completed, we will publish it online and create marketing and awareness for technicians to use the guide. We expect to issue the guide in FY 2020.
<b>A-09-17-50252 (22017052) Dually Entitled Beneficiaries Who Are Subject to The Windfall Elimination Provision and Government Pension Offset</b>	8/1/18	Recommendation 3: Decide whether it should revise its rules on administrative finality to allow for the correction of WEP and Government Pension Offset overpayments for the populations of dually entitled beneficiaries identified by our audits.	Open	<b>Open.</b> As part of the Workgroup to Revise the Rules of Administrative Finality, we are considering potential revisions that would allow for the correction of some or all of the improper payments identified in this audit. We are currently in the process of obtaining data related to the proposed recommendations. Once data is obtained and the proposed recommendations are finalized, we will seek agency approval. This recommendation requires legislative action.
<b>A-04-16-50145 (22018024) The Social Security Administration's Use of Administrative Tolerance Waivers</b>	8/2/18	Recommendation 1: As part of its Debt Management modernization initiative, establish controls in the new Debt Management Product that ensure technicians can only use the administrative tolerance waiver for overpayments allowable under the provision.	Open	<b>Open.</b> The DMP includes changes to the administrative waiver process. The modernized system will electronically receive, process, track, and store waiver requests and incorporate improved controls for technicians.
<b>A-02-17-50140 (22018001)</b>	8/20/18	Recommendation 2: Determine whether there is value in establishing	Open	<b>Open.</b> We are attempting to identify how to determine whether a beneficiary is institutionalized if

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<b>Institutionalized Beneficiaries Who Have Earnings</b>		a control to identify Primary Insurance Amount increases caused by earnings added to the records of beneficiaries after they began residing in institutions, especially those with higher earnings amounts or older beneficiaries. If such a change would add value, make the change.		he or she does not have a representative payee. We are compiling a list of possible data sources within our current queries. We do not have a completion date for this recommendation.
<b>A-02-17-50140 (22018001) Institutionalized Beneficiaries Who Have Earnings</b>	8/20/18	Recommendation 3: Re-examine the controls to prevent the erroneous posting of earnings for individuals with previously removed or disclaimed earnings.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We determined that institutionalized beneficiaries who have earnings is in scope under the IT modernization initiative. We will continue to work through the discovery, design, and development of Benefit Domain products. We do not currently have an implementation date for the product.
<b>A-01-17-50219 (22017041) Supplemental Security Income Recipients Who Have Not Had a Redetermination in Longer than 10 Years</b>	8/24/18	Recommendation 1: Incorporate the findings of this audit, as well as the planned Office of Quality Review study, to enhance the business process used to select SSI cases for a redetermination.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We have modified the existing SSI redetermination (RZ) business process to incorporate a special release of cases each year that have not undergone an RZ in six or more years. In FY 2019, we completed about 120,000 cases that had not undergone an RZ for the longest period. In descending order of time since their last RZ, we are continuing a special release of cases each year and in FY 2020 are planning to initiate a special RZ release of about 150,000 cases. We anticipate it will take us 6 years at the current rate to complete the work on all individuals.
<b>A-01-17-50219 (22017041) Supplemental Security Income Recipients Who Have Not Had a Redetermination in Longer than 10 Years</b>	8/24/18	Recommendation 2: Evaluate whether it should implement a process similar to continuing disability review mailers for Supplemental Security Income recipients who have not had a redetermination in 6 years.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We convened a workgroup to evaluate the feasibility of implementing an SSI RZ mailer. The workgroup determined that developing and implementing an RZ mailer would require a major investment and would take a number of years to design, develop, and implement. As an alternative to the mailer, we are considering developing a more streamlined approach to reviewing SSI recipients who have not had an RZ in a number of years. We are continuing to incorporate a special release of cases

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				that have not undergone an RZ in more than six years into our agency Redetermination Business Process. In FY 2019, we completed about 120,000 of these cases. In FY 2020, we are planning to release about 150,000 of these cases for an RZ.
<b>A-06-18-50568 (22018023) Match of Treasury Death Information Against Social Security Administration Records</b>	8/27/18	Recommendation 2: Determine the feasibility and cost effectiveness of obtaining death reports from Treasury when Treasury receives confirmed death information for other federal benefit-paying agencies' beneficiaries.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We are continuing our evaluation of the issues. We have completed the paperwork necessary to work with the Department of the Treasury (Treasury) and will reach out to Treasury to discuss appropriate solutions. Completion of this recommendation depends on completion of our work with Treasury.
<b>A-07-18-50295 (22018014) Accuracy of Supplemental Security Income Payments to Recipients with Manually Deemed Income</b>	8/29/18	Recommendation 1: Take appropriate action to address the 46 recipients we identified with payment errors.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We released cases to the regions and we anticipate completing the cases by the end March 2020.
<b>A-07-18-50295 (22018014) Accuracy of Supplemental Security Income Payments to Recipients with Manually Deemed Income</b>	8/29/18	Recommendation 3: Consider implementing a secondary review process for cases that require manual deeming.	Open	<b>Open.</b> On May 20, 2019, we released/published an Administrative Message (AM-19024 SEN REV, "Reminders for SSI Manual Deeming Cases"). The AM included language informing technicians that they may want to consider a peer review, such as having a technical expert or other technicians in the office review manual deeming cases due to the complexity of these type of cases. We are taking further action to update our policy and anticipate completing the efforts by the end of April 2020.
<b>A-07-18-50391 (22018027)</b>	8/29/18	Recommendation 2: Continue monitoring processing times at the pre-hearing case review step at the	Open	<b>Open.</b> We worked with the regions to focus on the timely processing of CDR appeals. We will analyze the results after the end of FY 2019 and make a

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>Processing Times for Continuing Disability Review Pre-hearing Case Reviews at the Reconsideration Level of Appeal</b></p>		<p>reconsideration level, and determine whether a formal goal for Continuing Disability Review (CDR) appeals is warranted if timeliness does not improve.</p>		<p>determination as to the need for a formal goal for CDR appeals.</p>
<p><b>A-13-18-50154 (22017058) Representative Payee Criminal Bar Policy</b></p>	<p>8/31/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Determine whether it should review the 4,856 payees we identified in its efforts to comply with the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018.</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> There were two sets of cases associated with this recommendation: 2,692 cases that we had our regional offices correct and 2,164 that we determined will be addressed in a batch run with other cases as a result of the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018 (SPSSBA) to take place in FY 2020. Our plan is to release the after-criminal-bar cases (2,656) and the before-and-after cases (36) by January 2020 for corrective action in the regions. Soon we will hold internal discussions on the expected due date for the corrective action. For the remaining before-criminal-bar cases (2,164), we will include them in the FY 2020 batch run that will be completed to correct 650,000 cases because of the SPSSBA.</p>
<p><b>A-14-17-50097 (22017016) The Social Security Administration's Comprehensive Integrity Review Process</b></p>	<p>9/10/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Conduct a comprehensive review of Comprehensive Integrity Review Process (CIRP) to determine whether it identifies potentially improper or fraudulent transactions in the most cost-effective manner.</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We will resolve this finding in a phased approach ending in 2021 with the full migration to the Re-engineered Comprehensive Integrity Review Program (RCIRP). We have 11 scenarios migrated to the modernized RCIRP platform. By the end of March 2020, we anticipate completing migration of scenarios involving employee queries, which will bring the total number of scenarios migrated to 17. We are also reviewing the results of data analytics to determine its potential effect on this workload.</p>
<p><b>A-14-17-50097 (22017016) The Social Security Administration's</b></p>	<p>9/10/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Review CIRP alert criteria to determine whether (a) existing criteria remain appropriate</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We will resolve this finding in a phased approach ending in 2021 with the full migration to RCIRP. We have reviewed 11 of 41 scenarios and migrated them to a modernized platform. We are on</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<b>Comprehensive Integrity Review Process</b>		and (b) additional criteria should be developed and implemented.		schedule to migrate an additional 6 scenarios at the end of March 2020. This will bring the total number of scenarios migrated to the modernized RCIRP platform to 17. We formed a workgroup to ensure that the scenarios meet all requirements.
<b>A-14-17-50097 (22017016) The Social Security Administration's Comprehensive Integrity Review Process</b>	9/10/18	Recommendation 3: Review CIRP guidance, including the Integrity Review Handbook, to ensure it is accurate and current.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We continue to review and update the Integrity Review Handbook to ensure it is accurate and current. We will complete our actions on this recommendation once we migrate all criteria to RCIRP in FY 2021.
<b>A-02-18-50543 (22018028) Interim Benefits Paid After a Disability Claim is Denied</b>	9/13/18	Recommendation 1: Review and take appropriate actions to correct the cases we determined were not accurately processed.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We are working on final approval for processing instructions and policy updates. We expect to release the updates in FY 2020.
<b>A-02-18-50543 (22018028) Interim Benefits Paid After a Disability Claim is Denied</b>	9/13/18	Recommendation 2: Reassess its policy to stop IB payments after the 60-day appeals period. SSA can stop payments after it makes its decision and restart IB payments should a claimant file a timely appeal.	Open	<b>Open.</b> The revisions to the OASDI interim benefits policy instructions are complete and will be released for internal-component review through the internal review draft process (eIRD). We expect to publish the new instructions in FY 2020.
<b>A-04-17-50238 (22018015) Cost of Administering Claimant Representative Fee Payments</b>	9/19/18	Recommendation 2: Determine whether action is necessary for the remaining records with incorrect user fees in our population.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We are currently evaluating the cases as well as the feasibility of processing the cases and determining appropriate next steps. We do not have a timeline for completion.
<b>A-04-17-50238 (22018015) Cost of Administering</b>	9/19/18	Recommendation 3: Evaluate the feasibility of automating the claimant representative fee process to	Open	<b>Open.</b> We are developing an ITIP submission to address automating some features. While 100 percent automation may present some obstacles, some systems enhancements and automation improvements

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<b>Claimant Representative Fee Payments</b>		eliminate manual transactions, where cost effective to do so.		can help increase the accuracy of claimant representative fees in certain situations. We do not currently have a timeline for completing this recommendation.
<b>A-03-18-50537 (22018036) Employers Reporting Wages with Nonwork Social Security Numbers</b>	9/25/18	Recommendation 1: Re-examine controls and procedures to ensure SSA employees update citizenship/work authorization on the Numident during the benefit-claims process.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We will update related Program Operation Manual System (POMS) sections by the end of FY 2020 to include guidance reminding technicians to ensure they record citizenship and work authorization information on the Numident during the claims process, when warranted. We also continue to explore the possibility of integrating an edit into the claims systems that are currently under development with IT Modernization.
<b>A-02-14-34090 (22018038) Accuracy of the Determination of Workers' Compensation Offset During Disability Insurance Claims Processing</b>	9/25/18	Recommendation 2: Determine whether it should review additional cases in the population of DI beneficiaries who filed or intended to file for Workers' Compensation/Public Disability Benefits (WC/PDB).	Open	<b>Open.</b> We are reviewing the corrective actions taken for recommendation one to determine whether we should review additional cases for DI beneficiaries who filed or intended to file for Workers' Compensation/Public Disability Benefits (WC/PDB). There is currently no timeline for completion.
<b>A-02-14-34090 (22018038) Accuracy of the Determination of Workers' Compensation Offset During Disability Insurance Claims Processing</b>	9/25/18	Recommendation 3: Take appropriate actions to improve the accuracy of WC/PDB offset determinations during DI claims processing. For example, determine whether it should clarify policy, improve access to online resources, improve systems controls, and/or initiate data matches with WC/PDB payers. See Appendix B for our specific suggestions.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We have addressed some of the issues in Appendix B through our policy updates. During the period October 2018 to January 2019, we updated the 13 State Specific Workers' Compensation (WC) POMS sections with a paragraph and a link to bring better awareness of the limited online WC resource page and provided a link to DI 52140.020, where information can be accessed.  In August 2016, we initiated conversations with DOL to establish a data exchange between SSA and DOL for FECA payment data to increase OASDI payment accuracy. In July 2018, the project was deferred until FY 2020.

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				We continue to work on the remaining issues in Appendix B.
<b>A-02-14-34090 (22018038) Accuracy of the Determination of Workers' Compensation Offset During Disability Insurance Claims Processing</b>	9/25/18	Recommendation 4: During systems modernization, consider requiring that reporting sheets be included in printed applications provided to beneficiaries in every case. The reporting sheets should not be an optional selection staff have to select to include them in the printed applications.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We are currently evaluating our policy and exploring automation. We currently have no timeline to complete this recommendation.
<b>A-04-18-50600 (22018026) Social Security Administration's Programs and Projects that Assist Beneficiaries in Returning to Work</b>	11/26/18	Recommendation 1: Evaluate the viability and cost-effectiveness of the return to work programs and advise Congress whether the results warrant continued expenditures.	Open	<b>Open.</b> We have efforts underway to evaluate both programs. There are three ongoing internal studies of the Ticket to Work (TTW) program that are in the latter stages of development. The "Effects of the Ticket to Work program: Return on investment and overall assessment of outcomes vs design" is expected in the third quarter of 2020. The "Administrative costs of SSA's Ticket to Work program: Design and estimation of 2017 costs" is expected in the third quarter of 2020. The "Impact of Ticket to Work notices and subsequent participation on new awardees to Social Security's disability benefit programs: A regression discontinuity analysis" is expected in the fourth quarter of 2020.



**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

**Recommendations Classified as “Open” in OIG’s Semi-Annual Report to Congress with which SSA Disagrees and have Closed**

OIG Recommendation Number (SSA Audit Number) Report Title	Recommendation	OIG Status	SSA Status <sup>2</sup>
<b>A-09-11-21171 (22011075) OASDI Deceased Beneficiaries Who Do Not Have Death Information on the Numident</b>	7/9/12 Recommendation 1: Analyze its death processing systems to ensure it records death information on the Numident and determine whether it can efficiently correct any of the 1.2 million beneficiary records identified by our audit.	<b>Open.</b> SSA has still not taken action on the second part of the recommendation, which was to determine if it could efficiently correct any of the 1.2 million beneficiaries identified by our audit. Not recording these deaths on the Numident reduces the effectiveness of the Death Master File, Earnings After Death Program, and E-Verify. Therefore, we “Agree to Disagree.”	<b>Closed on April 9, 2013.</b> We believe we took the action to determine if we could correct the 1.2 million records by completing an analysis of our death processing system. We implemented a match to ensure that deaths recorded on the Numident are also posted to the MBR/SSR. Additionally, at the completion of our analysis, we started a large-scale redesign of the death reporting system to eliminate the causes of the incorrect/incomplete death processing. The first phase of this redesign went into production August 2014. Finally, we have undertaken the Continuing Death Data Improvement project under IT modernization and are actively updating our records.
<b>A-09-10-20133 (22011076) Beneficiaries Who Have Not Cashed Their Social Security Checks Within 1 Year</b>	7/19/12 Recommendation 1: Take corrective action, as appropriate, to resolve and reissue payments to the 202 beneficiaries identified by our audit. Based on the results of the corrective action for the	<b>Open.</b> Given that we found 81 percent (202 out of 250) of the beneficiaries in our sample were eligible for payments, we believe that a change in SSA’s current policy may be warranted. However, before making any policy changes or reviewing the entire population of	<b>Closed on September 20, 2012.</b> In August 2014, we reconsidered OIG's disagreement with our actions on this recommendation. We continue to disagree. As we stated before, we followed our policy in approximately 98 percent of the 250 cases OIG reviewed. We also took action to

<sup>2</sup> All statuses are current through November 30, 2019.

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

		<p>202 beneficiaries, develop a cost-effective method to reissue payments to the estimated population of 140,977 beneficiaries who had not cashed their Social Security checks.</p>	<p>140,977 beneficiaries, we recommended that SSA first resolve and reissue payments, if appropriate, to the 202 beneficiaries identified by our audit. Upon completion of this review, SSA would have better information to determine whether it is cost-effective to review all or part of the larger population of beneficiaries who may be eligible for reissuance of their benefits. It should also provide SSA with information to determine whether policy revisions would be appropriate. Regardless, we believe SSA should take additional steps when representative payees do not cash beneficiaries' checks or when beneficiaries do not cash several checks. The intent of our recommendations is not to increase workloads for SSA but to ensure all beneficiaries are paid the benefits they are entitled to receive and to reduce the vulnerability of issuing payments to beneficiaries who may be deceased. We are conducting a follow-up audit and believe SSA should do more to resolve uncashed checks. Therefore, we continue to "Agree to Disagree."</p>	<p>reissue payments for the remaining cases where OIG determined that we did not follow policy. We will evaluate whether action is still necessary based on OIG's follow-up review.</p>
<p><b>A-06-09-29149 (22011016) Supplemental Security Income Payments to</b></p>	<p>8/7/12</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Consider the viability of a legislative proposal to extend payment limits currently in effect only for married couples to other</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We believe it is a significant issue that SSA should reconsider addressing. Director "agrees to disagree."</p>	<p><b>Closed on December 6, 2016.</b> The SSI simplification workgroup considered an option that would use savings generated by a multi-recipient sliding scale to make other program improvements, such as increase the</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<b>Multi-Recipient Households</b>		multi-recipient households.		resource limit and simplify resource exclusions. The workgroup does not currently consider the multi-recipient benefit structure to be a viable option as the administrative complexity of such a change would outweigh other program simplifications or improvements.
<b>A-13-12-11245 (22012063) Benefit Payments Managed By Representative Payees of Children in Pennsylvania's State Foster Care Programs</b>	12/6/12	Recommendation 1: Conduct assessments for the 130 representative payees identified to determine whether the payees are suitable, and if necessary, refer suspected misuse to our Office of Investigations.	<b>Open.</b> As reported in December 2012, the 130 children had representative payees who were not the county-based foster care program or the foster care parent. To identify these children, a computerized data comparison of foster care data and SSA records was completed. Similar comparisons were completed for reviews we conducted for children in foster care in Maryland, Florida, Indiana, and Michigan. SSA reviewed a sample of the payees serving those children to determine whether they were appropriate. Of the 189 children reviewed, SSA determined 54 had payees who misused about \$225,000 in benefits. At the time of our prior reviews, we estimated about 294 children in foster care in Florida, Michigan, and Indiana had payees who misused about \$1.3 million in benefit payments. Based on those results, we made the recommendation in question. Given the age of the reported information, the circumstances for the 130 children may have changed. However, for	<b>Closed on December 6, 2012.</b> We disagree due to the insufficient analysis, scarce sample size, and the age of the cited cases from the original audit.  Insufficient Analysis: OIG based this recommendation on similar comparisons using foster care data from four different states. As a result, we cannot support the conclusion that these minors are more vulnerable to payee misuse. Our position is that a parent, or other relative, would be a more suitable payee for a minor in the custody of a foster care agency. Sample Size: The OIG recommendation is based solely on the premise of other reviews completed for four other states. OIG identified 130 cases using a computerized data comparison, but did not conduct an actual review of any of the identified cases. Age of Cases: The data and statistics from this audit are at least eight years old, which means that the feasibility of conducting an accurate review of the

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

			<p>those children that the same conditions exists, we believe SSA should conduct assessments to determine whether the payees are suitable, and if necessary, refer suspected misuse to our Office of Investigations. See the following reports for results of work completed pertaining to children in foster care in Maryland, Florida, Indiana, and Michigan: (a) Benefit Payments Managed by Representative Payees of Children in Foster Care (A-13-07-17137), June 17, 2010; (b) Benefit Payments Managed by Representative Payees of Children in the Florida State Foster Care Program (A-13-11-11173), March 19, 2012; and (c) Benefit Payments Managed by Representative Payees of Children in Foster Care in the Social Security Administration’s Chicago Region (A-13-11-21105), June 18, 2012.</p>	<p>130 cases identified is extremely low. Many of the claimants may have new payees, be in direct pay once reaching age 18, or no longer receiving benefits from SSA. Moreover, many of the former payees may not have supporting documents since they are no longer obligated to retain documentation once they cease to be the claimant’s representative payee and have completed a final accounting form.</p>
<p><b>A-14-12-21271 (22012008) Direct Deposit Changes Initiated Through Financial Institutions and the Social Security Administration's Internet and Automated 800-</b></p>	<p>12/20/12</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 8:</b> Notify beneficiaries of all direct deposit changes in a more timely and effective manner. For example, SSA could improve the clarity of its notification, encourage beneficiaries to notify the Agency if they believe a change was unauthorized, and develop an automated notification system.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> Although we acknowledge that some services were not available for SSI at the time of our audit, the audit did include SSI recipients where possible, not just OASDI beneficiaries. We think it is important that the notice language be consistent, as stated in our recommendation, for “all direct deposit changes.”</p>	<p><b>Closed on May 17, 2017.</b> We fully implemented new notices with changed language for OASDI in FY 2016. In FY 2015 and FY 2016, we submitted the SSI direct deposit notice language through ITIP, but it was not funded due to systems resources and competing priorities. We will work on re-establishing the workgroup in an effort to implement the SSI direct deposit notice language when funds become available.</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

Number Applications				
<p><b>A-15-12-11233 (22013012) Supplemental Security Income Telephone Wage Reporting</b></p>	<p>2/6/14</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Add language to overpayment notices due to wages to inform Supplemental Security Income (SSI) recipients, their representative payees, and deemors of the methods available to report wages.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> In response to the agency comment on Recommendation 2, we agree that informing SSI recipients of their reporting responsibilities before they receive an overpayment notice is a proactive approach. However, in those instances where an SSI recipient receives an overpayment notice due to wages, we believe SSA's overpayment notice should serve as a reminder to recipients of the methods available to report wages. A recently issued overpayment notice could garner more attention for future action than the information SSA provided the recipient when first approved. As such, this additional reminder provides SSA an opportunity to prevent future overpayments due to wages. In addition, we maintain that our second recommendation is feasible at no substantial additional cost to SSA. Director "agrees to disagree."</p>	<p><b>Closed on March 12, 2014.</b> We disagree. Currently, we provide SSI recipients with an SSI reporting folder and a business card containing information on their reporting responsibilities as well as information on how to contact us to report changes that may affect their SSI payments. Information on reporting responsibilities is also available on our public website. In addition, as the audit acknowledges on page 3, our staff are required to "recruit recipients who had wages and representative payees as well as other household members whose wages may have influenced the SSI recipient's eligibility or payment to report wages using SSITWR." Thus, it is unlikely that adding information to our overpayment notice, which already contains a large amount of information related to the actual overpayment and instructs the recipient how to contact us if they have any questions, will produce a return on investment. We believe that informing SSI recipients of their reporting responsibilities before they receive an overpayment notice is a more proactive approach and could be a more cost effective method of improving SSI wage reporting. In July 2014, we reevaluated our actions for this</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				<p>recommendation based on OIG's disagreement. We continue to disagree with the recommendation. Staff are required to attempt to recruit wage reporters when an individual reports starting to work, at application or completing a pre-effectuation interview, completing a redetermination involving wages, or during another post-eligibility contact involving wages, including processing an overpayment. Additionally, the reporting recruitment effort should be tailored for the individual. There are a number of exceptions and system exclusions to SSITWR and SSIMWR reporting related to an individual's characteristics or to the particular record. Therefore, a more targeted approach is more suitable. Sending boilerplate notice language about reporting methods may be inappropriate for many individuals, especially if they are not currently using an automated method because they are unable to navigate the system or their profile falls under an exclusion.</p>
<p><b>A-09-13-23023 (22013037) Supplemental Security Income Recipients Who Had Not Cashed Their Checks Within One Year</b></p>	4/7/14	<p>Recommendation 4: Remind employees of the policy to resolve uncashed checks before they clear pending diaries.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> SSA stated that its technicians did not manually clear the pending diary and, therefore, do not need to be reminded of policy. However, our audit analysis indicated that the diaries were improperly cleared. Therefore, we continue to “Agree to Disagree” with SSA’s position.</p>	<p><b>Closed on April 29, 2014.</b> We disagree. Our technicians follow our policy to resolve uncashed checks. Based on the technician's input after the contact attempt, the system automatically clears the diary. The technician does not manually clear the diary. In August 2014, we</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				<p>reconsidered OIG's disagreement with our actions in closing the recommendation. We continue to disagree with OIG's allegation that our technicians did not follow current policy for clearing diary alerts for SSI limited payability cases. Instructions in GN 02401.903 - .904 provide guidance to technicians for updating the SSR, paying an underpayment, or adjusting an existing overpayment based on the person's response. SSA's policy does not require technicians to place additional messages on the record when processing diary alerts for SSI limited payability cases</p>
<p><b>A-06-14-21416 (22013053) Payments to Individuals with Deaths Reported in California from 1980 to 1987</b></p>	<p>8/14/14</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Work with the State of California to obtain and process death information for the 64,193 non-beneficiary number holders or process the death information contained in the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) data files used for the audit.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We strongly disagree with SSA's assertion that it does not have a reason to process non-program related information. With its comments, SSA appears to disregard the fact that numberholders who are not current beneficiaries can still have benefit claims filed in their names as in the 2010 Florida case discussed in the Background section of this report. The perpetrators of that fraud scheme mined the same CDPH data used for this audit to identify deceased individuals whose PII were not included in the Death Master File (DMF), and subsequently filed fraudulent retirement benefit claims using the deceased individuals' identities. The numberholders discussed in Recommendation 2</p>	<p><b>Closed on August 14, 2014.</b> We have policy and procedures in place to verify the identity of applicants and for reviewing earnings associated with an SSN to minimize the risk of fraudulent misuse of a deceased person's SSN. Unfortunately, we do not have the resources to process non-beneficiary death information or similar non-program related information at this time. In March 2015, we reconsidered OIG's disagreement with our actions on the recommendation. We acknowledge the Numident and the DMF are imperfect, but updating these files and correcting records for non-beneficiaries from the CDPH file retroactively would require us to divert significant resources away from our core business. Therefore, we must</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

			<p>present a similar potential for benefit fraud. Further, Federal benefit paying entities, the Department of Homeland Security’s E-Verify program, State and local government entities, and private industry customers rely on the accuracy and completeness of SSA’s death information to detect unreported deaths and prevent fraud without regard to the deceased individuals’ Social Security benefit status.</p>	<p>respectfully disagree with recommendation two of the report. The recommendation would create a significant manual and labor-intensive workload and impede the core mission of our programs. OIG states, "Further, Federal benefit paying entities, the Department of Homeland Security's E-Verify program, State and local government entities, and private industry customers rely on the accuracy and completeness of SSA’s death information to detect unreported deaths and prevent fraud without regard to the deceased individuals' Social Security benefit status." We continue to advise users that the DMF is a database comprised of most deaths of which we are aware. We authorize the use of this database as a death verification tool, but note that it may contain inaccuracies. Entities that use the DMF are aware of this disclaimer.</p> <p>Note: This status update reflects the agency’s position in 2014; however, we have since reconsidered our position and had resources available to update nonbeneficiary records for deceased individuals in California. OIG acknowledged our efforts in their follow-up audit on California’s death information: <a href="#">2017 CA Death Match Audit</a>".</p>
--	--	--	--	--



**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>A-01-14-14036 (22014017) Auxiliary Beneficiaries Who Do Not Have Their Own Social Security Number</b></p>	<p>9/29/14</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Take additional steps to ensure aged auxiliary beneficiaries without an SSN are alive.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> Our report demonstrates a need for SSA to take additional steps to ensure that aged auxiliary beneficiaries without an SSN are alive. Specifically, we identified—with SSA’s current policies and safeguards in place—three individuals (more than 80 years old each) improperly paid \$136,153 after death for an average of 51 months. In addition, as of July 2013, we identified 12,370 auxiliary beneficiary records without an SSN on the MBR. Approximately a year later, SSA’s systems updated 597 (5 percent) of these records with an SSN and 11,773 (95 percent) remained without an SSN. Furthermore, of the 11,773 auxiliary beneficiaries’ without an SSN, 8,528 (72 percent) were aged 80 or older. As the Agency bases most of its data matching—including death matches—on the SSN, having an SSN on the MBR—regardless of the date of entitlement or presence in the United States—improves SSA’s ability to prevent improper payments. Director "agrees to disagree."</p>	<p><b>Closed on October 30, 2014.</b> We disagree. Aged auxiliary beneficiaries are subject to the same policies and full processing procedures as non-aged beneficiaries, such as benefit suspension for not responding or refusal to apply for an SSN. We agree it is important to ensure aged auxiliaries without an SSN are alive, which is why we have well-established policies and programs in place to verify that these individuals are still living. We believe our current safeguards are appropriate to meet our program needs. Our Beneficiary's Own Account Number (BOAN) Verification System, cited in the report on page 1, describes how we monitor auxiliaries residing in the United States. We understand that OIG is particularly concerned with the population of aged auxiliary beneficiaries living outside the United States. As the report indicates, 93 percent of the auxiliary beneficiaries without an SSN, who were age 90 or older, lived outside the United States. However, we have the following processes in place to ensure that aged and non-aged beneficiaries who live outside the United States are alive including aged auxiliaries without an SSN. --Foreign Enforcement Program - This process verifies the existence and identity of beneficiaries of all ages</p>
---	----------------	---	--	---

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				<p>living abroad either annually or biennially. We contact beneficiaries age 90 and over annually.</p> <p>--Nonagenarian and Centenarian Program - This process includes in-person contacts with each foreign beneficiary in the year he or she attains age 97 or 100. These programs were replaced by the Medicare Non-Utilization Project (MNUP), which utilizes a data exchange between SSA and CMS to identify Medicare enrollees, aged 90 and above, who have not used Part A or Part B for 3 or more years.</p> <p>--Totalization Data Exchange - Countries with which we have totalization agreements provide us death information for auxiliaries and beneficiaries, and we initiate contact with each identified individual to confirm the accuracy of the death report. Furthermore, the absence of a BOAN is not relevant to these processes. Rather, these programs identify auxiliaries based on a combination of the number holders' SSNs and the claimants' own beneficiary identification codes, not by BOANs. We may select individual cases for review based on the auxiliary's recorded date of birth. In addition, we require all foreign beneficiaries to respond to our contacts in person, by telephone, or by mail. Non-responders are subject to</p>
--	--	--	--	---

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				suspension of monthly benefits. In October 2014, we reevaluated OIG's rebuttal to our disagreement with the recommendation (see final report), and we still believe our steps as described above are sufficient and our policy and procedures meet program needs.
<b>A-15-15-25002 (22014049) Fraud Risk Performance Audit of the Social Security Administrations Disability Programs</b>	4/29/15	Recommendation 4: Correct identified design and operating effectiveness weaknesses in its anti-fraud measures.	<b>Open.</b> The Agency disagrees with all of the findings and no new action was identified within the response. Director "agrees to disagree."	<b>Closed on April 29, 2015.</b> We disagree with the categorization of some of the weaknesses identified in the report. However, we consistently modify and correct design and operating effectiveness weaknesses as necessary and will correct any design effectiveness weakness related to Scheme 3 (Fabricated and/or exaggerated impairment presented to doctor and our agency). We disagree that the Office of Appellate Operation's Division of Quality pre-effectuation reviews are an anti-fraud measure and are not designed appropriately. For the operating effectiveness weakness identified related to Scheme 9 (High Volume/High Approval ALJs), we disagree that we should pursue legislative changes to the Administrative Procedure Act. In addition, while we agree that ALJ collusion with representatives to manipulate the random assignment of cases is a slight fraud risk, we note that this scenario occurred only once and that we have placed significant safeguards in place to prevent its

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				<p>recurrence. ODAR's Office of the Chief ALJ periodically reminds managers of the importance of compliance with the reassignment of cases to ALJs through email reminders and during all-manager calls. While we support the recommendation that includes OMB expediting its review of changes in our listings, we do not agree with the recommendation that we should re-evaluate our current process for updating policy. The report lacks complete information and contains inaccuracies relative to our listings. For example, the report does not substantiate the following statement, "public availability of medical and vocational listings have been utilized by claimants and beneficiaries to fabricate or exaggerate symptoms in order to receive benefits." In January 2016, we reconsidered OIG's disagreement with our actions on the recommendation. We continue to believe our position from April 2015 is valid.</p>
<p><b>A-14-15-50008 (22015011) Observations and Recommendations for the Disability Case Processing System</b></p>	<p>5/4/15</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Require implementation of a comprehensive Disability Case Processing System (DCPS) access control process for each DDS that enforces least-privilege and segregation of duties for all accounts, including vendors.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We plan to follow-up on this recommendation when we perform our Security of DCPS review.</p>	<p><b>Closed on March 31, 2017.</b> With the rollout of DCPS2 Early Adopter Release in December 2016, we developed Access Control guidelines that help DDSs enforce the concept of least privilege and separation of duties as they assign tasks to their staff based on their organizational needs. This supplements the SSA Information Security Policy and POMS.</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p align="center"><b>A-09-14-34080 (22015034) Higher Retirement Benefits Payable to Families of Disabled Beneficiaries</b></p>	<p align="center">2/2/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Take appropriate action for the 159 beneficiaries and their families identified by our audit.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> The December 2016 policy clarification established conflicting requirements for SSA employees to inform disabled beneficiaries who may be eligible for a higher retirement benefits at age 62. Specifically, the December 2016 clarification conflicts with POMS DI 52150.030 and SM 00619.057 which requires SSA employees to contact disabled beneficiaries who are subject to workers compensation offset at age 62 (which could be many years after their initial claim) to inform them they may be eligible for higher retirement benefits. OIG "agrees to disagree."</p>	<p><b>Closed on April 10, 2017.</b> Our longstanding policy has been to evaluate disability beneficiaries (without WC) at the point at which they file for reduced retirement benefits. Therefore, we do not believe our policies in POMS RS 00615.110 and RS 00615.742 conflict with DI 52150.0300 and SM 00619.057. Consequently, we remain steadfast in our position to only evaluate disability beneficiaries (without WC) when they file for reduced retirement benefits.</p>
<p align="center"><b>A-09-14-34080 (22015034) Higher Retirement Benefits Payable to Families of Disabled Beneficiaries</b></p>	<p align="center">2/2/16</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Evaluate the results of the Social Security Administration's (SSA) actions for the 159 beneficiaries and their families and take appropriate action to notify the remaining population of disabled beneficiaries who may be eligible for higher family benefits.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> The December 2016 policy clarification established conflicting requirements for SSA employees to inform disabled beneficiaries who may be eligible for a higher retirement benefits at age 62. Specifically, the December 2016 clarification conflicts with POMS DI 52150.030 and SM 00619.057 which requires SSA employees to contact disabled beneficiaries who are subject to workers compensation offset at age 62 (which could be many years after their initial claim) to inform them they may be eligible for higher retirement benefits. OIG "agrees to disagree."</p>	<p><b>Closed on April 10, 2017.</b> We used our revised December 2016 policy to reduce the total population from 20,600 to 3,284. We reviewed a 20 case sample of the 3,284, and determined no cases required action. Results of our review are below:</p> <p>3 – Numberholders (NH) declined reduced retirement benefits on the application; 6 - NHs received reduced retirement before disability benefits; 1- NH received unreduced retirement before disability; 4 – NHs receiving SSI are ineligible to elect reduced retirement benefits;</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				<p>4 - Total family benefit higher when auxiliaries became entitled when NH was over full retirement age;  1 - Auxiliary was a Disabled Adult Child (DAC) living in a different household - no advantage to elect reduced retirement benefits;  1 - Auxiliary child technically entitled on the NH's record - receiving higher benefit on another parent's record.</p> <p>Based on the cases sampled, we have decided not to review the remaining population of 20,600 cases.</p>
<p><b>A-09-14-34080 (22015034) Higher Retirement Benefits Payable to Families of Disabled Beneficiaries</b></p>	2/2/16	<p>Recommendation 3: Improve controls to ensure SSA informs disabled beneficiaries when they are eligible for higher family benefits if they elect retirement benefits.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> The December 2016 policy clarification established conflicting requirements for SSA employees to inform disabled beneficiaries who may be eligible for a higher retirement benefits at age 62. Specifically, the December 2016 clarification conflicts with POMS DI 52150.030 and SM 00619.057 which requires SSA employees to contact disabled beneficiaries who are subject to workers compensation offset at age 62 (which could be many years after their initial claim) to inform them they may be eligible for higher retirement benefits. OIG "agrees to disagree."</p>	<p><b>Closed on April 10, 2017.</b> Based on the POMS revision in December 2016, we determined we have no duty to inform disabled beneficiaries when they are eligible for higher family benefits if they elect retirement benefits. We are only required to explore and provide information regarding all entitlement scenarios at the time of filing.</p>
<p><b>A-08-14-14098 (22015010) Households with Multiple Children Receiving</b></p>	3/2/16	<p>Recommendation 1: Take steps, including necessary policy and systems changes, to ensure field offices notify disability</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We recognize SSA partially agreed with our recommendation and that SSA believes it partially implemented it. However, we do not agree. We do not believe SSA's</p>	<p><b>Closed on April 18, 2016.</b> We partially agree. Current policy covers all claims and is not limited to the population identified in this audit. Our policy is broader and more</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>Supplemental Security Income Payments for Mental Impairments</b></p>		<p>determination services about claims in which multiple children are applying for, or receiving, Supplemental Security Income payments because of mental impairments and document such actions.</p>	<p>action plans or current policy and process adequately address our concern. As stated in our report response, we believe field offices should routinely notify DDSs about households that have multiple children receiving SSI payments because of mental impairments, which was a recommendation that the Government Accountability Office made previously. Furthermore, DDS staff we interviewed requested that SSA field offices notify the DDS of all multi recipient households, not just those for which they suspect potential fraud. Director “agrees to disagree.”</p>	<p>comprehensive, and as noted in our general comments, our longstanding policy has been, and continues to be, to ensure FOs and DDSs have the information needed to identify potential fraud. Our current policy alerts technicians to case characteristics that may indicate a potential for fraud--including, but not limited to cases in which multiple children in the same household are applying for or receiving SSI benefits. However, the factors we evaluate are not limited to cases in which members of a claimant's family or household are also receiving disability benefits, including cases with mental impairments. In evaluating all cases, our current policy requires FOs to alert the DDS if they suspect potential fraud. In response to a June 2012, Government Accountability Office recommendation, we released an AM in October 2013, and revised it in January 2014, to clarify the policy and provide a reminder to the FOs on the proper use of the Electronic Disability Collect System flags to document possible fraud or similar fault referrals to the DDS. In addition, if the DDS reviews the claim file and it indicates potential fraud, our policy requires the DDS to submit a fraud referral to OIG's Office of Investigations by completing an electronic form 8551 (Referral of Potential Violation).</p>
--	--	--	---	--

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>A-09-16-50159 (22016039) Individual Representative Payees Who Do Not Have a Social Security Number Recorded on the Social Security Administration's Payment Records</b></p>	<p>2/17/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Evaluate the results of its actions for the 77 beneficiaries and determine whether it should review the remaining population of 224,164 beneficiaries we identified.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> SSA's review found that a payee change would be warranted for an estimated 17,000 beneficiaries. I also disagree with SSA's assertion that it should not correct an estimated 148,000 beneficiary records (66% of our population) whose payee's SSN is incorrect. An incorrect SSN on the payment records (MBR/SSR) for a rep payee can cause improper payments because SSA will be unable to detect unreported deaths, incarcerations, etc. of rep payees</p>	<p><b>Closed on November 11, 2018.</b> We reviewed a sample of 77 cases in which individual representative payees did not have an SSN recorded on our payment records and found that further review of the remaining population of 224,164 would not be practical.</p> <p>Specifically, the 77 cases revealed only 6 instances in which a change of payee occurred, which is 7.79 percent of the population. For the six cases, the payee change was made when we contacted the beneficiary and he/she indicated that he/she would like to change the payee. The incorrect data field did not cause us to improperly pay benefits or pay benefits to a payee ineligible to receive those benefits. For the majority of the cases reviewed, these were situations in which the payee on the record was correct, but the representative payee's SSN on the record needed correction.</p> <p>In December 2017, the Stuck Sweeper system enhancement was implemented in eRPS to compare eRPS application and information on the application to the payment record to identify discrepancies. If Stuck Sweeper identifies a discrepancy, it alerts the FO on a monthly basis in order to address any issues with the application. Stuck Sweeper will not allow an application to process until</p>
---	----------------	---	--	---



**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				<p>the discrepancy is resolved. eRPS also has a synchronization feature, that when identified, FO staff can post data in eRPS when correct information is on the MBR/SSR.</p> <p>Based on our sample review and the new system enhancement, we do not believe it would be cost effective to review 224,164 cases that could potentially have been corrected. With the system enhancements, any new applications are precluded from being processed with an incorrect representative payee SSN.</p> <p>Finally, based on a very low risk of improper payments, it would take 195 work years to review and process actions on the population of 224,164 cases, at a total cost of approximately \$19.5 million. Our evaluation of 77 cases from the population did not identify any instances where benefits were misdirected because of this incorrect data in the payee field.</p>
<p><b>A-15-17-50255 (22017020) The Social Security Administration's Compliance with the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery</b></p>	<p>5/4/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Develop systems to capture data that measure the effectiveness of existing corrective actions.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> On December 6, 2018, OIG noted: We will look at how SSA addressed our findings and recommendations from the prior IPERA audits. Director would like to relook at these again in July/August.</p>	<p><b>Closed on January 5, 2018.</b> As we develop program and systems changes related to reducing improper payments, we evaluate the possibility of including data and MI to help us evaluate the effectiveness of corrective actions. We have steadily increased the data available to evaluate the effectiveness of our actions.</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

Improvement Act of 2012 in the Fiscal Year 2016 Agency Financial Report				
<p align="center"><b>A-15-17-50255 (22017020) The Social Security Administration's Compliance with the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 in the Fiscal Year 2016 Agency Financial Report</b></p>	<p align="center">5/4/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: In accordance with Office of Management and Budget guidance, annually review its existing corrective actions to determine whether any action can be intensified or expanded, resulting in a high-impact, high return on investment in terms of reduced or prevented improper payments.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> On December 6, 2018, OIG noted: We will look at how SSA addressed our findings and recommendations from the prior IPERA audits. Director would like to relook at these again in July/August.</p>	<p><b>Closed on November 6, 2018.</b> In accordance with OMB guidance, we annually review existing corrective actions. Annual reviews are conducted to prepare improper payments information reported in our annual performance report, our financial report, and our priority goals updates. We have a team in place dedicated to improper payments and executive groups that provide oversight including the Improper Payments Oversight Board and the Associate Commissioner Improper Payments Roundtable who conduct more frequent reviews of our existing corrective actions expected to reduce improper payments.</p> <p>In FY 2018, we completed our annual studies for FY 2017 payment accuracy in the OASDI and SSI programs. Based on these studies, we review policies and business processes where corrective actions could reduce improper payments. For example, in June 2018, we expanded the use of myWR and to SSI recipients and other reporters such as representative payees. Timely wage reporting is necessary to reduce improper</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				payments by making accurate SSI payment amounts and eligibility determinations.
<b>A-09-16-50114 (22016052) Controls Over Death Underpayments Issued to Non- Beneficiaries</b>	6/29/17	Recommendation 3: Determine whether [SSA] should modify the Single Payment System (SPS) to require a non-beneficiary's SSN when they have one.	<b>Open.</b> SSA should provide some rationale to support their statement --- "Systems could not make the field mandatory, so it was not worth the effort or expense". In addition, if SSA determines an SSN is not always required, it should, at minimum produce an alert when no SSN is entered for the SPS payment and should validate the accuracy of any SSN entered for an SPS payment to the Numident.	<b>Closed on August 17, 2017.</b> We reconsidered our position based on OIG's comments. We are evaluating the feasibility of including an enhancement to the SPS application in the PSC Automation Initiative. We are confirming this enhancement will comply with policy and will not cause any barriers to case processing. Once we determine it is feasible, the enhancement will require discovery and a determination that the enhancement can be included in the investment proposal. We presented the PC Automation Initiative Investment Proposal to ITIRB on January 23, 2020. We will revisit our list of prioritized enhancements to determine when SPS item will be addressed.
<b>A-09-17-50187 (22016053) Widow(er)s Eligible for an Earlier Initial Month of Entitlement</b>	8/7/17	Recommendation 1: Take appropriate action for the 101 widow(er)s we identified.	<b>Open.</b> SSA has not taken action on these two recommendations. SSA continues to assume that the error cases were processed correctly even though there was no documentation to support the MOE decision. However, we concluded that the lack of evidence, which policy mandates be present, indicates SSA policy was not followed. Therefore, we continue to "Disagree" with SSA's position.	<b>Closed on June 20, 2018.</b> We continue to believe that we resolved the recommendation. OIG cites POMS GN 04010.050 to say error exists when it is clear that the determination, or decision, was incorrect. The lack of documentation does not tell us the claims were processed incorrectly nor that the determinations are incorrect, and, therefore, we are precluded from reopening these initial claims due to the rules of administrative finality.

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>A-09-17-50187 (22016053) Widow(er)s Eligible for an Earlier Initial Month of Entitlement</b></p>	<p>8/7/17</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Determine the feasibility of reviewing the remaining population of widow(er)s who may be eligible for additional months of benefits before their application filing date and could have chosen an earlier initial month of entitlement.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> SSA has not taken action on these two recommendations. SSA continues to assume that the error cases were processed correctly even though there was no documentation to support the MOE decision. SSA has assumed that the cases were processed correctly even though there was no documentation to support the MOE decision. However, we concluded that the lack of evidence, which policy mandates be present, indicates SSA policy was not followed. Therefore, we continue to “Disagree” with SSA’s position.</p>	<p><b>Closed June 20, 2018.</b> We continue to believe that we resolved the recommendation. OIG cites POMS GN 04010.050 to say error exists when it is clear that the determination, or decision, was incorrect. The lack of documentation does not tell us the claims were processed incorrectly nor that the determinations are incorrect, and therefore, we are precluded from reopening these initial claims due to the rules of administrative finality.</p>
<p><b>A-09-18-50559 (22017042) Higher Benefits for Dually Entitled Widow(er)s Had They Delayed Applying for Retirement Benefits</b></p>	<p>2/14/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Take action, as appropriate, for the 41 beneficiaries identified by our audit.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We disagree that administrative finality applies as our audit found that SSA did not comply with its policy requirement to inform claimants of the option to delay their retirement application when they applied for benefits.</p>	<p><b>Closed on April 5, 2018.</b> We reviewed the records and determined, based on our rules of administrative finality (POMS GN 04001.070 Do Not Reopen Correct Determinations and GN 04001.010 When and Why SSA Reopens), that we are preclude from reopening these 41 initial decisions.</p>
<p><b>A-09-18-50559 (22017042) Higher Benefits for Dually Entitled Widow(er)s Had They Delayed Applying for Retirement Benefits</b></p>	<p>2/14/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Evaluate the results for the 41 beneficiaries in our sample and determine whether it should review the remaining population of 13,514 beneficiaries.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We disagree that administrative finality applies as our audit found that SSA did not comply with its policy requirement to inform claimants of the option to delay their retirement application when they applied for benefits.</p>	<p><b>Closed on April 5, 2018.</b> Based on our analysis of the 41 cases from recommendation 1, in which we found we are precluded from taking action because of administrative finality rules (GN 04001.070 Do Not Reopen Correct Determinations and GN 04001.010 When and Why SSA Reopens), we are not taking action to reopen these 13,514 decisions.</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>A-15-17-50279 (22017035) Undeliverable Social Security Number Cards</b></p>	<p>4/2/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: Provide the United States Post Office (USPO) with enough mailbag locks to keep all undeliverable SSN cards locked.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> The response discusses accountability of locks, it does not specifically address that the USPO have enough locks to keep all undeliverable SSN cards locked.</p>	<p><b>Closed on March 8, 2018.</b> We will work with the USPO to ensure they have adequate locks and apply appropriate security protocols and procedures when handling undeliverable mail from SSA.</p>
<p><b>A-15-17-50279 (22017035) Undeliverable Social Security Number Cards</b></p>	<p>4/2/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 6: Conduct a cost benefit analysis to determine whether tracking SSN cards would be beneficial to the Agency.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We disagree that IT modernization will address this recommendation in the near future.</p>	<p><b>Closed on April 2, 2018.</b> In lieu of conducting a cost benefit analysis for tracking SSN cards, we have included SSN tracking into the IT Modernization roadmap. The roadmap also includes an address validation routine and business process that was released March 6, 2019, in the SSN Application Process application to ensure we are sending SSN cards to valid U.S. postal addresses.</p>
<p><b>A-15-18-50566 (22018017) The Social Security Administration’s Compliance with the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 in the Fiscal Year 2017 Agency Financial Report</b></p>	<p>5/1/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Develop new initiatives to address improper payments.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> On December 6, 2018, OIG noted: We will look at how SSA addressed our findings and recommendations from the prior IPERA audits. Director would like to relook at these again in July/August.</p>	<p><b>Closed on November 6, 2018.</b> Based on the findings of audits, reports, pilot programs, and the stewardship reports, we continuously explore and develop new initiatives. We have a team in place dedicated to improper payments and executive groups that provide oversight including the Improper Payments Oversight Board and the Associate Commissioner Improper Payments Roundtable. In FY 2018 and continuing in FY 2019, we regularly participate in Federal interagency groups to share best practices including the Federal Improper Payments Community of Practice and the Data Exchange Community of Practice.</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

				<p>The Arrival and Departure Information System (ADIS) project is a data exchange, with the Department of Homeland Security, that will reduce improper payments to certain SSI recipients and OASDI beneficiaries who do not self-report foreign travel accurately or in a timely manner. The ADIS Project Product Discovery Team convened in September 2018 to develop a roadmap for a phased integration of the ADIS data into our business system for FYs 2019 and 2020. Our Acting Commissioner approved the roadmap, and product development will begin in the first quarter of FY 2019.</p> <p>A data exchange product investment will create the Enterprise Data Exchange Network (EDEN), which will reduce and centralize the many different systems and applications that process and manage data exchanges. EDEN will be the foundation for data exchange that can support future customer requests, commissioner priorities, and legislative mandates. In the future, we will consider additional data exchanges; for example, obtaining state marriage and divorce data that will help us reduce improper payments caused by unreported marriages and divorces.</p>
<p><b>A-08-17-50261 22017037)</b></p>	<p>9/19/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: Revise its Medicare Non-</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> Director “agrees to disagree.”</p>	<p><b>Closed on June 4, 2019.</b> We completed our analysis for</p>

**Report of Social Security Administration Outstanding/Unimplemented Recommendations from the  
Office of the Inspector General as required by Public Law 115-414**

<p><b>Effectiveness of the Social Security Administration's Medicare Non-utilization Project</b></p>		<p>utilization Project (MNUP) guidance to include additional online searches that will aid technicians in identifying potential deceased beneficiaries. We encourage the Social Security Administration to conduct online searches first.</p>		<p>implementing this recommendation and determined that there are policy, operational, and legal reasons we are unable to implement the recommendation.</p>
<p><b>A-08-17-50261 (22017037) Effectiveness of the Social Security Administration's Medicare Non-utilization Project</b></p>	<p>9/19/18</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: Conduct face-to-face interviews of all MNUP beneficiaries to establish a baseline of individuals who are alive.</p>	<p><b>Open.</b> We continue to believe face-to-face interviews are necessary to effectively identify deceased beneficiaries. As explained in our report, we determined SSA incorrectly concluded via a telephone interview that 11 percent of our sample beneficiaries were alive when, in fact, they had died 12 years, on average, before SSA's 2013 MNUP. Had SSA attempted to interview these beneficiaries in person, we estimate it would have prevented about \$16.5 million in overpayments.</p>	<p><b>Closed on September 21, 2018.</b> We continue to disagree with the recommendation. Due to security concerns, we have for our employees, we cannot require in person interviews for all MNUP beneficiaries. We did agree to create subsequent listing and conduct periodic reviews, and we agreed to do further investigation to determine whether we can prioritize and identify cases where we could encourage in-person interviews.</p>