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INTRODUCTION

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is an independent regulatory agency exercising authority delegated to it by Congress under the Communications Act of 1934 as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The FCC is charged with regulating interstate and international communications by radio, television, wire, satellite and cable. The FCC’s jurisdiction covers the fifty states, the District of Columbia, and U.S. possessions. The mandate of the FCC under the Communications Act is to make available to all people of the United States a rapid, efficient, nationwide, and worldwide wire and radio communication service. The FCC performs four major functions to fulfill this charge:

- Spectrum allocation;
- Creating rules to promote fair competition and protect consumers where required by market conditions;
- Authorization of service; and
- Enforcement.

The Chairman and four Commissioners are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Michael Powell was designated as Chairman on January 22, 2001. Harold W. Furchtgott-Roth, Gloria Tristani and Susan P. Ness serve as Commissioners. One seat is vacant. The majority of FCC employees are located in Washington, D.C. FCC field offices and resident agents are located throughout the United States. FCC headquarters staff are now housed in entirety in the Portals II building located at 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

The OIG has dedicated itself to assisting the Commission as it continues to improve its efficiency and effectiveness. The Inspector General (IG) H. Walker Feaster III, reports directly to the Chairman. The OIG staff consists of eight professionals with Assistant IG’s serving in the areas of Audits, Thomas D. Bennett; Investigations, Charles J. Willoughby; and Policy & Planning, Thomas M. Holleran. Mr. Willoughby also serves as counsel.

This semiannual report includes the major accomplishments and general activities of the OIG during the period October 1, 2000 through March 31, 2001.
INVESTIGATIONS

Investigative matters pursued by this office are generally initiated as a result of allegations received through the OIG Hot Line or from FCC managers and employees who contact the OIG directly. Investigations may also be predicated upon audit or inspection findings of fraud, waste, abuse, corruption, or mismanagement by FCC employees, contractors, and/or subcontractors. Upon receipt of an allegation of an administrative or criminal violation the OIG usually conducts a preliminary inquiry to determine if an investigation is warranted. Investigations may involve possible violations of regulations regarding employee responsibilities and conduct, federal criminal law, and other regulations and statutes pertaining to the activities of the Commission. Investigative findings may lead to criminal or civil prosecution, or administrative action.

The OIG also receives complaints from the general public, both private citizens and commercial enterprises, about the manner in which the FCC executes its programs and oversight responsibilities. All complaints are examined to determine whether there is any basis for OIG audit or investigative action.

If nothing within the jurisdiction of the OIG is alleged, the complaint is usually referred to the appropriate FCC bureau or office for response directly to the complainant. A copy of the response is also provided to the OIG. Finally, matters may be referred to this office for investigative action from other governmental entities, such as the General Accounting Office, the Office of Special Counsel or congressional offices.

ACTIVITY

Nine cases were pending from the prior period. An additional eight complaints were received during the reporting period. Over the last six months twelve cases have been closed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Pending, September 30, 2000</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Cases</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Closed</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Pending, March 31, 2001</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of those cases closed, one resulted in disciplinary action being taken against an employee and one was referred to management for action.

SIGNIFICANT CASES

- **The OIG initiated four investigations into the release of nonpublic documents or information to members of the media with respect to matters pending before the Commission.** The matters in question pertained to the Commission’s consideration of the AT&T/Time Warner merger, the GTE/Bell Atlantic merger, the open access issue and the AOL/Time Warner merger. Although one member of the press who wrote articles on the matters in question, indicated that he had possession of at least two documents which contained nonpublic information, the OIG was unable to conclusively determine who within the Commission released the information in question either verbally or in document form. Also, the OIG was unable to determine if the reporter, who claimed to have the actual documents, did in fact have the documents. However, in the course of the investigation, the OIG did discover an instance where nonpublic information was improperly shared with someone outside the Commission. The OIG found no evidence that this information was shared with members of the media. Disciplinary action was taken against the employee who shared the information and the matter has been closed.

- **The OIG initiated an investigation into allegations of employees conspiring to falsify official records in the performance of official duties.** While the office determined that there was a lack of uniformity with respect to record keeping and the use of time during slow periods, the office found no evidence of employee misconduct. Management was notified of the OIG’s finding and the matter has been closed.

- **The OIG conducted an inquiry into allegations that Commission employees improperly refused to furnish a prospective licensee with public information.** The office determined that the information in question was available on the Commission’s web site, which was accessible to the public, and found no evidence of employee misconduct. Accordingly, the OIG concluded that the matter did not merit further action and was
• The OIG initiated an inquiry into allegations that a member of the public’s Freedom of Information (FOIA) request had been improperly denied. The OIG determined that while there may have been personality differences with the requestor, no evidence of employee misconduct was found. The matter has been closed.

• Pursuant to a referral from the General Accounting Office (GAO), the OIG initiated an inquiry into alleged fraud in the Universal Services program of the Commission in California. It was alleged that several parties had conspired to defraud funds of the program. Through investigation, it was determined that the parties’ application was denied on grounds unrelated to the fraud allegations. The application was denied due to the parties’ failure to meet the funding requirements under the program. Consequently, the OIG found insufficient evidence of fraud and the matter has been closed.

• During the reporting period, the OIG initiated two inquiries into allegations of employee misconduct in the rendering of administrative decisions by the Commission. The OIG determined that the allegations related to policy and more particularly to the merits of the decisions. Accordingly, no evidence of employee misconduct was found and the matters were closed.

• The OIG continues to investigate allegations of possible fraud by contractors within the Universal Services program of the Commission in Georgia.

• During the reporting period, the OIG initiated two additional investigations with regard to the Universal Services program. The investigations pertain to allegations of improprieties in the Alabama and California programs. The investigations are currently pending.
HOTLINE CALLS

During the reporting period, the OIG Hotline Technician received 104 hotline calls to the published hotline numbers of (202)418-0473 and toll free (888)863-2244. The OIG Hotline continues to be a vehicle by which Commission employees and parties external to the FCC can contact the OIG.

Callers who have general questions or concerns not specifically related to the missions or functions of the OIG office are referred to the FCC Consumer Center (NCC) at (888) 225-5322. Examples of calls referred to the NCC include complaints pertaining to customers’ phone service and local cable providers, long-distance carrier slamming, interference, or similar matters within the program responsibility of other FCC bureaus and offices.
LEGISLATION

Overview

Pursuant to section 4(a)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (IG Act), as amended, our office monitors and reviews existing and proposed legislative and regulatory items for their impact on the Office of the Inspector General and the Federal Communications Commission programs and operations. Specifically, we perform this activity to evaluate their potential for encouraging economy and efficiency and preventing fraud, waste, and mismanagement.

Activity During This Period

The Counsel to the IG continued to monitor legislative action affecting the activities of the OIG and the FCC.

During this period, this office continued to monitor those legislative proposals which directly or indirectly impact on the ability of Designated Federal Entity IG’s to function independently and objectively. Those specific proposals concerned proposals to consolidate OIG’s and to directly or indirectly draw distinctions between presidentially-appointed IG’s and Designated Federal Entity IG’s, which may have the effect of undermining the role of the latter.
AUDITS

The office has responsibility for reviewing FCC programs and making recommendations to enhance their effectiveness and improve their efficiency. This activity includes such diverse areas as financial statements audits required by the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 (CFO Act); audits of agency compliance with laws and regulations; contract audits; and performance audits of FCC programs.

In this reporting period, as part of our ongoing effort to improve the Commission’s procurement process and ensure the timely delivery of goods and services by Commission contractors, we also initiated a series of labor charging and timekeeping practices reviews.

REPORTS ISSUED

FCC Collection System
Nov. 6, 2000
Report No. 00-AUD-07-47

The objectives of this special review were to: examine the status of the FCC’s resolution of the findings detailed in the original Special Review of the Collection System (Sept 25, 1998, Report No. 97-21); evaluate the level of expenditure required to maintain the existing Collection System; and evaluate the FCC’s selection of the product RAMIS and the detailed implementation plan.

Based on our review, it was determined that:

- Several findings from the previous review had not been resolved to completion or the supporting documentation provided was not sufficient to allow the team to agree with closure of the finding. Only (15) of the (47) high and medium risks originally cited have been adequately resolved.
- The expenditure levels for maintenance and support of the existing Collection System did not decrease during the period under review, and, in fact, appear to have increased since the completion of the original review.
- There appears to be a satisfactory process for the identification and selection of RAMIS to replace the current Collection System.

The Office of the Managing Director (OMD) did not agree with the status of eight of the original findings. OMD also provided information that indicates that the expenditure levels for maintenance and support did not agree with the status of
eight of the original findings. OMD also provided information that indicates that the expenditure levels for maintenance and support of the existing Collection System had decreased from fiscal year 1999 to fiscal year 2000.

OIG will continue to monitor the status of our original review findings and will incorporate steps in our audit of the fiscal year 2000 financial statements to assess the effectiveness of the corrective actions in addressing deficiencies identified.

MITRE Corporation Proposal for the “Support of the FCC Common Carrier Bureau.”
Dec. 12, 2000
Report No. 01-AUD-03-07

The objective of this audit was to determine if proposed costs in MITRE’s Cost Plus Fixed Fee revised proposal were acceptable as a basis to negotiate a fair and reasonable contract price.

After evaluating the proposed costs we determined that the proposal was acceptable as a basis for negotiation of a fair and reasonable price.

Web Page Accessibility
Jan. 19, 2001
Report No. 00-AUD-10-55

The objective of this special review was to determine whether Commission web sites are accessible to disabled users. We sought to determine if the Commission would be able to comply with federal standards related to web accessibility when they become effective next year.

As a result of our review and testing over three hundred (300) FCC Internet pages, we found accessibility issues in thirty-one (31) web pages. In our opinion, the Commission has a proactive and effective web accessibility program supported by the Disabilities Rights Office within the Consumer Information Bureau (CIB), the Office of Media Relations (OMR), and the Information Technology Center (ITC).

The Chief, CIB, the Director, OMR, and the Managing Director all concurred with our findings. They stated that “OMR and the ITC will ask the developers responsible for the identified pages to review and fix the accessibility problems within ninety days, or submit a work plan and time table by February 1, 2001 for revising the pages.”
The objective of this review was to evaluate the labor charging and timekeeping practices of the contractor. Based on an unannounced floor check of the contractors’ employees, an analysis of selected timesheets, and interviews of selected employees, five timekeeping deficiencies were noted as follows:

- Timesheets were completed and/or signed in advance,
- Timesheets were prepared in pencil rather than in ink,
- There were unauthorized overtime charges and hours worked were improperly recorded,
- Improper corrections of hours worked were made, and
- Employees did not possess the same written timekeeping policies and procedures.

The contractor concurred in three of the five deficiencies noted, objecting to the ones dealing with consistent timekeeping policies and procedures, and unauthorized overtime. The OIG will follow up on the timekeeping practices issue. We will also be initiating an audit of the billings under this contract to address the noncompliance and potential erroneous labor charging issue.

The objective of this review was to evaluate the labor charging practices of the contractor. Based on an unannounced floor check of the contractor’s employees, an analysis of selected timesheets, and interviews of selected employees, three timekeeping deficiencies were noted as follows:

- Timesheets were signed in advance,
- Timesheets were not kept current, and
- Two GCI employees were not provided written timekeeping policies and procedures.

Because the contractor was replaced at the beginning of FY 2001 the findings were not forwarded to GSI for comment.
The objective of this review was to determine if contractor employees were actually at work, that they were performing in their assigned job classifications, and that their time was charged to the appropriate jobs. Based on unannounced floor checks five deficiencies in the contractor’s timekeeping system were noted as follows:

- Timesheets were not signed at the end of the work week,
- There was an error correction with no explanation,
- One employee failed to record hours worked,
- Two employees worked through lunch without taking a lunch break in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and
- One employee failed to record their time in military hours in violation of company procedures.

The contractor concurred in all findings and stated their belief that they can readily comply with all recommendations.

Ernst & Young, LLP  
February 8, 2001  
Report No. 01-AUD-05-15

The objective of this review was to evaluate the labor charging and timekeeping practices of the contractor.

Based on an unannounced floor check of the contractor’s employees, an analysis of selected timesheets, and interviews of selected employees, one instance of an employee failing to complete his timesheet through the previous day was discovered.

The contractor concurred in the finding and stated that they intend to instruct their employees and subcontractors to record time charges at the end of each day or the beginning of the next day.

Computech, Inc.  
February 27, 2001  
Report No. 01-AUD-05-14

The objective of this review was to evaluate the labor charging and timekeeping practices of the contractor.

Based on an unannounced floor check of the contractor’s employees, an analysis of selected timesheets, and interviews of selected employees, three timekeeping deficiencies were noted as follows:

- Hours were not recorded on timesheets correctly,
- Timesheets were not completed through the previous day, and
- A timesheet correction was not properly initialed by the employee.
The contractor agreed with most of the time reporting findings and emphasized their commitment to accurate and timely labor recording practices. However, they disagreed with the findings regarding timesheets that had no hours recorded for three specific days. OIG found their argument without merit. The report has been forwarded to the Contracting Officer for resolution.

**Computech, Inc.**  
December 12, 2000  
Report No. 00-AUD-12-63

The objective of this audit was to determine the acceptability of Computech’s claim as a basis for settlement. It was initiated in response to a request from the Contracts and Purchasing Center to examine the contractor’s claim for recovery of costs resulting from government caused delays.

Upon examination of the pertinent timesheets and other documentation, the OIG opined that the contractor’s claim was unacceptable for settlement because the contractor failed to provide adequate documentation to support this claim. The contracting officer has not rendered a final decision on this matter as of this report date.

**Frye-Williams & Company**  
January 26, 2001  
Report No. 01-AUD-01-03

The objective of this review was to determine the extent of unauthorized overtime being charged to the FCC during a one month period in the year 2000.

Upon examination of the pertinent timekeeping records, timekeeping policies and procedures, and other documentation, we verified that the contractor worked 46.5 overtime hours without approval. The value of the unauthorized overtime was $1,201.00. The contractor does not concur with this finding. The Contracting Officer has not made a final decision on this matter as of this report date.

**Telecordia Technologies, Inc.**  
February 26, 2001  
Report No. 01-AUD-05-17

The objective of this review was to evaluate the direct labor rates, indirect rates, subcontractor costs and other direct costs contained in the contractor’s competitive proposal.

We have completed our “agreed-upon procedures” cost realism review of the bidder’s proposal. Since source selection has not been completed as of this report date, no further comment will be made regarding the results of our review.
The objective of this review was to evaluate the direct labor rates, indirect rates, subcontractor costs and other direct costs contained in the contractor’s competitive proposal.

We completed an “agreed-upon procedures” cost realism review of the bidders proposal. Since source selection has not been completed as of this report date, no further comment will be made regarding the results of our review.
SURVEYS

As part of our ongoing effort to test new and high risk areas to determine whether or not additional audit work needs to be performed, we conducted a number of surveys.

Wireless Telecommunications Bureau’s Universal Licensing System (ULS)  
July 25, 2000

The objectives of this survey were to obtain information about the ULS development project; evaluate project documentation to identify weaknesses or inefficiencies; and determine the nature and extent of any subsequent review work.

We concluded that OIG should not perform any additional work on the ULS system because we felt that an audit would just reiterate the findings of the survey. As a result, we have concluded that we should focus on two specific areas in the future: Information Systems Strategic Planning and Electronic Filing.

Mass Media Bureau’s Multipoint Distribution System, Instructional TV, Fixed Services (MDS/ITFS) System  
December 14, 2000

The objectives of this survey were to obtain information about the MDS/ITFS development project; evaluate project documentation to assess whether the Bureau developed and implemented the system in an economic and efficient manner; and determine the nature and extent of any subsequent review work.

As a result of our survey work, we found that the MDS/ITFS represents a measurable improvement over the largely manual systems it replaced. However, we did identify cost increases that resulted from delays and disruptions in the Bureau’s development and implementation of MDS/ITFS.

We determined that additional audit work would not be an efficient use of limited audit resources. We believe that the Commission’s recent adoption of a Commission-wide Systems Development Life Cycle will address the causal factors that contributed to the problems with the MDS/ITFS
The objectives of this survey were to develop a computer-assisted audit technique using advanced audit software; search for indicators of questionable or unusual disbursement attributes with this advanced audit software; and examine any disbursement that displays any indicator of questionable or unusual activities.

As a result of our survey work, we were able to explain to our satisfaction the anomalies we found.

We conclude that we should not perform any additional work on the disbursements data for the fourth quarter of FY 1999 or the first three quarters of FY 2000. We do believe that we should continue this program by instituting a recurring system that would obtain disbursements data, analyze it using the tested techniques, identify exceptions, and research, reconcile and verify each anomaly. We also believe that this periodic review should be streamlined and further automated.
ONGOING ACTIVITY

Special Review of Internet Privacy and Web Cookies

The objectives of this Special Review are to evaluate Commission practices related to Internet Privacy and Web Cookies and to provide a report to Congress on these practices.

A draft report was submitted to the FCC’s Chief Information Officer on March 23, 2001 for review and comment.

Audit of Web Presence Security

The objective of this audit is to measure how successful the Commission has been in securing its web portals.

Financial Statement Audit

The overall audit objective is to provide an opinion on the FY2000 financial statements which is part of our continuing effort to support management efforts to bring the FCC’s financial accounting and reporting system into compliance with applicable accounting principles and standards, federal laws and regulations, and policy guidance.

A draft report was submitted to the Managing Director and the Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau for review and comment on March 28, 2001.
TECHNICAL ADVICE and ASSISTANCE

During the six-month reporting period covered by this report, OIG management and staff have continued to dedicate resources toward assisting the agency in areas in which our expertise can provide benefit. For example, OIG personnel have participated in the following projects:

Financial Management Advisory Services

The OIG provided advisory and assistance service to the Commission as it continues the task of realigning its financial management functions to implement CFO Act financial reporting.

OIG staff continued to provide extensive assistance to the CFO staff as it prepared to expand financial reporting to include all principal statements for FY 2000.

- As the Commission moves in lockstep with the U.S. Treasury on its pay.gov electronic payment initiative the OIG staff provided advice in the form of comments on the “concept of operations” paper as well as the draft “Agency Participation Agreement.”

- The OIG was represented on Commissioner Powell’s Commission-wide task force on the management of non-public information. The end product of the task force was a proposed directive tightening the management and controls of such information.

Systems Development Life Cycle

Over the past two years, our auditors have worked closely with Commission representatives from the Information Technology Center (ITC) and Commission Bureaus and Offices to develop a Systems Development Life Cycle (SDLC). The SDLC is a methodology designed to assist project managers direct and supervise the development lifecycle for computer applications. It was implemented the last quarter of calendar year 2000.

Auditors participated with representatives from the ITC to prepare the final version of the SDLC, compose a user guide, and develop both a training program and web page for the project.
As part of the SDLC process, the OIG is participating in the development of new and updated information systems. These include the Consumer Information Management System (CIMS), the Intelligent Gateway proposal, and an International Bureau Electronic Filing System (IBFS) maintenance project.

**Inventory Capitalization Revision**

At the request of Administrative Operations personnel, the OIG participated in a series of meetings regarding the feasibility of changing the FCC’s capitalization threshold for selected items. Under the change, approximately 12,000 traceable items at FCC headquarters would be excluded from current policy. Management’s ability to adjust accountability thresholds is a necessary and common function of property management. We expect the issue to be resolved during the next reporting period.

**Procurement Advisory Services**

In the OIG’s efforts to provide comprehensive contract audit services to the FCC’s Contracts and Purchasing Center, the OIG also advises the Commission’s contracting officers (COs) on contract and contractor financial and performance matters that do not require contract audits. OIG contract auditors performed the following contract advisory services during this reporting period:

Advised the CO on a potential contractor’s claim of “monetary exemption” from Cost Accounting System (CAS) requirements. Advised that the contractor was CAS exempt because they are participating in a competitive procurement. However, the contractor’s cost accounting system still must be adequate to support claims to the government on government contracts.

This advice resulted in the contractor changing his accounting system to comply with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) cost accounting requirements.

OIG auditors continued to provide technical input and assistance to the Deputy Associate Managing Director—Administrative
Operations and Office of General Counsel in addressing a contract dispute between a contractor and the FCC that was being litigated before the GSA Board of Contract Appeals (GSBCA).

The contractor disputed the FCC’s determination denying the contractor’s approximate $288,000 cost claim and filed an appeal with the GSBCA for recovery.

During this reporting period, the GSBCA dismissed the case because the parties agreed to participate in an alternative dispute resolution (ADR) proceeding which resulted in a $130,000 settlement with the contractor.
SPECIFIC REPORTING REQUIREMENTS of the INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT

The following summarizes the Office of Inspector General response to the twelve specific reporting requirements set forth in Section 5(a) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended.

1. A description of significant problems, abuses, and deficiencies relating to the administration of programs and operations of such establishment disclosed by such activities during the reporting period.

No such problems, abuses or deficiencies were disclosed during the reporting period.

2. A description of the recommendations for corrective action made by the Office during the reporting period with respect to significant problems, abuses, or deficiencies identified pursuant to paragraph (1).

No recommendations were made. See the response to paragraph (1).

3. An identification of each significant recommendation described in previous semiannual reports on which corrective has not been completed.

No significant recommendations remain outstanding.

4. A summary of matters referred to prosecutive authorities and the prosecutions and convictions which have resulted.

One case associated with the Commission’s Universal Services program has been referred to the Department of Justice.

5. A summary of each report made to the head of the establishment under section (6)(b)(2) during the reporting period.

No report was made to the Chairman of the FCC under section (6)(b)(2) during the reporting period.
6. A listing, subdivided according to subject matter, of each audit report issued by the Office during the reporting period, and for each audit report, where applicable, the total dollar value of questioned costs (including a separate category for the dollar value of unsupported costs) and the dollar value of recommendations that funds be put to better use.

Each audit report issued during the reporting period is listed according to subject matter and described in part II, above.

7. A summary of each particularly significant report.

Each significant audit and investigative report issued during the reporting period is summarized within the body of this report.

8. Statistical tables showing the total number of audit reports with questioned costs and the total dollar value of questioned costs.

The required statistical table can be found at Attachment A to this report.

9. Statistical tables showing the total number of audit reports with recommendations that funds be put to better use and the total dollar value of such recommendations.

10. A summary of each audit report issued before the commencement of the reporting period for which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period (including the date and title of each such report), an explanation of the reasons such management decision has not been made, and a statement concerning the desired timetable for achieving a management decision on each such report.

No audit reports fall within this category.

11. A description and explanation of the reasons for any significant revised management decision made during the reporting period.

No management decisions fall within this category.

12. Information concerning any significant management decision with which the Inspector general is in disagreement.

No management decisions fall within this category.
## Table I. OIG Audit Reports With Questioned Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspector General Reports With Questioned Costs</th>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
<th>Questioned Costs</th>
<th>Unsupported Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$265,180</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Which were issued during the reporting period.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,064,276</td>
<td>$253,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals (A+B)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,329,456</td>
<td>$253,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Dollar value of disallowed costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$135,180</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Dollar value of costs allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,064,276</td>
<td>$253,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports for which no management decision was made within six months of issuance.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II. OIG Audit Reports With Recommendations That Funds Be Put To Better Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspector General Reports With Recommendations That Funds Be Put To Better Use</th>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
<th>Dollar Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. For which no management decision has been made by the commence of the reporting period.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Which were issued during the reporting period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals (A+B)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Dollar value of recommendations that were agreed to by management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Based on proposed management action.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Based on proposed legislative action.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Dollar value of recommendations that were not agreed to by management.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For which no management decision was made within six months of issuance,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report Fraud, Waste or Abuse to:

Office of the Inspector General
Federal Communications Commission

CALL

Hotline: 202/418-0473
or
http://www.fcc.gov/oig/

You are always welcome to write or visit.

Federal Communications Commission
Portals II Building
445 12th St., S.W.—Room #2-C762
Washington, D.C.  20554