```
actant Procurement Frau
  Presented By:
```

Presented By:

Ransom McClung CPA, CFE, Cr.FA, CFF

Adjunct Instructor

Florida State University

Aggreyate Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firms 2,807.4,300 3,482 10,970 18,470 Number of Unprofitable Firms 103 63 87 94 42 Aggregate Pre-Tax arnings of Profitable Firms (2,183) (428) (663) (3,385) (989) 374 Quanter 2001 37 Quanter 2000 2nd Quarter 2001 Nine Months 2005 Nine Months 2005 Perenues 343,441 354 338 350,789 3152,499 3183,706**

E penses 43,018 55,40 47,979 144,918 168,224**

Atter-Tax Profit/Loss 405 2,516 1,832 4,927 11,362**

Atter-Tax Profit/Loss 405 2,516 1,832 4,927 11,362**

Atter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1,1% 7,3% 510% 4,5% 13,4%

A c 5 ** 2,080,452 2,342 225 2,562,618; 2,680,452 ** 2,342,225

- Ask Questions???? (863) (31388) (989)
- Have Fun!!!
- **Give Answers???**
- Have Fun!!!
- - Who am 1 ????
 - Have Fun!!!
 - Mistakes are Okay!!!

AGENDA

Introduction to Government Fraud Introduction to Contract and **Procurement Fraud Legal Elements of Procurement Fraud False Claims and Statements Collusion Among Bidders Collusion Between Contractors and Employees**



Performance Schemes

Contract and Procurement Fraud Indicators

Investigative Steps in a Contract Fraud

Case 10 7000 200 Quarter 2001 Nine Months 2001 Nine Months 2000

Go Home to either Prevent or Fight Fraud

Introduction to Government Fraud

Fraud is a silent offense.

Fraud costs trillions of dollars in worldwide damages each year, and it costs the public, too.

All government entities are victims of every conceivable kind of swindle, and everyone pays for fraud in direct and indirect ways.

Fraud victims, however, are not defenseless.

A 11+13 ** 2.680, 452 1, 142, 125 2, 562, 616 2, 680, 452 * 2, 343, 225

But prevention starts with being well informed.

Introduction to Government Fraud

Black's Law Dictionary defines fraud as:...all multifarious means which human ingenuity can devise, and which are resorted to by one individual to get an advantage over another by false suggestions or suppression of the truth. It includes all surprise, trick, cunning or dissembling, and any unfair way by which another is cheated.

The important point of the definition is that all forms of cheating, involving money or property, are fraud. Although there are many kinds of fraud, this course will focus on fraud committed against the government.

Government Fraud Versus Other Types of Fraud

Serve the public's trust.

Violation of public trust

Obligation to put public interest in front of self interest.

Guardian of public welfare

Discredit to public service

Contract and procurement fraud include a number of common and recurring schemes related to the procurement of goods and services by government organizations.

Definition of a Contract: A contract is an oral or written mutual agreement between two or more individuals or entities. It must contain the following five elements to be enforceable:

Competent parties

Lawful subject matter or objectives

Legal consideration

Mutual promises

Mutual obligations

Competent Parties: The parties to the agreement must have the legal right or capacity to make a contract

Lawful Subject Matter or Objective: The subject of the contract must not be contrary to law or public policy.

Legal Consideration: Must be supported by a mutual exchange of value, not merely a naked promises.

Mutual Promises: A mutual promise to exchange value, rather than requiring actual performance.

Manual Obligations: Both parties must intend to be bound for a contract to be formed.

Enforceability: Do not necessarily have to be in writing.

Oral Agreements: If a contract is in writing, courts will usually ignore separate oral agreements to terms made prior to at the same time as the writing if the oral agreements conflict with the written terms.

Contract terms: Must be "certain and definite" to be enforceable.

Revoking a Contract: Parties can revoke a contract if they mutually agree to do so.

Breach of Contract: When one of both parties fail to perform, or announce they do not intend to perform.

Procurement Process:

Refers to those processes, procedures and entities involved in the purchase of goods or services by public or private entities. The primary objective of an effective procurement process is achieving the best value.

Public Procurement:

Refers to theses processes, procedures, and entities involved in the government's process of acquiring goods and services.

While there are many types of procurement fraud schemes, they can be broken down into three groups:

False Claims and Statement

Collusion among contractors

Collusion between contractors and employees

Performance schemes

Methods of Procurement

Depends on complexity of the procurement.

Can range from using a government credit card for small dollar off-the-shelf items to negotiated multi-million dollar contracts that provides computer services.

In both cases a solicitation document provides information necessary for potential bidders to make their proposals.

Methods of Procurement

Simplified Acquisition Procedures

Small purchase procedures used to acquire supplies and services that do not exceed the acquisition threshold

Blanket purchase orders and credit cards

Purchase orders

Impress funds (petty cash funds)

These methods designed to speed up the procurement process by minimizing applicable regulations.

Methods of Procurement

Sealed-Bids (Formal Advertising)

A procuring entity used sealed bidding when its requirements are clear, accurate, and complete. It involves competitive bids. It uses an invitation to bid document which contains a purchase description, the condition for purchase, all contractual terms, and the deadlines for submitting bids. They are publicly solicited and this process requires that each bid be sealed and opened in a public forum attended by all interested parties. Lowest price is usually the bases for the selection.

Methods of Procurement

Competitive Negotiation

This method permits bargaining between the procuring entity and prospective contractors before the final award of a contract.

Request for Proposals or Request for Quotations are used.

Methods of Procurement

Noncompetitive Proposals

Not open and free completion. This exception results in sole source contracting.

Procurement through this process requires justification.

Some exceptions that can be invoked are:

Only one responsible source and not other supplies or services will satisfy agency requirements.

Unusual and compelling urgency

Stages in the Procurement Process (four basic stages):

The Pre solicitation Phase

The Solicitation Phase

The Bid Evaluation and Award Phase

Post Award/Performance and Administration Phase

Phases in the Procurement Process Months 2001 NIN Months 2000

For the purpose of fraud detection, the procurement process can be reduced to four basic stages:

The pre solicitation phase—Generally, the pre solicitation phase begins with the procuring entity identifying its needs, developing the specifications (what, how much, and how good), and determining the method to be used for acquiring the goods or services.

Phases in the Procurement Process

The solicitation phase—The solicitation phase involves bid solicitation, bid preparation, and bid submission.

The bid evaluation and award phase—After receiving the bids, the procuring entity publicly opens each bid in the presence of interested parties (the bid opening) and evaluates the bids or proposals. During this time, the purchasing entity may conduct discussions/negotiations, and it may give the bidders an opportunity to revise their proposals. The purchasing entity then selects the winning bid or proposal

Dital & Superdinations 150,315, 139,721 146,179 150,319 139,721 mm:ssion Revenues 6,062 7,415 6,668 20,215 25,868

A 11+13 ** 2,500,452 1,342,125 2,562,616 2,580,452 * 2,342,225

Phases in the Procurement Process Months 2001 NIA Months 2000

The post-award and administration phase—During this phase, the contracting parties fulfill their respective duties through the performance of their contractual obligations.

Types of Government Contracts

Fixed-Price Contracts- the contractor agrees to do what is in the contract for a flat, fixed price that may be subject to adjustments in appropriate circumstances.

Cost-Reimbursement Contracts (Cost-Plus Contracts) – The government reimburses the contractor for the allowable costs (i.e., allocable, properly accounted for, and not specifically disallowed) it incurs during the terms of the contract. Cost-reimbursable contracts serve to establish an estimate of total cost and a ceiling that the contractor may not exceed.

The U.S. legal system provides for both private and public remedies for procurement fraud.

All states and the federal government have a number of criminal statutes that can be used to prosecute contract and procurement fraud.

Official Bribery

Conflicts of Interest

Criminal False Claims

Official Bribery

Prohibits giving or receiving something of value for the purpose of influencing the performance of an official act.

The elements of an official bribery offense are as follows:

Giving or receiving
With corrupt intent
Any 'thing of value''
To a public official
To influence
An official act

Official Bribery

Giving or receiving – Includes directly, indirectly offering, promising, or soliciting a bribe. An unsuccessful attempt to bribe can violate the statue if the other elements are present.

With Corrupt Intent – Must act willfully and corruptly.

Defendant acted knowingly and deliberately. Acted with the intent to influence an official act through the payment of a thing of value.

Any "Thing of Value" – Inappropriate gifts, free travel, and lavish entertainment. Payment of credit card debt. Loans (whether repaid or not). Cash. Checks (disguised as legitimate fees). Hidden interests in a business or transaction?

Official Bribery

To a Public Official. Includes those in public service, those chosen for public service but not yet confirmed. State and local government employees who administer federal or sate funds or programs may be considered public officials.

To Influence – Evidence must be shown that the payment was intended to cause the official to act favorably to the payer or third party.

An Official Act. Refers to an act, matter, or decision that might properly be brought before a public official.

Conflicts of Interest

Prohibits situations in which a government employee engages in activities that create a conflict between his personal interests and his duty to protect and serve the interests of the government.

Elements: Whoever participates personally and substantially in a contract, claim or other proceeding in which, to his knowledge, he (or a related party) has a financial interest without full disclosure of such interest and receiving approval to participate.

Conflicts of Interest

Whoever: Covers officers and employees of the government.

Participates: Participates through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, negotiations, or other means.

Related Party: he, his spouse, a minor child, a general partner or any organization by which he is employed has a financial interest.

Financial Interest: A substantial and direct financial interest, capable of adversely influencing the official's decision-making. Remote or inconsequential interests are exempted. 28

Conflicts of Interest

Without Full Disclosure: Disclosure must be given to the government official responsible for the subject's appointment. A full disclosure of the nature and circumstances of his involvement in the official proceedings and financial interest.

Criminal False Claims

It is illegal to present or make any false, fictitious, or fraudulent claims against any agency or department of the government.

The crime is complete when the claim is presented and payment of the claim is not an element of the offense.

Elements:

Makes or presents any claim

Upon the government

Knowing such claim to be false, fictitious, or fraudulent.

Criminal False Claims

Makes or Presents: A claim must actually be presented. Can be presented indirectly or through an intermediary.

Any Claim Upon or Against the Government: Includes any request or demand for money or property upon the government.

Knowing: Actual knowledge of falsity; Deliberate ignorance of truth or falsity; Reckless disregard of truth or falsity

It is not necessary to prove that the defendant had the specific intent to defraud the government.

Embezzlement of public money, property or records

Criminalizes intentional and unauthorized taking, destruction, or use of government money, property, or records. It also prohibits receiving to concealing such property or records.

Elements:

Willfully and knowingly

Stealing, converting, or embezzling

Any "thing of value" from

The government

Embezzlement of public Money, Property or Records

Willfully and Knowingly: Person converted or took money or property intentionally and not be accident or mistake.

Stealing, converting, or embezzling: means the person took money or property belonging to the government with the intent to permanently or temporally deprive the government of its value or use.

Anything of value from the government: Includes money, property, intangible rights, or any other items capable of having a momentary value.

apital & Subordinations 150,319.* 139,721 146,179 150,319 * 139,721 ommission Revenues 6,062 7,415 6,668 20,215 25,868 *

Embezzlement of public Money, Property or Records

Value: Means face, par, or market value, cost of price, either wholesale ort retail, whichever is greater.

```
3rd Quarter 2001 3rd Quarter 2000 2nd Quarter 2001 Nine Months 2001 Nine Months 2000 Revenues 343,641 839,138 850,789 $132,499 $183,766*

Expenses 43,048 55 467 47,979 194,918 (86,224*
```

Types of Government Fraud

Capital & Superdinations 150/319* 139,721 146,179 150,319* 139,721 commission Revenues 6,062 7,415 6,668 20,215 25,868*

```
False Claims and Statements
```

Types of Government Fraud

umber of Firms Peporting 263 273 258 272 284 umber of Profitence Firms 158 210 171 178 242 ggregate Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firms 2,807 4,300 3,482 10,870 18,

Introduction

Although there are a number of federal statutes that prohibit making false claims and statements to the government, or its official.

Briefly stated, the law prohibits a person from lying to or concealing information from a governmental official

Introduction (continued)

Thousands of false statements made a year to federal government.

To get entitlement benefits – representations made not true.

Medicare – false statements about income level, number of children they have.

Small business fraud – make false statements to get into program.

False Statements

A statement is *false* if it was known to be untrue when it was made, and it is *fraudulent* if it was known to be untrue and was made with the intent to deceive a government agency.

For a violation to occur, the government agency need not actually have been deceived, nor must it have in fact relied upon the false statement, but the statement must have been capable of influencing the agency involved.

The statute covers both oral and written statements, whether sworn or unsworn. Additionally, it applies to false statements that are not made directly to the government if the statements result in false statements to the government.

False Statements (continued)

Prosecutors most often use the False Statements statute to prosecute false statements made to law enforcement or regulatory officials not made under oath, in the course of an official investigation, or on an application for such things as federal employment, credit, and visa applications.

The elements of the violation are set forth below:

The defendant made a false statement (or used a false document).

The statement was material.

The statement concerned a matter within the jurisdiction of any agency of the United States.

The defendant knew the claim was false, acted in deliberate ignorance of the claim's truth, or acted in reckless disregard of the claim's truth.

However, does not require that the government actually rely upon, be deceived or influenced by, or suffer a financial loss because of the false statement.

Example:

A large highway construction firm admitted to making false statements during the construction of an interstate highway. The firm admitted to making false statements regarding the testing of concrete used to construct certain bridges. Core samples taken from the concrete batches used in construction were cured in a lime bath, which hardened the samples, instead of in the field as required by the contract. Under the contract, the construction firm was paid according to the hardness of the concrete samples.

Other Federal Laws Prohibiting False Statements

There are a number of other federal statutes related to false claims and statements made to the federal government as well. Among the most useful are:

Conspiracy to Defraud the Government with Respect to Claims (18, U.S.C., § 286)—This section makes it a crime for two or more people to agree or conspire to defraud the United States by obtaining, or aiding in obtaining, payment or allowance of any false, fictitious, or fraudulent claim.

The Criminal False Claims Act (18, U.S.C., § 287)—This statute, which addresses false claims, makes it illegal to present or make any false, fictitious, or fraudulent claim against any agency or department of the United States.

Types of False Statements

Often, false claims or statements occur in the following areas:

Contracting bids and cost proposals (e.g., false information concerning contractor qualifications, financial capabilities, facilities, size of business, ownership of equipment and supplies, information provided to other agencies to support special status, qualifications of personnel, successful performance of previous jobs, etc.)

False certifications or assurances contract (e.g., certifications of compliance, size of business certification, minority business certification, certification of independent price determination, manufacturer's certificate of warranty, etc.).

Billing documents (e.g., billing for fictitious employees or billing for goods and services not provided)

Records or invoices

Progress reports

Test and inspection results

Invoices from nonexistent companies

Duplicate or altered invoices

Inflated costs or substitution of cheaper goods

Fictitious transactions

Official investigations

Preventing False Statements

117,641 \$59,738 \$50,709 \$157,499 \$183,706*

Prevention, prevention, prevention

2,680,452 2,142,225 2,562,618 2,680,452* 2,142,225

Front end of process most important – controls

te Pre-Tax Barnings of Profitable Firms 2,807 4,100 3,482 10,970 18,47

Make sure eligible at front end.

\$ \$43,541 \$59,330 \$50,709 \$152,499 \$183,70 \$ 43,018 55.467 47,979 \$44,818 \$60,224

Fraud prevention cheapest control

on Revenues 6,062-7,415-6,668-20,215-25,866*

of Firms Reporting 261 273 258 272 284 For Profitable Firms 158 210 171 178 242

ate Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firms 2 of unprofitable Firms 103 63 87 94 42

of Unprofitable Firms 103 63 87 94 42 Le Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firms (2

\$43,041 \$59,338 \$50,789 \$152,499 \$183,7

055 405 2,516 1,832 4,927 11,362

d Return on Capital 1 1% 7.3% 5 0% 4.

179 150 319 139 721

45

Red Flags of False Statements

Some common red flags of false statements include:

Failure to produce documents in a timely manner

Failure to respond to inquiries in a timely manner

Refusal or inability to provide supporting documentation

Inadequacies in reporting requirements (e.g., untimely reports, incomplete reports, and others)

Failure to have an adequate information gathering and retrieval system

Red Flags of False Statements

Inadequate or apparently altered, missing, or incomplete supporting documentation

Photocopied or duplicate documents

Failure to have adequate supporting documentation for reports and summary data

Detecting False Statements and Claims

One of the best methods for detecting false statements is to examine the source documents for the transactions in question.

This approach is called tracing (i.e., from the source document out to the report) and it can help the examiner identify any changes or discrepancies between what actually occurred—per the source documents—and what is being claimed in statements made to the government.

In addition, the examiner might be alerted to false statements by looking for any of the red flags previously discussed.

Types of Procurement Fraud

While there are many types of procurement fraud schemes, they can be broken down into three groups:

Collusion among Contractors

Collusion between Contractors and Employees

Performance Schemes

3rd Quarter 2001 3rd Quarter 2000 2nd Quarter 2001 Nine Months 2001 Nine Months 2000 Revenues 543,641 559,138 550,769 \$152,499 \$183,706+

Expenses 43,018 55,467 47,979 244,918 (86,224*

Types of Government Fraud

opital & Superdinations 150,319* 139,721 146,179 150,319* 139,721

Collusion Among Contractors A 11+15 * 2.580, 452 1, 142, 125 2, 562, 618 2, 680, 452 * 2, 542, 225

Collusion is a type of fraud where two or more individuals agree to commit an act designed to deceive or gain an unfair advantage.

Often, when contracting for the supply of goods and services, two or more vendors collude to circumvent the competitive bidding process. When this happens, prices are inflated and the procuring entity is cheated out of its right to the benefits of free and open competition.

The most common forms of collusion between competitors involve:

Collusive Bidding (Bid Rigging)

Bid rotation

Bid suppression

Market division

Collusive Biding – also called bid rigging is a form of anticompetitive activity that limits competition where purchases use competitive procurement processes to obtain goods or services.

Suppliers or contractors in a certain geographic area or trade conspire to defeat the competition and rig prices using a variety of means.

The object of each of the schemes is to limit competition and thereby increase the amount of business available to each of the participants and the prices they can charge.

Complementary Bidding

Complementary bidding (also known as protective, shadow, or cover bidding) occurs when competitors submit token bids that are not serious attempts to win. For the conspirators to bid higher than the designated winning bidder, they might agree to submit:

Bids that are too high to be accepted

Bids that appear to be competitive in price but deliberately fail to meet other requirements of the tender

Bids that contain special terms that will not be acceptable to the 53 buyer

141 859,138 850,789 \$152,499 \$183,706-

Types of Government Fraud

Bid Rotation

Bid rotation schemes occur when two or more contractors conspire to alternate the business between them on a rotating basis. Instead of engaging in competitive contracting, which drives down the contract price, contractors perpetrating these schemes prefer exchanging information on contract solicitations to guarantee that each contractor will win a share of the purchasing entity's business.

Similar to complementary bidding schemes, bid rotation schemes may be coupled with a scheme to award subcontracts to losing bidders. This allows losing bidders to improve their cash flow as they wait for their turn to win. Similarly, losing bidders might receive a percentage of the winning company's profits.

Bid Suppression

Bid suppression occurs when two or more contractors enter an illegal agreement whereby at least one of the conspirators refrains from bidding or withdraws a previously submitted bid. The goal of these schemes is to ensure that a particular competitor's bid will be accepted.

. Market Division

Market division schemes involve agreements in which competitors divide markets among themselves and refrain from competing in each other's designated portion of the market. Markets are generally divided according to geographic area—the competitors take turns on contracts according to the geographic area—or are based on the customer—the competitors allocate specific customers or types of customers among themselves.

The result of these schemes is that competing firms will not bid against each other, or they will submit only complementary bids when a solicitation for bids is made by a customer or in an area not assigned to them.

. Market Division

The customer thereby loses the benefit of true competition and ends up paying a higher price than would be dictated by fair bidding under normal economic forces.

Corrupt contractors often conceal market division schemes by submitting bids from shell companies (i.e., companies that have no physical presence and generate little independent economic value).

Red Flags of Collusion Among Contractors

The industry has limited competition. (6.63) (3.388) (989)

The same contractors bid each job.

The winning bid appears too high.

The range of bid prices shows a wide gap between the winner and all other bidders.

All contractors submit consistently high bids.

The continued presence of egregious price increases.

Red Flags of Collusion Among Contractors (continued)

A low bidder withdraws and becomes a subcontractor.

Bids appear to be complementary bids by companies unqualified to perform the work.

Some of the bids fail to meet obvious requirements or provisions.

Fewer competitors than normal submit bids on a project or product.

When a new contractor enters the competition, the bid prices begin to fall.

Red Flags of Collusion Among Contractors (continued)

There is a rotational pattern to winning bidders (e.g., geographical, customer, job, or type of work).

The winning bidder subcontracts work to one or more losing bidders or to non-bidders. high bids.

The continued presence of egregious prices increases.

Qualified contractors do not submit bids.

Red Flags of Collusion Among Contractors (continued)

Physical evidence of collusion in the bids (e.g., bidders make the same mathematical or spelling errors; bids are prepared using the same typeface, handwriting, stationery, or envelope; or competitors submit identical bids).

A pattern where the last party to bid wins the contract.

Competitors frequently change prices in similar amounts at about the same time.

Losing bids do not comply with bid specifications, or only one bid is complete and other bids are poorly prepared.

61

Red Flags of Collusion Among Contractors (continued)

Any patterns of conduct by bidders or their employees that suggest the possibility of collusion (e.g., competitors regularly socialize, hold meetings, visit each other's offices, subcontract with each other, etc.).

and Quarter 2001 3rd Quarter 2000 2nd Quarter 2001 Nine Months 2001 Nine Months 2000 Revenues 543,641 559 130 550 789 5152 499 5183 706*

Types of Government Fraud

iltal & Subordinations 150,319, 139,721 146,179 150,319 139,721

Dommitsion Revenues 6,002 7,415 6,668 20,215 25,868

Number of Profitable Firms 193 210 171 178 242

Aggregate Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firms 2,807 4,300 3,452 10,870 18,470

Xumber of Unprofitable Firms 103 63 87 94 42

Aggregate Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firms (2,183) (428) (693) (3,388) (989)

314 Quarter 2001 314 Quarter 2000 2nd Quarter 2001 Kine Months 2001 Nine Months 2000

Revenues 342 641 158,338 150,789 1157:499 5183,706

Collusion Between Contractors and

Employees A 11+11-1 2 5 0 0 0 45 2 1 5 42 2 2 5 2 5 6 2 6 6 6 2 7 6 8 0 7 4 5 2 7 2 5 4 2 2 5 5

Procurement fraud schemes involving contractors and employees of the purchasing entity generally include the following:

Need recognition schemes

Bid tailoring

Bid manipulation

Unbalanced bidding

Leaking bid data

Bid splitting

Unjustified sole source awards

Generally, procurement actions begin with the procuring entity making a determination of its general needs. These initial determinations include assessments of the types and amounts of goods or services required to meet the entity's needs. Fraud occurring during this phase of the procurement process may result in decisions to purchase excessive or possibly unnecessary goods or services.

Typically, need recognition schemes involve the following scenarios:

Purchases for personal use or resale—In these schemes, employees with procurement authority exploit their position of power by using their employer's funds to obtain items for their personal use or resale (e.g., tools, office supplies, computers, automobile parts, etc.).

Unnecessary purchases—In these schemes, an employee of the buyer receives something of value and in return recognizes a need for a particular product or service offered by the supplier.

Excessive purchases—In these schemes, a corrupt employee purchases goods or services in excess of amounts actually needed.

Red Flags of Need Recognition Schemes

Some common red flags of need recognition schemes include:

The assessment of needs is not adequately or accurately developed. Unreasonably high stock levels or inventory levels.

There is no list of backup suppliers for items, spare parts, or services continually purchased from a single source.

There is an unusual or unexplained high volume of purchases of products that are suitable for resale.

Unusually large numbers of surplus items are written off to scrap.

Red Flags of Need Recognition Schemes

Estimates are not prepared or are prepared after solicitations are requested.

Consumer items are purchased but need replacement in a relatively short amount of time.

There is a high volume or unusual purchase of consumer items or items suitable for resale.

Items suitable for personal use or resale are missing from inventory or are unaccounted for.

Red Flags of Need Recognition Schemes

Purchased items are unnecessary or unrelated to the procuring entity's needs.

A suspect employee operates an outside business.

A suspect employee displays sudden wealth, pays down debts, or lives beyond his means.

Bid Tailoring Schemes

Bid-tailoring schemes occur during the pre solicitation phase.

In these schemes, an employee with procurement responsibilities, often in collusion with a supplier or contractor, manipulates bid specifications to give an unfair advantage to a certain contractor.

Bid Tailoring Schemes

Bid specifications are a list of elements, measurements, materials, characteristics, required functions, product name or brand number, and other specific information relevant for completion of the project. Specifications are included to assist contractors in the bidding process, informing them what they are required to do and providing information necessary to make and accept bids.

There are three primary bid-tailoring schemes:

Drafting narrow specifications—A corrupt employee of the buyer tailors the bid specifications to accommodate a vendor's capabilities so it is effectively assured of winning the contract.

Drafting broad specifications—A corrupt employee of the buyer designs unduly broad qualification standards to qualify an otherwise unqualified contractor to bid.

Drafting vague specifications—The buyer's personnel and the contractor collude to write vague specifications or intentionally omit bid specifications. This enables subsequent contract amendments, allowing the contractor to raise the price of the contract.

Some common red flags of bid-tailoring schemes include:

Weak controls over the bidding process

Only one or a few bidders respond to bid requests

Contract is not re-bid even though fewer than the minimum number of bids are received

Similarity between specifications and winning contractor's product or services

Unusual or unreasonably narrow or broad specifications for the type of goods or services being procured 73

Requests for bid submissions do not provide clear bid submission information (e.g., no clear time, place, or manner of submitting bids)

Unexplained changes in contract specifications from previous proposals or similar items

High number of competitive awards to one supplier

Socialization or personal contacts between contracting personnel and bidders

High number of change orders for one supplier

Bid Manipulation

In these schemes, which occur during the solicitation phase, a procuring employee manipulates the bidding process to benefit a favored contractor or supplier. Some common ways to commit these schemes include:

Accepting late bids Altering bids

Extending bid opening dates

Prematurely opening bids

Bid Manipulation (Continued)

Unnecessarily re-bidding work

Discarding or losing a bid or proposal

regate Pre-Tax Barnings of Profitable Firms 2,807 4,300 3,482 10,970 18,47

Improper disqualification (e.g., voiding bids for alleged errors in specifications)

Some common red flags of bid manipulation schemes include:

Weak controls over the bidding procedures

Evidence of changes to bids after they were received

Winning bid is voided for errors and job is re-bid or awarded to another contractor

An otherwise qualified bidder is disqualified for seemingly arbitrary, false, frivolous, or personal reasons

Some common red flags of bid manipulation schemes include:

Procurement employee accepts late bids

Contract is awarded to a non-responsive bidder

The bids of competing contractors are lost

Bid deadlines are extended

Despite receiving fewer than the minimum number of bids, the contract is not re-bid

Some common red flags of bid manipulation schemes include:

Invitations for bids are sent to unqualified contractors

Invitations for bids are sent to contractors that previously declined to

bid Thanks Firms 190 210 173 178 242

A 11+15 * T 2.580, 452 1, 142, 125 2, 562, 618 2, 680, 452 * 2, 342, 225

Unbalanced Bidding

Unbalanced bidding is a type of bid submission scheme in which a bidder, usually in collusion with contracting personnel, becomes aware that one of several line items in a request for a bid on certain works, goods, or services will not be called for under the contract. This information, which is not available to other bidders, allows the favored firm to submit a very low price for the line item and to be the overall low bidder.

Unbalanced Bidding

Some common red flags of unbalanced billing schemes include:

Certain line items in a request for a bid seem unusually low.

Certain line items in a request for a bid differ from those in the actual contract.

Following the contract award, there are change orders that reduce the requirements for low-bid line item (s).

Unbalanced Bidding

Some common red flags of unbalanced billing schemes include:

Certain line item bids have not been performed or purchased as required under the contract.

Other similar contract awards do not require line item bids.

In change orders that are issued soon after the contract is awarded, line items are deleted, or line items are modified.

The contractor's bid is similar to or the same as the budgeted estimate.

Leaking Bid Data

#15 * - 2,580,452 1,542,225 2,562,618 2,680,452 2,542,225

Employees of a procuring entity can leak pre-bid information or confidential information from competing bidders to a favored bidder, giving that bidder an unfair advantage in the bidding process. Typically, these schemes occur as the result of corruption

Leaking Bid Data

Some common red flags of leaking bid data schemes include:

The procuring entity has weak controls over its contracting system.

The winning bid is just under the next lowest bid.

The winning bid is unusually close to the procuring entity's estimates.

Leaking Bid Data

Some common red flags of leaking bid data schemes include:

The last party to bid wins the contract.

The contract is unnecessarily re-bid.

A contractor submits false documentation to get a late bid accepted.

Bid-Splitting Schemes

- 2.580,452 1,542,125 2,562,618 2,680,452 · 2,342,125

In bid-splitting schemes, employees of a procuring entity split large contracts into smaller contracts, allowing them to avoid the scrutiny required for larger dollar value contracts. In basic terms, splitting bids into several separate tenders creates more opportunities for corrupt employees to influence the award.

Bid-Splitting Schemes

Bid splitting often is used to avoid competitive bidding. Because procuring entities are generally required to use competitive methods for projects over a certain dollar amount, employees of a procuring entity might break a large project up into several small projects to avoid these requirements.

Bid-Splitting Schemes (continued)

Some common red flags of bid-splitting schemes include:

Two or more similar or identical procurements from the same supplier in amounts just under upper-level review or competitive bidding limits

Two or more consecutive related procurements from the same contractor that fall just below the competitive bidding or upper-level review limits

Bid-Splitting Schemes (continued)

Some common red flags of bid-splitting schemes include:

Unjustified split purchases that fall under the competitive bidding or upper-level review limits

Sequential purchases just under the upper-level review or competitive bidding limits

Sequential purchases, which fall under the upper-level review or competitive bidding limits, that are followed by change orders

Unjustified Sole Source Awards

Sole source contracting is an exception to the general rule of competition; it is a noncompetitive procurement process accomplished through the solicitation of only one source, thereby limiting full and open competition.

Because quotation and bid requirements do not apply to sole source purchases, procurement through this process requires justification, which typically occurs when the goods or services are available only from a single source, when exigent circumstances will not permit delay resulting from a competitive solicitation, or when solicitation is determined inadequate after soliciting a number of sources. Therefore, unjustified sole source contracts unfairly exclude competition.

Unjustified Sole Source Awards

Sole source contracting is more vulnerable to fraud because there is greater freedom for manipulation and collusion with a vendor/contractor, and because of this, federal government entities cannot conduct sole source acquisitions unless they provide their justifications in writing and the acquisition is approved at all necessary levels.

Unjustified Sole Source Awards (continued)

Some common red flags of unjustified sole source award schemes include:

Frequent use of sole-source procurement contracts

High number of sole-source awards to one supplier

Requests for sole-source procurements when there is an available pool of contractors to compete for the contract

Unjustified Sole Source Awards (continued)

Some common red flags of unjustified sole source award schemes include:

Procuring entity did not keep accurate minutes of pre-bid meetings

False statements made to justify sole source of negotiated procurement

Justifications for sole-source or negotiated procurement signed or approved by employees without authority

Failure to obtain the required review for sole-source justifications 93

3rd Quarter 2001 3rd Quarter 2000 2nd Quarter 2001 Nine Months 2001 Nine Months 2000 Revenues \$43,641 \$59,138 \$50,769 \$152,499 \$183,706*

Expenses 43,018 55 467 47 979 194,918 186,224*

Types of Government Fraud

apital & Sunordinations 190,319, 139,721 146,179 150,319, 139,721

Performance Schemes

Procurement fraud schemes occurring during the performance phase of contracting generally include:

Progress payment fraud

False or inflated invoices

Duplicate invoices

Non-conforming goods or services

Procurement fraud schemes occurring during the performance phase of contracting generally include:

Change order abuse

mmistion revenues 6,062 7,415 5,060 20,215 25 0 mper of firms Reporting 261 271 256 273 284

Cost mischarging

er of Unprofitable Firms 103 of 87 84 42 egale Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firm:

Commingling of contracts

apita A Subordinar(one 150.319 * 139.721 1 + 6.179 150.319 * 139.721 ommission Revenues 6.062 7.815 6.668 20.215 25.868 * Unit of Pirms Reporting 201 273 258 27.2 26 * Unit of Pirms Reporting 201 273 258 27.2 26 * Unit of Pirms Reporting 201 273 258 27.2 26 * Unit of Pirms Reporting 5 of Profitable Firms 2.807 4.300 3.482 10.970 48.470 (Unit of Unit of Erit of Erit of Unit of Pirms 103 63 87 94 42 * Ogregate Pirms Earnings of Profitable Firms (2.183) (428) (663) (3.388) (989) rd Quarter 2001 3rd Quarter 2000 2rd Quarter 2001 Nine Months 2005 Nine Months 2006 viewenues 343.241 559.338 350.789 \$152.499 \$183.706 * xpenses 43.018 35.467 47.979 144.918 186.224 * tter-Tax Profit/Loss 405 2.516 1.832 4.927 11.362 * tter-Tax Profit/Loss 405 2.516 1.832 4.927 11.362 * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 5.0% 4.5% [1.4% * tter-Tax Annualized Re

Progress Payment Fraud

Allets: 2,580,452 1,342,225 2,562,618 2,680,452 2,342,225

Progress payment fraud is a specific type of fraud that occurs in government contracts. Progress payments are payments made as work progresses under a contract. Generally, progress payments are based upon the costs incurred, the percentage of work completed, or the completion of a particular milestone.

Progress Payment Fraud (continued)

Fraud in progress payments occurs when a contractor submits a progress payment request based on false statements, such as false direct labor charges, material costs for items not actually purchased, or false certification of work completed. More specifically, in the Handbook on Indicators of Fraud in DOD Procurement, the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) defines progress payment fraud as "the submission of a progress payment request based on falsified direct labor charges, on material costs for items not actually purchased, or on falsified certification of a state of completion attained/work accomplished."

Progress Payment Fraud (continued)

A 11+15 * T 2.580, 452 1, 142, 125 2, 562, 618 2, 680, 452 * 2, 342, 225

Progress payment frauds usually involve falsified labor charges for work not yet performed, charges for materials not purchased, or false certification of the percentage or stage of completion.

Some common red flags of progress payment fraud schemes include:

The contractor is slow in paying (or nonpayment of) suppliers, employees, or the government.

The contractor has cash flow problems.

Little or no physical progress on the contract is made even though significant costs have been billed.

The contractor's progress payment claims do not appear to coincide with the contractor's plan to perform the contract.

Some common red flags of progress payment fraud schemes include:

The contractor's progress payment claims do not appear to coincide with the contractor's capability of performing the contract

The cancellation date on the contractor's check to a subcontractor is the same as or later than the date the contractor received payment from the government.

False, Inflated, and Duplicate Invoices

To generate false payments, a contractor or vendor may submit false, inflated, or duplicate invoices—itemized statements of money owed for goods or services supplied. When perpetrating these schemes, the contractor may be acting alone or in collusion with an employee of the victim organization who shares in the profits.

False, Inflated, and Duplicate Invoices (continued)

False invoices are invoices submitted when no goods or services were provided, or they are invoices that do not properly represent the quantity or quality of goods and services supplied or work done as per contracted specifications.

Inflated invoices include bills that charge for a higher grade, cost of material, or service than actually delivered.

False, Inflated, and Duplicate Invoices (continued)

15 - 2,500,452 1,542,225 2,562,618 2,680,452 2,342,225

Duplicate invoices occur when a contractor separately submits copies of the same invoice for payments, or submits more than one original invoice for the same goods or services, and is subsequently paid twice.

False, Inflated, and Duplicate Invoices (continued)

Some common red flags of false, inflated, and duplicate invoices include:

Proper controls are not in place over the inventory and purchase accounts

Supporting documents provided are inadequate or appear to be copied, altered, or forged

Missing, copied, or fraudulent invoices

False, Inflated, and Duplicate Invoices (continued)

Some common red flags of false, inflated, and duplicate invoices include:

The invoice amount is an even amount (round number) that is not expected or reasonable

Invoice prices, amounts, item descriptions, or terms exceed or do not match contract items, purchase order, receiving records, inventory, or usage records

False, Inflated, and Duplicate Invoices (continued)

Some common red flags of false, inflated, and duplicate invoices include:

Unusually high volume of vendor activity for vendor

Multiple invoices at or just under approval cut-off levels

Invoices from vendors not in the approved vendor file

False, Inflated, and Duplicate Invoices (continued)

Some common red flags of false, inflated, and duplicate invoices include:

Invoices without a valid purchase order

No segregation of duties in the purchasing function

Absence of detail on vendor invoices

Non-Conforming Goods or Services (1989)

Non-conforming goods or services fraud refers to attempts by contractors to deliver goods or services to the procuring entity that do not conform to the contract specifications. The contractor then bills and receives payment for conforming goods or services without informing the purchaser of the deficiency.

Non-Conforming Goods or Services (continued)

This type of scheme can be committed by the contractor acting alone, or it can be facilitated by procurement or inspection personnel as the result of corruption. In non-conforming fraud schemes involving corruption, the dishonest supplier might give gifts or favors to inspectors or pay kickbacks to contracting officials to facilitate the scheme. The supplier would then submit false documentation to conceal it.

Non-Conforming Goods or Services (continued)

Non-conforming goods or services schemes may include:

Delivery of inferior/substandard material

Delivery of materials that have not been tested

Falsification of test results

Delivery of used, surplus, or reworked parts

Non-Conforming Goods or Services (continued)

Non-conforming goods or services schemes may include:

Delivery of counterfeit products

Submission of false certifications

Product substitution

Non-Conforming Goods or Services (continued)

Some common red flags of non-conforming goods or services schemes include:

Supporting documentation for proposed standards is unavailable or inadequate

Test or inspection records reflect high rate of failure

High percentage of product returns to the vendor for noncompliance with specifications

Non-Conforming Goods or Services (continued)

Some common red flags of non-conforming goods or services schemes include:

Discrepancy between product's description or normal appearance and actual appearance (e.g., a new product appears to be used)

Material or product returns not handled through normal procedures or handled by high-level personnel

Non-Conforming Goods or Services (continued)

Some common red flags of non-conforming goods or services schemes include:

Product compliance certificate is missing or is apparently altered or modified

Test performed or compliance certificate signed by unqualified or inappropriate personnel (e.g., employee with no quality assurance responsibilities)

Unusually high number of test or operation failures

Non-Conforming Goods or Services (continued)

Material testing done by the supplier, using his own personnel and facilities

Absent or inadequate test or inspection reports

Product packaging, appearance, and description do not appear genuine

Machines with identification or specification plates removed

Non-Conforming Goods or Services (continued)

Invoice or inventory item numbers or descriptions do not match purchase order terms; inventory item numbers or descriptions do not match invoice terms

The contractor always offers to select the sample and prepare it for testing

Change Order Abuse

In change order abuse schemes, a bidding contractor submits a low bid to ensure the winning of the contract award, but a corrupt employee of the procuring entity has assured the contractor that contracting personnel will prepare contract change orders during the life of the contract, which will more than compensate for the low bid. After the procuring entity awards the contract, the corrupt contractor increases its price by submitting change order requests.

If successful, these schemes will, at the very least, cause the procuring entity to lose any advantage received through the competitive bidding process.

Change Order Abuse

gregate Prestak Earnings of Profitable Pirms (2,183) (428) (663) (3,388) (989) i Querter 2001 and Querter 2000 and Querter 2001 Nine Months 2001 Nine Months 200

Similarly, a dishonest contractor, acting in collusion with contract personnel, can use the change order process to improperly extend or expand contracts and avoid re-bidding.

Aggregate Pre-Tax Earnings Of Profitable Firms 2,807 4,300 3,482 10,970 18,470 Number of Unprofishable Firms 103 63 87 84 88 Aggregate Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firms (2,883) (428) (663) (1,388) (989) 3rd Quarter 2001 3rd Quarter 2000 2nd Quarter 2001 kine Months 2001 Nine Months 2000 Revenues 343,841 359) 338 850,749 8132;499 8188,700; Expenses 45,018 55,467 37,979 144,918 1669224*

After Tax Profit/Loss 405 2,516 1832 4,927 (1,382*
After Tax Profit/Loss 405 2,516 1832 4,927 (1,382*
After Tax Profit/Loss 405 2,516 1832 4,927 (1,382*
After Tax Subordinations 150,319* 139,721 146,179 150,319* 339,725

Capital A Subordinations 150,319* 139,721 146,179 150,319* 339,721

Commission Revenues 0,062 7,315 8,668 20,215 25,868*

flumber of Pirms Reporting 261 273 258 272 284*

number of Pirms Reporting 261 273 258 272 284*

number of Brofitable Firms 103 63 87 94 42

Aggregate Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firms 2,807 4,300 3,482 10,970 (8,470 Number of Unprofitable Firms 103 63 87 94 42

Aggregate Pre-Tax Farnings of Profitable Firms 2,807 4,300 (663) (5,385) (989) 3rd Quarter 2001 3rd Quarter 2000 2nd Quarter 2001 Nine Months 2001 Nine Months 2000 Revenues 843,44 359,338 350,789 3152,499 \$183,706)*

Expenses 41,018 55,467 47,975 144,918 166,224*

After-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7.3% 510% 4.5% til 4%

Assets** 2,080,452 2,342,225 3,562,618 2,680,452* 2,342,225

Change Order Abuse (continued)

Change orders generally receive less scrutiny than the bidding process or the negotiation of contract terms, making them a popular way to fraudulently access funds or generate funds for kickbacks.

Even though change orders are inevitable and can develop for various reasons (e.g., design error, ambiguous specifications or omissions in specifications, change in scope, weather delays, improvement in time or cost, building code changes, etc.), fraud examiners should view all contract change orders with a sense of watchfulness.

Cost Mischarging

gregate Pre-Tak Earnings of Profitable Firms (2,183) (+28) (693) (3,388) (989) d Quarter 2001 and Quarter 2000 and Quarter 2001 Nine Months 2001 Nine Months 2006

Cost mischarging schemes occur when a contractor charges the procuring entity for costs that are not allowable, not reasonable, or that cannot be allocated to the contract directly or indirectly.

Expenses 43,018 SS,467 47,979 144,918 166,224 *

After-Tax Profit/Loss 405 2,516 1,832 4,927 11,352 *

After-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1,1% 7,3% 5,0% 4,5% 12,4%

Assets - 2,580,452 1,342,225 2,562,618 2,680,452 * 2,343,225

Capital A. Subordinations 150,319 * 139,721 1 % ,279 150,319 * 139,721

Commission Revenues 6,062 7,815 6,668 20,215 25,866 *

Number of Firms Reporting 261 273 258 2,72 26 *

Number of Profitable Firms 158 210 171 178 242

Aggregate Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firms 1,807 4,300,3,482 10,970 48,470

Number of Unprofitable Firms 103 63 87 94 42

Aggregate Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firms (2,183) (428) (563) (3,388) (989)

ord Quanter 2001 3rd Quarter 2000 2nd Quarter 2001 Nine Months 2001 Nine Months 2006

Revenues 843,241 359,338 350,789 3152,499 \$183,706 *

Expenses 43,018 55,467 47,979 144,916 166,224 *

Atter-Tax Profit/Loss 405 2,516 1,832 4,927 it,362 *

Arter-Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1,1% 7,3% 510% 4,5% 43,4%

Assets * 2,060,452 2,342,275 3,562,618 2,680,452 * 2,342,225

Cost Mischarging (continued)

Cost mischarging is a type of procurement fraud that contractors commit in the following types of contracts:

Cost-reimbursement contracts—These contracts are paid based on incurred costs (i.e., the government reimburses the contractor's costs that are allowable, allocable to the contract, and reasonable).

Fixed-price contracts (if contract changes and equitable adjustments are reimbursed on the basis of incurred costs)—In these contracts, the contractor agrees to do what is provided in the contract for a flat, fixed price that may be subject to adjustments in appropriate circumstances.

Cost Mischarging (continued)

There are three types of mischarges perpetrated by contractors:

Accounting mischarges—These occur when a contractor knowingly charges or conceals unallowable costs within allowable expenses or in accounts that are not closely monitored (e.g., office supplies). Another common variation involves charging types of costs with limits, such as bid and proposal costs or independent research and development costs, to other cost categories.

Material mischarges—Occasionally, material costs are mischarged, both as to their reasonableness and their allocation.

Cost Mischarging (continued)

There are three types of mischarges perpetrated by contractors:

Labor mischarges—Labor mischarging occurs when the contractor charges the procuring entity for work that was not actually performed. Labor costs are perhaps more susceptible to mischarging than material costs because, unlike other items of cost, labor is not supported by external documentation or physical evidence to provide an independent check or balance, and because employee labor can readily be charged to any contract.

Some common red flags of cost-mischarging schemes include:

Charging the same cost to more than one contract

Charging normal indirect costs as direct costs

A contractor has a mix of cost-type and fixed-price contracts

Transfers from cost-type contracts to fixed-price contracts

Costs still charged to the original job order, but no physical inventory is left on the job

Some common red flags of cost-mischarging schemes include:

Initial billings for actual material costs in excess of negotiated costs

Later billings that show a downward adjustment in material costs as labor/overhead costs increase

Contractor failed to report excess or residual inventory

Unusually large numbers of surplus items are written off to scrap

Excessive or unusual labor charges

Some common red flags of cost-mischarging schemes include:

Labor charges are inconsistent with contract progress

Apparent changes to timecards or timesheets

Timecards that cannot be found, or are "found" after a delay

Labor charges are inconsistent with contract progress

Timecards contain information that is altered

Some common red flags of cost-mischarging schemes include:

Supervisory employees, not the individuals, prepared the timecards

Education, credential, and experience qualification requirements for labor hour contracts are vague or appear minimal for the position needed

Commingling of Contracts

Like cost-mischarging schemes, commingling of contract schemes result in overcharging for goods or services. They are contractor fraud schemes perpetrated against the procuring entity.

Simply put, commingling of contracts occurs when a contractor bills for the same personnel, fees, or expenses under one or multiple contracts.

Commingling of Contracts (continued)

In situations where contractors are awarded more than one contract, they may collude with an employee of the procuring entity who will write similar work orders to facilitate the duplicate billing. As a result, each contract has provisions to allow for items that are in the other contracts.

Commingling schemes often involve duplicate contract payments. In these schemes, the contractor submits copies of the same invoices for payment, or submits more than one copy of the same invoice for the same goods and services, and is subsequently paid twice.

Commingling of Contracts (continued)

Some common red flags of commingling of contracts schemes include:

Contractor is holding more than one contract that has the same or nearly similar work statements

Contractor submits several invoices for the same or similar expense or work under different jobs or contracts

Contractor submits invoices for more than one job for the same time period

Commingling of Contracts (continued)

Some common red flags of commingling of contracts schemes include:

Procuring entity gives the same contractor multiple contract awards for similar work

The contractor bills the same employee to more than one job for the same time period

```
and Quanter 2001 3rd Quarter 2000 2md Quarter 2001 Nine Months 2005 Nine Months 2000 Revenues 543,641 $59,124 $50,769 $152,499 $483,766* Expenses 43,018 $5,467 47,979 184,918 (66,224* After Tax Profit/Loss 405 2,516 1,882 4,927 11,362* After Tax Annualized Return on Capital 1,1% 7 3% 5,0% 4,5% 11,4% Assets** 2,680,452 2,342,225 2,562,618 2,680,452* 2,342,225 Capital & 540,721 146,179 150,319* 139,721
```

```
Contract and Procurement
    Fraud Indicators
```

Acting beyond then Normal Scope of Duties – An employee who assumes responsibilities in procurement beyond or below his normal duties.

Appearance of an Unknown Bidder – A previously unknown or questionable bidder could be a shell company used by other bidders to submit complementary bids.

Award to Other than Lowest Bidder – Instances or a pattern of contract awards to other than the lowest bidder could suggest corruption, conflict of interest, bid rigging schemes to manipulate the bid process.

Bad Reputation – Reputation, allegations and rumors of wrongdoing by an employee or company.

Bending or breaking the Rules – Significant instances of the purchaser bending or breaking the rules to favor a particular contractor or supplier.

Bid Information Available – The apparent leaking of competitor's bids or other confidential information by the purchaser.

Close Socialization – Close socialization by contracting personnel and contractors could suggest a corrupt relationship.

Complaints About the Job – An employee who is unhappy about his compensation, promotions, working conditions, or lack of appreciation.

Different Specifications- Delivery of an item with specifications different from those specified in the purchase order ort contract. Continued acceptance of non-conforming items can mean corruption or a hidden interest in the supplier.

Discrepancies or Errors in Invoices, Labor Costs, Material Costs- Discrepancies or errors by am contractor, if continued, after notice of such problems might indicate corruption.

Duplicate Documentation – Specifications, Cost charging, Performance, Payment, and Performance

Excusing Non-performance – A pattern of purchasing personnel excusing the failure of a particular contractor or supplier to perform and then rehiring the company.

Failed Tests or Inspections – A consistent pattern of significant instances of failed tests or inspections, especially if pattern is ignored or excused by the purchaser.

Failure to Accept Promotion – The failure of an employee to accept an apparently desirable promotion form a purchasing or contracting position might indicate that he is involved in fraud or corruption.

Failure to File Conflict of Interest Statement – Failure to file the Statement or disclose pertinent information on such form might indicate corruption or a hidden interest in a supplier.

Failure to Take a Vacation - The failure of an employee to take a vacation or time off, or the occurrence of excessive working hours over an extended time period might be an sign of fraud.

Favoritism of a Particular Supplier – Repeated, unjustified or unexplained favorable treatment of a particular contractor or supplier is one of the most common indicators of corruption.

Few Bidder Participate – A pattern of fewer than normal or expected bidders responding to proposals, or the award of a contract without the minimum number of bidders can indicate rigged specifications, the exclusion of qualified bidders, or collusive bidding.

Financial Problems – An employee with money problems might resort to fraud or corruption.

Gifts, Travel, and Entertainment – The acceptance of inappropriate gifts, travel, or entertainment by employees of the purchaser might signal the start of a corrupt relationship.

High Employee Turnover – High turnover in the contract and procurement area can be an indicator of fraud or corruption.

High Price – Unusual or unjustified high prices, or explosive price increases, are common indicators of fraud.

High Volume Purchases – A supplier or contractor that obtains a very high volume or percentage of business when such business doe not seem justified might be paying kickbacks.

Ignoring Controls and Proper Procedures – The deliberate or repeated failure to enforce existing controls could suggest a fraud scheme.

Improper or Excessive Change Orders – Excessive, expensive, or undocumented change orders suggest a variety of frauds, particularly manipulation of bids and corruption.

Instance on a Certain Subcontractor – An employee who insists that contractors use a certain subcontractor might have an undisclosed interest in the subcontractor.

Keen Interest in a Transaction or Contractor – An employee who takes an unusual keen interest in certain transactions, contractors, or accounts, or assumes responsibilities for matters beyond the normal scope of his duties, might be involved in fraud.

Large Differences on Bid Prices – Large, unexpected differences in bid prices between bidders could indicate corruption or a conflict of interest.

Line Item Bids Too Low – An unusually low line item bid might indicate unbalanced bidding.

Living Beyond Means – Indications of an employee with procurement responsibilities is living beyond his apparent means could mean the employee is involved in a fraud.

Low Bid Award Followed by Change Orders – Unjustified instances or a pattern of low bid awards, followed by change orders that significantly increase payments to the contractor, might indicate corruption involving the contractor and the purchaser.

Manipulation of the Bidding Process – Bid manipulation is usually the result of corruption involving the favored contractor and procurement personnel.

Multiple Purchases Just Under Bid Limit – Multiple awards just under the competitive bidding or upper-level review limits is one of the most useful indicators of contract and procurement fraud

Multiple Same or Similar Contracts – Two or more of the same similar contracts could provide the opportunity for a dishonest vendor to charge the same goods or services to both contracts.

Poor Quality – Consistent poor quality of service to product, late deliveries, and other persistent deficiencies can indicate fraud.

Price Discrepancies – Discrepancies between prices quoted and charged in a cost-type contract suggest possible defective pricing.

Qualified Contractor Fail to Bid – The failure of qualified contractors to bid could indicate rigged specifications, manipulation of the bidding process, collusive bidding, or corruption.

Questionable Documents – Missing, altered, copies or other questionable documents could indicate a variety of fraud.

Questionable Sole-Source Awards – Sole-source awards in violation of procurement rules or standard procedures might indicate fraud or corruption.

Tips and Complaints – Reports of wrongdoing, anonymous or otherwise, are the most common way to detect fraud.

Too narrow or Too Vague Contract Specifications — Unreasonably narrow contract specifications can be drafted to ensure the selection of a favored contractor.

Unknown vendor – A vendor for which there is little documentation or background information might be a shell company.

Unusual Approval Pattern – the continued award of work to a contractor that previously failed to provide satisfactory goods, services or price might indicate corruption.

Unusual Bidding Patters – Unusual bidding patterns are indicators of possible collusive bidding, also know as bid rigging.

Employee and Vendor Information Matches – Address, telephone number or zip code.

Vendor Not in Business Directories — An allegedly legitimate vendor that does not appear in business or telephone directories is obviously suspect.

Vendor Not on Approved Vendor List – Payments made to a vendor not on the approved vendor list are a prime indicator of a fictitious vendor scheme operated by an employee.

Vendors with Inappropriate Industrial Classification Codes – A vendor whose invoice reflect the sale of appropriate business items, but whose Standard Classification Code indicates that it is in a different type of business might be selling unnecessary goods or items intended for personal use.

Assets** 2,680,452 2,342,225 2,562,618 2,680,452* 2,342,225 Capital & Subordinations 150,319* 139,721 146,179 150,319* 139,721 Commission Revenues 6,062 7,415 6,668 20,215 25,858*

Number of Profesole firms 158 210 174 178 242 Aggrepate Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firms 2,807 4,300 3,482 10,970 18,470 Number of Unprofitable Firms 103 63 67 94 42 Aggregate Pre-Tax Earnings of Profitable Firms (2,183) (428) (663) (3,388) (989)

Weak or Unenforced Controls – Non-existent, weak, or unenforced controls inevitably lead to fraud and corruption.

Preliminary Matters

Prediction: Investigation can not be conducted without a predication.

Predication is the totality of circumstances that would lead a reasonable, professionally trained, and prudent individual to believe a fraud has occurred, is occurring, and/or will occur.

Understand the business: Tour the business; Interview key personnel; Analysis documents; review processes; watch employees do their job

Collecting documents: Chain of custody; Authentication; Database; and Lists

Atter-Tax Addualized Return on Capital 1.1% 7 3% Cases

Summary of the Basic Steps: 1 A ST 1

Begin the case

Do Background checks

Document collection

Write report

151

Cases

Begin the case:

Tips or reports

Debrief the Informant

- Precise allegation
- Details: who, what, when, why, and how much
- Ask for records or documents
 - Other witnesses
 - Similar transactions
 - Other person's knowledge

Do background checks:

Initial review confirms suspicion of fraud, the examiner must begin collecting information to conduct background checks on the suspect.

Discovering external information about the suspect contractor and employee.

Contractor checklist; check public records and the internet for general background information on the contractor. For example, ownership, customers, sales volume, and litigation history,

Cases

Do background checks:

- Employee checklist: Public and non-public information.
- Public records; business filings; court records; real property; other public information
- Non-public records: banking records, tax returns, credit reports, credit car account records

Cases

Interviews

Preliminary analysis is complete, the fraud examiner should complete document collection and begin interviewing neutral third parties witnesses and corroborative witnesses. Possible to identify the subordinates and associates of the suspect employee who were involved in the suspect transaction.

Interview cooperative witnesses

Interview hostile witnesses

Interview suspect

Document collection

Request: the simplest method used to obtain relevant documents is to request them.

Obtain documentary evidence by subpoena: Subpoenas are issued by the court. Call for the product of documents and records.

Obtain documentary evidence by search warrant: Search warrant are issued by a court judge. Based on probable cause that additional evidence is needed.

Right to audit clause in contract: Legal right to request pertinent documents.

46, 179 150, 319 139, 7

Prove financial transactions

At this stage the examiner should begin tracing the illegal proceeds from the suspected fraud scheme. Bribery, corruption, and fraud are examples of illegal activity that tends to be closely linked to the concealment of illicit funds.

Trace funds from the point of payment

Trace funds from the point of receipt

Cases

Write the report

The final report should adequately answer the classical questions of who, what, why, where, when, and how.

General rules for writing the report: State only the facts; do not make errors.

Internal control report.