# Fiscal Year 2017 President's Budget Office of Inspector General (OIG)



February 2016



Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide Summary (\$ in thousands)
Budget Activity (BA) 01: Office of Inspector General (OIG)

	FY 2015	Price	Program	FY 2016	Price	Program	FY 2017
	Actual	Change	Change	Enacted	Change	Change	<u>Estimate</u>
OIG	309,257	3,720	-418	312,559	4,553	4,923	322,035

<sup>\*</sup> The FY 2015 Actual column includes \$6,252 thousand of FY 2015 Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) Appropriations funding (PL 113-235).

- I. <u>Description of Operations Financed</u>: The Department of Defense Office of Inspector General (DoD OIG) is the principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense (SecDef) for matters relating to the prevention and detection of fraud, waste, and abuse in Department of Defense (DoD) programs and operations. The DoD OIG audits, investigates, inspects, and evaluates the programs and operations of the (DoD) and, as a result, recommends policy and process improvements that promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in DoD programs and operations. The DoD OIG carries out its duties, mission, and responsibilities through the activities of seven Components: Audit, Criminal Investigations, Administrative Investigations, Policy and Oversight, Intelligence and Special Program Assessments, Special Plans and Operations, and Mission Support. These components:
- 1) Conduct independent, relevant, and timely audits that promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness with sound actionable recommendations that when effectively implemented improve the Department's programs, operations, and stewardship of its resources.
- 2) Conduct highly relevant, objective, and professional investigations of matters critical to DoD property, programs, and operations that provide for our national security with emphasis on life, safety, and readiness.

<sup>\*</sup> The FY 2016 Enacted column excludes \$10,262 thousand of FY 2016 OCO Appropriations funding (PL 114-113).

<sup>\*</sup> The FY 2017 Estimate excludes \$22,062 thousand of requested FY 2017 OCO funding.

#### I. Description of Operations Financed (cont.)

- 3) Promote public confidence in the integrity and accountability of DoD leadership by investigating allegations of misconduct by senior DoD officials and whistleblower reprisal, and by providing a confidential, reliable DoD Hotline for reporting fraud, waste, and abuse, and detecting and/or preventing threats and danger to the public health and safety of the DoD.
- 4) Provide proactive policy, oversight, and technical assessments that are timely and relevant to the DoD, Congress, and the American Public.
- 5) Provide oversight across the full spectrum of programs, policies, procedures, and functions of the Intelligence, Counterintelligence, Security, and Nuclear enterprises, and Special Access Programs (SAPs) within the DoD.
- 6) Provide assessment oversight that addresses priority national security objectives to facilitate informed and timely decision making by senior leaders of the DOD and the U.S. Congress

The aggregate budget request for the operations of the DoD OIG is \$331.0 million: \$318.9 million O&M, \$3.1 million RDT&E, and \$9.0 million Reimbursable Authority. The portion of O&M funding needed for DoD OIG training is \$3.5 million, and the amount needed to support the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) is \$927 thousand.

#### I. Description of Operations Financed (cont.)

<u>Auditing</u>: The Office of Deputy Inspector General for Auditing (AUD) conducts independent and objective audits of all facets of DoD operations and provides oversight of key DoD operations and initiatives. AUD focuses its oversight efforts on rebalancing the joint force; controlling internal cost growth; addressing critical life and safety issues; improving operations and financial accountability; strengthening internal controls; identifying fraud, waste, and abuse; ensuring compliance with statutes and regulations; improving national security; and identifying potential monetary benefits.

AUD is composed of four directorates: Acquisition, Parts, and Inventory (API); Contract Management and Payments (CMP); Readiness and Cyber Operations (RCO); and Financial Management and Reporting (FMR). Some audits are required by law. Other audits are requested by the SecDef, other DoD leaders, and Congressional staff. Audits also result from Defense Hotline allegations and DoD OIG risk analyses of various DoD programs. Audit topics include contract management, services contracts, improper payments, contractor overhead costs, major weapons systems acquisitions, financial management and audit readiness efforts, business systems modernization, cyber security, cyber operations, health care, and joint warfighting and readiness.

• API audits focus on weapons system and information technology acquisition, spare parts procurement and pricing, and management of Government-owned inventory. These audits assess best value, fair and reasonable cost, and the adequacy of program planning and execution. API also determines whether the DoD provides adequate program management during the acquisition process for major and non-major weapon and information technology systems.

#### I. Description of Operations Financed (cont.)

- CMP audits focus on contract award and administration, Government Purchase Cards (GPCs), improper payments, transportation payments, contract payments, health care payments, and construction and sustainment.
- RCO audits address key areas of the Defense Critical Infrastructure Program, cyber operations, global logistics, force management, and readiness and issues that span all combatant commands to ensure the warfighter is well equipped and trained for the mission.
- FMR audits focus on key finance and accounting systems and their related financial management operations, including DoD's audit readiness efforts regarding financial statement audits. FMR conducts some of the Department's financial statement audits and contracts with independent public accounting firms to audit other DoD financial statements.

#### I. <u>Description of Operations Financed (cont.)</u>

<u>Investigations</u>: The Office of the Deputy Inspector General for Investigations (INV) includes the Defense Criminal Investigative Service (DCIS). DCIS primarily focuses on fraud (e.g. procurement and acquisition; defective, substituted, and counterfeit products); public corruption (e.g. bribery, kickbacks, and theft); technology protection (e.g. illegal transfer, theft, or diversion of DoD technologies and U.S. Munitions List items to forbidden nations and persons); healthcare; and cybercrimes.

Procurement fraud investigations continue to comprise a major part of the DCIS case inventory. Of all forms of white-collar crime, procurement fraud is probably the least visible, yet the most costly. Procurement fraud includes, but is not limited to, cost or labor mischarging, defective pricing, price fixing, bid rigging, and defective and counterfeit parts. Because this crime threatens DoD's ability to achieve its operational objectives, DCIS focuses its investigations on safety and operational readiness in order to protect the welfare of warfighters throughout the procurement process.

DCIS is an active member of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) and task forces such as the Department of Justice National Procurement Fraud Task Force (created to promote the prevention, early detection, and prosecution of procurement fraud) and the International Contract Corruption Task Force (created to deploy criminal investigative and intelligence assets worldwide to detect, investigate, and prosecute corruption and contract fraud resulting primarily from Overseas Contingency Operations).

Corruption by public officials threatens the country's national security and overall safety and undermines public trust in the Government. Public corruption also wastes billions of tax dollars and negatively affects DoD and the warfighter. DCIS combats public corruption through undercover operations, court-authorized electronic

#### I. Description of Operations Financed (cont.)

surveillance, and forensic investigations. Using these tools, DCIS pursues those who undermine the integrity of DoD acquisition system.

DCIS also supports the DoD and its warfighting mission through timely and comprehensive investigations of counterfeit, defective or substandard products, and substituted products that do not conform to the requirements of the contract. Nonconforming products affect readiness, waste economic resources, and threaten the safety of military and Government personnel. Substituted products can significantly affect mission critical processes and capabilities until those products are removed from the DoD supply chain. DCIS works with Federal law enforcement partners, supply centers, and the defense industrial base to ensure that DoD contractors provide the correct parts and components to meet DoD requirements. DCIS actively participates in the Defense Supply Center, Columbus Counterfeit Material/Unauthorized Products Substitution Team and partners at the national level with the Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center to prevent the proliferation of counterfeit parts.

DCIS also investigates the theft and illegal export or diversion of strategic technologies and U.S. Munitions List items to banned nations, criminal enterprises, and terrorist organizations. This includes the illegal transfer or theft of defense technology, weapon systems, and other sensitive components and programs. In this capacity, DCIS is an integral participant in the President's Export Control Reform Initiative and a member of the Export Enforcement Coordination Center, a multiagency center established to coordinate and enhance Government export enforcement efforts.

Part of DCIS' criminal investigative effort includes undercover operations. These undercover operations target crimes with significant impact on the DoD's warfighting capabilities, which include the theft of critical technology, unlawful access to

#### I. Description of Operations Financed (cont.)

sensitive computer networks, and the substitution of counterfeit, substandard or defective material used in major DoD weapons systems. Undercover operations have proven to be very productive in addressing these types of crimes and directly supporting DoD's efforts to maintain a technological edge over its adversaries and the Global Information Grid.

The rising costs associated with health care continue to be a national concern. Allegations of health care fraud continue to rise and combatting this crime is one of DCIS' top investigative priorities. Of particular concern are allegations of potential harm to DoD military members and their dependents. Investigations also focus on health care providers participating in corruption or kickback schemes, overcharging for medical goods and services, marketing drugs for uses not approved by the Food and Drug Administration, and approving unauthorized individuals to receive TRICARE health care benefits.

#### I. Description of Operations Financed (cont.)

Administrative Investigations: The Office of the Deputy Inspector General for Administrative Investigations (AI) investigates and performs oversight reviews of investigations conducted by the Service Inspectors General into allegations of senior official misconduct, whistleblower reprisal, improper mental health referrals, and restriction of military members from contacting an Inspector General or member of Congress. AI also provides a confidential and reliable DoD Hotline for reporting allegations of fraud, waste, and abuse and detecting and/or preventing threats and dangers to the public health and safety of the Department. AI is comprised of three directorates: Whistleblower Reprisal Investigations (WRI), Investigations of Senior Officials (ISO), and the DoD Hotline.

The WRI Directorate is responsible for the DoD Whistleblower Protection Program which encourages personnel to report fraud, waste, and abuse to appropriate authorities. WRI also addresses complaints of reprisal and recommends remedies for whistleblowers who encounter reprisal, in a manner consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

WRI has statutory responsibility to investigate complaints of reprisal for making disclosures protected by three Federal Statutes under Title 10 of the United States Code: 1) 10 U.S.C. 1034 for members of the Armed Services, 2) 10 U.S.C. 1587 for DoD non-appropriated fund employees, 3) 10 U.S.C. 2409 for DoD contractor employees. Further, WRI is responsible under Presidential Policy Directive 19: Protecting Whistleblowers with Access to Classified Information, for investigating complaints filed under Parts A and B or reviews and approves the results of investigations by specific DoD components.

In addition, WRI also has authority to protect appropriated fund whistleblowers consistent with provisions under 5 U.S.C. 2302, which identifies reprisal as a prohibited

#### I. Description of Operations Financed (cont.)

personnel practice. Although the Office of Special Counsel is the primary government agency protecting appropriated fund federal employees and applicants from prohibited personnel practices, including reprisal for whistleblowing, through WRI DoD OIG provides parallel, and sometimes crucially greater, protections to DoD civilian appropriated fund employees. Because members of the intelligence community cannot avail themselves of OSC and Merit Systems Protection Board protection, WRI has been the only recourse for members of the Defense intelligence community who believe they have been retaliated against, especially if retaliation takes the form of suspension, revocation, or denial of security clearances.

The ISO Directorate has the primary mission of investigating and performing oversight reviews of investigations conducted by the Service IGs into allegations of misconduct against general officers, flag officers, members of the Senior Executive Service, and Presidential Appointees. ISO evaluates the impact of these investigations on public confidence in DoD leaders and ultimately on national security. ISO investigations involve allegations of ethics violations, conflicts of interest on the part of senior DoD officials, misuse of position and resources, mismanagement of major Defense programs, and travel or contracting irregularities.

Additionally, as part of its responsibility to fully inform the President and Senate of adverse information concerning senior officials being nominated for promotion, reassignment, or other action, the ISO Directorate conducts over 11,000 name checks annually on DoD senior officials. The Senate Armed Services Committee relies exclusively on name checks completed by ISO before confirming military officer promotions.

The DoD Hotline provides a confidential avenue for individuals to report allegations of wrongdoing pertaining to Department of Defense programs, personnel, and operations.

#### I. Description of Operations Financed (cont.)

Members of the public and Department of Defense employees (military members, civilian employees, and DoD contractor employees) may file a complaint with the DoD Hotline. The Director, DoD Hotline, serves as the DoD Whistleblower Ombudsman ensuring DoD employees are aware of whistleblower protections.

<u>Policy and Oversight</u>: The Office of the Deputy Inspector General for Policy and Oversight (P&O) provides policy, guidance, and oversight for the Department's audit and criminal investigative functions. P&O also provides analysis and comments on all proposed draft DoD policy issuances, conducts technical assessments of DoD programs, and provides engineering support for other DOD IG audits, investigations, and assessments.

• The Audit Policy and Oversight Directorate (APO) provides audit policy direction, guidance, and oversight for the ODIG-AUD, the Military Departments' audit organizations, the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), other Defense audit organizations, and for public accounting firms under the Single Audit Act. This oversight responsibility includes more than 8,200 DoD auditors in 21 DoD audit organizations and 22 single audit cognizant organizations. APO is also responsible for conducting and/or overseeing peer reviews of 19 DoD audit organizations. In addition, APO develops audit policy, evaluates program performance, and monitors actions taken by all components of the DoD in response to DCAA audits. APO also provides DoD-wide policy on performing inspections and evaluations. In this capacity, APO provides guidance for inspections and evaluations performed by the 17 Defense agencies, the Joint and Combatant commands, and the Military Departments. Further, APO is responsible for six DoD-wide policy documents which include directives, instructions,

#### I. Description of Operations Financed (cont.)

and one manual, along with six internal DoD OIG instructions, including policy on OIG Inspections and Evaluations.

- The Investigative Policy and Oversight Directorate (IPO) evaluates and develops policy for the DoD criminal investigative and law enforcement community (comprised of approximately 48,000 law enforcement and security personnel, including 4,000 special agents). IPO also manages the DoD Subpoena program and the DoD Contractor Disclosure program. The Contractor Disclosure program requires DoD contractors to notify the DoD IG when a Federal criminal law is violated or a violation of the False Claims Act occurs, including reporting electronic counterfeit parts. Over the past few years, IPO evaluated systemic processes including data collection and analysis to determine the effectiveness of management control systems related to sexual assault and other violent crime investigations. This includes reviewing sexual assault and other violent crime investigative policies and related programs, and determining compliance with Federal law, DoD, and Military Service investigative standards.
- The Technical Assessment Directorate (TAD) conducts expert, independent technical engineering assessments to improve defense system acquisitions, operations, and sustainment. Additionally, TAD provides a variety of engineering support functions for the DOD IG audit, investigative, and evaluation components and to other DoD organizations as needed.

#### I. Description of Operations Financed (cont.)

Intelligence and Special Program Assessments: The Office of the Deputy Inspector General for Intelligence and Special Program Assessments (ISPA) conducts evaluations, inspections, and administrative investigations, to include monitoring and reviewing various programs, policies, procedures, and functions of the Intelligence, Counterintelligence, Security, and Nuclear Enterprises and Special Access Programs (SAPs). The ISPA reviews and evaluates topics required by law and responds to requests from the Secretary of Defense (SecDef) and other DoD leadership, and Congressional staff. ISPA also conducts reviews and evaluations in response to Hotline allegations and internal analyses of risk in DoD Intelligence, Counterintelligence, Security, and Nuclear Enterprises. ISPA works closely with other Federal agency and organizational Inspectors General, such as the Central Intelligence Agency, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and the Department of Justice, coordinating and collaborating on projects to ensure proper operation, performance, and results for various national organizations within ISPA oversight purview.

The DIG-ISPA chairs the Defense Intelligence and Special Programs Oversight Committee (DISPOC) which promotes and improves information sharing among DoD Auditors and Inspectors General, seeks to avoid duplication, and ensures effective coordination and cooperation. ISPA also collaborates with the Office of the Director National Intelligence Inspector General's Intelligence Community Inspectors General Forum to enhance the collective partnerships of each of the group's members and to continue to foster increased collaboration, coordination, and information sharing.

<u>Special Plans and Operations</u>: The Office for Special Plans and Operations (SPO) provides timely, high-value assessment reports on a wide variety of national security challenges. SPO is staffed with a core combination of civilian and military personnel who frequently

#### I. Description of Operations Financed (cont.)

deploy to provide oversight of overseas contingency operations. SPO's work complements the efforts of the other DoD OIG components.

SPO's assessments focus on improving national security particularly with regard to ongoing contingency operations in support of the DoDIG's Lead IG statutory responsibilities (e.g. Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR), Operation Freedom Sentinel (OFS) and Operation United Assistance (OUA)); critical life and safety issues; improving DoD operational performance and strengthening its internal controls; identifying fraud, waste, and abuse; ensuring compliance with statutes and regulations; and identifying potential savings.

Assessment topics are determined by statutory requirements, Congressional requests, requests from the Secretary of Defense and other DoD leaders, including field commanders, Lead IG and self-identified high priority issues, and DoD IG Hotline allegations.

Assessment topics include:

- Training Advising and Assistance operations in OIR, OFS, and OUA;
- Security Assistance programs worldwide;
- Joint Warfighting and Readiness;
- Health and Safety of the DoD total force;
- Biological Safety and Security;
- Congressional requests, such as Rights of Chaplains and Service Members, Combatting Trafficking in Persons, Section 847;

#### I. Description of Operations Financed (cont.)

• Recurring Congressional requirements, such as the Federal Voting Assistance Program and the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

<u>Mission Support:</u> The Mission Support elements provides mission essential services to the Operational Components, both at the DoD OIG headquarters and at over 70 field offices located throughout the world. These support services include Financial Management, Human Capital Management, Equal Employment Opportunity, Office of General Counsel, Security Program Management, Logistics Management, Information Services, Strategic Planning, and Legislative Affairs and Communications.

#### II. Force Structure Summary:

N/A

#### III. Financial Summary (\$ in thousands)

Total

FY 2016 Congressional Action FY 2015 FY 2017 Budget Current A. BA Subactivities Actual Request Amount Appropriated Enacted Estimate Percent -1.3 1. Audit 75,963 78,497 -988 77,509 77,509 83,717 2. Investigations 80,109 80,057 2,469 3.1 82,526 82,526 81,166 3. Admin Investigations 16,735 17,641 566 3.2 18,207 18,207 18,471 4. Policy and Oversight 16,784 18,754 -583 -3.1 18,171 18,985 18,171 5. Intelligence 8,090 8,267 -30-0.4 8,237 8,237 8,199 210 2.6 8,272 6. Special Plans and 8,046 8,062 8,272 7,882 Operations 7. Mission Support 97,278 104,881 -5,244-5.099,637 99,637 103,615 8. OCO 6,252 0 n/a 0 0 0

-3,600

-1.1

312,559

312,559

322,035

316,159

309,257

<sup>\*</sup> The FY 2015 Actual column includes \$6,252 thousand of FY 2015 Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) Appropriations funding (PL 113-235)

<sup>\*</sup> The FY 2016 Enacted column excludes \$10,262 thousand of FY 2016 OCO Appropriations funding (PL 114-113).

<sup>\*</sup> The FY 2017 Estimate excludes \$22,062 thousand of requested FY 2017 OCO funding.

### III. Financial Summary (\$ in thousands)

	Change	Change
B. Reconciliation Summary	FY 2016/FY 2016	FY 2016/FY 2017
Baseline Funding	316,159	312,559
Congressional Adjustments (Distributed)		
Congressional Adjustments (Undistributed)		
Adjustments to Meet Congressional Intent	-3,600	
Congressional Adjustments (General Provisions)		
Subtotal Appropriated Amount	312,559	
Fact-of-Life Changes (2016 to 2016 Only)		
Subtotal Baseline Funding	312,559	
Supplemental	10,262	
Reprogrammings		
Price Changes		4,553
Functional Transfers		206
Program Changes		4,717
Current Estimate	322,821	322,035
Less: Wartime Supplemental	-10,262	
Normalized Current Estimate	312,559	

DoD OIG OP-5 Exhibit

### III. Financial Summary (\$ in thousands)

C. Reconciliation of Increases and Decreases FY 2016 President's Budget Request (Amended, if applicable) 1. Congressional Adjustments	Amount	Totals 316,159 -3,600
a. Distributed Adjustments b. Undistributed Adjustments		
c. Adjustments to Meet Congressional Intent		
1) Reduction in RDT&E previously approved for	-2,600	
development of EDOMIS system	2,000	
2) Reduction in Procurement - No identified requirements	-1,000	
d. General Provisions	,	
FY 2016 Appropriated Amount		312,559
2. War-Related and Disaster Supplemental Appropriations		10,262
a. OCO Supplemental Funding		
1) FY 2016 Supplemental Budget Request	10,262	
3. Fact-of-Life Changes		
FY 2016 Baseline Funding		322,821
4. Reprogrammings (Requiring 1415 Actions)		
Revised FY 2016 Estimate		322,821
5. Less: Item 2, War-Related and Disaster Supplemental		-10,262
Appropriations and Item 4, Reprogrammings		
FY 2016 Normalized Current Estimate		312,559
6. Price Change		4,553
7. Functional Transfers		206
a. Transfers In	226	
1) Civilian Pay and benefits associated with the	206	
functional transfer of 2 FTEs from Army Contracting		
Command.		10 150
8. Program Increases		12,152
a. Annualization of New FY 2016 Program b. One-Time FY 2017 Increases		
c. Program Growth in FY 2017		
DoD OIG OP-5 Exhibit		OIG-103

### III. Financial Summary (\$ in thousands)

<pre>C. Reconciliation of Increases and Decreases 1) O&amp;M Civilian Personnel changes:</pre>	<b>Amount</b> 10,353	Totals
A) Increased Civilian Pay and benefits for an	_0,000	
additional 50 FTEs to support financial improvement		
and audit readiness efforts across the DoD. (+\$7,300,		
+50 FTEs)		
B) Higher cost per FTE in excess of the 1.52% Price		
increase due to changing grade structure. (+\$1,188,		
+0 FTEs)		
C) Realignment of \$1,000 thousand from Procurement to		
Civilian Pay; (+\$1,000, +5 FTEs).		
D) Increased Civilian Pay and benefits for the		
Enterprise Case Activity Tracking System DCATSe		
Program Management Office (+\$624, +4 FTEs)		
E) Civilian Pay associated with higher permanent change of station (PCS) benefits. (+\$241, +0 FTEs)		
change of station (FCS) benefits. (+9241, +0 Files)		
(FY 2016 Baseline \$234,663 thousand, 1,536 FTEs)		
(+50 FTEs)		
2) O&M: Increased Equipment purchases; Replacement of	748	
OIG VOIP Telephone due to obsolescence; impact is across		
all programs. (FY 2016 Baseline \$4,452 thousand, 0 FTEs)		
3) RDT&E: Increase funding for development of the DCATSe	553	
Enterprise Defense Case Activity Tracking System as an		
efficiency & cost saving initiative; (FY 2016 Baseline		
\$2,600 thousand, 0 FTEs)	0.05	
4) O&M: Increased Communication Service and Telephone	396	
Equipment Costs. (FY 2016 Baseline \$3,213 thousand; 0		
FTEs)	0.0	
5) O&M: Increases to Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS)	89	
Software Maintenance that affects all Programs (FY 2016		

### III. Financial Summary (\$ in thousands)

C. Reconciliation of Increases and Decreases	Amount	Totals
Baseline \$187 thousand, 0 FTEs)	1.2	
6) O&M: Increase in Purchased Utilities (+\$3);	13	
Commercial Transportation (+\$1); Postal (+\$1); Printing		
(+\$2); Equipment Maintenance (+\$6). (FY 2016 Baseline		
\$1,279 thousand, 0 FTEs)		7 425
9. Program Decreases		-7,435
a. Annualization of FY 2016 Program Decreases		
b. One-Time FY 2016 Increases		
c. Program Decreases in FY 2017	1 767	
1) O&M: Reduction in Civilian Pay due to 2 less	-1,767	
compensable days in FY 2017 (260 vs 262) (FY 2016		
Baseline \$234,663 thousand, 1,536 FTEs) 2) O&M: Reduced Management & Professional Support	-1,721	
Services for Non-IT support (-\$1,000) and Microsoft	-1,721	
Premier Support (-\$721) (FY 2016 Baseline \$20,191		
thousand, 0 FTEs)		
3) O&M: Reduced Policy & Oversight Assessment Support	-1,138	
Agreements. (FY 2016 Baseline \$1,795 thousand, 0 FTEs)	1,130	
4) O&M: Reduced Travel Costs as a cost saving	-785	
initiative. (FY 2016 Baseline \$6,597 thousand, 0 FTEs)	, 0 3	
5) O&M: Reduced Minor Construction - elimination of a	-737	
planned Audit/DCIS Co-location in Germany (-\$440); delay	, 5 ,	
DCIS Field Office relocations (-\$297). (FY 2016 Baseline		
\$1,976 thousand, 0 FTEs)		
6) O&M: Reduced Lease payments in the Mark Center due to	-449	
reallocation of OIG space usage. (FY 2016 Baseline		
\$21,292 thousand; 0 FTEs)		
7) O&M: Reduced DFAS Contract Service Support. (FY 2016	-400	
Baseline \$1,247 thousand, 0 FTEs)		
8) O&M: Reduction to the Defense Criminal Investigative	-177	
<b>.</b>		

DoD OIG OP-5 Exhibit

### III. Financial Summary (\$ in thousands)

C. Reconciliation of Increases and Decreases	Amount	Totals
Service (DCIS)Federal Occupation Health Agreement. (FY		
2016 Baseline \$252 thousand, 0 FTEs)		
9) O&M: Reduced Personal Security Investigation costs.	-124	
(FY 2016 Baseline \$827 thousand, 0 FTEs)		
10) O&M: Reduced CRANE Intrusion Detection System	-65	
maintenance agreement. (FY 2016 Baseline \$865 thousand,		
0 FTEs)		
11) O&M: Reduced DHS Security agreement for monitoring	-50	
of commercial leased facilities. (FY 2016 Baseline \$500		
thousand, 0 FTEs)		
12) O&M: Reduced Engineering & Technical Services (-	-22	
\$17); Interest & Dividends (-\$5); (FY 2016 Baseline		
\$1,803 thousand, 0 FTEs)		
FY 2017 Budget Request		322,035
		,

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

#### Auditing:

A prime objective of the AUD is to assess the risks and weaknesses in DOD and provide recommendations to develop or strengthen management practices and controls. The goal is to ensure the efficient use of resources and to promote effective operations.

Key measures of AUD's success include identifying questioned costs and funds put to better use, as well as the clients' concurrence on audit recommendations to correct deficiencies. In FY 2015, AUD oversight identified more than \$485 million in questioned costs and \$2 billion of funds that could be put to better use as identified by Directorate. Audit clients concurred with 99 percent of the recommendations that were made. ODIG-AUD also:

- addressed critical areas such as quality assurance and testing of equipment and parts;
- identified protections needed against cyber threats;
- monitored redistribution and accountability of assets returned from the field;
- determined improvements needed in contingency contracting to reduce the potential for fraud, waste, and abuse; and
- identified and clarified force readiness challenges.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

#### API Directorate:

In FY 2015, API identified inefficiencies in managing weapon and information systems acquisitions, determining fair and reasonable prices for spare parts, and managing and using excess Government owned inventory. Oversight in these areas during FY 2015 provided savings and opportunities to put \$1.8 billion of funds to better use and identified \$18 million of questionable costs. For example, API identified that the DoD experienced increased program costs and schedule delays, and purchased equipment that did not meet performance requirements. API also identified inadequate processes to determine fair and reasonable prices, and ineffective management of spare parts inventories. API re-emphasized the need to address ongoing problems related to the award, administration, and management of contracts for contingency operations.

In FY 2016, API will continue to perform audits to improve how DoD buys weapons and information technology systems, and how it purchases and manages spare parts and inventory. API will remain focused on acquisition areas including analyzing the Department's determinations for requirements that address procurement quantities, program cost and schedule, and testing performance.

In FY 2017, API will continue its audits of weapons and information technology acquisitions, and continue to ensure the effective use and accountability of Government owned inventory. API will also continue to focus on how DoD buys and manages its spare parts inventory.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

#### CMP Directorate:

In FY 2015, CMP identified significant problems in the Department's oversight of Government travel charge cards and improper payments. CMP questioned costs related to the noncompetitive award of information technology contracts. CMP determined that the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer met five of the six requirements of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010. However, the reported improper payment estimates were not reliable. DoD also did not meet the requirement to achieve the reduction target for the DoD Travel Pay program and did not achieve the improper payment reductions intended in the Act or comply with the Act for FY 2014. In addition, the Defense Health Agency and Defense Finance and Accounting Service methods did not fully capture improper payment estimates or fully disclose recovered overpayments in the FY 2013 DoD Agency Financial Report. The unreliable estimates limit DoD's ability to identify and report improper payments, determine weaknesses causing the improper payments, and initiate corrective actions.

CMP identified \$234 million in questioned costs when DoD contracting activities did not properly justify the sole source award of four Army contracts and one Defense Information System Agency contract, and \$232 million related to energy saving contracts. In addition, CMP identified \$171 million of funds that could be put to better use as the result of audits on medical billings and management contracts. CMP determined that contracting personnel with the Army, Air Force, and Defense Information System Agency generally did not follow Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) synopsis requirements, potentially excluding sources.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

During FY 2015, the Contingency Operations (CO) Division was established to conduct audits supporting overseas contingency operations, focusing on high-risk areas that leave DoD vulnerable to fraud, waste, and mismanagement of taxpayer funds. CO identified numerous property accountability problems during the drawdowns from Iraq and Afghanistan. Without proper accountability, there was increased risk that equipment could be improperly destroyed, abandoned, or lost. CO also audited the Army's property accountability for equipment in Kuwait to determine if the Army had effective controls for processing equipment. CO determined that U.S. Army officials generally designed adequate controls to monitor contractor performance on the basic life support services contract at the King Abdullah II Special Operations Training Center. However, Army officials needed to implement other controls that require a subject matter expert to review the contractor's performance and enhance the performance work statement and quality assurance surveillance plan.

For FY 2016, CMP will continue to audit contract award and administration of service contracts, Berry Amendment and Buy American purchases; energy contracts and facilities construction; and real property maintenance. Additional audits are planned on DoD payments, including contract payments; improper payments; the Government Travel and Purchase Card Programs; and military health care for active-duty, reserve, retired, and dependent personnel. CO will also continue to audit property accountability, contract oversight, and facilities in contingency operations.

For FY 2017, CMP will focus on contract award and administration, facilities construction, and real property maintenance. Audits are planned on DoD payments including energy contracts; improper payments; the Government Purchase Card Program; and military health care for active duty, reserve, retired, and dependent personnel. CO will

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

continue to audit facilities, equipment, logistics, information operations, and the training, advising, and equipping of Iraqi Security Forces. CO will determine whether DoD contracts include effective oversight and controls, whether construction contracts include adequate quality assurance and oversight, and whether effective controls exist for equipment provided directly to Iraqi Security Forces.

#### RCO Directorate:

In FY 2015, RCO focused on areas of high risk or high impact, including the cyber workforce, cybersecurity and operations, global logistics, military construction, workplace violence, and individual and unit readiness and training. For example, RCO identified that DoD did not effectively migrate to Internet protocol version 6. As a result, DoD did not realize potential benefits to DoD operations, such as the ability to improve situational awareness for warfighters and commanders during battle maneuvers. RCO also identified \$103 million of funds that could be put to better use resulting from audits of overseas military construction projects. RCO conducted other critical cyber operations and cybersecurity audits in which the results were classified; however, the corrective action taken by DoD will help reduce associated security risks.

RCO also identified that Naval Facilities Engineering Command contract administration personnel did not effectively administer one task order for the Guam Design-Build Multiple Award Construction contract. As a result, DoD did not have a comprehensive record of decisions made on the task order; spent \$1.45 million more than necessary; added 93 days to the construction schedule; and facilities did not meet requirements, requiring further modifications.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

In FY 2016, RCO will continue to focus on high-risk areas including large-scale, complex logistics systems; readiness; training; foreign military sales; cyber security, and cyber operations. Projects will include DoD supply chain management, demilitarization programs, military readiness reporting, and cyber security controls.

In FY 2017, RCO will continue to focus on cybersecurity and cyber operations, to include emerging technology within the cyber domain. RCO will also continue its focus on military readiness as the DoD continues to support Overseas Contingency Operations around the world.

#### FMR Directorate:

In FY 2015, FMR limited its financial statement audit work based on concerns in DoD management statements of financial statement reliability. DoD limited the scope of the FY 2015 Statement of Budgetary Resources General Fund audits to the Schedule of Budgetary Activity, which includes current-year appropriation activity and transactions, but excludes balances from prior-years' activity. Contracts were awarded to Independent Public Accounting (IPA) firms to audit the Schedule of Budgetary Activity. FMR performed contract oversight over the IPA firms that performed these audits. FMR continued to focus on audits related to DoD's audit readiness efforts for all DoD financial statements by the end of FY 2017. FMR continued its coordination with the Office of the Secretary of Defense Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) Office on an Audit Services Acquisition Strategy, which is designed to prepare DoD to undergo a full financial statement audit by Congressionally mandated timelines.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

FMR issued disclaimers of opinion on the FY 2015 DoD Agency-wide and Closing Package financial statements and six of the components' statements that supported DoD Agency-wide statements. FMR transmitted the unmodified opinion from the IPA firms on the financial statements of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Military Retirement Fund, TRICARE Management Activity's Contract Resource Management; a qualified opinion on the DoD Medicare Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund; and a disclaimer of opinion on the U.S. Marine Corps Schedule of Budgetary Activity. Other audits included examinations of Army general equipment, real property, and operating materials and supplies; an examination of select Air Force operating materials and supplies, ammunition and tactical missiles; and the Navy's representation of audit readiness related to ordnance. FMR also reviewed and summarized the financial management material weaknesses and other audit concerns identified in reports DoD OIG issued from October 1, 2011, through December 31, 2014 and audited the Army and Navy reconciliation process and conducted a NATO ANA Trust Fund examination. FMR's audits have identified \$1 million of questioned costs.

In FY 2016, FMR will continue to audit DoD's Schedules of Budgetary Activity and other financial statement areas the DoD asserts are audit ready. FMR audits will identify deficiencies and recommend corrective actions to assist DoD in improving its overall financial management operations and, as a result, prepare auditable financial statements. FMR will provide contract oversight of the IPA firms that audit the Defense Information Systems Agency and Defense Logistics Agency. As OSD and service components identify segments of financial statements that are ready for audit, ODIG-AUD will announce audits or attestation engagements, as appropriate. Through participation in the FIAR governance board and various other meetings, the DOD OIG will advise the FIAR Directorate in updating and executing the FIAR plan and FIAR guidance.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

In FY 2017, FMR will continue to focus on audits supporting DoD's efforts to achieve audit readiness of all DoD financial statements by the end of FY 2017. As DoD components achieve successful audit opinions on current year appropriation activity, FMR or an IPA will begin to audit the full Statement of Budgetary Resources. FMR will provide contract oversight of the IPA firms that perform the audits of the U.S. Transportation Command, U.S. Special Operations Command, and Defense Health Program. FMR will also continue to work with the DoD components to identify deficiencies and recommend corrective actions to assist DoD in improving its overall financial management operations and, as a result, prepare auditable financial statements. As OSD and Service components identify segments of financial statements that are ready for review, ODIG-AUD will announce audits or attestation engagements, as appropriate.

#### Investigations:

The Defense Criminal Investigative Service (DCIS) uses several methods to evaluate performance. DCIS established a performance metric that 80 percent of the investigative caseload must be focused in its priority areas of fraud investigations, public corruption, technology protection, healthcare and cybercrimes. Another DCIS performance metric is that at least 85 percent of total man-hours must be attributed to investigations within these DCIS priority areas. DCIS also monitors arrests, indictments and criminal charges, convictions, fines, recoveries, restitution, suspensions and debarments, to ensure consistency in effort and historical output, and the effective use of its valuable investigative resources.

As of June 30, 2015, in FY 2015, DCIS investigations have resulted in total investigative receivables and recoveries of \$1.102 billion for the U.S. Government (which includes recovered Government property, civil judgments/settlements, criminal fines, penalties, and restitution ordered and administrative recoveries), 68 arrests,

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

151 criminal charges, and 164 criminal convictions; and contributed to 65 suspensions and 171 debarments of contractors. DCIS conducted the following major investigations requiring extensive efforts in FY 2015: Supreme Food Service AG (\$324.8 million government recovery), Da Vita, Inc. (\$289.6 million government recovery), Iron Mountain, Inc. (\$36.5 million government recovery), American President Lines Ltd, Inc. (\$31.9 million government recovery), and Daiichi Sankyo/Forest Labs (\$27.9 million government recovery).

In FY 2016 & FY 2017, DCIS will: (1) maintain its focus on significant procurement and acquisition fraud investigations with emphasis on defective, substituted, and counterfeit products that impact the safety and mission-readiness of our warfighters; (2) continue its focus on combating corruption by ferreting out and investigating major DoD procurement fraud, including bribery, corruption, kickbacks, conflicts of interest, and major thefts; (3) continue to concentrate on investigations, and awareness aimed at the illegal transfer of technology, systems, and equipment critical to DoD and dangerous if in the hands of restricted nations and persons; (4) continue to focus on healthcare investigations involving potential harm to DoD military members and their dependents and healthcare fraud schemes; and (5) continue defense against cyber crimes and computer intrusions that impact DoD.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

#### Administrative Investigations:

In FY15 ODIG-AI has continued an organizational transformation to achieve its vision of being the model administrative investigation organization in the Federal government. ODIG-AI realigned resources and continued to revise policies and procedures to streamline operations and reduce the average time necessary to complete investigations. Building on prior-year recruitment and restructuring efforts, AI devoted significant effort to training DoD OIG and Military Service IG investigators, developing performance metrics for timeliness and quality, and planning deployment of the Defense Case Activity Tracking System Enterprise (D-CATSe) across the Department. Other key training initiatives included a DoD OIG Basic Whistleblower Reprisal Investigator Course and a Hotline Investigator Course; these courses were attended by investigators from the DoD OIG, the Military Services, the Combatant Commands, and Defense Agencies.

AI continues to emphasize performance measures and metrics to track and improve timeliness and quality of administrative investigations and Hotline referrals. Timeliness metrics measure the life-cycle of the investigation, including the intake process, the planning process, field work, first draft report of investigation, and total days to close. As a result of the organizational transformation efforts described above, ODIG-AI achieved a 26% reduction in the average time to complete ISO investigations, a 29% reduction in the average time to complete WRI investigations, and a 95% reduction in the average time for Hotline completion reports. Highlights during FY 15 included:

- •AI-ISO closed 20 investigations of which 11 (55%) were closed in 210 days or less.
- AI-WRI closed 21 military and contractor reprisal cases of which 6 (29%) were closed in 180 days or less; and closed 22 civilian and NAFI cases of which 8(36%) were closed in 240 days or less.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

- •AI-Hotline made 253 Priority 1 referrals (life and death; safety), 204 (81%) in one business day or less.
- •AI Hotline reviewed 872 Hotline Completion Reports.

A significant part of the AI transformation has been the deployment of D-CATS. D-CATS has enabled AI to transform to a paperless environment by employing functionalities for data, documentation, dashboards, and reports. This system has significantly enhanced the investigation process and reduced the time necessary to transmit Hotline complaints to the appropriate investigative office. D-CATS has been approved as a DoD business system to be deployed as an IG Enterprise System to the Military Services. Expanded use of this system will achieve further efficiencies in transmitting cases throughout the Department of Defense, as well as cost savings by avoiding the stove-pipe development of next generation systems by the Military Services.

AI is continuing an aggressive campaign of outreach and training to improve the performance of investigations programs across the Department of Defense. In addition, ODIG-AI is engaged in a significant effort to update the DoD-level policies and directives to implement the latest changes in whistleblower law including: 1) Presidential Policy Directive 19, "Protecting Whistleblowers with Access to Classified Information"; 2) the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012; and 3) the National Defense Authorization Act for FY13 amendment to Title 10, U.S.C. 2409, "Contractor Employees" and the FY14 NDAA amendments to Title 10 U.S.C. 1034, "Protected communications, prohibition of retaliatory personnel actions." In FY15, DoD issued a revised DoDD 7050.06, "Military Whistleblower Protection," dated April 17, 2015 and a Guide to Investigating Military Whistleblower Reprisal and Restriction Complaints in October 2014.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

In FY16 and 17, AI will continue on a strategic path to being a model administrative investigations organization. Through robust strategic planning, AI monitors performance to standards on a quarterly basis to improve timeliness and adhere to CIGIE standards. AI initiatives include ongoing and continuous process improvement, implementation of best practices, outreach and training, and deploying D-CATS as a DoD IG Enterprise System. These initiatives, along with our strategic performance metrics, will achieve improved efficiencies, timeliness, and quality in the investigations programs across the Department of Defense.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

#### Policy and Oversight:

In FY 2015, P&O issued a total of 28 reports and seven Notices of Concern, processed 700 subpoenas, provided technical support to six DOD IG audit and investigative projects, and managed DOD IG's coordination process for 300 DoD policy issuances. P&O operations are evaluated based on the outcomes of evaluating significant DoD programs and operations, significance and quality of audit and investigative policies, subpoenas and contractor disclosures processed, timeliness and quality of technical support provided, positive impact on draft DoD policy issuance coordinations, and follow-up of DCAA report recommendations. P&O updated and published the following four DoD Issuances:

- DoDI 7600.02 "Audit Policies," October 16, 2014;
- DoDI 5505.11 "Fingerprint Card and Final Disposition Report Submission Requirements," Change 1, Published October 31, 2014;
- DoDI 5525-19 "The Establishment of Special Victim Investigation and Prosecution Capability within the Military Criminal Investigative Organizations," February 3, 2015; and
- DoDI 5505.18 "Investigation of Adult Sexual Assault in the Department of Defense," Change 2, Published June 18, 2015;

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

In FY 2015, APO issued four Oversight reports, eight external quality control reviews of Defense organizations' audit operations, and three single audit quality control reviews. APO also issued one Notice of Concern. APO performed 151 desk reviews of single audit reports covering \$8.4 billion in DoD funds and issued 98 memorandums that identified 185 findings and \$16.7 million in questioned costs. APO administered peer review programs for 11 DoD audit organizations and has two peer reviews ongoing. As of the semiannual reporting period ending March 31, 2015, APO provided oversight on contracting officers' actions related to 2,406 open and closed contract audit reports with more than \$12.4 billion in potential savings. Contracting officers disallowed \$407 million (32.1%) in response to \$1.271 billion of questioned costs from 440 significant DCAA post-award contract audit reports during the period. Also, APO issued 60 report recommendations to date achieving a 100 percent agreement rate for those recommendations. APO worked on updating DoD Instruction 5106.05, "Defense Inspectors General Program," and led the effort to issue the first OIG Inspection and Evaluation Handbook. Finally, APO made significant updates to DoD Instruction 7640.02, "Policy for Follow-up on Contract Audit Reports," and reissued this instruction on April 15, 2015. APO also reissued DoDI 7600.02, "Audit Policies," on October 16, 2014.

In FY 2016, APO will continue focusing on monitoring and evaluating the Defense Contract Management Agency, including the contracting officer use of DCAA audit reports; and reissuing DoD Instruction 7600.10, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations." APO is also focusing on policy and oversight of DoD audit organizations efforts in identifying and detecting fraud, waste, and abuse including support to the Contractor Disclosure Program; and internal control and fraud assessments, guidance, and training. APO continues to update its DoD IG Fraud website, including adding additional contract audit and other fraud scenarios, monitoring DCAA fraud referrals and efforts on

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

contractor disclosures; and providing input to DCAA revisions to its fraud-related audit quidance. APO is performing or overseeing peer reviews of the Army Internal Review Office, Defense Logistics Agency, Marine Corps Non-appropriated Fund Audit Service, Naval Exchange Command, National Reconnaissance Office, and U.S. Special Operations Command. In the Single Audit area, APO is performing four single audit quality control reviews and one follow-up review, and continues to review all single audit reports for audit findings that require grant/contracting officer follow-up actions. The Single Audit area encompasses \$7.0 billion in DoD research and development funds associated with 22 cognizant organizations. APO continues to evaluate contracting officer actions on DCAA audits of incurred costs, Cost Accounting Standards, and forward-pricing. APO is again monitoring the quality of contract audits within DoD and performing the Quality Control Review of the DCAA. For inspection and evaluation policy, APO is focusing on the issuance of DoD-wide policy for performing inspections and evaluations through the Defense Council on Integrity and Efficiency, and working with other IG components to increase coordination of inspections and evaluations, including increasing awareness of and best practices for inspections and evaluations and timely updating of the OIG Inspection and Evaluation Handbook and related forms and tools.

In FY 2017, APO will continue its focus on oversight of DCAA; DoD Components' contracting officers' actions on DCAA audit report recommendations; peer reviews of DoD audit organizations; fraud related training, guidance, scenarios, and other tools to update APO's fraud website; liaison on the Contractor Disclosure Program including related policy and oversight of DCAA; and quality control reviews on three or four Single Audit cognizant/oversight organizations. For inspection and evaluation policy, APO will continue efforts to increase awareness and quality of DoD inspections and evaluations; coordinate inspection and evaluation activities among DoD and other IG organizations; and

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

update the OIG Inspection and Evaluation Handbook and related forms, documents, and OIG instructions.

IN FY 2015 IPO collaborated with the Military Criminal Investigative Organizations to address National Defense Authorization Act requirements for evidence retention on sexual assault investigations and the development of special victim capability units. In addition, IPO participated with various DoD and other government agencies such as the Defense Enterprise-wide Working Group and the DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office to facilitate the development of criminal investigative policy. The CDP office evaluated more than 200 disclosures submitted by Defense contractors and subcontractors concerning certain violations of criminal law and violations of the civil False Claims Act and suspected counterfeit/non-conforming parts discovered during the contractors' self-policing activities. The CDP office oversaw and coordinated courses of administrative, civil, and criminal actions for the disclosures with the Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch (Fraud Section), Defense Criminal Investigative Organizations (DCIOs), Defense and Service audit agencies, and the Services' Offices of Procurement Fraud Remedies and Acquisition Integrity. In addition, the CDP office evaluated 32 "Suspected Fraud and Irregularity Reports." In consultation with the Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch (Fraud Section) and DCAA auditors, referred the matters to the DCIOs for criminal investigation determinations.

The DOD IG Subpoena Program issued 700 subpoenas in FY 2015. IPO also trained 550 criminal investigators and attorneys from other DoD agencies. IPO conducted, initiated or completed projects evaluating DoD adult sexual assault investigations; compliance with the DCIOs Defense Incident-Based Reporting System; matters related to the death of a Navy seaman; Military Investigative Organizations' child death investigations; DCIOs'

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

compliance with the Lautenberg Requirements and Implementing Guidance; DoD compliance with Criminal History Data Reporting Requirements; Transfer of International Traffic in Arms Regulations Controlled Missile Defense Technology to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Air Force Office of Special Investigations roles and responsibilities for Internet-based operations; Investigation of sexual assault cases at the U.S. Air Force Academy; and a Congressional request regarding an USACIDC sexual assault investigation.

In FY 2016, IPO is revising the following investigative policies: DoDI 5505.03, "Initiation of Investigations by Defense Criminal Investigative Organizations;" DoDI 5505.18, "Investigation of Adult Sexual Assault in the Department of Defense;" and IGDINST 7050.09, "Use of Department of Defense Inspector General Administrative Subpoenas in Support of Audits, Evaluations and Investigations." The Subpoena Program Division is seeking to decrease subpoena processing time, and the CDP is working within our constituent community to improve and manage the process of DCAA fraud referrals.

In FY 2017, IPO's work will involve issues as varied as evaluations of the DCIOs Source Management Programs, Adult Sexual Assault Investigations closed and adjudicated in CY 2015, Criminal Investigations conducted by the Pentagon Force Protection Agency, Fingerprint Collection Requirements for Army Law Enforcement Investigations, Military Criminal Investigative Organizations compliance with Sexual Assault Investigation Initiation Requirement; DNA Collection Requirements for Criminal Investigations; Naval Criminal Investigative Service' Roles and Responsibilities during Internet-based Operations; Military Criminal Investigative Organizations' Suicide Investigations; Non-DCIO Criminal Investigations; DoD Law Enforcement Agencies Compliance with the Lautenberg Amendment; and Sexual Assault Victims Discharge Characterizations.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

In FY 2015, TAD issued eight reports. TAD also initiated six Notices of Concern to address immediate safety and environmental issues; one for C-5 Reliability Enhancement and Re-engineering Program Hotline Evaluation, two for military housing in the Republic of Korea, and three for military housing in the Continental United States Southeast Region. These Notices of Concern required immediate attention by the Service organizations responsible for environmental, safety, and occupational health of the C-5, and operations and maintenance of accompanied and unaccompanied housing used by the Warfighter and their families. In addition, TAD provided engineering support to six DoD OIG projects.

In FY 2016, TAD is performing technical assessments that address issues affecting life, health, and safety. This includes inspections of military housing in the Middle East and Jordan, a Congressional request to Evaluate Ammunition Data Cards, two Chemical-Demilitarization inspections, a Quality Assurance evaluation of the Electro-Magnetic Aircraft Launch System, a Safety-Risk evaluation of the MH-53 Sea Dragon program, a Quality Assurance evaluation of the Family of Beyond Line of Sight Terminals, and an evaluation of the Next Generation GPS(GPS OCX) that will deter potential catastrophic system failures caused by critical software products. TAD is also supporting DoD OIG components on their audit/evaluation assist requests, as well as conducting analysis of several ACAT I programs for potential FY 2017 projects.

In FY 2017, TAD will perform technical assessments that address issues of concern to Congress, DoD, and the public, and give priority to those that affect life, health, and safety. In addition, TAD will perform a major military housing inspection in CONUS or OCONUS as follow-on inspections to the FY 2015/16 projects previously conducted in

### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

Korea, the Middle East, and CONUS. TAD will also support DoD OIG components on their audit/evaluation assist requests.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

### Intelligence and Special Program Assessments:

In FY 2015, ISPA completed 20 reports and expect to complete about the same number of reports in FY 2016. In 2015, ISPA established a new team to support the Intelligence Line of Effort under the Lead IG mandate. This new effort expanded the exchange of information within our Defense Intelligence Special Program Oversight Committee and engagement with members of the IC IG via the IC IG Forum.

In 2016, ISPA personnel will continue to reassess oversight of defense priorities and Congressional perspectives to ensure resources provide the best coverage. Key measures of ISPA's success are several classified evaluations and inspections leading to increased DoD and Intelligence Community knowledge of weaknesses in National Security. ISPA reports will continue to make meaningful and actionable recommendations to address root causes of these weaknesses. ISPA personnel will continue to seek clients' concurrence on these recommendations, which is currently at 90%. In FY 2016, ISPA will continue to conduct oversight projects that support operational forces that focus on critical areas such as security, acquisition, and contracting within the DoD Intelligence community, and intelligence and counterintelligence programs, systems, training, analysis and funding. ISPA's Sensitive Activities division will continue to provide emphasis in this area. In 2016 and 2017, ISPA will continue to evaluate stakeholder input and provide timely and relevant reports. FY 2016 oversight reports will also address updates to strategic DoD guidance and emerging legislative requirements. Moreover, oversight projects will emphasize updates in technology, changes in funding strategy, adaptations in acquisitions, updates to intelligence law, intelligence community realignments/initiatives, intelligence support to overseas contingency operations, and DoD worldwide engagement and collaboration among different DoD agencies and commands as well as coalition partners.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

### Intelligence:

In FY 2015, as a result of heightened Congressional interest, ISPA completed an evaluation of DoD Unmanned Aerial Systems support to domestic civil authorities. ODIG-ISPA also completed an evaluation of Intelligence training and education programs to determine if they were providing the DoD intelligence workforce the fundamental competencies necessary to perform their duties. ISPA also evaluated the DoD Defense Sensitive Support Program. Additionally, ISPA investigated specific mission areas to ensure that sensitive information and operations was adequately protected, including a questionable intelligence activity investigation to determine intelligence agency access to a predominately law enforcement data base. In support of the Lead-IG mission, ISPA assessed the intelligence support to the Moderate Syrian Opposition Vetting Process, and evaluated the Intelligence Sharing process within Operation Inherent Resolve.

In FY 2016, ISPA's main effort is focused on OUSD (Intelligence) programs that the intelligence agencies have responsibility to implement as well as programmatic updates on their progress in implementing various initiatives. FY 2016 areas of emphasis include: completing legislative taskings to review the Foreign Officer Program at SOCOM, and the evaluation supporting the Over-classification Act; assessing DoD Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance reconstitution efforts; and evaluating DoD intelligence support to countering weapons of mass destruction. In line with DoD strategy and the Lead IG mandate, ISPA will also evaluate the effectiveness of Afghan Intelligence training, OIR HUMINT coordination/deconfliction, and Operation Freedom Sentinel Collection Management practices.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

In FY 2017 ISPA will continue to conduct oversight projects throughout the intelligence enterprise. Key issues to be addressed include increased awareness and utilization of the Intelligence Community Whistleblower Protection Act and addressing hotline complaints. ISPA will also evaluate the implementation of insider threat initiatives and revised data collection procedures in response to updated legislation including the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) amendments. In FY 2017, ISPA will also conduct assessments supporting the intelligence line of effort for Overseas Contingency Operations in Afghanistan and Iraq.

#### Counterintelligence:

In FY 2015, ISPA completed an assessment of counterintelligence support in the Force Protection Detachment program, and completed an audit of a hotline allegation related to managing appropriations for Foreign Counterintelligence Program (FCIP) billets.

In FY 2016, ISPA is assessing counterintelligence support to protect DoD research, development, and acquisition and support to the Foreign Military Sales program. ISPA also plans to complete a review of the US Army Counterintelligence investigations and evidence handling procedures. We are currently assessing the Counterintelligence Support to the Defense Critical Infrastructure Program and plan will issue a report before the end of FY 2016.

In FY 2017, ISPA will continue its oversight efforts related to changes in critical technologies that drive updates to counterintelligence support to deter foreign intelligence adversaries. Key issues include counterintelligence support to cyberspace/forensics, changes in counterintelligence funding and technical surveillance

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

countermeasures, supporting counterterrorism efforts related to Lead IG intelligence oversight requirements.

#### Security Enterprise:

In FY 2015, ISPA identified a new DoD IG Management Challenge for Insider Threat. In FY 2016, ISPA will conduct an assessment of insider threat to overseas contingence operations to support Lead IG requirements and assess privileged users within the Service intelligence organizations. For FY 2016, ODIG-ISPA will also conduct and evaluation of the NSA relationships with second party partners, and will also complete an ongoing project assessing the process of releasing DoD classified or sensitive information to the media. ISPA also plans to complete an assessment of the effectiveness of the Defense Critical Infrastructure Program as well as an assessment of the DoD Militarily Critical Technologies Program.

In FY 2017 ISPA will continue to look at critical issues throughout the security enterprise. We will assess implementation efforts from the Defense Security Enterprise related to Insider Threat initiatives including Continuous Monitoring and Continuous Evaluation and emphasize information sharing.

### Nuclear Enterprise:

The Nuclear Enterprise continues to be one of DoD's management challenges. Congressional committees continue to show interest in the DoD IG nuclear enterprise oversight resulting in several discussions with Congressional staff and with DoD leadership focusing nuclear governance and readiness. In FY 2015, ODIG-ISPA issued reports on the Assessment of Minuteman III material availability, theater nuclear

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

planning, and an evaluation of the Integrated Tactical Warning & Attack Assessment mobile ground system.

In FY 2015, ISPA also completed an assessment of the Nuclear Warhead Unsatisfactory Reports process and issued to the Department, a comprehensive oversight summary report of the nuclear enterprise. One of the major goals for FY 2015 was enhanced collaboration of the Nuclear Enterprise Oversight Coordination Group. This group has representatives from organizations that have nuclear enterprise oversight responsibilities and is used to coordinate oversight activities and identify emerging developments within the nuclear enterprise community.

In FY 2016, ISPA will continue to assess issues throughout the nuclear enterprise based on inputs from OSD leadership, USSTRATCOM, the Joint Staff, and DASD (Nuclear Matters). Numerous vital areas need attention throughout the nuclear enterprise to ensure recent revitalization efforts stay on track to meet Presidential direction. Other oversight efforts will include a continued review of the Integrated Tactical Warning & Attack Assessment with emphasis on ground radars, explosive ordinance support to the DoD nuclear mission, and E6B Airborne Command Post availability/reliability.

In FY 2017, ISPA will continue to assess strategies and programs related to nuclear surety, Command and Control planning/governance, and nuclear operational readiness.

### Special Access Programs:

In 2015, ISPA established a Deputy Assistant Inspector General position and an associated team to provide focused oversight efforts on Special Access Programs (SAP). ISPA has performed audits and evaluations that were both self-initiated and requested by

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

the Director, DoD Special Access Program Central Office. The types of audits performed include performance audits of major acquisition programs; information technology; intelligence; security; systemic issues; and organizational reviews which ensure compliance with DoD directives, policies, guidance and internal operating instructions. ODIG-ISPA also performed assessments of several intelligence SAPs.

In FY 2015, ISPA performed three classified program and acquisition audits and reported on issues including contracting, procurement, testing, security, program management, and an evaluation of the Departments Alternate Compensatory Control Measures program. In FY 2016 and FY 2017, ISPA will continue to conduct oversight of SAP program management. In FY 2016, emphasis is on several operationally sensitive programs, SAP industrial security, and the DCAA Field Detachment. In FY 2017, emphasis will include acquisition efforts related to the Defense Security Environment Architecture, DoD-Intelligence community capabilities integration, and SAP program review and associated contracts and program management.

### Special Plans and Operations:

A prime objective of the SPO Strategic Plan is to assess the risks and weaknesses in DOD programs and provide recommendations to develop or strengthen management practices and controls. The goal is to ensure the efficient use of resources and to promote effective operations. SPO's three major performance criteria are timeliness, effectiveness, and impact on Departmental planning and operations (relevancy). In each area, SPO has consistently met or exceeded expectations of stakeholders.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

In FY 15, SPO sent the first oversight team into Iraq in support of Operation Inherent Resolve, conducting the "Assessment of DoD/CENTCOM and Coalition Efforts to Train, Advise, and Assist the Iraqi Army to Defeat ISIL." In addition, SPO:

- 1) Deployed multiple oversight teams of evaluators worldwide to report on U.S. operations and programs including training, preparing and sustaining defense forces of the governments of Afghanistan and Iraq; providing security assistance to countries across four of the five Combatant Commands; and executing DoD and Federal Programs.
- 2) Assigned experienced staff in Afghanistan and Kuwait to monitor senior commanders and staff conducting overseas contingency operations.
- 3) Published 13 reports addressing complex issues and include multiple findings and recommendations related to contingency operations, health and safety of the total force, or Congressional requests. Five of the FY 15 reports focused on operations in Southwest Asia in the logistics, advise, train, and assist role. SPO also conducted four reports in the medical field and three other congressionally mandated reports. All reports were timely, current, and relevant, meeting or exceeding stakeholder needs. For example, the final report for the "Assessment of DoD/CENTCOM and Coalition Plans/Efforts to Train Advise, and Assist the Iraqi Army to Defeat ISIL" was published less than four months after completing in-country fieldwork, an unprecedented level of timeliness in response to the needs of stakeholders. Management concurred with 153 of 158 recommendations where

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

SPO effected major changes in the military logistics activities, medical care, and suicide prevention monitoring.

4) Provided significant resources to address Lead IG, Overseas Contingency Operations, and Ebola and Anthrax emergency reporting and oversight needs. SPO maintained its high level of excellence as reflected by a SecDef letter of Appreciation for the published report on POW/MIA Accounting and a message from the Chair of the SASC complimenting the Rights of Conscience report. SPO also initiated a comprehensive quality assurance program that met CIGIE and DoD OIG I&E standards to further enhance the quality of the reports SPO issues.

### Southwest Asia:

In FY 2015 SPO continued its series of command-requested assessments that focusing on the train and equip mission in Afghanistan, a mission in support of the Lead Inspector General (LIG) and Operation Freedom Sentinel (OFS).

SPO published the report on its "Assessment of USG and Coalition Efforts to Develop the Logistics Sustainment Capability of the Afghan National Army," and the "Assessment of USG and Coalition Efforts to develop the Logistics Sustainment Capability of the Ministry of Interior Police Forces." This report highlighted that while Afghan National Defense Security Forces demonstrated the capability to conduct combat operations, the Afghan Army and Police logistics system remained a work in progress.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

SPO issued the "Summary of Lessons Learned — DoD IG Assessment Oversight of "Train, Advise, Assist, and Equip" Operations by U.S. and Coalition Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan." The report provided DoD military commanders and other stakeholders responsible for Operation Inherent Resolve a summary of lessons learned gleaned from DoD IG assessment oversight of U.S. and Coalition "Train, Advise, Assist, and Equip" efforts during Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom.

SPO released the report on the "Assessment of U.S. and Coalition Efforts to Develop the Sufficiency of Afghan National Security Forces' Policies, Processes, and Procedures for the Management and Accountability of Class III (Fuel) and V (Ammunition)." This report highlighted the need for updated policy, procedures, and management controls; improved policy enforcement/implementation; and increased contract oversight.

SPO issued the "Assessment of DoD/CENTCOM and Coalition Efforts to Train, Advise, and Assist the Iraqi Army to Defeat ISIL" report. This report made recommendations to management in the areas of planning, equipping, inventory management, facilities, managing expectations, and leadership.

#### Medical:

SPO published the report on the "Assessment of DoD-Provided Healthcare for Members of the United States Armed Forces Reserve Components." We determined that reserve component service members, when eligible, had access to DoD-provided care to enable units to meet DoD-required individual medical readiness rates. We also determined that line of duty medical care was available to treat wounded, ill, and injured RC service members. However, we determined that delayed or denied access to line of duty care presented a risk to the service members.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

SPO assessed the DoD Suicide Event Report (DoDSER), a standardized database used by the military services as the "system of record" for reporting suicidal behavior/suicides. The report, identified seven topics for DoDSER submissions improvement. During FY 2015, SPO initiated Phase 3 "Assessment of DoD Suicide Prevention Processes." The project evaluated the processes used to develop suicide prevention policy and determine what process changes are required to improve suicide prevention and intervention policies/programs. The resulting report made recommendations to management in the areas of policy and implementing instructions.

SPO conducted the "Evaluation of DoD Force Health Protection Measures During Operation United Assistance (OUA)" to evaluate OUA force health protection policies, programs, and logistical requirements for all personnel for whom DoD may be responsible and to identify possible gaps between force health protection requirements and implementation; and to recommend improvements, if appropriate. The report made recommendations to management in the areas of requirements, identification of enduring capabilities, implementing instructions, and disbursement of family separation allowance.

### Congressional / Other:

SPO released a report in October 2014 on The "Assessment of the Department of Defense Prisoner of War/Missing in Action Accounting Community." We found the DoD personnel assigned to the accounting community was not able to reach its full potential to perform effectively and efficiently. In addition, this group has not met the long-standing

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

expectations of the surviving family members still hoping for closure on the loss of their loved ones.

SPO completed the annual assessment of the Federal Voting Assistance Program for Service members highlighting risks to program objectives, and violations of law, policy, or regulation. SPO also issued the report on the "Assessment of Electronic Absentee System for Elections Grants." This report did not identify any instances of inappropriate use of grant funds and the Federal Voting assistance Program office was able to demonstrate how they accounted for RDT&E funds received between 2010 and 2013.

SPO conducted an assessment of the "Rights of Conscience Protections for Armed forces Service Members and Their Chaplains" in FY 15. The assessment, required by Section 533 of the 2014 NDAA, determined 1) the extent to which DoD had complied with regulations designed to protect the rights of conscience for service members and chaplains, and 2) the number of contacts regarding incidents involving rights of conscience of a service member/chaplain received by the DoD OIG and the IGs of the Military Departments. The final report made recommendations to management in the areas of policy and implementing instructions.

### FY 2016

### Southwest Asia:

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

SPO is continuing its series of command-requested assessments that focus on the train and equip mission in Afghanistan, in support of Operation Freedom Sentinel.

SPO conducted research on allegations of child sexual abuse by Security Ministry and Afghan National Defense Security Force Officials and DoD activities, and in response to these allegation to gather and review information, identify criteria, and analyze previous reporting as a basis for potential future work. This research project has evolved into a formal FY 16 assessment—"Allegations of Child Sexual Abuse by Members of Afghan Security Forces." In addition to examining the issue of child sexual abuse by members of the Afghan security forces and DoD response to such allegations, we will assess implementation of the Leahy Law on human rights violations as it applies to DoD interaction with, and Title 10 support of, the Afghan Security Ministries and the ANDSF.

SPO will also assess whether U.S. Government and Coalition goals, objectives, plans, and resources to train the Afghan National Army Special Operations Forces are sufficient, operative, and relevant; and the US and Coalition Forces are planning for and developing the Afghan National Security Forces Inspector General systems in Afghanistan.

In support of Operation Inherent Resolve, SPO will assess whether: (1) DoD/CENTCOM and Coalition goals, objectives, plans, guidance, operations, and resources to train, advise, assist, and equip Iraqi Sunni Forces to defeat ISIL are operationally effective so as to enable them to initiate and sustain successful combat operations as part of the Iraqi National Security Forces; (2) DoD/CENTCOM and Coalition goals, objectives, plans, guidance, operations, and resources to train, advise, assist, and equip Peshmerga forces to defeat ISIL and to determine whether they are operationally effective to initiate and sustain successful combat operations; and (3) DoD/CENTCOM and Coalition goals,

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

objectives, plans, guidance, operations, and resources to train, advise, assist, and equip the Iraqi Army Special Operations Forces to defeat ISIL and to determine whether they are operationally effective to initiate and sustain successful combat operations.

#### Global Security Issues:

SPO will complete its self-initiated "Assessment of DoD Efforts to Build Counterterrorism and Stability Operations Capacity of Foreign Military Forces with Section 1206 Funding," This assessment evaluated the overall effectiveness of the Section 1206 program in supporting combatant commands' counterterrorism mission and stability operations. SPO will also publish a second report on "Evaluation of DoD Force Health Protection Measures During Operation United Assistance (OUA)." This report will focus primarily on lessons learned in Operation United Assistance pertaining to DoD force health protection measures.

In FY 2016, SPO will publish its assessment report on evaluating DoD's biological surety and security oversight, and DoD component biological surety and security compliance with the relevant statutes and regulations. Biosurety is defined as the combination of security, biosafety, agent accountability, and personnel reliability needed to prevent unauthorized access to select agents of biological warfare.

SPO will also evaluate implementation of DoD's Global Health Security Agenda responsibilities, specifically partnering with selected countries to implement cooperative efforts in the fields of epidemiology, diagnostic tests, and other capabilities.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

Further, in FY 2016 SPO will assess U.S. European Command support of the European Reassurance Initiative. Specifically, we will review the:

- 1. sufficiency of U.S. European Command plans and resources,
- 2. readiness of Component and DoD Agencies,
- 3. availability of critical infrastructure,
- 4. coordination with other NATO initiatives, and,
- 5. efforts to build partner capacity and train-advise-assist partner nations.

SPO will also evaluate DoD implementation of the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement (EDCA)in support of the long-term modernization of the Armed Forces of the Philippines as it works to establish a minimum credible defense by assessing:

- 1. DoD progress in expanding opportunities for bilateral training with the AFP.
- 2. The extent to which DoD is providing the AFP with proper military equipment/hardware, such as Excess Defense Articles.
- 3. The degree to which the EDCA has resulted in increased presence of U.S. forces, ships, aircraft, and equipment in the Philippines, including greater U.S. access to the Philippines' military bases.

Additionally, in FY 2016 SPO will evaluate the Military Services' ability to support the Global Advise and Assist mission by determining the extent to which:

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

- 1. DoD has developed a comprehensive management strategy for prioritizing advise and assist missions and sustaining future missions.
- 2. Geographic Combatant Command campaign plans and Military Service strategies are synchronized and aligned with the DoD strategy.
  - 3. Military Services support the advise and assist missions.

#### Medical:

SPO will assess the implementation plans to improve the effectiveness of Wounded Warrior Transition Programs. The objectives of this oversight effort are to:

- 1. Assess the implementation of the 10 recommendations made by the Department of Defense Recovering Warrior Task Force to DoD (required by: NDAA for FY2010, Section 724), and
- 2. Assess the development and implementation of new metrics for planning and oversight of the Component Wounded Warrior Programs (required by: NDAA for FY2013, Section 738).

SPO will also initiate an assessment of DoD's Suicide Prevention Policy development and dissemination. This will be Phase 4 of our ongoing series of projects/reports on DoD efforts to prevent suicide. In this project, we will evaluate:

- 1. DoD suicide prevention policy development.
- 2. Defense Suicide Prevention Office process to coordinate and then disseminate the new suicide prevention policies to the Military Services/stakeholders.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

3. Military Service/stakeholders understanding of their responsibilities established in the new DoD- level suicide prevention policies.

#### Congressional/Other:

SPO will conduct its annual assessment of DoD Voting Assistance Programs for Calendar Year 2015. In addition, SPO will conduct its third evaluation of the "Requirements for Senior Defense Officials Seeking Employment with Defense Contractors," in accordance with section 847 of Public Law 110-181 and direction specified by the HASC Chairman's Markup on the NDAA for FY 2016. The objectives of this assessment are to:

- 1. Determine whether the written ethics opinions that have been requested and provided pursuant to Section 847 comply with the requirements of Section 847.
- 2. Sum, by DoD organization, the total number of opinions issued and retained pursuant to Section 847.
- 3. Compile a summary of referrals to, and/or complaints received by, the DoD IG or the Department of Justice regarding potential violations of post-employment restrictions, including the final disposition of such cases.
  - 4. Determine the status of pre-2012 records created pursuant to Section 847.
- 5. Follow-up on previous DoD OIG reviews and report any other matters relevant to a comprehensive assessment of Section 847 compliance.

In FY 2016, SPO will initiate an "Inspection of the Armed Forces Retirement Home," required not less than once every three years. This assessment will:

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

- 1. Assess the quality of services provided to the residents of the Retirement Home, and
- 2. Determine to what extent the AFRH management has implemented the recommendations from the DoD OIG report "Inspection of the Armed Forces Retirement Home," dated July 23, 2014 and the OUSD (P&R) report "Armed Forces Retirement Home Review Report" dated April 2013.

#### FY 2017

In response to a growing need to assess key national security objectives globally, SPO will continue to explore its expanding role in assessments outside of Southwest Asia. Areas of interest include, but are not limited to:

- Oversight of other ongoing contingency operations, as applicable,
- Readiness of U.S. forces in Africa, the Pacific, and the Middle East,
- Training and equipping foreign military forces,
- Security Cooperation/Assistance programs worldwide,
- $\bullet$  Counter-terrorism operations, and
- Emerging security threats.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary:

SPO will continue to assess critical healthcare topics, such as transition of wounded service members to the Department of Veterans Affairs, military mental health programs, and medical research activities.

Additional known projects for FY 2017 include the Congressionally-mandated annual assessment/report of "The Federal Voting Assistance Program" and completing the "Inspection of the Armed Forces Retirement Home," also a Congressional requirement.

				Change	Change
V. Personnel Summary	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2015/	FY 2016/
				FY 2016	FY 2017
Active Military End Strength (E/S) (Total)	<u>28</u>	<u>28</u> 27	<u>28</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Officer	27	27	27	0	0
Enlisted	1	1	1	0	0
Civilian End Strength (Total)	1,490	1,583	1,635	<u>93</u>	<u>52</u>
U.S. Direct Hire	1,489	1,582	1,634	93	52
Total Direct Hire	1,489	1,582	1,634	93	52
Foreign National Indirect Hire	1	1	1	0	0
Active Military Average Strength (A/S)	28	28	28	0	0
(Total)				_	_
Officer	27	27	27	0	0
Enlisted	1	1	1	0	0
Civilian FTEs (Total)	1,495	1,537	1,587	42	<u>50</u>
U.S. Direct Hire	1,494	1,536	1,586	42	50
Total Direct Hire	1,494	1,536	1,586	42	50
Foreign National Indirect Hire	1	1	1	0	0
Average Annual Civilian Salary (\$ in thousands)	156.9	152.7	155.6	-4.2	2.9
Contractor FTEs (Total)	107	107	104	<u>0</u>	<u>-3</u>

DoD OIG OP-5 Exhibit

VI. OP 32 Line Items as Applicable (Dollars in thousands):

<del></del>		Chan	ge	Change			
	FY 2015	FY 2015/FY 2016		FY 2016	FY 2016/FY 2017		FY 2017
OP 32 Line	Actual	Price	Program	Enacted	Price	Program	Estimate
101 Exec, Gen'l & Spec Scheds	232,757	2,852	-3,091	232,518	3,532	8,552	244,602
111 Disability Compensation	1,223	0	0	1,223	0	0	1,223
121 PCS Benefits	568	0	354	922	0	241	1,163
199 Total Civ Compensation	234,548	2,852	-2,737	234,663	3,532	8,793	246,988
308 Travel of Persons	5,686	96	815	6,597	119	-785	5,931
399 Total Travel	5,686	96	815	6,597	119	-785	5,931
647 DISA Enterprise Computing Centers	3,471	-347	89	3,213	-321	396	3,288
699 Total DWCF Purchases	3,471	-347	89	3,213	-321	396	3,288
771 Commercial Transport	2,247	38	-2,182	103	2	2	107
799 Total Transportation	2,247	38	-2,182	103	2	2	107
912 Rental Payments to GSA (SLUC)	20,731	352	209	21,292	383	-449	21,226
913 Purchased Utilities (Non-Fund)	68	1	2	71	1	3	75
917 Postal Services (U.S.P.S)	15	0	4	19	0	1	20
920 Supplies & Materials (Non- Fund)	1,710	30	57	1,797	32	89	1,918
921 Printing & Reproduction	120	2	1	123	2	2	127
922 Equipment Maintenance By Contract	1,481	25	185	1,691	30	6	1,727
923 Facilities Sust, Rest, & Mod by Contract	3	0	0	3	0	0	3
925 Equipment Purchases (Non-Fund)	5,578	95	-1,221	4,452	80	1,301	5,833
932 Mgt Prof Support Svcs	19,361	329	501	20,191	363	-1,721	18,833
934 Engineering & Tech Svcs	2,473	42	-712	1,803	32	-17	1,818
955 Other Costs (Medical Care)	260	9	-269	0	0	0	0
960 Other Costs (Interest and Dividends)	0	0	300	300	5	-7	298
987 Other Intra-Govt Purch	7,029	120	2,335	9,484	171	-1,954	7,701
989 Other Services	4,476	76	2,205	6,757	122	-737	6,142
999 Total Other Purchases	63,305	1,081	3,597	67,983	1,221	-3,483	65,721
Total	309,257	3,720	-418	312,559	4,553	4,923	322,035

- \* The FY 2015 Actual column includes \$6,252 thousand of FY 2015 Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) Appropriations funding (PL 113-235).
- \* The FY 2016 Enacted column excludes \$10,262 thousand of FY 2016 OCO Appropriations funding (PL 114-113).
- \* The FY 2017 Estimate excludes \$22,062 thousand of requested FY 2017 OCO funding.