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Mission
By conducting independent and objective audits, evaluations and investigations, we inspire public confidence in the integrity and security of SSA’s programs and operations and protect them against fraud, waste and abuse. We provide timely, useful and reliable information and advice to Administration officials, Congress and the public.

Authority
The Inspector General Act created independent audit and investigative units, called the Office of Inspector General (OIG). The mission of the OIG, as spelled out in the Act, is to:

- Conduct and supervise independent and objective audits and investigations relating to agency programs and operations.
- Promote economy, effectiveness, and efficiency within the agency.
- Prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse in agency programs and operations.
- Review and make recommendations regarding existing and proposed legislation and regulations relating to agency programs and operations.
- Keep the agency head and the Congress fully and currently informed of problems in agency programs and operations.

To ensure objectivity, the IG Act empowers the IG with:

- Independence to determine what reviews to perform.
- Access to all information necessary for the reviews.
- Authority to publish findings and recommendations based on the reviews.

Vision
We strive for continual improvement in SSA’s programs, operations and management by proactively seeking new ways to prevent and deter fraud, waste and abuse. We commit to integrity and excellence by supporting an environment that provides a valuable public service while encouraging employee development and retention and fostering diversity and innovation.
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 28, 2011

To: The Commissioner

From: Inspector General

Subject: Collection, Use, and Disclosure of Social Security Numbers in States’ Newborn Screening Programs (A-08-11-11181)

OBJECTIVE

Our objective was to evaluate the collection, use, and disclosure of Social Security numbers (SSN) in States’ newborn screening programs.

BACKGROUND

Each year, State Departments of Health (DoH) screen millions of newborns for disorders that require early detection and treatment to prevent serious illness or death. To assist in this process, many hospitals and birthing facilities collect mother and infant demographic information, including the mother’s SSN, on the State’s newborn screening form.\(^1\) Although no single Federal law regulates overall use and disclosure of SSNs, the Social Security Act,\(^2\) and the Privacy Act of 1974\(^3\) contain provisions that govern disclosure and use of SSNs. Additionally, the Administrative Simplification provisions in the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) address the privacy and security of all “. . . individually identifiable health information, including SSNs.”\(^4\) See Appendix B for more information on the specific provisions of these laws.

---

\(^1\) Hospitals and birthing facilities may collect other data, such as the name of the hospital, physician, and insurance, on the newborn screening form. The hospital or birthing facility generally sends this form, along with the infant’s blood sample, to a State laboratory for processing.


To accomplish our objective, we reviewed relevant laws from all 50 States to determine whether SSN collection is legally mandated for their respective newborn screening programs. We contacted the States’ DoHs to determine their use of SSNs or alternate identifiers in their newborn screening programs. We visited six DoHs and one hospital in each of these six States. For each DoH and hospital visited, we interviewed personnel and reviewed policies and procedures for the collection, use, and disclosure of SSNs in the newborn screening program. See Appendix C for additional details regarding the scope and methodology of our review.

RESULTS OF REVIEW

Our review of State DoHs’ newborn screening programs disclosed that many routinely collected and used mothers’ SSNs as identifiers, despite the continuing rise in identity theft. We believe such practices increase the risk of SSN misuse and unnecessarily subject mothers to the possibility of identity theft. Based on our previous audit and investigative work, we believe unnecessary collection and use of SSNs increase the potential for dishonest individuals to obtain these numbers and misuse them.

Our review also disclosed that privacy issues or identity theft concerns have led several DoHs to eliminate SSN collection and use in their newborn screening programs. One DoH eliminated SSN collection because of State law. Low compliance rates in providing SSNs, driven by concerns over privacy, led another DoH to eliminate the collection of mothers’ SSNs in its newborn screening program. We applaud those State DoHs that have taken steps to eliminate SSN collection and use in their newborn screening programs.

While pending Federal legislation, if enacted, would change how such entities as DoHs collect and use SSNs, we believe it is necessary to highlight the continued over-reliance on the SSN and the inherent risks associated with such use. We recognize that the Social Security Administration (SSA) has conducted outreach efforts to educate such entities as State and local governments. We also believe SSA is well-positioned to encourage DoHs that use SSNs in their newborn screening programs to eliminate this practice and adopt alternate identifiers in their record systems.

---


6 H.R. 220, Identity Theft Protection Act of 2011, introduced January 7, 2011. This bill includes an amendment to the Privacy Act of 1974 that prohibits any Federal, State, or local government agency or instrumentality from requesting an individual to disclose his/her SSN on either a mandatory or voluntary basis.
SSN COLLECTION AND USE IN STATE NEWBORN SCREENING PROGRAMS

Of the 50 DoHs contacted, 17 (34 percent) collected and used mothers’ SSNs in their newborn screening programs. These DoHs stated that they collected and used mothers’ SSNs in their program for a variety of purposes. For example, they generally used SSNs to associate infants with mothers and track infants’ initial and subsequent screenings in the State’s record repository. DoHs also collected mothers’ SSNs for billing purposes, because insurance companies and healthcare facilities use SSNs as primary or secondary identifiers. Yet, one hospital we visited collected mothers’ SSNs only because the State DoH newborn screening form had a space asking for the SSN. According to these DoHs, they did not use the SSN as the primary identifier in their programs. Instead, these DoHs generally used the SSN in conjunction with other data elements, such as the names and dates of birth for mother and baby. Other identifiers used by DoHs included hospital name, patient number, or mother’s address and telephone number. While these DoHs stated the SSN was not the primary identifier in their programs, several used SSNs as an identifier when healthcare providers accessed infants’ screening results by telephone.

Some DoH officials told us they continued collecting SSNs because the number was important for identification. One DoH official stated that notification is crucial when screening results indicate an infant has a life-threatening disease. These DoHs also told us that, if the mother did not provide her SSN, they processed the infant’s screening without the number. One official stated that the SSN is the best identifier because it is unique to an individual and will not change like other identifiers. Yet, we believe other unique identifiers can be used that will not put mothers at risk of identity theft.

POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH SSN COLLECTION AND USE

Although none of the State DoHs or hospitals we contacted was aware of any SSN misuse in the newborn screening programs, one hospital had inadvertently disclosed mothers’ SSNs. The official with whom we spoke told us that the hospital had mailed completed newborn screening forms containing SSNs to the wrong address. The DoH advised us that, because of HIPAA and State data breach notification laws, its newborn screening program notified the affected mothers.

---

7 These State DoHs were in Alabama, California, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. Of these 17 State DoHs, Michigan and Pennsylvania officials told us that they only collect a partial SSN. In addition, California DoH stated they were in the process of revising their practice and plan to begin collecting only a partial SSN. Only South Carolina DoH stated that it collects mothers’ SSNs in its newborn screening program because it is lawfully mandated. S.C. Code Regs. 61-80.

Our prior audit work has highlighted risks associated with the collection and use of SSNs. In 2007, we reported that State and local governments’ collection and use of SSNs contributed to instances in which some public documents containing SSNs were posted on the Internet. In 2006, we also reported on hospitals’ collection and use of SSNs that contributed to individuals unlawfully using patients’ SSNs and other identifying information to open credit card accounts and file fraudulent tax returns. These examples show that each time individuals disclose their SSNs, dishonest individuals are given an opportunity to obtain this personal information and use it to commit unlawful acts.

**STEPS TAKEN TO LIMIT SSN COLLECTION AND USE**

A recognition of current identity theft concerns and the critical role of the SSN as a personal identifier have led several DoHs to eliminate the use of SSNs in their newborn screening programs. In 2010, the State of New York enacted a law restricting the use of SSNs by its agencies. As a result, the State’s DoH issued a policy prohibiting the collection, use, or transmittal of SSNs in its newborn screening program. Because of the change in its process, the DoH excluded the SSN field on its form and began relying primarily on an accession number to match infants’ screening results.

Identity theft awareness and privacy issues have also caused changes. For example, informed mothers do not always provide their SSNs for newborn screening. Because of the resulting low compliance, one DoH stopped requiring hospitals to collect mothers’ SSNs for its newborn screening program. In addition, one hospital we visited did not collect or use SSNs for the newborn screening program, although the State DoH requested this information on its form.

As identity theft and privacy concerns have moved to the forefront, Federal agencies, such as SSA and the Internal Revenue Service, have reached out to organizations, such as educational institutions and government agencies, to encourage reduction of SSNs in their business processes. SSA’s Philadelphia Regional Office also has initiated a public information program on its Website to encourage businesses, government agencies, medical facilities, and educational institutions to protect SSNs by

---


12 SSA’s Kansas City region has an initiative directed toward educational institutions; [http://www.socialsecurity.gov/kc/id_ssn_ed.htm](http://www.socialsecurity.gov/kc/id_ssn_ed.htm) (last modified February 9, 2011). The Internal Revenue Service initiatives are at [http://www.irs.gov/privacy/article/0,,id=228444,00.html](http://www.irs.gov/privacy/article/0,,id=228444,00.html) (last updated December 20, 2010).

13 See SSA’s Philadelphia region’s initiative at [http://www.socialsecurity.gov/phila/ProtectingSSNs.htm](http://www.socialsecurity.gov/phila/ProtectingSSNs.htm) (last modified November 14, 2011).
using alternate identifiers in their record systems. While we believe these initiatives have increased awareness, we also realize it may take Federal legislation to compel some entities to reduce or limit SSN collection and use. Nonetheless, as the Agency that assigns SSNs, we believe SSA provides a valuable service to the numberholder, and inspires public trust, when it encourages others to take steps to reduce SSN collection and use. Accordingly, we encourage SSA to continue its outreach efforts.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Despite the potential risks associated with using SSNs as identifiers, many State DoHs continue collecting mothers’ SSNs in their newborn screening programs. We believe this practice increases the risk of SSN misuse and unnecessarily subjects mothers to the possibility of identity theft. While SSA cannot prohibit SSN collection and use, we believe it can take steps to enhance SSN integrity. Accordingly, we recommend that SSA encourage State DoHs to eliminate the collection and use of mothers’ SSNs in their newborn screening programs.

AGENCY COMMENTS AND OIG RESPONSE

SSA agreed with our recommendation. See Appendix D for the Agency’s comments.

Patrick P. O’Carroll, Jr.
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### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.F.R.</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoH</td>
<td>State Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPAA</td>
<td>Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R.</td>
<td>House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIG</td>
<td>Office of the Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub. L. No.</td>
<td>Public Law Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regs.</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Social Security Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSN</td>
<td>Social Security Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stat.</td>
<td>Statutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Laws that Govern Disclosure and Use of the Social Security Number

The following Federal laws establish a general framework for disclosing and using the Social Security number (SSN).

The Privacy Act of 1974

The Privacy Act of 1974 indicates, in part, that it is unlawful for any Federal, State, or local government agency to deny any individual any right, benefit, or privilege provided by law because of such individual’s refusal to disclose his/her SSN, unless the disclosure is required by Federal statute or is to any Federal, State, or local agency maintaining a system of records in existence and operating before January 1, 1975, such disclosure was required under statute or regulation adopted before such date to verify the identity of an individual.\(^1\) Further, any Federal, State, or local government agency requesting that an individual disclose his/her SSN must inform the individual whether the disclosure is voluntary or mandatory, by what statutory or other authority the SSN is solicited and what uses will be made of the SSN.\(^2\)

The Social Security Act

The Social Security Act provides, in part, that “Social security account numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained by authorized persons pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990, shall be confidential, and no authorized person shall disclose any such social security account number or related record.”\(^3\) The Social Security Act also provides, in part, that “. . . [w]hoever discloses, uses, or compels the disclosure of the social security number of any person in violation of the laws of the United States; shall be guilty of a felony . . . .”\(^4\) The Social Security Act authorized certain State and local agencies to use the SSN for certain purposes and allows, or in certain instances requires, such agencies to require individuals to furnish their SSNs for such purposes.\(^5\)

---


\(^2\) Id.


\(^4\) Social Security Act § 208(a)(8), 42 U.S.C. § 408(a)(8).

\(^5\) Social Security Act § 205(c)(2)(C)(i), (ii), (v), (vi), (D), and (E); 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(i), (ii), (v), (vi), (D), and (E).
The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA)

HIPAA’s Administrative Simplification provisions address the privacy and security of health data, including SSNs. HIPAA’s Privacy Rule protects all "individually identifiable health information" held or transmitted by a covered healthcare entity or its business associate, in any form or media, whether electronic, paper, or oral. HIPAA’s Security Rule specifies administrative, technical, and physical safeguards the covered healthcare entity must comply with to assure the confidentiality of electronic protected health information.6

Appendix C

Scope and Methodology

To accomplish our objective, we:

- Reviewed relevant Federal laws and regulations.
- Reviewed relevant laws from all 50 States to determine whether Social Security number (SSN) collection is legally mandated for the newborn screening program.
- Contacted all 50 State Departments of Health (DoH) to determine whether each collected or used mothers’ SSNs in the newborn screening program.
- Visited six State DoHs and one area hospital near each DoH. For those sites visited, we interviewed DoH and hospital personnel regarding their collection, use, and disclosure of mothers’ SSNs in the newborn screening program.
- The States visited were California, Colorado, Florida, North Carolina, New York, and Ohio. The hospitals visited were California Pacific Medical Center, Exemplia Saint Joseph, Tallahassee Memorial, Wake Med, Albany Medical Center, and Riverside Methodist.

Our review of internal controls was limited to gaining an understanding of State DoHs’ collection, use, and disclosure of SSNs. The Social Security Administration entity reviewed was the Office of the Deputy Commissioner of Operations. We conducted our audit from February through August 2011 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. We believe the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective.
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 01, 2011  Refer To: S1J-3

To: Patrick P. O’Carroll, Jr.
Inspection General

From: Dean S. Landis  /s/
Deputy Chief of Staff


Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft report. Please see our attached comment.

Please let me know if we can be of further assistance. You may direct staff inquiries to Frances Cord at (410) 966-5787.

Attachment
Recommendation 1

The Social Security Administration should encourage the States’ Departments of Health to eliminate the collection and use of mothers’ Social Security numbers in their newborn screening programs.

Response

We agree.
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Commissioner of Social Security
Chairman and Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and Means
Chief of Staff, Committee on Ways and Means
Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Social Security
Majority and Minority Staff Director, Subcommittee on Social Security
Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives
Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives
Chairman and Ranking Minority, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives
Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate
Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate
Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Finance
Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Social Security Pensions and Family Policy
Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, Senate Special Committee on Aging
Social Security Advisory Board
Overview of the Office of the Inspector General

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) is comprised of an Office of Audit (OA), Office of Investigations (OI), Office of the Counsel to the Inspector General (OCIG), Office of External Relations (OER), and Office of Technology and Resource Management (OTRM). To ensure compliance with policies and procedures, internal controls, and professional standards, the OIG also has a comprehensive Professional Responsibility and Quality Assurance program.

Office of Audit

OA conducts financial and performance audits of the Social Security Administration’s (SSA) programs and operations and makes recommendations to ensure program objectives are achieved effectively and efficiently. Financial audits assess whether SSA’s financial statements fairly present SSA’s financial position, results of operations, and cash flow. Performance audits review the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of SSA’s programs and operations. OA also conducts short-term management reviews and program evaluations on issues of concern to SSA, Congress, and the general public.

Office of Investigations

OI conducts investigations related to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement in SSA programs and operations. This includes wrongdoing by applicants, beneficiaries, contractors, third parties, or SSA employees performing their official duties. This office serves as liaison to the Department of Justice on all matters relating to the investigation of SSA programs and personnel. OI also conducts joint investigations with other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies.

Office of the Counsel to the Inspector General

OCIG provides independent legal advice and counsel to the IG on various matters, including statutes, regulations, legislation, and policy directives. OCIG also advises the IG on investigative procedures and techniques, as well as on legal implications and conclusions to be drawn from audit and investigative material. Also, OCIG administers the Civil Monetary Penalty program.

Office of External Relations

OER manages OIG’s external and public affairs programs, and serves as the principal advisor on news releases and in providing information to the various news reporting services. OER develops OIG’s media and public information policies, directs OIG’s external and public affairs programs, and serves as the primary contact for those seeking information about OIG. OER prepares OIG publications, speeches, and presentations to internal and external organizations, and responds to Congressional correspondence.

Office of Technology and Resource Management

OTRM supports OIG by providing information management and systems security. OTRM also coordinates OIG’s budget, procurement, telecommunications, facilities, and human resources. In addition, OTRM is the focal point for OIG’s strategic planning function, and the development and monitoring of performance measures. In addition, OTRM receives and assigns for action allegations of criminal and administrative violations of Social Security laws, identifies fugitives receiving benefit payments from SSA, and provides technological assistance to investigations.