
Denali Commission Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress



October 1, 2024-March 31, 2025

Denali Commission

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS



October 1, 2024-March 31, 2025

Table of Contents

Message from the Inspector General	4
Executive Summary	6
Denali Commission Overview	6
Oversight Areas	7
Energy Reliability and Security/Bulk Fuel Safety and Security	7
Village Infrastructure Protection	7
Transportation	7
Sanitation	7
Health Facilities	8
Housing	8
Broadband	8
Workforce and Economic Development	8
Completed Work	10
Planned Work	13
Reporting Requirements	14
Statistical Data	15
Additional Section 405(b) Reporting	19

Online Report Availability

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) audits, evaluations, inspections, special review reports, and ongoing work are available at <https://www.denali.gov/office-of-inspector-general/>, as well as at www.oversight.gov.

Information about the federal Inspector General community is available through the Inspectors General Network at www.ignet.gov.

Public reports from all federal Inspectors General who are members of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) are available at www.oversight.gov.

MESSAGE FROM THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

April 30, 2025

OIG-2025-005

Commissioners:

I am pleased to present this *Semiannual Report to Congress* for the period of October 1, 2024, through March 31, 2025, covering the past six months of work for the Denali Commission Office of Inspector General (OIG). This report describes the work of the OIG during the reporting period and reflects our responsibility to report independently to Congress and the Denali Commission (the Commission). The work that is described illustrates the OIG's efforts to promote the efficiency and effectiveness of the Commission and demonstrates the impact that the OIG's work has had on the Commission's programs and operations.

During this reporting period, the Commission, like several other federal agencies, continued its work in issuing Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOA) for both regular program funds and funds made available under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), reviewing grant applications, and overseeing grant awards. In a time of continued supply chain and labor force challenges, the Commission continues to invest in projects designed to address critical infrastructure needs while enhancing the quality of life in Alaska's communities, especially in those who have historically been the most economically distressed. During this reporting period the Commission welcomed a new Federal Co-Chair, Julie Kitka, who has served for many years as a commissioner as President of the Alaskan Federation of Natives.

During this period, utilizing the contractual services of SB & Company, LLC (SBC), we issued two reports and a memorandum setting forth the top management and performance challenges facing the Commission in fiscal year 2025. The work conducted by the OIG during this semi-annual period focused upon ensuring that no operational or internal control or cybersecurity issues existed that would impede the Commission in the delivery of its mission. This work included the audit of the Commission's financial statements for fiscal years ending September 30, 2024, and 2023, and an evaluation of the Commission's compliance with the Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) and related information security policies, procedures, standards and guidelines for fiscal year 2024.

Fostering trust and confidence in the operations of the Commission strengthens the Commission's ability to enter partnership opportunities with federal, state, and local governments and corporations, non-profit organizations, and the Alaskan Federation of Natives and the 227 federally recognized tribes, 141 village corporations, 12 regional corporations, and 12 regional nonprofit and tribal consortiums that contract and compact to run federal and state programs that it represents. As the Commission seeks to realize efficiencies through reduced staffing levels and tools like compacting and focusing on grants that support the goals and objectives of the administration, the need for robust oversight increases even more.

As Inspector General I will continue to seek the staff, resources, and tools to ensure that those who would exploit the funding of infrastructure projects critical to resource development, manufacturing, and national security in Alaska are audited, investigated, and referred for prosecution when appropriate to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse. By providing oversight of and transparency into the Commission's activities, and those of its grantees, the OIG supports the effectiveness and efficiency

of this mission. In the coming fiscal year, I will continue working with the Federal Co-Chair and OMB to strengthen the oversight of the Commission's operations and programs.

I appreciate the significant support that I continue to receive from the Commissioners and staff, as well as Congress. I look forward to continuing to work closely with all the Commission's stakeholders to accomplish this mission.



RODERICK H. FILLINGER
Inspector General

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Semiannual Report, submitted pursuant to Section 405 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. §405), summarizes the major activities and accomplishments of the Denali Commission Office of Inspector General (OIG) for the period October 1, 2024, through March 31, 2025.

Audits and Reviews Highlights

During this reporting period, the OIG performed, through its contract with SB & Company, LLC (SBC), three reports including: (1) Fiscal Year 2024 Financial Statement Audit Report; (2) Top Management and Performance Challenges Fiscal Year 2025 Report; and (3) Results of the Evaluation of the FY 2024 Denali Commission Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA) Reporting Metrics.

Looking Ahead

The OIG plans to complete the following audits and reviews during the second half of FY 2025:

1. Audit of the Commission's FY 2025 financial statements;
2. Review of the Commission's FY 2025 compliance with FISMA;
3. Review of the Commission's Compliance with Fiscal Year 2024 Improper Payments;
4. Review of the Commission's Privacy Program; and
5. A risk assessment of the Commission's charge card program.

DENALI COMMISSION OVERVIEW

The Denali Commission Act of 1998 (Denali Commission Act) established the Denali Commission (Commission) to deliver a wide range of services to Alaska in the most cost-effective manner by reducing administrative and overhead costs. As part of the Denali Commission Act, the Commission provides job training and other economic development services in rural communities, with a focus on promoting development in rural Alaska and on providing key infrastructure, such as power generation and transition facilities, modern communication systems, and water and sewer systems.

Since its enactment, the Denali Commission Act has been updated several times, expanding the Commission's mission to include the planning and construction of health care facilities and the establishment of the Denali Access System Program to support surface transportation infrastructure and waterfront transportation projects.

OVERSIGHT AREAS

Energy Reliability and Security/Bulk Fuel Safety and Security

Recognizing the critical role energy plays in the quality of life and economic development of Alaska's rural communities; the Commission has made energy and bulk fuel its primary infrastructure theme since it was created in 1998. The types of projects currently being funded include the design and construction of replacement bulk fuel storage facilities, upgrades to community power generation and distribution systems (including interties), and energy efficiency related initiatives. The Commission primarily works with the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA), Alaska Village Electric Cooperative (AVEC), and Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium to prioritize projects based on need. Other key partners include the US Department of Energy – Office of Indian Energy, US Department of Agriculture – Rural Utilities Service, State of Alaska Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development, and Rural Alaska Fuel Services.

Village Infrastructure Protection

The goal of the VIP Program is to mitigate the impact of erosion, permafrost thaw, and flooding threats with respect to safety, health, and the protection of infrastructure. In fiscal years 2016 through 2020 the agency invested a total of just under \$40 million of its discretionary program funds for VIP related initiatives; primarily in support of the four most vulnerable communities identified in GAO Report 09-551 (Newtok, Kivalina, Shaktoolik, and Shishmaref). Program development funding has also been allocated to statewide initiatives such as establishing the technical-assistance Center for Environmentally Threatened Communities (CETC), conducting a coastal infrastructure erosion vulnerability assessment, hazard mitigation plans (HMPs), project designs stemming from HMPs, emergency drills & exercises, and publishing a Catalog of Federal Programs. The Commission has worked directly with 18 communities on VIP efforts - and 13 other communities assisted through Dept of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (DHS&EM/DMVA) for Hazard Mitigation and Small Community Emergency Response Planning, seven more through YKHC for health clinic permafrost-affected foundation repair, and other statewide mapping, reporting, and prototype efforts.

Transportation

The Transportation Program aids rural Alaskan communities in developing or improving transportation infrastructure. The roads portion of the program targets basic roads and trail projects, drainage, bridge, and safety development and improvements. The waterfront portion of the program addresses port, harbor, barge landings and other rural waterfront needs. The Commission's Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) is the body that advises the Federal Co-Chair on transportation needs in rural Alaska and evaluates project applications.

Sanitation

The Indian Health Service, Environmental Protection Agency, and State of Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation have historically been the lead agencies for the design and construction of sanitation facilities in rural Alaska. However, over the years the Commission has contributed approximately \$34 million for various projects, primarily village washeterias.

Health Facilities

The Health Facilities program funds the design, construction, and improvements of primary care clinics throughout rural Alaska and has supported other new hospital projects in Nome and Barrow, behavioral health facilities, and rural Emergency Medical Services.

Housing

The Housing program funds the design and construction of senior housing, long-term care facilities, teacher housing, domestic violence shelters, and adolescent residential treatment facilities.

Broadband

The Broadband program intends to implement, expand, and extend infrastructure to reduce the cost of connecting unserved and underserved areas in Alaska, as well as coordinate efforts on strategy, plans, and asset mapping for increasing eligibility of the state.

Workforce and Economic Development

The Workforce and Economic Development program supports construction training with the intent to increase local hire on capital projects being funded by the Commission and others, leading to improved economic conditions in rural villages. Developing administrative and technical capabilities in rural communities increases long term employment opportunities, and such training extends the useful life of infrastructure constructed in rural Alaska. This program also focuses on projects and initiatives that support overall economic conditions in rural communities.

The Commission works with various program partners that include other federal agencies, the state of Alaska, Alaskan Native groups, and several non-profit organizations throughout the state of Alaska.

The Commission's approved FY 2024 work plan includes funding for each of these programmatic areas. The work plan also includes programmatic funding for grants consistent with the Commission's mission not specifically addressed by one of the other program areas.

Organization

The Commission is organized into three direct components: Programs, General Counsel, and Financial Operations.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) is an independent office established under the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (hereafter referred to as the IG Act). The IG Act, as amended by the Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2016, safeguards OIG access to agency information and mandates additional reporting to increase transparency in government operations.

The IG Act gives the Inspector General the authority and responsibility to:

1. Conduct and supervise audits and investigations of the Commission's programs and operations;
2. Provide leadership, coordination, and recommend policies for activities designed to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the administration of the Commission's programs and operations; and prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse of the Commission's programs and operations; and
3. Keep the Federal Co-Chair, Commissioners, and Congress fully and currently informed about problems and deficiencies, as well as the necessity for corrective actions.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL ACTIVITIES

COMPLETED WORK

OIG-AR-2025-02 Fiscal Year 2024 Financial Statement Audit Report

SBC completed an audit of the Commission's FY 2024 financial statements in accordance with the Government Accountability Office's Government Auditing Standards and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Bulletin 17-03, Audit Requirements for Federal Financial Statements. SBC issued an unmodified opinion on the financial statements.

OIG-ER-2025-04 Fiscal Year 2024 FISMA Evaluation

SBC completed an evaluation of the Commission's FY 2024 compliance with the Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) in accordance with the guidance that DHS, in conjunction with OMB and the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), developed for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 - 2024 FISMA Reporting Metrics. Consistent with applicable FISMA requirements, OMB policy and guidance, and National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) standards and guidelines, Denali Commission established and maintained its information security program and practices for its information systems for the five cybersecurity functions and nine FISMA metric domains. The Commission's information security program was effective.

OIG-MR-2025-03 Top Management and Performance Challenges Fiscal Year 2025

On November 18, 2024, the OIG issued their report on the top management and performance challenges facing the Commission in FY 2025. The OIG identified five management and performance challenges: (1) implementation of a course of action to demonstrate the value of the Commission; (2) long term grants monitoring; (3) succession planning; (4) cohesive, collaborative, and engaged employees in a remote working environment; and (5) continued focus on cyber security. These challenges were identified based on audit work performed for the Office of Inspector General, input from Commission management, and knowledge of the Commission's programs and operations. With the return-to-work Executive Order and related guidance, the fourth challenge has been ameliorated although it presents its own challenges.

Challenge 1: Implementation of a Course of Action to Demonstrate the Value of the Commission

During the financial statement audit, the auditors noted that during the year ended September 30, 2022, a one-time appropriation of \$75 million was made to the Commission in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. While additional funding is a welcomed opportunity, there still exists a longer-term threat to the funding of the Commission if the Commission does not show the value of the additional funding. This risk could be potentially offset with the implementation of a vision and plan that demonstrates the value the Commission provides. Effectively, what the Commission needs to be able to demonstrate is that through the Commission's experience with a wide variety of solutions to economic and environmental issues throughout Alaska and the Arctic Circle, the American taxpayer receives the best value and return on investment through the continuance of the Commission. This may be as simple as a cost benefit analysis that shows that it will be more expensive for other Federal agencies to complete work in Alaska without the Commission.

Through MAP 21 language the Commission has begun to spend budgetary authority on behalf of other Federal agencies. While this is a good first step, as management continues to pursue these opportunities, management should also consider the development of performance metrics to show the value the Commission provides. For instance, developing estimates of the additional costs another Federal agency would incur to implement programs that the Commission could implement on their behalf could demonstrate value added. Further metrics could include how the Commission is better able to leverage knowledge, experience, and familiarity with the unique challenges in Alaska to expend budgetary dollars more effectively to obtain greater results. This in turn could inform other agencies about the value of being able to do more with less by partnering with the Commission.

Further, the Commission should leverage its current grants monitoring process to provide statistics on the positive impact of previous grants. The Commission should consider an analysis of how other grant making agencies within the Federal government benchmark performance. Through consideration of this bench-marking process, the Commission can highlight what it does best and develop improvement plans for areas that the Commission is falling behind. We recommend the development of benchmarking attributes to mirror the items included in its considered course of actions.

Challenge 2: Long Term Grants Monitoring

The Commission currently does not have a robust process to determine that the grants previously awarded have been and continue to be used as intended. Through the adoption of uniform grant guidance regulations, the Commission has begun to rate grantees based upon risk and has internally reviewed certain projects through various means during the grant award period. However, after grant award closure, there is not a process to follow up on the grant project to determine whether the project is having its intended outcome or providing a longer-term benefit.

While the monitoring process during the grant period begins the process of answering whether the intended use of resources has been continually met (i.e., a care facility is continued to be used as a care facility), it currently does not track whether the long-term performance of the grant outcome has been met. In other words, it does not answer the question “how many people have benefited from the construction or improvement of a care facility?”

The development of performance metrics to show how a project is performing in the long term against the original plan can assist management in the risk rating process of grantees and can be a tool to report to constituents on the effectiveness of the use of taxpayer resources. For instance, to be able to quantify the effect of the installation of a project that shows long term reduction in taxpayer resources can be a powerful tool. As importantly, the quantification of a project that does not show long term reduction in needed additional taxpayer resources will allow the Commission to analyze how to improve grant awards in the future. The performance success of projects can assist with the determination of the value that the Commission provides.

Challenge 3: Succession Planning

Several personnel changes have occurred over the last couple of years, inclusive of changes in the Federal Co-Chair position. Management should consider documentation of various duties as others fill in the position to facilitate future knowledge transfer. This will allow for faster transition and

elimination of intellectual capital that leaves when an employee departs.

There are only two members of the Finance group. If either of these two people were to leave the Commission, management would likely be overwhelmed, and the limited staff would create internal controls deficiencies. Specifically, there would be segregation of duties issues that could leave the Commission more susceptible to accounting errors or misappropriation of assets (both internal and external). These deficiencies would cause the Commission not to comply with the Office of Management and Budget and General Accountability Office requirements and could further hinder management efforts to obtain additional funding. Internal controls are typically a variable cost (as an organization grows the cost grows as well); however, there is a certain fixed portion of cost that needs to be incurred regardless of the size of the organization (based on Federal requirements) and continued reduction in staff may cause the Commission to be below the fixed portion of internal controls. While specifically addressing concerns related to the finance function of the Commission, the diminishing staff and related internal control impact will affect all areas of the Commission (grant origination, grants monitoring, etc.).

Management should be aware that the documentation and development of succession planning can go hand in hand along with long-term strategic planning. There are many Federal agencies and related organizations that can assist in the development of strategic and succession planning.

Challenge 4: Cohesive, Collaborative, and Engaged Employees in a Remote Working Environment

The Commission is predominantly a remote working environment. While generally this appears to have had positive effects on the morale of staff and cost savings, building and maintaining a cohesive, collaborative, and engaged team is more difficult in a remote environment. Management should consider periodic team building events that are in person to have staff interact with one another. These events can lead to increases in teamwork, collaboration, and communication among employees. Further, these events can build bridges across administrative and programmatic functions. Given the interoperability of processes and procedures between administrative and programmatic functions at the Commission, intentionally promoting interaction can help foster innovation and improve employee engagement and morale.

Challenge 5: Continued Focus on Cyber Security

The Commission has made significant and measurable improvements to meet the requirements of the DATA Act and FISMA requirements. The theft of data and ransomware have become more prevalent with over 422 million individuals impacted by data breaches in 2022. Management should continue to be vigilant about cyber security and continue to invest in counter measures and training. Additionally, the Commission should consider investing in tools and resources, funding permitting, that will periodically test the policies and procedures in place and identify weaknesses to allow such items to be addressed prior to an actual cybersecurity incident occurring.

PLANNED AUDITS AND MANAGEMENT REVIEWS

1. Audit of the Commission's FY 2025 financial statements;
2. Review of the Commission's FY 2025 compliance with FISMA;
3. Review of the Commission's Compliance with Fiscal Year 2024 Improper Payments;
4. Review of the Commission's Privacy Program; and
5. A risk assessment of the Commission's charge card program.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

No administrative reviews were performed during this reporting period.

INVESTIGATIONS

The Commission OIG receives and investigates allegations of fraud, waste, abuse and misconduct within Commission programs and operations. Commission OIG investigations can give rise to administrative, civil, and criminal penalties. Based on investigations conducted, the Commission OIG issues reports that set forth the allegations and an objective description of the facts to Commission management regarding administrative and civil matters. Investigations which uncover potential criminal activity are referred to the Department of Justice. As of the end of the semiannual reporting period, the OIG has no ongoing investigations.

OIG Hotline

To facilitate reporting of allegations, the Commission OIG maintains a hotline (see "Contacting the Office of Inspector General"). Callers who have general questions or concerns that do not fall within the OIG's jurisdiction are referred to other entities, such as other Commission offices, Federal agencies, Federal offices of inspectors general, and local or state governments. During the semiannual reporting period, we received 190 hotline inquiries.

REPORT ON INSTANCES OF WHISTLEBLOWER RETALIATION

For this semiannual reporting period, the OIG found no instances of whistleblower retaliation to report.

Liaison Activities

The IG is a member of CIGIE, which was established on October 14, 2008, pursuant to the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008. The IG also serves on the Audit, Inspections and Evaluations, and Investigations Committees of CIGIE, as well as the CIGIE Awards Working Group, and the Small/Unique IG Working Group. The IG attended regular meetings of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), the Council of Counsels to Inspectors General (CCIG), and served as an adjunct instructor for the CIGIE Training Institute's Leadership & Mission Support Academy.

Reporting Requirements of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as Amended

The following table lists the reporting requirements of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, along with the location of the required information. The work “None” appears where this is no data to report under a particular requirement.

Reference	Reporting Requirements	Page
Section 404(a)(2)	Review of legislation and regulations	19
Section 405(b)(1)	Significant problems, abuses, and deficiencies relating to the administration of programs and operations	20
Section 405(b)(2)	Recommendations with respect to significant problems, abuses, or deficiencies	20
Section 405(b)(3)	Significant recommendations included in previous reports on which corrective action has not been taken (Table 1)	20
Section 405(b)(4)	Matters referred to prosecutive authorities	20
Section 405(b)(5)	Summary of instances where information was refused	20
Section 405(b)(6)	Listing of reports by subject matter (Table 2)	16
Section 405(b)(7)	Summary of significant reports	10
Section 405(b)(8)	Statistical table – Reports with questioned costs (Table 3)	17
Section 405(b)(9)	Statistical table – Recommendations that funds be put to better use (Table 4)	17
Section 405(b)(10)	Summary of each audit, inspection, and evaluation report issued before this reporting period for which no management decision was made by end of the reporting period, no establishment comment was returned within 60 days; or for those with any outstanding unimplemented recommendations, including the potential aggregate cost savings (Table 5)	20
Section 405(b)(11)	Description and explanation of significant revised management decisions	20
Section 405(b)(12)	Significant management decisions with which the Inspector General disagrees	21
Section 405(b)(13)	Information under section 804(b) of the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996	21
Sections 405(b)(14)(15)(16)	Peer review activity on OIG and Peer review activity by OIG on another OIG	21
Section 5(b)(17)	Statistical Table – Investigative Reports / Summary of Investigative Activity for the Reporting Period of October 1, 2022, to March 31, 2023 (Table 6)	21
Section 405(b)(18)	Description of metrics used for developing the data for the statistical table under Section 5(a)(17)	21
Section 405(b)(19)	Report on each investigation involving a senior Government employee where allegations of misconduct were substantiated	22
Section 405(b)(20)	Description of whistleblower retaliation	22
Section 405(b)(21)	Description of any attempt by establishment to interfere with independence including budget constraints, resisted to or objected to oversight, delayed access to information	22
Section 405(b)(22)	Description of particular circumstances of each inspection, evaluation, and audit conducted that is closed and was not publicly disclosed; and investigations conducted by the Office involving a senior Government employee that is closed and was not disclosed to the public	22
PL 117-348 § 122(e)	Anti-Trafficking-In-Persons Activity	22

First Half of FY 2025 Freedom of Information Act Requests

Activity	Total
Number of Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Requests Received	0
Number of FOIA Requests Processed	0
Number Granted	
Number Partially Granted	
Number Not Granted	
Reasons for Denial	
No Records Available	
Referred to Other Agencies	
Requests Denied in Full Exemption 3	
Requests Denied in Full Exemption 5	
Requests Denied in Full Exemption 7(A)	
Requests Denied in Full Exemption 7(C)	
Request Withdrawn	0
Not a Proper FOIA Request	
Not an Agency Record	
Duplicate Request	
Other	
Requests for OIG Reports from Congress and Other Government Agencies	
Received	
Processed	
Number of OIG Reports/Documents Released in Response to Requests	

Investigations Statistical Highlights for this Period

Table 1. Reports from Previous Periods with Unimplemented Recommendations

Report Title	Unimplemented Recommendations
None	None

Table 2. Listing of Reports Issued

Report Number	Subject Matter	Issue Date	Report Title	Questioned Cost	Unsupported Cost	Funds Put to Better Use
OIG-AR-2025-02	Audit	Nov. 18, 2024	Results of the Audit of the FY 2024 Denali Commission Financial Statement Audit Report	\$0	\$0	\$0
OIG-ER-2025-04	Evaluation	Dec. 13, 2024	Results of the Evaluation of the FY 2024 Denali Commission Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA) Reporting Metrics	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 3. Reports With Questioned Costs

Description	Number of Reports	Questioned Costs	Unsupported Costs
A. For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period.	0	\$0	\$0
B. Which were issued during the reporting period.	0	\$0	\$0
Subtotals (A + B)	0	\$0	\$0
C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period.	0	\$0	\$0
i. Dollar value of disallowed costs; and	0	\$0	\$0
ii. Dollar value of costs not disallowed.	0	\$0	\$0
D. For which no management decision was made by the end of the reporting period.	0	\$0	\$0

Table 4. Recommendations That Funds Be Put to Better Use

Description	Number of Reports	Unsupported Cost
A. For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period.	0	\$0
B. Which were issued during the reporting period.	0	\$0
Subtotals (A + B)	0	\$0
C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period.	0	\$0
i. Dollar value of recommendations that were agreed to by management; and	0	\$0
ii. Dollar value of recommendations that were not agreed to by management.	0	\$0
D. For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period.	0	\$0

Table 5. Summary of Reports for Which No Establishment Comment Was Returned within 60 Days of Providing the Report

Fiscal Year	Number of Reports with Unimplemented Recommendations	Number of Unimplemented Recommendations	Dollar Value of Aggregate Potential Cost Savings
0	0	0	\$0

Table 6. Listing of Investigative Reports/ Summary of Investigative Activity for the Reporting Period of October 1, 2024, to March 31, 2025

The data contained in this table was compiled from the OIG’s investigations records.

Investigative Caseload	Number
Cases Open at Beginning of Period	0
Cases Completed but Not Closed* at Beginning of Period	0
Cases Opened During Period	0
Cases Closed During Period	0
Cases Completed but Not Closed at End of Period	0
Open Cases at End of Period	0
Investigative Reports Issued During the Reporting Period	0

* A case is “completed” but not “closed” when the investigative work has been performed but disposition (such as corrective administrative action) is pending.

Criminal and Civil Investigative Activities	Number
Referrals for Criminal Prosecution to DOJ	0
Accepted	0
Indictments/Information	0
Arrests	0
Convictions	0
Referrals for Criminal Prosecution to State and Local Prosecuting Authorities	0
Referrals for Civil Prosecution to DOJ	0
Accepted	0
Referrals for Civil Prosecution to State and Local Prosecuting Authorities	0

Additional Section 405(b) Reporting

The following section includes information that is required under the Inspector General Act that is not otherwise addressed in this report, along with supplemental information on select reporting topics.

Section 4(a)(2): Review of Legislation and Regulations

This section requires the Inspector General of each agency to review existing and proposed legislation and regulations relating to that agency's programs and operations. Based on this review, the Inspector General is required to make recommendations in the semiannual report concerning the impact of such legislation or regulations on (1) the economy and efficiency of the management of programs and operations administered or financed by the agency or (2) the prevention and detection of fraud and abuse in those programs and operations. This review includes legislation that could affect the Denali Commission, or the oversight work of offices of inspectors general. During this reporting period, the following legislation was monitored and reviewed for potential effect on future work conducted in oversight of the Commission:

S.323 - PLAN for Broadband Act

Senator Roger Wicker (R-MS) on January 29, 2025, introduced the bill which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Senators Ben Ray Lujan (D-NM) and Peter Welch (D-VT) are co-sponsors. The Proper Leadership to Align Networks (PLAN) for Broadband Act would direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to develop a national strategy to synchronize federal broadband programs. The Denali Commission is one of the agencies covered by the bill.

H.R.2101 - Duplicative Grant Consolidation Act

Representative Stephanie Bice (R-OK) on March 14, 2025, introduced the bill, which was referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability. Representative Kieth Self (R-TX) is a co-sponsor. (The bill was introduced in the 118th Congress as H.R. 10177 – Decreasing Overlapping Grants Efficiently (DOGE) Act on November 20, 2024, by Rep. Bice).

The bill prohibits the head of an executive agency from awarding a grant to an applicant determined by the Inspector General (IG) or agency head to have received another grant from the head of another executive agency for the same or identical purpose. If it is determined that a duplicative grant exists, the heads of the agencies shall jointly determine which agency is the appropriate one to award the grant.

In addition, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Act, the OMB Director would make available to the heads of executive agencies and their IGs, an electronic system through which the head of an executive agency may determine before awarding a grant, or through which an IG of an executive agency may determine in conducting an audit or investigation, whether any applicant for such grant has received, or submitted an application to the head of another executive agency for, another grant for the same or identical purpose. The OMB director would also establish an electronic system which contains information for all federal research awards through which the executive agency heads and IGs could determine whether applicants have received or applied to the head of another executive agency for another award for essentially equivalent work.

Section 5(b)(1) and 5(b)(2): Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies, and Resulting Recommendations for Corrective Action

These sections require a description of significant problems, abuses, and deficiencies relating to the administration of programs and operations disclosed during the reporting period and the resulting recommendations for corrective action. There were no significant problems, abuses, or deficiencies found during the reporting period, and no resulting recommendations for corrective action were issued.

Section 5(b)(3): Prior Significant Recommendations Unimplemented

This section requires identification of each significant recommendation described in previous semiannual reports for which corrective action has not been completed. Section 5(b) requires that the Commission transmit to Congress statistical tables showing the number and value of audit reports for which no final action has been taken, as well as an explanation of why recommended action has not occurred, except when the management decision was made within the preceding year. There are no prior significant unimplemented recommendations.

Section 5(b)(4): Matters Referred to Prosecutorial Authorities

This section requires a summary of matters referred to prosecutorial authorities and the resulting prosecutions and convictions. No new matters were referred to prosecutorial authorities during this reporting period.

Sections 5(b)(5) and 6(c)(2): Information or Assistance Refused

These sections require a summary of each report to the Commissioners when access, information, or assistance has been unreasonably refused or not provided. We were not refused access, information, or assistance.

Section 5(b)(10): Prior Audit Reports Unresolved

This section requires: a summary of each audit report, inspection report, and evaluation report issued before commencement of the reporting period (A) for which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period, an explanation of why a decision has not been made, and a statement concerning the desired timetable for delivering a decision on each such report; (B) for which no establishment comment was returned within 60 days of providing the report to the establishment; and (C) for which there are any outstanding unimplemented recommendations, including the aggregate potential cost savings of those recommendations. There are no reports for which no management decision was made by the end of the reporting period or for which no establishment comment was returned within 60 days of providing the report to the establishment.

Section 5(b)(11): Significant Revised Management Decisions

This section requires an explanation of the reasons for any significant revision to a management decision made during the reporting period. There were no significant revised management decisions during this period.

Section 5(b)(12): Significant Management Decisions with Which OIG Disagreed

This section requires information concerning any significant management decision with which the inspector general disagrees. There were no significant management decisions with which the previous or current inspector general disagreed.

Section 5(b)(13): Noncompliance with Federal Financial Management Systems

Agencies are required to implement and maintain financial management systems that comply substantially with federal financial management systems requirements, applicable federal accounting standards, and the U.S. Government Standard General Ledger at the transaction level. If an agency does not comply with federal financial systems, it is required to establish a remediation plan. This section requires the reporting of instances and reasons when an agency has not met target dates established in the remediation plan. There were no instances of noncompliance with federal financial management systems.

Section 5(b)(14) and 5(b)(15): Results of Peer Review Received by OIG

These sections require an appendix containing the results of any peer review conducted by another inspector general during the reporting period and a list of outstanding recommendations.

No peer review of the OIG was conducted during this reporting period. On May 10, 2024, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Office of Inspector General (EEOC OIG) completed a modified peer review of the OIG. In its report, the EEOC OIG concluded that the OIG monitored the independent public accountants work that was planned in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards. There are no outstanding recommendations from this report. The next peer review will be conducted in the first half of fiscal year 2027 in accordance with the peer review schedule set by CIGIE. A copy of the report is available [here](#) on the OIG's website.

Section 5(b)(16) Results of Peer Review Conducted by OIG

This section requires a list of any peer reviews conducted of another inspector general during the reporting period, including a list of any outstanding recommendations made from any previous peer reviews.

During this reporting period, our office did not conduct a peer review another office of inspector general.

Sections 5(b)(17) and 5(b)(18): Investigations, Criminal Prosecutions, and Criminal Indictments and Metrics Used to Develop Statistical Data of Investigations, Criminal Prosecutions, and Criminal Indictments

These sections require a statistical table and a description of the metrics used to develop the data related to (1) the number of investigative reports issued, (2) number of persons referred to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution, (3) number of persons referred to state and local authorities for criminal prosecution, and (4) number of criminal indictments and criminal information

resulting from any prior referrals to prospective authorities. There were no investigations, criminal prosecutions, or criminal indictments.

Section 5(b)(19): Substantiated Investigations of Senior Government Employees

This section requires a detailed description of each investigation involving a senior government employee where allegations of misconduct were substantiated, including a detailed description of (1) the facts and circumstances of the investigations and (2) the status and disposition of the matter—including, if referred to or declined by the Department of Justice, the date of referral or declination. There are no substantiated allegations of misconduct involving a senior government employee.

Section 5(b)(20): Instances of Whistleblower Retaliation

This section requires a detailed description of any instance of whistleblower retaliation, including (1) information about the official found to have engaged in retaliation and (2) the consequences the agency imposed to hold the official accountable. There were no instances of whistleblower retaliation.

Section 5(b)(21): Interference with Inspector General Independence

This section requires a detailed description of any attempt by the Commission to interfere with the independence of the inspector general, including (1) budget constraints designed to limit OIG capabilities and (2) incidents where the establishment has resisted OIG oversight or delayed OIG access to information, including the justification of the establishment for such action. There were no instances of the Commission attempting to interfere with the independence of the OIG.

Section 5(b)(22): Closed Inspector General Matters Not Publicly Disclosed

This section requires a detailed description of the particular circumstances of each (1) inspection, evaluation, and audit conducted by OIG that is closed and was not publicly disclosed and (2) investigation conducted by OIG involving a senior government employee that is closed and was not disclosed to the public. There are no closed inspection, evaluation or audit reports not publicly disclosed. Similarly, there are no investigations involving a senior government employee that were not disclosed to the public.

Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection (Pub.L. 117-348, Section 122(e))

As required by PL 117-348, section 122(e), the OIG received no reports of suspected violations, and did not conduct any investigations or recommend any actions to improve the programs and operations related to trafficking victims.



Denali Commission Office of Inspector General
600 Maryland Ave, SW #695e
Washington, DC 20024

REPORT WASTE, FRAUD, ABUSE, OR MISMANAGEMENT

Hotline: 907-271-3500

<https://denali.gov/office-of-inspector-general/oig-hotline>