

Office of Inspector General



The Department of Commerce Office of Inspector General provides oversight services to the Denali Commission through a Memorandum of Understanding.

E-mail hotline@oig.doc.gov

COVER: View of Denali, the highest peak in North America.

Denali Commission

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS



September 2017

Contents

Completed Works
Work in Progress3
Oversight Areas
Energy4
Transportation4
Government Coordination
Health Facilities6
Training6
Statistical Data
Reporting Requirements14





DENALI COMMISSION

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.

The Commission oversees five program areas: Energy, Transportation, Government Coordination, Health Facilities, and Training. The Commission's current priorities relate primarily to its energy and government coordination programs.

Completed Works

During the semiannual reporting period, we completed a review of the Denali Commission's compliance with FY 2016 improper payments requirements and developed the FY 2018 work plan.

REVIEW OF THE DENALI COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE WITH FY 2016 IMPROPER PAYMENTS REQUIREMENTS (DCOIG-17-004-M)

In August 2017, we completed our review of the Commission's compliance with requirements of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (IPIA), as amended. Our objective was to evaluate the accuracy and completeness of the Commission's reporting and, if applicable, its performance in reducing and recapturing improper payments.

Overall, we found that the Commission met the applicable Office of Management and Budget (OMB) criteria for compliance with IPIA, as amended, for FY 2016.

FY 2018 WORK PLAN

In September 2017, we developed the Denali Commission OIG's annual work plan. We included a series of review required of all Inspectors General, as well as audits of programs unique to the Commission.

Work in Progress

AUDIT OF THE DENALI COMMISSION'S FY 2017 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

SB & Company, LLC (SBC), an independent public accounting firm, is currently performing an audit of the Commission's FY 2017 financial statements in accordance with the Government Accountability Office's Government Auditing Standards and OMB Bulletin 15-02, *Audit Requirements for Federal Financial Statements*.

AUDIT OF THE DENALI COMMISSION'S FY 2017 COMPLIANCE WITH FISMA

SBC is currently performing an audit of the Commission's FY 2017 compliance with FISMA in accordance with OMB Memorandum 17-05, *Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Guidance on Federal Information Security and Privacy Management Requirements*.

REVIEW OF THE DENALI COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE UNDER THE DATA ACT

SBC is currently performing a review of the Commission's compliance under the DATA Act in accordance with the Federal Audit Executive Committee's *Inspectors General Guide to Compliance Under the DATA Act*.

AUDIT OF THE DENALI COMMISSION GOVERNMENT TRAVEL PROGRAM

On March 30, 2016, we initiated an audit of the Denali Commission's government travel card program. Our objective is to determine whether the Commission has sufficient controls over travel card transactions to ensure federal funds are being appropriately managed.

DENALI COMMISSION'S FY 2018 TOP MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE CHALLENGES

In September 2017, we began our assessment of the top management and performance challenges facing the Commission in FY 2018. The Commission has been substantially affected by its evolving role in the village infrastructure protection program, continued budget constraints, and the upcoming change in the Federal Co-chair position. We plan to issue our assessment of the Commission's FY 2018 top management and performance challenges in November 2017.

2018 RISK ASSESSMENT

In September 2017, we began our annual risk assessment of the Commission's programs and activities, to include an assessment of risks related to its funding recipients. The assessment will be used to develop program audits unique to the Commission based on risk.

Oversight Areas

ENERGY

Recognizing the critical role energy plays in the quality of life and economic development of Alaska's communities, the Commission has made energy its primary infrastructure theme since 1999.

The Energy Program funds the design and construction of replacement bulk-fuel storage facilities, upgrades to community power-generation and distribution systems, energy efficiency measures, and alternative energy projects. The Commission primarily works with the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) and Alaska Village Electric Cooperative (AVEC) to meet rural communities' fuel storage and power generation needs.

TRANSPORTATION

The Transportation Program was created in 2005 as part of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and accompanying amendments to the Denali Commission Act. The program focuses primarily on two areas: rural roads and waterfront development.

The roads portion focuses on planning, design, and construction to address basic road improvement needs, including projects that connect rural communities to one another and to the state highway system, and opportunities to enhance rural economic development. Eligible project types include board roads (boardwalk-like systems) for all-terrain vehicles, local community road and street improvements, and roads and board roads to access subsistence-use sites (specifically designated locations used by Alaska Natives and rural community members to gather food).

The waterfront portion addresses planning, design, and construction of port, harbor, and other rural waterfront needs. Eligible project types include regional ports, barge landings, and docking facilities. In addition, legislation was passed on December 18, 2015, that allowed the use of Trans-Alaska Pipeline Liability funds for the repair of barge mooring points and barge landing sites to facilitate pumping fuel from fuel transport barges into bulk fuel storage tanks.

SAFETEA-LU expired in 2009 and operated under continuing resolutions from June 2009 through June 2012. In June 2012, Congress passed a 2-year transportation bill, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, which did not include authorization or funding for the Commission's Transportation Program. The Commission's Transportation Program is still functioning with funding appropriated several years

TRANSPORTATION

ago, but is winding down as projects are completed. Commission staff continues to administer the program in coordination with members of the Transportation Advisory Committee, which rates and ranks project submissions, recommends projects to the Commission's Federal Co-Chair, and advises the Commission on rural surface transportation needs in Alaska.

The Commission works with these recipients and program partners: U.S. Federal Highway Administration, Western Federal Lands Highway Division and Alaska Division; Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District; regional, local, and tribal governments; and regional tribal nonprofits.

GOVERNMENT COORDINATION

The Commission is charged with the special role of increasing government effectiveness. The Commission does so by acting as a catalyst and strategic partner for many federal and state programs in Alaska. The Commission joined others in a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that outlines the roles of agencies in coordinating resources and efforts in areas such as community planning, sustainability, data sharing, and coordination of pre-construction activities. This MOU served as the basis for creating several multiagency workgroups and cooperative projects that have increased overall government effectiveness. The MOU, amended in 2003 with increased participation from both state and federal partners, was renewed once again in 2008. This renewed effort focuses on improving the channels of communication among the heads of all federal and state agencies with an emphasis on critical issues that affect the entire state of Alaska: the high cost of energy, outmigration, and coordination of efforts among all government agencies. Government coordination has become a mainstay of the efforts of the Denali Commission in improving communities in rural Alaska.

HEALTH FACILITIES

Congress amended the Denali Commission Act in 1999 to provide for the planning, design, construction, and equipping of healthcare facilities. The Health Facilities Program collaborates with numerous organizations, including the Alaska Native Regional Health Corporations, from which the program receives support. The Commission has invested in regional networks of primary care clinics across Alaska and, in response to Congressional direction in 2003, initiated efforts to fund additional program areas addressing other health and social service-related facility needs. Further, the Health Facilities Program incorporated behavioral health, dental care, and other components into its clinic design. Over the years, the program has expanded to include annual initiatives to support domestic violence facilities, elder housing, primary care in hospitals, emergency medical services equipment, and hospital designs.

During the past decade, the program used a universeof-need model for primary care and an annual selection process via a Health Steering Committee for other program areas. In 2000, the program created a deficiency list for primary care clinics and found 288 communities statewide in need of clinic replacement, expansion, and/or renovation. That list was last updated in 2008. In the past, projects were recommended for funding if they demonstrated project readiness. However, the Health Facilities Program was last funded by Congress in FY 2010.

TRAINING

As the Commission funded projects for new clinics, roads, and tank farms, it also provided sustainability for these projects by including training for local residents to maintain and operate new facilities.

The Commission has administered the training program through numerous program partnerships. Each program partner has provided a high level of training opportunities that support Commission investments in rural Alaska by providing training for careers related to Commission programs such as Energy, Transportation, and Health Facilities. Types of training funded have included allied health professions, construction trades, facility operations, and maintenance, administration of public infrastructure, and youth initiatives. However, the training program was last funded in 2009, and applications for new training initiatives are no longer being accepted.

Statistical Data

OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS STATISTICAL HIGHLIGHTS FOR THIS PERIOD

Investigative activities covers investigations opened and closed by OIG; arrests by OIG agents; indictments and other criminal charges filed against individuals or entities as a result of OIG investigations; convictions secured at trial or by guilty plea as a result of OIG investigations; and fines, restitution, and all other forms of financial recoveries achieved by OIG as a result of investigative action. No investigative activities occurred during this reporting period.

Allegations processed presents the number of complaints from employees, stakeholders, and the general public that we were able to identify from the limited records maintained by the previous inspector general. No allegations were processed during this reporting period.

TABLE 1. INVESTIGATIONS, CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS, AND CRIMINAL INDICTMENTS

Туре	Number of Reports
Investigative Reports Issued	0
Persons Referred to the Department of Justice for Criminal Prosecution	0
Number of Persons Referred to State and Local Authorities for Criminal Prosecution	0
Criminal Indictments and Information Resulting from Prior Referrals to Prospective Authorities	0

AUDIT RESOLUTION AND FOLLOW-UP

The Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, requires us to present in this report audits issued before the beginning of the reporting period (April 1, 2017) for which no management decision had been made by the end of the period (September 30, 2017).

Audit resolution is the process by which the Commission reaches an effective management decision in response to audit reports.

Management decision refers to the Commission's evaluation of the findings and recommendations included in the audit report and the issuance of a final decision by Commission management concerning its response.

TABLE 2. MANAGEMENT DECISIONS

Report Category	Recommendations
Management Decisions Pending (April 1, 2017)	0
New Management Decisions Required	0
New Management Decisions Submitted	0
Management Decisions Accepted by OIG	0
Actions Pending (September 30, 2017)	0

AUDIT, EVALUATION, AND INSPECTION STATISTICAL HIGHLIGHTS FOR THIS PERIOD

Audits of federal establishments, organizations, programs, activities, and functions must comply with standards established by the Comptroller General of the United States. Evaluations and inspections include reviews that do not constitute an audit or a criminal investigation. We completed a review of the Denali Commission's compliance with FY 2016 improper payments requirements; however, we found neither questioned costs nor funds that could have been put to better use.

Questioned cost refers to a cost that is questioned by OIG because of (1) an alleged violation of a provision of a law, regulation, contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or other agreement or document governing the expenditure of funds; (2) a finding that, at the time of the audit, such cost is not supported by adequate documentation; or (3) a finding that an expenditure of funds for the intended purpose is unnecessary or unreasonable.

Value of audit recommendations that funds be put to better use results from an OIG recommendation that funds could be used more efficiently if Commission management took action to implement and complete the recommendation. Such actions may include (1) reductions in outlays; (2) deobligation of funds from programs or operations; (3) withdrawal of interest subsidy costs on loans or loan guarantees, insurance, or bonds; (4) costs not incurred by implementing recommended improvements related to the Commission, a contractor, or a grantee; (5) avoidance of unnecessary expenditures identified in pre-award reviews of contracts or grant agreements; or (6) any other savings specifically identified.

REPORT TYPES FOR THIS PERIOD

Performance audits are engagements that provide assurance or conclusions based on an evaluation of sufficient, appropriate evidence against stated criteria such as specific requirements, measures, or defined business practices. Performance audits provide objective analysis so that management and those charged with governance and oversight can use the information to improve program performance and operations, reduce costs, facilitate decision making by parties with responsibility to oversee or initiate corrective action, and contribute to public accountability.

Financial statement audits provide reasonable assurance through an opinion (or disclaimer of an opinion) about whether an entity's financial statements are presented fairly in all material respects in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles, or with a comprehensive basis of accounting other than these principles.

Evaluations and inspections include evaluations, inquiries, and similar types of reviews that do not constitute an audit or investigation. An inspection is defined as a process that evaluates, reviews, studies, or analyzes the programs and activities of a department or agency to provide information to managers for decision making; make recommendations for improvements to programs, policies, or procedures; and identify where administrative action may be necessary.

TABLE 3. REPORT TYPES FOR THIS PERIOD

Туре	Number of Reports	Table Number	
Performance Audits	0	N/A	
Financial Statement Audits	0	N/A	
Evaluations and Inspections	1	3-A	
Total	1		

TABLE 3-A. EVALUATIONS AND INSPECTIONS

Report Title	Report Number	Date Issued	Funds to Be Put to Better Use (\$)	Amount Questioned (\$)	Amount Unsupported (\$)
Denali Commission's Compliance with FY 2016 Improper Payments Requirements	DCOIG-17-004-M	8.23.2017	0	0	0

TABLE 4. UNIMPLEMENTED RECOMMENDATIONS

Resolved reports are reports for which (a) the Commission agreed to OIG recommendations and (b) OIG approved the action plan submitted by the Commission. Table 4 lists 5 resolved performance audit, evaluation, and inspection reports with a total of 10 unimplemented recommendations that were issued between May 15, 2015, and November 29, 2016. There is no potential monetary benefit of unimplemented recommendations associated with these reports.

Unresolved reports include reports with no approved action plan as of September 30, 2017, and reports for which the action plans are not due until after the reporting period ending on September 30, 2017. Currently, there are no unresolved reports.

Date Report Issued	OIG Report No. and Title	Total Recommendations Made	Recommendations Agreed to by Management	Unimplemented Recommendations	Potential Monetary Benefits of Unimplemented Recommendations
05.15.2015	DCOIG-17-007-I FY2014 Compliance with Improper Payments Requirements	2	2	2	\$0

Objective(s)

Our objective was to evaluate the accuracy and completeness of the Commission's reporting and, if applicable, its performance in reducing and recapturing improper payments.

Summary

We found that, while the Commission's reporting on improper payments appeared accurate, it could be incomplete due to areas omitted from the risk assessment. The Commission did not perform the required risk assessment prior to publishing the FY 2014 *Agency Financial Report*. In addition, the assessment completed in March 2015 did not include all of the required risk factors, including payments to employees and whether grant payments were made for eligible services.

Unimplemented Recommendations

We recommended that the Commission strengthen its risk assessment process by:

- 1. Performing a risk assessment prior to completing its FY 2017 Agency Financial Report.
- 2. Adding assessment areas to include (a) payments to employees and (b) grant payments made for eligible services, thus assuring consideration of all of OMB's required risk factors.

Date Report Issued	OIG Report No. and Title	Total Recommendations Made	Recommendations Agreed to by Management	Unimplemented Recommendations	Potential Monetary Benefits of Unimplemented Recommendations
09.24.2015	DCOIG-15-012-A Audit of Denali Commission Grant Monitoring Process	t	9	1	\$0

Objective(s)

Our objectives were to determine (1) whether the Commission's grant monitoring process effectively ensures that federal funds are being expended as intended and (2) whether the Commission is effectively allocating its grant monitoring resources.

Summary

Based on this review, we determined improvements are needed in the Commission's grant monitoring process. Specifically, the Commission could better (1) exercise consistent grants management processes and procedures to identify and limit risk to the organization, (2) communicate federal requirements to its grantees, and (3) manage grantee progress reports.

Unimplemented Recommendations

We recommended that the Commission:

9. Maintain written notification to grantees of past due progress reports in the official grant file.

Date Report Issued	OIG Report No. and Title	Total Recommendations Made	Recommendations Agreed to by Management	Unimplemented Recommendations	Potential Monetary Benefits of Unimplemented Recommendations
05.26.2016	DCOIG-16-005-A Improvements Are Needed in the Denali Commission Inventory Management and Equipment Acquisition Process	1	5	2	\$0

Objective(s)

Our objective was to determine whether the Commission's processes and procedures for inventory management and equipment acquisition were sufficient to ensure that federal assets and funds were being appropriately managed.

Summary

Based on this review we determined that improvements are needed in the Commission's inventory management. Specifically, we found that the Commission (1) maintained an inaccurate and inconsistent inventory record, and (2) allowed unrestricted access to its official inventory.

Unimplemented Recommendations

We recommended that the Commission strengthen its inventory management and equipment acquisition process by formalizing the following processes:

- 1. Implement inventory policies and procedures, to include required inventories and a definition of accountable equipment.
- 5. Disseminate the equipment purchase policy to all employees and enforce the process for equipment acquisition

Date Report Issued	OIG Report No. and Title	Total Recommendations Made	Recommendations Agreed to by Management	Unimplemented Recommendations	Potential Monetary Benefits of Unimplemented Recommendations
09.28.2016	DCOIG-16-008-A Improvements Are Needed in the Denali Commission Government Purchase Card Program		4	4	\$0

Objective(s)

Our objective was to determine whether the Commission's internal control over purchase card transactions is sufficient to ensure that federal funds were being appropriately managed.

Summary

Based on this review, we determined that improvements are needed in the Commission's government purchase card program. Specifically, the Commission could improve internal control over (1) purchase card transactions and documentation, and (2) the online purchase card management system.

Unimplemented Recommendations

We recommended that the Commission strengthen internal control in its purchase card program by:

- 1. Updating internal guidance to better reflect federal requirements with regards to purchase card transactions and documentation and emphasizing the importance of following guidance when making purchases.
- 2. Removing access to the online purchase card management system from staff no longer employed by the Denali Commission.
- 3. Including a procedure during the off-boarding process to verify any access to the online purchase card management system is removed.
- 4. Updating the purchase card merchant category code template to reduce risk and revising the allowed merchant category codes for current cardholders.

Date Report Issued	OIG Report No. and Title	Total Recommendations Made	Recommendations Agreed to by Management	Unimplemented Recommendations	Potential Monetary Benefits of Unimplemented Recommendations
11.29.2016	DCOIG-17-001-A Denali Commission New Stuyahok Bulk Fuel Facility Grant	n	3	1	\$0

Objective(s)

Our objectives were to determine whether (1) costs associated with the development of the New Stuyahok bulk fuel facilities were allowable, allocable, and reasonable; and (2) the project was developed as intended and operating successfully.

Summary

Based on this review, we found that (1) sampled costs associated with the development of the New Stuyahok bulk fuel facility were allowable, allocable, and reasonable, and (2) the project was developed as intended and operating successfully. However, we also found that improvements are needed in (1) the maintenance of the AVEC bulk fuel facility and (2) the review of consultant fees.

Unimplemented Recommendations

We recommended the Commission instruct the grantee to:

1. Determine the cause of standing water and vegetation in the AVEC bulk fuel facility and implement any necessary changes to ensure the facility is properly maintainedcategory codes for current cardholders.

Reporting Requirements

The Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, specifies reporting requirements for semiannual reports. The requirements are listed below and indexed to the applicable pages of this report.

Section	Topic	Page
4(a)(2)	Review of Legislation and Regulations	15
5(a)(1)	Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies	15
5(a)(2)	Resulting Recommendations for Corrective Action	15
5(a)(3)	Prior Significant Recommendations Unimplemented	15
5(a)(4)	Matters Referred to Prosecutorial Authorities	15
5(a)(5) and 6(b)(2)	Information or Assistance Refused	15
5(a)(6)	Listing of Audit Reports	2, 9*
5(a)(7)	Summary of Significant Reports	2, 9*
5(a)(8)	Audit Reports—Questioned Costs	2, 9*
5(a)(9)	Audit Reports—Funds to Be Put to Better Use	2, 9*
5(a)(10)	Prior Audit Reports Unresolved	16
5(a)(11)	Significant Revised Management Decisions	16
5(a)(12)	Significant Management Decisions with Which OIG Disagreed	16
5(a)(13)	Noncompliance with Federal Financial Management Systems	16
5(a)(14) and 5(a)(15)	Results of Peer Review Received by OIG	16
5(a)(16)	Results of Peer Review Conducted by OIG	17
5(a)(17) and 5(a)(18)	Investigations, Criminal Prosecutions, and Criminal Indictments	7, 17
5(a)(19)	Substantiated Investigations of Senior Government Employees	17
5(a)(20)	Instances of Whistleblower Retaliation	17
5(a)(21)	Interference with OIG Independence	17
5(a)(22)	Closed OIG Matters Not Publicly Disclosed	18

^{*}Reference Completed Works, page 2 and Table 3-A, page 9.

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. There were no existing and proposed legislation and regulations relating to the Commission's programs and operations.

SECTION 5(A)(1) AND 5(A)(2): SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS, ABUSES, AND DEFICIENCIES, AND RESULTING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION

These sections requires 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.

SECTIONS 5(A)(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. We have no prior significant unimplemented recommendations.

SECTION 5(A)(4): MATTERS REFERRED TO PROSECUTORIAL AUTHORITIES

This section requires a summary of matters referred to prosecutorial authorities and the resulting prosecutions and convictions. There were no matters referred to prosecutorial authorities.

SECTION 5(A)(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(A)(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. There are currently 5 reports, with 10 unimplemented recommendations, that do not have any associated potential cost savings (see Table 4).

SECTION 5(A)(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 are no appeals pending at the end of this period.

SECTION 5(A)(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 OIG disagreed.

SECTION 5(A)(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, they are 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(A)(14) AND 5(A)(15): RESULTS OF PEER REVIEW RECEIVED BY OIG

These sections require an appendix containing the results of any peer review conducted by another OIG during the reporting period and a list of outstanding recommendations. As of this reporting period, the Denali Commission OIG has not been peer reviewed and there are no outstanding recommendations.

SECTION 5(A)(16): RESULTS OF PEER REVIEW CONDUCTED BY OIG

This section requires a list of any peer reviews conducted by the Inspector General of another OIG during the reporting period, including a list of any outstanding recommendations made from any previous peer reviews. The previous Inspector General did not conduct any peer reviews during the reporting period.

SECTION 5(A)(17) AND 5(A)(18): INVESTIGATIONS, CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS, AND CRIMINAL INDICTIMENTS & METRICS USED TO DEVELOP STATISTICAL DATA OF INVESTIGATIONS, CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS, AND CRIMINAL INDICTMENTS

This section requires 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(A)(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 were no investigations involving senior government employees.

SECTION 5(A)(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(A)(21): INTERFERENCE WITH OIG INDEPENDENCE

This section requires a detailed description of any attempt by the Commission to interfere with the independence of OIG, 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(A)(22): CLOSED OIG 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 the OIG involving a senior government employee that is closed and was not disclosed to the public. There were no instances of inspections, evaluations, and audits or investigations involving senior government employees that were not disclosed to the public.

REPORT







www.oig.doc.gov | 800-424-5197

The Department of Commerce Office of Inspector General investigates hotline complaints related to the Denali Commission.

