

~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

INSPECTOR GENERAL

U.S. Department of Defense

JUNE 18, 2019



(U) Audit of the Training of the Army's Regionally Aligned Forces in the U.S. Africa Command

~~Classified By: Troy M. Meyer~~
~~Derived From: Multiple Sources~~
~~Declassify On: 20440502~~

INTEGRITY ★ INDEPENDENCE ★ EXCELLENCE

~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Copy ___ of 17





(U) Results in Brief

(U) Audit of the Training of the Army's Regionally Aligned Forces in the U.S. Africa Command

(U) June 18, 2019

(U) Objective

(U) The objective of this audit was to determine whether U.S. Africa Command (USAFRICOM) Regionally Aligned Forces (RAF) were trained to meet the RAF's mission requirements. We focused on whether the regionally aligned training was adequate in preparing RAF personnel for missions in USAFRICOM.

(U) Background

(U) USAFRICOM is focused on building partner capacity, while developing and conducting its activities to enhance safety, security, and stability in Africa. To succeed in this effort and address the continent's most pressing challenges, USAFRICOM relies on the RAF to execute operations, exercises, and security cooperation activities. According to Army Strategic Planning Guidance, the RAF provides combatant commanders with tailored, responsive, and consistently available Army forces for their region. The Army allocates a different Brigade Combat Team (BCT) to the RAF each year and this BCT executes most of the RAF missions.¹

(U) Before deploying for RAF missions, USAFRICOM RAF personnel must complete both mission essential tasks (METs) training and regionally aligned training.

(U) METs training focuses on the fundamental capabilities that units should possess in any operational environment. For example, METs training for an infantry BCT would include training for key combat skills, such as conducting an attack on enemy forces or securing an area.

(U) Regionally aligned training, which includes required and supplemental training, is specific to the RAF mission. Required regionally aligned training is mandatory for all

Background (cont'd)

(U) RAFs, regardless of the combatant command they support, while supplemental training relates to the skills needed for specific missions or an individual combatant command. Examples of the required regionally aligned training include Level 1 Antiterrorism Awareness training and Personnel Recovery training. Supplemental training for the USAFRICOM RAF includes training on foreign weapons and United Nations infantry standards. Regionally aligned training does not have a standardized training plan, so the unit commander has discretion to decide which supplemental training is necessary for RAF personnel.

(U) Finding

(U) RAF personnel allocated to USAFRICOM did not receive adequate regionally aligned training to meet the RAF's mission requirements. For example, senior U.S. officials from country teams, individual RAF personnel, a USAFRICOM Branch Chief, and an Army Asymmetric Warfare Group observation reported the need for more robust preparation in several areas, including cultural awareness training, instructor training to enable the teaching and advising of skills and tactics to partner nations, and training on partner nations' environments or militaries.

(U) We determined that Army components did not plan, implement, or monitor the regionally aligned training provided to the USAFRICOM RAF in accordance with Army requirements. Specifically,

- (U) The Center for Army Analysis, U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM), and U.S. Army Africa (USARAF) did not perform assessments of the implementation, training and preparation, and performance of the RAF

¹ (U) BCTs, which contain between 4,400 and 4,700 soldiers, are the Army's combined-arms formations. Combined-arms are the appropriate combinations of infantry, mobile protected firepower, offensive and defensive fires, engineers, Army aviation, and joint capabilities.



~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

(U) Results in Brief

(U) Audit of the Training of the Army's Regionally Aligned Forces in the U.S. Africa Command

(U) Finding (cont'd)

(U) regionally aligned training program, as required by Fragmentary Order 1, Annex E to the RAF Execute Order. The assessments, if done correctly, would have identified whether RAF training was sufficient, whether RAF training given to units was tailored to the units' RAF missions, and whether RAF personnel felt adequately prepared for RAF missions. In addition, the assessments also would have identified whether the BCT is the best unit to support the RAF compared to other military formations.

- (U) USARAF did not provide RAF units with clear directions for completing after-action reviews or use lessons learned from completed missions, as required by Army Regulation 11-33 and affirmed by the DoD in 2015, to identify areas for improvements in the RAF's regionally aligned training program. Specifically, Army Regulation 11-33 requires USARAF to direct RAF units in their submission of after-action reviews and to manage the collection, analysis, and dissemination of lessons learned and best practices. In addition, the DoD stated in 2015 that it would use after-action reviews submitted by RAF units to update the RAF's training guidance.² However, the USAFRICOM RAF's after-action reviews were not standardized and did not address the RAF's training.

(U) As a result, the RAF has not been consistently prepared for its deployments to Africa, which has degraded the effectiveness of the RAF's missions. Specifically, U.S. senior officials from country teams, individual RAF personnel, and the Army Asymmetric Warfare Group reported that the lack of RAF mission preparation, cultural awareness training, instructor training, and training on the partner nation's environment or military has resulted in RAF personnel being

(U) unable to meet mission requirements. Security cooperation is a key element of USAFRICOM's theater campaign plan because it helps build our African partners' capabilities and capacities, which promotes regional security, stability, and prosperity in Africa. Therefore, ineffective RAF training could disrupt or delay the execution of USAFRICOM's strategy for the continent.

(U) Recommendations

(U) We recommend that the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7, direct the Center for Army Analysis, or a more appropriate Army component, to assess the USAFRICOM RAF's implementation. The assessment should, at a minimum, analyze how RAF units are selected; identify how the RAF uses metrics and determine whether the BCTs have the right mix of personnel, including rank and expertise, to execute RAF missions; and determine whether the BCT is the best option for the RAF compared to other options, such as the Security Forces Assistance Brigade.

(U) In addition, the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7, should direct FORSCOM, or a more appropriate Army component, to assess the USAFRICOM RAF's regionally aligned training program. The assessments should, at a minimum, analyze the RAF commanders' training plans; compare training plans to the RAF missions and determine whether training plans are properly aligned; analyze mission after-action reviews and interview RAF personnel for areas of improvement related to training and preparation; and implement improvements to the RAF's regionally aligned training program that will ensure RAF personnel are prepared to meet mission requirements.

² (U) In 2015, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that the DoD could improve mission-specific preparation for Army brigades in USAFRICOM. In response, the Principal Director, African Affairs, in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs stated that updates to training guidance would be based on lessons learned and after-action reviews submitted by RAF elements returning from missions.

~~SECRET//NOFORN~~



~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

(U) Results in Brief

(U) Audit of the Training of the Army's Regionally Aligned Forces in the U.S. Africa Command

(U) Recommendations (cont'd)

(U) Furthermore, the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7, should direct USARAF, or a more appropriate Army component, to assess the USAFRICOM RAF's performance. The assessments should, at a minimum, incorporate a baseline to aid in measuring the effectiveness of RAF missions; include the results of after-action reviews and documented interviews with RAF and country team personnel to identify areas of improvement; and quantify the results of RAF missions and their contributions toward USAFRICOM's Theater Campaign Plan.

(U) Finally, we recommend that the USARAF Commanding General provide the RAF clear instructions to guide after-action reviews and use lessons learned from completed missions and rotations to identify improvements in the regionally aligned training program.

(U) Management Comments and Our Response

(U) The Division Chief of the Interoperability, Stability, and Security Cooperation Division, responding for the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7, agreed with the recommendations to assess the RAF, stating that the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7, will form a workgroup to review and update Execute Order 052-13 by July 2019. The Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7, will update tasks across the Army in the new Execute Order and plans to publish the new order by January 2020. The tasks pertaining to assessing RAF implementation, training, and performance will be updated in the new order.

(U) Comments from the Division Chief of the Interoperability, Stability, and Security Cooperation Division addressed all specifics of the recommendations. Therefore, the recommendations are resolved but will remain open. We will close the recommendations once we verify that the new Execute Order directs an appropriate component to assess RAF implementation, training, and performance.

(U) The Commanding General of USARAF agreed with the recommendation for improving after-action reviews and using lessons learned, stating that USARAF will add a task within the annual order and all individual activity orders that directs all subordinate units to complete after-action reviews and review previous lessons learned. In addition, USARAF plans to publish clear instructions and a standardized format to guide lessons learned by July 1, 2019. USARAF will continue to incorporate lessons learned into RAF onboarding and other RAF training.

(U) Comments from the Commanding General of USARAF addressed all specifics of the recommendation. Therefore, the recommendation is resolved but will remain open. We will close the recommendation once we verify that tasks for completing after-action reviews and using lessons learned have been added to the annual order and the individual activity orders, and that USARAF has published clear instructions to guide lessons learned.

(U) Please see the Recommendations Table on the next page for a status of the recommendations.

~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

(U) Recommendations Table

Management	Recommendations Unresolved	Recommendations Resolved	Recommendations Closed
(U) Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7	None	1.a, 1.b, and 1.c	None
(U) Commanding General, U.S. Army Africa	None	2	None

(U) Note: The following categories are used to describe agency management's comments to individual recommendations.

- (U) Unresolved – Management has not agreed to implement the recommendation or has not proposed actions that will address the recommendation.
- (U) Resolved – Management agreed to implement the recommendation or has proposed actions that will address the underlying finding that generated the recommendation.
- (U) Closed – OIG verified that the agreed upon corrective actions were implemented.



INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
4800 MARK CENTER DRIVE
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22350-1500

June 18, 2019

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER, U.S. AFRICA COMMAND
COMMANDER, U.S. FORCES COMMAND
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY, G-3/5/7
DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR ARMY ANALYSIS
AUDITOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
COMMANDER, U.S. ARMY AFRICA COMMAND

SUBJECT: (U) Audit of the Training of the Army's Regionally Aligned Forces in the
U.S. Africa Command (Report No. DODIG-2019-096)

(U) We are providing this report for your information and use. We conducted this audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

(U) We considered comments from the Division Chief, Interoperability, Stability, and Security Cooperation Division, responding for the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7, and from the Commanding General of the U.S. Army Africa Command on the draft of this report when preparing the final report. Those comments conformed to the requirements of DoD Instruction 7650.03.

(U) If you have any questions please contact me at (703) 604-8938 (DSN 312-664-8938). We appreciate the cooperation and assistance received during the audit.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Troy M. Meyer", is positioned above the typed name.

Troy M. Meyer
Principal Assistant Inspector General
for Audit

(U) Contents

(U) Introduction.....	1
(U) Objective.....	1
(U) Background	1
(U) Review of Internal Controls	10
(U) Finding.....	11
(U) The Army Needs to Improve the RAF’s Regionally Aligned Training.....	11
(U) Limited Documentation Related to Regionally Aligned Training	12
(U) Improvements Needed in Regionally Aligned Training	13
(U) Army Components Did Not Manage the RAF’s Training and Preparation as Required.....	16
(U) USAFRICOM RAF Has Not Been Consistently Prepared for Missions	21
(U) Recommendations, Management Comments, and Our Response	22
(U) Appendix A	25
(U) Scope and Methodology	25
(U) Use of Computer-Processed Data	27
(U) Prior Coverage	28
(U) Appendix B	29
(U) List of Classified Sources.....	30
(U) Management Comments.....	32
(U) Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7	32
(U) U.S. Army Africa	34
(U) Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	36

(U) Introduction

(U) Objective

(U) The objective of this audit was to determine whether U.S. Africa Command (USAFRICOM) Regionally Aligned Forces (RAF) were trained to meet the RAF's mission requirements. We focused on whether the regionally aligned training was adequate in preparing RAF personnel for missions in USAFRICOM.

(U) Background

(U) U.S. Africa Command

(U) The size and diversity of the African continent present challenges to U.S. forces and their partners seeking to promote security and stability there. Africa comprises 54 nations over an area three times the size of the United States. The continent's total population of approximately 1 billion is divided into more than 400 ethnic groups. Across the continent, 35 major languages are spoken, in addition to hundreds of regional and local dialects. Furthermore, seven of the world's fastest-growing economies are found in Africa. On top of these challenges, political and economic instability in Africa has attracted terrorist and insurgent groups. These groups are looking for new bases in remote locations to mount continued attacks against U.S. interests at home and abroad.

(U) To counter these threats and address the inherent challenges of operating in Africa, the DoD established USAFRICOM in 2007 as the sixth geographic combatant command. USAFRICOM's mission is to disrupt and neutralize transnational threats, protect U.S. personnel and facilities, prevent and mitigate conflict, and build African partner defense capability and capacity to promote regional security, stability, and prosperity. To achieve its objectives, USAFRICOM develops and executes a theater campaign plan, which includes various operations, exercises, and security cooperation on the African continent, its island nations, and surrounding waters.³ The Figure illustrates the USAFRICOM area of operations.

³ (U) Headquartered out of Stuttgart, Germany, USAFRICOM is responsible for 53 of the 54 countries in Africa. Egypt is under the U.S. Central Command.

(U) Figure. USAFRICOM Area of Operations



(U) Source: The Navy.

(U) Regionally Aligned Forces

(U) The RAF concept is the Army's approach for providing combatant commanders with tailored, responsive, and consistently available Army forces for their region. Specifically, RAFs are intended to provide combatant commanders with dedicated capabilities oriented to sociocultural and political aspects of specific geographic areas to execute a range of missions and contingency operations. Regional missions are driven by combatant command requirements and require some understanding of the cultures, geography, languages, and militaries of the countries where they are most likely to be employed, as well as expertise in teaching military knowledge and skills to others.

(U) The concept of the RAF first appeared in the 2008 National Defense Strategy. The Army issued Execute Order 052-13 in December 2012 to provide guidance for implementing the RAF concept. The Army then issued Fragmentary Order 1 to this Execute Order in October 2013 to require the Center for Army Analysis to conduct annual assessments of RAF implementation, U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM)

(U) to conduct biannual assessments of RAF training and preparation, and U.S. Army Africa (USARAF) to conduct biannual assessments of RAF performance.⁴ In 2013, USAFRICOM became the first combatant command to use a RAF.

(U) The Army has identified the following three categories of regionally aligned forces.

- **(U) Assigned Forces:** Forces and resources placed under the combatant commander by the Secretary of Defense. Assigned forces are available to the combatant command on a relatively permanent basis.
- **(U) Allocated Forces:** Forces and resources placed under the combatant commander by the Secretary of Defense for execution of assigned missions. The combatant commander can employ allocated Army forces for the purposes and within the parameters established by the Secretary of Defense.
- **(U) Service Retained, Combatant Commander Aligned:** Army forces and resources under the administrative control of the Secretary of the Army that provide support to a combatant commander. The combatant commander has no authority over these forces, but is made aware by the U.S. Army Forces Command of the specific capabilities provided to his or her area of responsibility.

(U) USAFRICOM's Regionally Aligned Force

(U) Army Service Component Commands are primarily operational organizations that serve as Army components for combatant commands. USARAF, based out of Vicenza, Italy, is the Army's Service Component Command of USAFRICOM. In support of USAFRICOM's theater campaign plan, USARAF executes its campaign support plan, which focuses on engaging with the land forces of African partner militaries and regional organizations; providing Army forces in the USAFRICOM theater; and supporting USAFRICOM operations to protect our national security interests. To execute the campaign support plan, USARAF relies primarily on the RAF.

~~(FOUO)~~ The majority of personnel in USAFRICOM [REDACTED] are allocated forces, which remain at their home stations and deploy to Africa to conduct assigned missions. Of the allocated forces, most are sourced by Brigade Combat Teams (BCT), which are

⁴ (U) The Center for Army Analysis conducts analyses to inform critical senior-level decisions. FORSCOM, the Army's largest command, is the Army's conventional force provider to combatant commanders worldwide. FORSCOM trains and prepares its force to build and sustain readiness to meet combatant command requirements.

~~(FOUO)~~ the Army's combined-arms formations. Combined-arms are the appropriate combinations of infantry, mobile protected firepower, offensive and defensive fires, engineers, Army aviation, and joint capabilities.

(U) Each BCT contains 4,400 to 4,700 soldiers and includes infantry, artillery, engineering, and other types of units. For an average RAF rotation, only 500 or so BCT personnel—approximately 11 percent of the BCT—will deploy to the African continent. Despite the small percentage of BCT personnel that actually deploy to Africa during a rotation, USARAF's Deputy G-3/5/7 personnel stated that the BCT still executes approximately 80 percent of the USAFRICOM RAF's missions.

(U) According to FORSCOM's USAFRICOM planner, USAFRICOM is currently on its seventh allocated BCT and has never received the same BCT twice. The last three BCTs allocated to USAFRICOM and the corresponding date of their employment are:

- (U) 1st BCT, 101st Airborne Division, from October 2016 to September 2017;
- (U) 1st BCT, 10th Mountain Division, from October 2017 to September 2018; and
- (U) 2nd BCT, 101st Airborne Division, from October 2018 to the present.

(U) The USAFRICOM RAF Supports Operations, Exercises, and Security Cooperation Activities

(U) The USAFRICOM mission is focused on building partner capacity while developing and conducting its activities to enhance safety, security, and stability in Africa. To succeed in this mission and address the continent's most pressing challenges, USAFRICOM relies on the USAFRICOM RAF's execution of three types of missions—operations, exercises, and security cooperation activities.

(U) Operations

(U) USAFRICOM RAF currently supports two primary operations: crisis-response operations in support of the East Africa Response Force and counter-extremist operations in northern Cameroon.⁵ According to a representative from USARAF's G-7 and a USARAF supervisory operations and plans specialist, USAFRICOM RAF personnel deploy to Africa for 179 days when supporting either of these operations and the operations require approximately 200 RAF personnel.

⁵ (U) The East Africa Response Force was created in the wake of the terrorist attack on the U.S. Embassy in Benghazi, Libya, and is designed to provide tailorable packages of forces to protect American interests in Africa should any threats arise. The operations in northern Cameroon are directed at countering Boko Haram, the violent extremist group responsible for terrorizing the region.

(U) Exercises

(U) Military exercises use realistic, battle-focused settings to simulate wartime operations for training commanders, staff, installations, and units. USAFRICOM-sponsored exercises enhance USAFRICOM, partner, and allied capability and interoperability, and encourage the development of partner security capabilities and professional philosophy among African military elements. The exercises in USAFRICOM often involve multiple Military Services and several partner nations. USAFRICOM's exercises vary each year, but USAFRICOM RAF personnel will usually participate in four to six exercises each year. The length and requirements of each exercise also vary, but exercises typically extend across several weeks and can require over 90 RAF personnel.

(U) Security Cooperation Activities

(U) USAFRICOM security cooperation activities encourage and enable the DoD's African partners to work with the United States to achieve strategic objectives. Security cooperation activities range in scope and size depending on the mission. These activities could include training an African military unit on identifying and countering improvised explosive devices, or building an African partner's infantry capabilities. USAFRICOM plans and develops security cooperation activities in coordination with the Offices of Security Cooperation and Defense Attaché Offices, called country teams, located in U.S. embassies in Africa. Security cooperation activities make up the majority of the missions that use USAFRICOM RAF personnel. According to data provided by USARAF's Theater Security Cooperation Specialist, the USAFRICOM RAF personnel participated in 69 security cooperation activities in FY 2018. However, the activities were relatively short and did not require extensive resources. For example, the 69 activities in FY 2018, on average, lasted 32 days and required only 5 RAF personnel per mission.

(U) The 69 activities in FY 2018, on average, lasted 32 days and required only 5 RAF personnel per mission.

(U) Army Regulation 11-31 requires Army organizations that plan security cooperation activities to establish measures of performance and measures of effectiveness for those activities as a basis for assessing progress toward specified security cooperation objectives.⁶ To ensure proper knowledge transfer, Army Regulation 11-33 requires USARAF to direct the RAF to complete an after-action review after each mission.⁷

⁶ (U) Army Regulation 11-31, "Army Security Cooperation Policy," March 21, 2013.

⁷ (U) Army Regulation 11-33, "Army Lessons Learned Program," June 14, 2017.

(U) USAFRICOM RAF Training

(U) According to FORSCOM's regionally aligned training guidance, USAFRICOM RAF personnel must complete both mission essential tasks (METs) training and regionally aligned training, which includes required and supplemental training, prior to a RAF deployment. We reviewed the Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS) to identify whether the BCTs allocated to the USAFRICOM RAF were trained on their METs and maintained readiness. Furthermore, we reviewed the RAF's regionally aligned training program and determined whether RAF personnel were prepared for their missions in USAFRICOM. We focused primarily on the RAF's regionally aligned training during this audit.

(U) METs Training

(U) USAFRICOM RAF personnel must be proficient in their METs before deploying to USAFRICOM. METs are the fundamental capabilities that units should possess in any operational environment. For example, METs training for an infantry BCT would include training for key combat skills, such as conducting an attack or securing an area. Army units execute METs training to a defined standard. After completing the METs training, the BCTs demonstrate and validate collective proficiency of the METs at a Combat Training Center.

(U) Regionally Aligned Training

(U) The BCT's METs do not always apply to RAF missions in USAFRICOM. Specifically, while an infantry BCT's METs are centered on key combat skills, the majority of the USAFRICOM RAF's missions are focused on engaging African partners in a peacetime environment.

Therefore, USAFRICOM RAF personnel are also expected to complete regionally aligned training, which includes required and supplemental training that is specific to the RAF mission.

(U) While an infantry BCT's MET are centered on key combat skills, the majority of the USAFRICOM RAF's missions are focused on engaging African partners in a peacetime environment.

(U) FORSCOM uses input from the combatant commands to annually publish regionally aligned training guidance. The guidance includes training that is required of all RAFs, regardless of the combatant command they support, and supplemental training that applies to specific missions or individual combatant command needs. Examples of the

(U) required regionally aligned training include Level 1 Antiterrorism Awareness training and Personnel Recovery training, while supplemental training for the USAFRICOM RAF includes training on foreign weapons, United Nations infantry standards, and translator usage. The FORSCOM regionally aligned training guidance does not provide a standardized training plan, so the unit commander has discretion in deciding which supplemental regionally aligned training he or she believes to be necessary for the mission.

~~(S)~~ After a unit completes required training and any supplemental training, the unit commander certifies in a memorandum his or her unit's mission-readiness. FORSCOM then must validate the signed memorandum before the unit aligns with USAFRICOM.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

However, commanders do not always have prior experience in the USAFRICOM RAF and may not know which specific supplemental training is necessary for mission success.

(U) The DoD's Method for Reporting Military Readiness

(U) Both United States Code and DoD guidance require the Military Services to track, assess, and report on readiness in a comprehensive readiness reporting system.⁸ To comply with these requirements, the DoD uses DRRS, which interfaces with over 60 systems to report the readiness of the DoD.

(U) In DRRS, commanders assess their ability to execute their missions, plans, and individual tasks based on the capabilities the commanders' units demonstrate in training and operations. Commanders rate their overall unit readiness with a "C-level" assessment, which reflects the unit's ability to accomplish core functions, provide designated capabilities, and execute the standardized METs. See Appendix B for the

⁸ (U) Sections 117 and 482, title 10, United States Code. DoD Directive 7730.65, "Department of Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS)," May 11, 2015.

(U) different C-level ratings and the Army's corresponding definition for each of those ratings. Commanders report on the following four areas to support their overall C-level assessments:

- (U) Personnel (P),
- (U) Equipment and Supplies On-Hand/Available (S),
- (U) Equipment Readiness/Serviceability (R), and
- (U) Unit Training Proficiency (T).

(U) Each of the four areas is measured against established standards. For example, the unit training proficiency, or T-Level, is based on the percentage of the METs that the unit has been trained on. While Army units are also required to determine and report additional training data, the T-level is determined based solely on the results of the MET proficiency assessments associated with the unit's core functions. Therefore, the T-level would not include a measurement of proficiency for regionally aligned training.

(FOUO)

(S//NOFORN)

Army commanders report T-Level ratings in DRRS based on the units' proficiency in METs associated with its designed capabilities. A T-Level 1 is the highest rating that a commander can give his or her unit. Specifically, when a commander reports a unit at T-Level 1, he or she is asserting that the unit is proficient in 85 percent or more of its METs training, and is categorized as having no untrained tasks. As a unit's proficiency in a given MET falls, the T-Levels also drop. For example, on the opposite end of the spectrum is a T-Level 4, which means that the unit is proficient in less than 55 percent of the METs.

(FOUO)

(FOUO)

Commanders determine and report an Overall Readiness (C-Levels) in DRRS to indicate the ability of the unit to accomplish its core functions and to carry out its designed capabilities. The commander's determination of the C-Level is an assessment of whether the unit possesses the required resources and is trained to undertake the mission for which it is designed.

(S//NOFORN)

(S//NOFORN)

(U) USARAF Made Dedicated Effort to Preserve BCT Readiness

(U) USARAF scheduled training events in USAFRICOM that would promote METs training and preserve BCT readiness. Specifically, as soon as a BCT is identified to be the next brigade allocated to the USAFRICOM RAF, USARAF coordinates with the BCT on its training needs and includes the BCT's planners in exercise planning efforts. Despite several variables that can affect USARAF's exercise planning, such as the requirements of African partners and last-minute changes to the dates of the mission, USARAF accommodated the BCT's METs training requirements. For example, through coordination with the BCT, USARAF identified that members of the BCT needed jungle warfare training as part of their core METs. USARAF then worked with our African partner nation and the BCT to provide that training in conjunction with an exercise, enabling the BCT personnel to complete the required training.

(U) Review of Internal Controls

(U) DoD Instruction 5010.40 requires DoD organizations to implement a comprehensive system of internal controls that provides reasonable assurance that programs are operating as intended and to evaluate the effectiveness of the controls.⁹ We identified internal control weaknesses pertaining to the USAFRICOM RAF's training. Specifically:

- (U) The Center for Army Analysis, FORSCOM, and USARAF did not assess the preparation and implementation of the RAF regionally aligned training program to identify and correct shortcomings in the RAF's regionally aligned training.
- (U) USARAF did not provide RAF units with clear directions for completing after-action reviews or use lessons learned from completed missions to identify improvements in the RAF's regionally aligned training.

(U) We will provide a copy of the report to the senior official responsible for internal controls at the U.S. Army's G-3/5/7, USAFRICOM, USARAF, the Center for Army Analysis, and FORSCOM.

⁹ (U) DoD Instruction 5010.40, "Managers' Internal Control Program Procedures," May 30, 2013.

(U) Finding

(U) The Army Needs to Improve the RAF's Regionally Aligned Training

(U) RAF personnel allocated to USAFRICOM did not receive adequate regionally aligned training to meet the RAF's mission requirements. For example, senior U.S. officials from country teams, individual RAF personnel, an USAFRICOM Branch Chief, and an Army Asymmetric Warfare Group observation reported the need for more robust preparation in several areas, including cultural awareness training, instructor training to enable the teaching and advising of skills and tactics to partner nations, and training on our African partners' environments or militaries.¹⁰

(U) We determined that Army components did not plan, implement, or monitor the regionally aligned training provided to the USAFRICOM RAF in accordance with Army requirements. Specifically:

- (U) The Center for Army Analysis, FORSCOM, and USARAF did not perform formal assessments of the implementation, training and preparation, and performance of the RAF regionally aligned training program, as required by Fragmentary Order 1, Annex E to the RAF Execute Order, to identify and correct shortcomings in the RAF's regionally aligned training.¹¹
- (U) USARAF did not provide RAF units with clear directions for completing after-action reviews or use lessons learned from completed missions and rotations, as required by AR 11-33, to identify areas for improvement in the RAF's regionally aligned training.

(U) As a result, the RAF has not been consistently prepared for its deployments to Africa, which has degraded the effectiveness of the RAF's missions. Specifically, senior U.S. officials from country teams, individual RAF personnel, and the Army Asymmetric Warfare Group reported that the lack of RAF mission preparation, cultural awareness training, instructor training, and training on the partner nation's environment or military has resulted in RAF personnel who are unable to meet mission requirements. Security cooperation is a key element of USAFRICOM's theater campaign plan because it helps build our African partners' capabilities and capacities, which promotes regional security, stability, and prosperity in Africa. Therefore, ineffective RAF training could disrupt or delay the execution of USAFRICOM's strategy for the continent.

¹⁰ (U) The Army Asymmetric Warfare Group provides operational advisory support to the RAF and USARAF and develops solutions for the Army and joint forces. Army Asymmetric Warfare Group personnel have previously accompanied the RAF on missions to Africa and provided feedback based on their observations.

¹¹ (U) Fragmentary Order 1 to Execute Order 052-013, Annex E, "Operations: Assessments," October 2013.

(U) Limited Documentation Related to Regionally Aligned Training

(U) To determine whether USAFRICOM RAF were trained to meet the RAF's mission requirements, we originally intended to review certificates of completion to see if all RAF personnel completed the regionally aligned training, but FORSCOM was unable to provide the training certifications for the completed RAF training. According to FORSCOM officials, the RAF is not required to maintain documentation related to RAF training, therefore, the training certificates for both the required and supplemental regionally aligned training would not be available. FORSCOM stated that in lieu of training certificates it relied on the unit commander's certification that his or her unit was prepared and had completed the necessary regionally aligned training. Therefore, the audit team obtained the unit commanders' certification memorandums for both the FY 2018 and FY 2019 USAFRICOM RAF. The audit team also met with planners from the 1st BCT, 10th Mountain Division and the 2nd BCT, 101st Airborne Division, to discuss the process for training for RAF missions and to discuss the after-action reporting procedures. We had originally intended to use after-action reviews to determine whether RAF regionally aligned training adequately prepared RAF units for missions in USAFRICOM. However, the feedback RAF units provided in the after-action reviews was not standardized, did not directly address RAF regionally aligned training, and did not include feedback from all relevant stakeholders.

(C) With these limitations in documented support related to the implementation and completeness of the USAFRICOM RAF's training, we obtained and relied on feedback received through interviews and surveys of personnel closely associated with RAF missions to assess the adequacy of RAF training.¹² Specifically, we gathered verbal and written feedback related to RAF regionally aligned training and execution from four Senior Defense Officials of country teams, five Chiefs of Offices of Security Cooperation in Africa, and five RAF personnel that executed RAF missions in FY 2018, including three Officers in Charge. In addition to the verbal and written feedback we received from RAF personnel and the country teams, we also received verbal and written feedback regarding RAF regionally aligned training from a USAFRICOM Branch Chief. Finally, we reviewed and evaluated an observation of the RAF that was conducted in [REDACTED] by two Operational Advisors from the Asymmetric Warfare Group. The documented observation was based on the Operational Advisors' observations of RAF units conducting a three-phased [REDACTED]

¹² (U) The audit team elicited feedback through interviews and surveys using standardized questions. For example, the audit team asked in surveys and interviews for input related to RAF training, RAF performance, and after-action reviews. In addition, the team asked the personnel for recommendations to better prepare the RAF for missions they support in Africa, including improvements to the RAF's training.

(C) [REDACTED] Using the verbal and written feedback from the various sources outlined above, we assessed whether USAFRICOM RAF were trained to meet the RAF's mission requirements in the USAFRICOM area of responsibility.

(U) Improvements Needed in Regionally Aligned Training

(U) RAF personnel supporting USAFRICOM did not receive adequate regionally aligned training to meet mission requirements in the USAFRICOM area of responsibility. Specifically, 7 of the 14 personnel from the RAF or country teams and the USAFRICOM branch chief expressed concern that RAF personnel did not always receive the necessary regionally aligned training to meet the USAFRICOM mission requirements. An Army Asymmetric Warfare Group observation of the RAF noted the same concern. For example, senior officials from country teams, individual RAF personnel, a USAFRICOM Branch Chief, and the Army Asymmetric Warfare Group reported the need for more robust preparation in several areas, including cultural awareness training, instructor training to enable the teaching and advising of skills and tactics to partner nations, and training on the partner nation's environment or military.

(U) RAF Personnel Did Not Receive Adequate Cultural Awareness Training

(C) RAF personnel did not receive cultural awareness training that supported the highest level of performance for their USAFRICOM missions. According to the U.S. Army Cadet Command Pamphlet, cultural awareness training prepares Army personnel to successfully communicate and interact with people of other cultures, which results in a greater understanding of how to interact with our African partners and teaches Army forces how to apply this understanding to solving problems and making decisions.¹³ RAF regionally aligned training includes a region brief for all RAF personnel and training on the partner nation's culture for RAF personnel on security force assistance missions or advise-and-assist missions. However, the cultural awareness training did not prepare RAF personnel to interact with partner nations. For example, the Chief, Office of Security Cooperation from the country team in [REDACTED] stated that the RAF did not understand the culture of our African partner, which prohibited the RAF from communicating effectively and understanding the needs of the partner nation during the training event. In addition, a RAF official who participated in Warehouse Management Training in [REDACTED] did not believe he was trained for the specific assignment or the norms of the partner nation and suggested that the Army provide an

¹³ (U) U.S. Army Cadet Command Pamphlet 145-9-1, "Cultural Awareness Training Program," August 19, 2015.

(C) in-depth brief on the culture of the African partner. Furthermore, the Asymmetric Warfare Group's observation of the RAF also identified that the RAF lacked the necessary cultural awareness training.

(U) RAF Personnel Did Not Receive Adequate Instructor Training

(C) RAF personnel did not receive adequate instructor training for the RAF to train a partner nation's personnel. Instructor training prepares Army personnel to train, advise, assist, accompany, and enable foreign security forces. The majority of RAF missions in USAFRICOM consist of a small group of RAF soldiers training and advising a partner nation on skills and tactics. For example, in FY 2018, personnel from the RAF deployed to [REDACTED] for a mission to provide entry-level Humanitarian Mine Action Explosive Ordnance Disposal training to [REDACTED] Army personnel. However, BCT personnel, who conduct most of the RAF's missions, were primarily trained to conduct combat operations, not to teach others combat skills and tactics. Therefore, receiving effective training on how to teach others is critical to the RAF's ability to train and advise the DoD's partner nations in the USAFRICOM area of responsibility.

(C) Regionally aligned training guidance requires RAF personnel that are assigned to security force assistance missions or advise-and-assist missions to complete training on advisor traits and individual advisor skills. However, neither a RAF official from the Humanitarian Mine Action Explosive Ordnance Disposal mission in [REDACTED] nor the Chief, Office of Security Cooperation, in [REDACTED] believed the instructor training the RAF received was sufficient to enable the RAF to train partner nations. The RAF official stated "the training to ensure soldiers are capable of teaching foreign militaries is lacking." The RAF official informed us that although he requested instructor training for his unit, the Army stated that it would provide formal instructor training only to soldiers filling instructor positions at an Advanced Individual Training or Professional Military Education school. The Chief, Office of Security Cooperation, from the [REDACTED] country team explained that an infantry unit can show a partner nation tactics, but does not have the necessary expertise or training to teach others to independently perform those same tactics. Both the RAF official and the Chief, Office of Security Cooperation, believed the lack of instructor training degraded the effectiveness of the missions.

(U) RAF Personnel Did Not Receive Adequate Training on Partner Nation's Environment or Military

(U) RAF units did not receive adequate training on the partner nation's environment, including the ability to respond to threats in the area, or adequate training on the partner nation's military. The RAF units are required to take classes or attend briefings

(U) to give them insight into the partner nation's environment and military. Specifically, the regionally aligned training guidance requires, among other requirements, that RAF personnel supporting USAFRICOM receive the following.

- (U) A region brief on the nation, which includes a general overview of political, military, cultural, religious, economic, and threat conditions in the region of deployment.
- (U) A country overview and training on integrating warfighting functions.
- (U) The entry-level survival, evasion, resistance, and escape training, which is an online training that provides a basic level of training on how to survive in a hostile environment.

(C) However, various officials affiliated with the RAF expressed concern that RAF units were not prepared for the African environment and did not have adequate training on surviving in a hostile environment. For example, the Chief, Office of Security Cooperation, from the country team in [REDACTED] stated that RAF personnel had not been trained on the African environment and were unaware that [REDACTED] soldiers would be carrying weapons into class. This caused the RAF personnel to feel threatened and disrupted the training by requiring the country team to find a solution to a problem that should have been identified and communicated prior to deployment. The Chief, Office of Security Cooperation, stated that having personnel who are familiar with the situation on the ground is vital to long-term success on the continent. In addition, the Army Asymmetric Warfare Group's observation and a noncommissioned officer who participated in a RAF mission in [REDACTED] stated that the required entry-level survival, evasion, resistance, and escape training and force protection training is insufficient for the USAFRICOM area of responsibility and that more in-depth training is necessary to ensure the safety of RAF personnel in such an austere area of operations. For example, the Army Asymmetric Warfare Group's observation stated that RAF personnel lacked the training, experience, and understanding to ensure basic force protection measures in USAFRICOM and recommended that USARAF develop and implement more stringent personnel recovery, escape and evade, and casualty evacuation preparation prior to deployment.

(C) Furthermore, a branch chief from USAFRICOM, the Asymmetric Warfare Group's observation, the RAF unit that participated in a mission in [REDACTED], and the Senior Defense Official for the [REDACTED] country team all expressed concern regarding the RAF's understanding of the partner nations' militaries. Specifically, they stated that the RAF was trying to train the partner nation to U.S. military standards instead of training the partner nation to the standards more widely followed in the region. For example, the RAF official stated that his unit was not required to complete any training that focused on the [REDACTED] military or environment. As a result, the RAF official stated that the unit "had no clue until we were on the ground as to how the [REDACTED] military

(C) doctrine differed from our own” and spent the majority of its mission trying to learn the [REDACTED] doctrine. He said that it would have been better to study and understand the [REDACTED] doctrine prior to arrival in Africa. Furthermore, the officials from the Army Asymmetric Warfare Group reported in their observation that the RAFs have repeatedly tried to provide training and resources that are not sustainable or applicable to the partner nation, and that the DoD has tried to force partner nations to adapt to the DoD’s abilities instead of strengthening the partner’s abilities. This approach has resulted in the partner nation reverting to its own practices after the RAF leaves.

(C) This approach has resulted in the partner nation reverting to its own practices after the RAF leaves.

(U) Army Components Did Not Manage the RAF’s Training and Preparation as Required

(U) We determined that Army components did not plan, implement, or monitor the regionally aligned training provided to the USAFRICOM RAF in accordance with Army requirements. Specifically, the Center for Army Analysis, FORSCOM, and USARAF did not conduct assessments of the training and preparation of RAF units. In addition, USARAF did not provide RAF units with clear directions for completing after-action reviews or use lessons learned from completed missions.

(U) Center for Army Analysis, FORSCOM, and USARAF Did Not Assess RAF Training

(U) The Center for Army Analysis, FORSCOM, and USARAF did not conduct required assessments of the RAF’s implementation, training and preparation, and performance. Fragmentary Order 1, Annex E to the RAF Execute Order requires the Center for Army Analysis to conduct annual assessments of RAF implementation, requires FORSCOM to conduct biannual assessments of RAF training and preparation, and requires USARAF to conduct biannual assessments of RAF performance. If performed correctly, these assessments could identify and improve shortcomings in the RAF’s regionally aligned training. However, the Center for Army Analysis, FORSCOM, and USARAF did not conduct these assessments.

(U) These assessments could identify and improve shortcomings in the RAF’s regionally aligned training. However, the Center for Army Analysis, FORSCOM, and USARAF did not conduct these assessments.

(U) Center for Army Analysis Did Not Assess RAF Implementation

(U) The Center for Army Analysis did not assess RAF implementation, as required by Fragmentary Order 1 to the RAF Execute Order. Fragmentary Order 1 requires the Center for Army Analysis to perform an annual written assessment of the implementation of the RAF policy. As part of the written assessment, the Center for Army Analysis was directed to answer 20 questions related to the implementation of the RAF each year. One of the questions was whether the BCT was the right type of unit for the RAF and whether the BCT had the right mix of personnel to execute the missions. If the BCT was not the right unit, the Center for Army Analysis was required to identify options that may be a better fit for the RAF. When we asked for the assessments in January 2019, officials from the Center for Army Analysis acknowledged that they had not completed the assessments required by the Fragmentary Order 1 since at least 2015. Officials from the Center for Army Analysis provided various reasons why they did not perform the assessments, including internal reorganizations and manpower reductions. The Center for Army Analysis also stated that the Center did not perform the assessments because the U.S. Army G-3/5/7 office that initially drafted the Execute Order was eliminated and the task was not migrated to another G-3/5/7 office.

(U) The Center for Army Analysis's assessment is critical to the RAF training requirements because using resources to train the BCT in subject areas that will not benefit the Army after the BCT's RAF rotation is not practical if there is a better Army unit already available. Specifically, since the majority of the RAF's missions relate to security cooperation, it may be more beneficial for the RAF to use units whose core functions are more closely aligned with training and advising allies and partner nations instead of a BCT, whose core training is in combat skills. In addition, since such a small percentage of the BCT will actually deploy to Africa during the RAF rotation, perhaps a smaller, more experienced unit may be a better use of the Army's resources. For example, personnel from USAFRICOM, FORSCOM, the 10th Mountain and 101st Airborne divisions, and a country team stated that a Security Forces Assistance Brigade would be a better fit for most RAF missions because its core mission is in training and advising other nations.¹⁴ Furthermore, the Army's Director of Force Management, G-3/5/7, has also highlighted the importance of using Security Force Assistance Brigades for growing partner capacity and allowing BCTs to focus on maintaining combat readiness. At a minimum, using a Security Force Assistance Brigade would reduce the regionally aligned training the Army would need to provide to the RAF, as the Security Force Assistance Brigade units would already be proficient in advising and assisting partner nations.

¹⁴ (U) A Security Forces Assistance Brigade is a specialized unit with the core mission to conduct training, advising, assisting, enabling, and accompanying operations with our allies and partner nations. The Army is in the process of standing up six Security Forces Assistance Brigades—two are already active and the Army aims to have all six fully manned and trained by the end of 2019.

(U) FORSCOM Did Not Assess RAF Training and Preparation

(U) FORSCOM did not assess RAF training and preparation, as required by Fragmentary Order 1, Annex E to RAF Execute Order. Fragmentary Order 1 requires FORSCOM to perform a written assessment of the training and preparation of RAF units every 6 months. Specifically, FORSCOM is directed to answer multiple questions related to the sufficiency of the RAF training and to validate the training given to the aligned units. Among the questions FORSCOM must answer are whether training given to RAF units is sufficient, whether training given to RAF units is tailored for upcoming missions, and whether RAF soldiers performing missions felt they were adequately prepared. The answers to these questions could identify shortcomings in the training program and help improve the regionally aligned training of future RAF units. However, FORSCOM officials acknowledged that FORSCOM had not completed the assessments, as required by Fragmentary Order 1. Specifically, the officials stated in December 2018 that FORSCOM had not completed the assessments because existing processes for maintaining situational awareness over RAF training satisfied the requirements that Annex E identifies.

(U) USARAF Did Not Assess RAF Performance

(U) USARAF did not assess RAF performance, as required by Fragmentary Order 1, Annex E to RAF Execute Order. Fragmentary Order 1 requires USARAF to perform a written assessment of the performance of RAF units every 6 months. Specifically, USARAF is directed to answer multiple questions related to performance of RAF units that deployed to Africa for RAF missions. Among the questions USARAF must answer are whether the RAF units were trained for the mission, whether the RAF units conducted after-action reviews of their missions, and whether the training improved the units' ability to execute the trained tasks and contributed toward accomplishing the objectives in the theater campaign plan. If USARAF properly executes these assessments, it could identify areas of improvement, which could lead to progress in carrying out USAFRICOM's plan for Africa. These areas of improvement could then be used to focus the regionally aligned training provided to RAF personnel. However, USARAF officials acknowledged that USARAF had not completed the assessments, as required by Fragmentary Order 1. USARAF officials stated in February 2019 that USARAF had not completed the assessments because the RAF regionally aligned training program had matured since the order was issued and that the requirements no longer seemed feasible or valid.

(U) Army Components Should Perform Required RAF Assessments

(U) We understand that the Fragmentary Order was issued in 2013 and that many changes, to include reorganizations and personnel reductions, have occurred since that time. However, the deficiencies we identified during this audit highlight the need for the assessments. Therefore, if the Army believes that the components tasked to complete the assessments are no longer best suited to execute the assessments or that certain tasks are no longer valid, the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7, should revalidate and reassign the tasks in the assessments. Upon revalidating and reassigning the tasks, the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7, should:

- (U) Direct the Center for Army Analysis, or a more appropriate Army component, to assess the USAFRICOM RAF's implementation. The assessment should, at a minimum, analyze how RAF units are selected; identify the RAF's utilization metrics and determine whether the BCTs have the right mix of personnel, including rank and expertise, to best execute RAF missions; and determine whether the BCT is the best option for the RAF compared to other options, such as the Security Forces Assistance Brigade.
- (U) Direct FORSCOM, or a more appropriate Army component, to assess the USAFRICOM RAF's regionally aligned training program. The assessments should, at a minimum, analyze the RAF commanders' training plans; compare training plans to the RAF missions and determine whether training plans are properly aligned; analyze mission after-action reviews and interview RAF personnel for areas of improvement related to training and preparation; and implement improvements to the RAF's regionally aligned training program that will ensure RAF personnel are prepared to meet mission requirements.
- (U) Direct USARAF, or a more appropriate Army component, to assess the USAFRICOM RAF's performance. The assessments should, at a minimum, incorporate a baseline to aid in measuring the effectiveness of RAF missions; include the results of after-action reviews and documented interviews with RAF and country team personnel to identify areas of improvement; and quantify the results of RAF missions and their contributions toward USAFRICOM's Theater Campaign Plan.

(U) USARAF Did Not Manage Lessons Learned

(U) USARAF did not provide RAF units with clear directions for completing after-action reviews or use lessons learned from completed missions and rotations, which could help identify needed training improvements. Army Regulation 11-33 requires USARAF to direct the assigned units of the RAF to complete an after-action review after each mission. AR 11-33 also requires USARAF to dedicate a lesson manager who can manage the collection, analysis, and dissemination of lessons learned and best practices.

(U) Furthermore, in the DoD's response to a FY 2015 Government Accountability Office (GAO) Report, which found that the DoD could improve mission-specific preparation for Army brigades in USAFRICOM, the DoD stated that updates to training guidance would be based on lessons learned and after-action reviews submitted by RAF elements returning from missions.

(U) USARAF was able to provide evidence that it held high-level lessons learned discussions in FY 2018 and 2019 and stated that lessons learned were used to improve the RAF's operations. However, USARAF could not provide evidence that it guided the RAF units in completing after-action reviews, reviewed after-action reviews from each mission, incorporated feedback from all necessary stakeholders, or implemented all the lessons learned from RAF feedback into training improvements. For example:

- (U) USARAF was able to provide documentation for only one after-action review resulting from the 69 activities the RAF completed in FY 2018.
- (U) When we collected after-action reviews directly from the BCT, the feedback was not standardized and did not address training as the DoD response to the GAO report stated it would.
- (U) The after-action reviews did not consistently include feedback from the country teams, who provide a different perspective on RAF missions and could have given USARAF extremely valuable feedback.
- (U) For the areas that after-action reviews identified as deficiencies, there is no evidence that USARAF formalized the lessons learned into institutional knowledge, such as changes to the regionally aligned training requirements.

(U) Knowledge management that includes developing and implementing lessons learned and best practices drives timely change through adaptive learning. Because the RAF experiences significant turnover in personnel each year, it is important that USARAF uses adaptive learning, carries forward lessons learned, and creates institutional knowledge related to the RAF. To ensure proper knowledge management, USARAF should provide the RAF clear directions to guide the RAF's after-action reviews and use the lessons learned from completed missions and rotations to identify training improvements. As a best business practice to ensure after-action reviews are consistent and reliable for lessons learned purposes, USARAF's direction to the RAF should include standard areas that each after-action review should address and require each after-action review to incorporate feedback from all stakeholders, including the country teams.

(U) USAFRICOM RAF Has Not Been Consistently Prepared for Missions

(U) The RAF has not been consistently prepared for its deployments to Africa, which has degraded the effectiveness of its missions. Specifically, senior officials from country teams, individual RAF personnel, and the Army Asymmetric Warfare Group reported that the lack of RAF mission preparation, cultural awareness training, instructor training, and training on the partner nation's environment or military has resulted in RAF personnel who are unable to meet mission requirements. For example:

- (C) Several officials, including the Chief, Office of Security Cooperation, in [REDACTED] and a RAF official from the Humanitarian Mine Action Explosive Ordnance Disposal mission in [REDACTED], stated that the RAF was not skilled in training partner nation personnel, which degraded mission execution and limited the value of the security cooperation activities.
- (C) The Chief, Office of Security Cooperation, in [REDACTED] and a Senior Defense Officer in [REDACTED] concluded that RAF personnel were not knowledgeable about the environment or military of our partner nation, which they stated resulted in a "figure it out" mentality on the ground and delayed the progress of missions. In addition, the Asymmetric Warfare Group concluded that the RAF repeatedly forcing its way on African nations has resulted in the partner nations reverting back to their old ways after the RAF leaves.
- (C) The Chief, Office of Security Cooperation, in [REDACTED] outlined that the RAF team conducting a Warehouse Management mission was forced to negotiate alternative plans and a second mission was canceled because the RAF was not prepared for the mission.
- (C) An Army officer who deployed with the RAF to [REDACTED] for Advanced Infantry Battalion Training stated that the RAF did not cater to the [REDACTED] needs and many of the planned classes were not taught during the mission.

(U) Each of the examples above illustrates instances where RAF missions were degraded, modified, or canceled because the RAF personnel assigned to support the mission were not adequately prepared through the USAFRICOM RAF's regionally aligned training program. Because security cooperation is a key element of USAFRICOM's theater campaign plan and the RAF is a primary contributor to USAFRICOM's security cooperation efforts, the effectiveness of the RAF is imperative to the success of the USAFRICOM campaign plan. The USAFRICOM RAF's support helps build African partners' capabilities and capacities, which promotes regional security, stability, and prosperity in Africa. Therefore, ineffective regionally aligned training for the RAF could disrupt or delay the execution of USAFRICOM's campaign plan for the continent.

(U) Recommendations, Management Comments, and Our Response

(U) Recommendation 1

(U) We recommend that the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7:

- a. **(U) Direct the Center for Army Analysis, or a more appropriate Army component, to assess the implementation of the U.S. Africa Command's Regionally Aligned Forces. The assessment should, at a minimum, analyze how Regionally Aligned Forces are selected; identify the Regionally Aligned Forces' utilization metrics and determine whether the Brigade Combat Teams have the right mix of personnel, including rank and expertise, to best execute Regionally Aligned Forces' missions; and determine whether the Brigade Combat Team is the best option for the Regionally Aligned Forces compared to other options, such as the Security Forces Assistance Brigade.**
- b. **(U) Direct U.S. Forces Command, or a more appropriate Army component, to assess the U.S. Africa Command Regionally Aligned Forces' training program. The assessments should, at a minimum, analyze the Regionally Aligned Forces commanders' training plans; compare training plans to the Regionally Aligned Forces' missions and determine whether training plans are properly aligned; analyze mission after-action reviews and interview Regionally Aligned Forces personnel for areas of improvement related to training and preparation; and implement improvements to the Regionally Aligned Forces training program that will ensure Regionally Aligned Forces personnel are prepared to meet mission requirements.**
- c. **(U) Direct U.S. Army Africa, or a more appropriate Army component, to assess the U.S. Africa Command Regionally Aligned Forces' performance. The assessments should, at a minimum, incorporate a baseline to aid in measuring the effectiveness of Regionally Aligned Forces' missions; include the results of after-action reviews and documented interviews with Regionally Aligned Forces and country team personnel to identify areas of improvement; and quantify the results of Regionally Aligned Forces' missions and their contributions toward U.S. Africa Command's Theater Campaign Plan.**

(U) Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7 Comments

(U) The Division Chief of the Interoperability, Stability, and Security Cooperation Division, responding for the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7, agreed with the recommendations, stating that the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7, will form a workgroup to review and update Execute Order 052-13 by July 2019. The Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7, plans to publish the new order by January 2020 with updated tasks for assessing RAF implementation and the RAF training program. In addition, to quantify the results of RAF missions in support of the geographic combatant command campaign plans, the Army tasks for the Army Service Component Commands, including USARAF, will include language to assess the RAF's performance.

(U) The updates will support ongoing Departmental efforts to more effectively assess, monitor, and evaluate security cooperation in support of the 2017 National Defense Authorization Act's Security Cooperation Reform efforts.

(U) Our Response

(U) Comments from the Division Chief of the Interoperability, Stability, and Security Cooperation Division addressed all specifics of the recommendations. Therefore, the recommendations are resolved but will remain open. We will close Recommendations 1.a, 1.b, and 1.c once we verify that the new Execute Order directs the appropriate components to assess RAF implementation, the RAF training program, and RAF performance, and that the assigned Army components have completed the assessments.

(U) Recommendation 2

(U) We recommend that the Commanding General of the U.S. Army Africa Command provide the Regionally Aligned Forces clear instructions to guide after-action reviews and use lessons learned from completed missions and rotations, as required by Army Regulation 11-33, to improve the regionally aligned training program.

(U) Commanding General, U.S. Army Africa Command, Comments

(U) The Commanding General of USARAF agreed with the recommendation, stating that USARAF will add a task within the annual order and all individual activity orders that directs all subordinate units to complete after-action reviews and review previous lessons learned in the Global Theater Security Cooperation Management and Information System and the Joint Lessons Learned Information System. The target completion date for this action is July 1, 2019. In addition, USARAF will publish clear instructions and a standardized format to guide lessons learned and will continue to incorporate lessons learned into RAF onboarding and other RAF training events.

(U) Our Response

(U) Comments from the Commanding General of USARAF addressed all specifics of the recommendation. Therefore, the recommendation is resolved but will remain open. We will close Recommendation 2 once we verify that tasks for completing after-action reviews and using lessons learned have been added to the annual order and the individual activity orders, and that USARAF has published clear instructions to guide lessons learned.

(U) Appendix A

(U) Scope and Methodology

(U) We conducted this performance audit from August 2018 through May 2019 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective.

(U) We reviewed criteria to determine whether the Army ensured that the USAFRICOM RAF was trained to meet mission requirements. Specifically, we reviewed U.S. Army Execute Orders and Fragmentary Orders that established and refined the requirements relating to the RAF. In addition, we reviewed DoD guidance, U.S. Army criteria, and U.S. Army orders that pertained to security cooperation, training, and readiness. These criteria and orders included, but were not limited to, the following:

- (U) Headquarters Department of the Army Execute Order 052-13 “ISO Regionally Aligned Forces (RAF),” December 27, 2012
- (U) Fragmentary Orders 1 and 2 to Execute Order 052-13, October 21, 2013 and July 29, 2015
- (U) DoD Directive 7730.65, “Department of Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS),” May 11, 2015
- (U) DoD Instruction 7730.66, “Guidance for the Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS),” July 8, 2011
- (U) Army Regulation 11-31, “Army Security Cooperation Policy,” March 21, 2013
- (U) Army Regulation 11-33, “Army Lessons Learned Program,” June 14, 2017
- (U) Army Regulation 220-1, “Army Unit Status Reporting and Force Registration-Consolidated Policies,” April 15, 2010
- (U) Army Regulation 350-1, “Army Training and Leader Development,” December 10, 2017
- (U) Army Regulation 350-28, “Army Exercises,” December 9, 1997
- (U) FORSCOM’s RAF Training Requirements, including supporting annexes

(U) We conducted site visits to USAFRICOM Headquarters in Stuttgart, Germany, and to USARAF Headquarters in Vicenza, Italy, from September to October 2018, to gain an understanding of the processes related to RAF training and mission execution. At these sites, we primarily met with staff responsible for operations, plans, and training. We also conducted a site visit to FORSCOM Headquarters in Fort Bragg, North Carolina, in October 2018, to understand the process for sourcing RAF requirements, generating RAF training requirements, and verifying that RAF units have completed required training prior to deployment. In addition to our site visits, we also conducted meetings with forces that previously served in the USAFRICOM RAF, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command personnel, Center for Army Lessons Learned personnel, and DRRS subject-matter experts.

(U) We originally intended to review certificates of completion to see if all RAF personnel completed the required regionally aligned training, but FORSCOM personnel stated that training certificates were not maintained for regionally aligned training. Instead, the unit commander certifies that his unit is prepared and has completed the necessary training. Therefore, the audit team obtained the unit commanders' certification memorandums for the FY 2018 and FY 2019 USAFRICOM RAF. We also intended to use after-action reviews to determine whether RAF training adequately prepared RAF units for missions. However, the feedback on the after-action reviews was not standardized, did not address RAF training as DoD affirmed they would, and did not include feedback from all relevant stakeholders. Therefore, we relied on feedback from interviews and surveys to assess the adequacy of RAF training.

(U) We gained additional assurance that RAF personnel completed the regionally aligned training and determined whether the regionally aligned training was sufficient for the RAF to meet mission requirements in the following ways.

- (U) We used surveys to obtain feedback from RAF personnel that had participated in RAF missions in FY 2018. Our coordination with RAF personnel was to identify, among other things, the training they completed for their missions; whether they thought the training they received prepared them for their assignments; and any suggested improvements in the RAF training process. To gather this feedback, we selected a non-statistical sample of six security cooperation activities that the RAF executed in FY 2018. As part of our sampling methodology, we considered countries that had recently hosted multiple RAF missions and RAF missions that were assigned a higher number of RAF personnel. For the missions we selected, we obtained and reviewed the after-action reviews and training plans for these missions. We also obtained personnel listings for the selected missions and sent a survey via e-mail to solicit feedback on their experience and preparation for the RAF mission.

- (U) We conducted meetings with or surveyed 22 DoD country teams in Africa. We coordinated with the country teams to identify, among other things, the country teams' overall responsibilities; the types of missions their countries have supported; their assessment of the RAF's training and mission execution, including instances where missions were not adequately executed; the impact of the RAF's annual transitions; and the country teams' involvement in the after-action review process.
- (C) We obtained the Army Asymmetric Warfare Group's [REDACTED] observation of the RAF from the Center for Army Lessons Learned. We reviewed the observation and identified deficiencies related to the RAF's regionally aligned training.

(U) Use of Computer-Processed Data

(U) We obtained and used computer-processed data from DRRS to retrieve overall readiness and training ratings for the BCTs that served in the USAFRICOM RAF in FYs 2017 and 2018. DRRS is a repository of readiness information that is assessed and submitted by unit commanders. As the DoD's readiness reporting system, DRRS is relied on by combatant commanders, the Military Services, Joint Chiefs of Staff, combat support agencies, and the Secretary of Defense in evaluating readiness and capability of the forces. The Office of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, 2016 Annual Report stated that DRRS was operationally effective, suitable, and survivable against a cyber threat.¹⁵ And though the 2016 report acknowledged that the data obtained from DRRS are only as reliable as the accuracy of the information the commanders submit, the report found that tactical units entered objective, accurate, and timely resource and training data into DRRS. To obtain greater assurance that the data obtained from DRRS were represented accurately in our findings and conclusions, we also consulted with DRRS experts on the BCT readiness ratings. Therefore, we believe that the data from DRRS and the way that we represent those data in the report is sufficient and appropriate.

¹⁵ (U) The Director, Operational Test and Evaluations, is the senior adviser to the Secretary of Defense on operational test and evaluations in the DoD. Among other responsibilities, the Director, Operational Test and Evaluations, issues DoD operational test and evaluations policy and procedures; reviews and analyzes the results of operational testing and evaluations conducted on major DoD acquisition programs; and oversees major DoD acquisition programs to ensure operational testing and evaluation is adequate to confirm operational effectiveness and suitability of the defense system.

(U) Prior Coverage

(U) During the last 5 years, the GAO issued one report discussing the USAFRICOM RAF and the DoD OIG issued two reports regarding readiness. Unrestricted GAO reports can be accessed at <http://www.gao.gov>. Unrestricted DoD OIG reports can be accessed at www.dodig.mil/reports.html/.

(U) GAO

(U) Report No. GAO-15-568, “Regionally Aligned Forces: DoD Could Enhance Army Brigades’ Efforts in Africa by Improving Activity Coordination and Mission-Specific Preparation,” August 26, 2015

(U) This report found that brigades have been trained and equipped for their core missions, which has generally prepared them to meet requirements in Africa, but opportunities exist to enhance their mission-specific preparation.

(U) DOD OIG

(U) Report No. DODIG-2018-141, “United States Marine Corps Aviation Squadron Aircraft Readiness Reporting,” August 8, 2018

(U) This report found that Marine Corps Aviation squadron commanders did not accurately report aircraft readiness.

(U) Report No. DODIG-2017-029, “Army National Guard Companies Have Not Developed Effective Training Programs to Attain or Sustain Mission Essential Task Proficiency,” December 5, 2016

(U) This report found that commanders of the nine audited units did not develop effective training programs to ensure units could attain or sustain mission essential task proficiency.

(U) Appendix B

(U) Army Pamphlet 220-1 defines the C-level rating as follows:¹⁶

- (U) A C-Level 1 rating, as the highest readiness rating, is given when a commander asserts that his or her unit is capable of undertaking the mission for which it is designed.
- (U) A C-Level 2 rating is given when the commander asserts that his or her unit is capable of undertaking most of the missions for which it is designed. A C-Level 2 rating indicates that the status of resources and training may cause isolated decreases in flexibility in methods for mission accomplishment, but will not increase the vulnerability of the unit under most envisioned operational scenarios. Additionally, the commander is indicating that the unit would require little, if any, help for deficiencies.
- (U) A C-Level 3 rating is given when the commander asserts that his or her unit possesses the required resources and is trained to undertake many, but not all, portions of the mission for which it is designed. A C-Level 3 rating indicates that the status of resources or training will result in a significant decrease in flexibility for mission accomplishment and will increase the vulnerability of the unit under many, but not all, envisioned operational scenarios. Additionally, the commander is indicating that the unit will require significant help for deficiencies.
- (U) A C-Level 4 rating is given when the commander asserts that his or her unit requires additional resources or training to undertake its designed mission, but that the unit may be directed to undertake some portions of its mission with resources on hand.
- (U) A C-Level 5 rating is given when the commander asserts that his or her unit is not prepared to undertake the full spectrum mission for which it is designed.

¹⁶ (U) Department of the Army Pamphlet 220-1, "Defense Readiness Reporting System—Army Procedures," November 16, 2011.

(U) List of Classified Sources

- Source 1: (U) Status of Resources and Training System Historical Reports
(Document Classified ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~)
Declassify on: December 19, 2043
Date of Source: December 19, 2018
- Source 2: (U) Commander's Unit Status Reports (Document Classified ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~)
Declassify on: December 20, 2043
Date of Source: December 20, 2018
- Source 3: (U) Regionally Aligned Force (RAF) Current and Historical Readiness Assessment (Document Classified ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~)
Declassify on: 09/01/2028
Date of Source: 09/01/2018
- Source 4: (U) Commander's Assessment of CORE Mission Essential Tasks
(Document Classified ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~)
Declassify on: March 15, 2044
Date of Source: March 15, 2019
- Source 5: (U) FY2018 RAF Onboarding Concept (Document Classified ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~)
Declassify on: April 19, 2042
Date of Source: April 19, 2017
- Source 6: (U) FY19 RAF Onboarding Concept (Document Classified ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~)
Declassify on: April 10, 2043
Date of Source: April 10, 2018
- Source 7: (U) Commander's Assessment and Unit Summary (Document Classified ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~)
Declassify on: March 25, 2044
Date of Source: March 25, 2019

Source 8: (S)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(Document Classified SECRET)

Declassify on: August 21, 2043

Date of Source: August 21, 2018

(U) Management Comments

(U) Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7
400 Army Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-0400

DAMO-SSC

29 May 2019

MEMORANDUM FOR Department of Defense Inspector General, Program Director for Audit Readiness and Global Operations, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Alexandria, VA 22350-1500

SUBJECT: Audit of the Training of the Army's Regionally Aligned Forces in U.S. Africa Command (Project No. D2018-D000RH-0188.000)

1. References:

- a. Department of Defense Inspector General (DoDIG) Draft Report for Audit of the Training of the Army's Regionally Aligned Forces in the U.S. Africa Command (Project No. D2018-D000RH-0188.000), 2 May 2019
- b. Army Regulation 36-2, Audit Services of the Department of the Army, 19 September 2017
- c. Memorandum HQ, United States Army Africa, ARAF-CG, 20 May 19, subject: Audit of the Training of the Army's Regionally Aligned Forces in U.S. Africa Command (Project No. D2018-D000RH-0188.000)

2. This memorandum is the Deputy Chief Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7 official command reply to the draft report for the subject audit. The draft report made three recommendations (referred to as Recommendation 1.a., 1.b., and 1.c.) to the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7. The Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7 (DCS G-3/5/7) concurs with Recommendations 1.a., 1.b., and 1.c. as noted below.

3. Recommendation 1.a.

a. Recommendation: Direct the Center for Army Analysis, or a more appropriate Army component, to assess the USAFRICOM RAF's implementation. The assessment should, at a minimum, analyze how RAF units are selected; identify how the RAF uses metrics and determine whether the BCTs have the right mix of personnel, including rank and expertise to execute the RAF missions; and determine whether the BCT is the best option for the RAF compared to other options, such as the Security Forces Assistance Brigade

b. DCS G-3/5/7 Reply: DCS G-3/5/7 concurs with recommendation. DCS G-3/5/7 will review task key stakeholders to form a workgroup to review and update HQDA EXORD 052-13, FRAGO 1 and FRAGO 2 to the EXORD by the beginning of July 2019 (to include CALL, USARAF, and FORSCOM). Based off of the workgroup, DCS G-3/5/7 will staff new EXORD with updated tasks across the Army with a targeted date of publication NLT January 2020. CALL tasks will be updated requesting assessments of RAF implementation across the Army. This will include RAF units supporting USAFRICOM. This assessment will also support ongoing Departmental efforts to more effectively assess, monitor, and evaluate Security Cooperation in support of NDAA 2017 Security Cooperation Reform efforts.

4. Recommendation 1.b.

(U) Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7 (cont'd)

DAMO-SSC

SUBJECT: Audit of the Training of the Army's Regionally Aligned Forces in U.S. Africa Command (Project No. D2018-D000RH-0188.000)

a. Recommendation: Direct FORSCOM, or a more appropriate Army component, to assess the USAFRICOM RAF's regionally aligned training program. The assessments should, at a minimum, analyze the RAF commanders' training plans; compare training plans to the RAF missions and determine whether training plans are properly aligned; analyze mission after-action reviews and interview RAF personnel for areas of improvement related to training and preparation; and implement improvements to the RAF's regionally aligned training program that will ensure RAF personnel are prepared to meet mission requirements.

b. DCS G-3/5/7 Reply: DCS G-3/5/7 concurs with recommendation. DCS G-3/5/7 will review task key stakeholders to form a workgroup to review and update HQDA EXORD 052-13, FRAGO 1 and FRAGO 2 to the EXORD by the beginning of July 2019 (to include CALL, USARAF, and FORSCOM). Based off of the workgroup, DCS G-3/5/7 will staff new EXORD with updated tasks across the Army with a targeted date of publication NLT January 2020. FORSCOM tasks will be updated requesting assessments of the total RAF regionally aligned training program.

5. Recommendation 1.c.

a. Recommendation: Direct USARAF, or a more appropriate Army component, to assess the USAFRICOM RAF's performance. The assessments should, at a minimum, incorporate a baseline to aid in measuring the effectiveness of RAF missions; include the results of after-action reviews and documented interviews with RAF and country team personnel to identify areas of improvement; and quantify the results of RAF missions and their contributions toward USAFRICOM's Theater Campaign Plan.

b. DCS G-3/5/7 Reply: DCS G-3/5/7 concurs with recommendation. DCS G-3/5/7 will review task key stakeholders to form a workgroup to review and update HQDA EXORD 052-13, FRAGO 1 and FRAGO 2 to the EXORD by the beginning of July 2019 (to include CALL, USARAF, and FORSCOM). Based off of the workgroup, DCS G-3/5/7 will staff new EXORD with updated tasks across the Army with a targeted date of publication NLT January 2020. The Army tasks to our ASCC's will include language to assess the RAF's performance within their theaters to quantify the results of RAF missions in support of the Geographic Combatant Commander Campaign plans. This will include USARAF Headquarters. These assessments will also support ongoing Departmental efforts to more effectively assess, monitor, and evaluate Security Cooperation in support of NDAA 2017 Security Cooperation Reform efforts.

6. My point of contact is [REDACTED]



ROBERT M. HOWIESON
Colonel, Division Chief
Interoperability, Stability, and Security Cooperation
Division

(U) U.S. Army Africa



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
UNITED STATES ARMY AFRICA/SOUTHERN EUROPEAN TASK FORCE
UNIT 31401, BOX 5
APO AE 09630-1410

20 MAY 2019

ARAF-CG

MEMORANDUM FOR Department of Defense Inspector General, Program Director for Audit Readiness and Global Operations, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Alexandria, VA 22350-1500

SUBJECT: Audit of the Training of the Army's Regionally Aligned Forces in U.S. Africa Command (Project No. D2018-D000RH-0188.000)

1. References:

a. Department of Defense Inspector General (DoDIG) Draft Report for Audit of the Training of the Army's Regionally Aligned Forces in the U.S. Africa Command (Project No. D2018-D000RH-0188.000), 2 May 2019

b. Army Regulation 36-2, Audit Services of the Department of the Army, 19 September 2017

2. This memorandum is the U.S. Army Africa (USARAF) official command reply to the draft report for the subject audit. The draft report made one recommendation (referred to as "Recommendation 2") to the Commanding General of USARAF. USARAF concurs with Recommendation 2 as noted below.

3. Recommendation 2:

a. Recommendation: We recommend that the Commanding General of USARAF provide the Regionally Aligned Forces clear instructions to guide after-action reviews and use lessons learned from the completed missions and rotations, as required by Army Regulation 11-33, to improve the regionally aligned training program.

b. USARAF Reply: USARAF concurs with this recommendation. USARAF will add a task within the annual order and all individual activity orders that directs all subordinate units to complete After Action Reviews (AAR) and review previous lessons learned in the Global Theater Security Cooperation Management and Information System (G-TSCMIS) and the Joint Lessons Learned Information System (JLLIS). Additionally, USARAF will publish clear instructions and a standardized format to guide lessons learned products and will continue to incorporate lessons learned into onboarding and other training events of future Regionally Aligned Forces. The target completion date for this action is 1 July 2019.

(U) U.S. Army Africa (cont'd)

ARAF-CG

SUBJECT: Audit of the Training of the Army's Regionally Aligned Forces in U.S. Africa
Command (Project No. D2018-D000RH-0188.000)

4. My point of contract is [REDACTED]

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. L. Cloutier, Jr.", with a stylized flourish at the end.

ROGER L. CLOUTIER, JR.
Major General, USA
Commanding

(U) Acronyms and Abbreviations

(U) BCT	Brigade Combat Team
(U) DRRS	Defense Readiness Reporting System
(U) FORSCOM	U.S. Army Forces Command
(U) GAO	Government Accountability Office
(U) MET	Mission Essential Task
(U) RAF	Regionally Aligned Forces
(U) USAFRICOM	U.S. Africa Command
(U) USARAF	U.S. Army Africa

Whistleblower Protection

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Whistleblower Protection safeguards DoD employees against retaliation for protected disclosures that expose possible waste, fraud, and abuse in government programs. For more information, please visit the Whistleblower webpage at <http://www.dodig.mil/Components/Administrative-Investigations/Whistleblower-Reprisal-Investigations/Whistleblower-Reprisal/> or contact the Whistleblower Protection Coordinator at Whistleblowerprotectioncoordinator@dodig.mil

For more information about DoD OIG reports or activities, please contact us:

Congressional Liaison

703.604.8324

Media Contact

public.affairs@dodig.mil; 703.604.8324

DoD OIG Mailing Lists

www.dodig.mil/Mailing-Lists/

Twitter

www.twitter.com/DoD_IG

DoD Hotline

www.dodig.mil/hotline

~~SECRET//NOFORN~~



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE | OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

4800 Mark Center Drive
Alexandria, Virginia 22350-1500
www.dodig.mil
Defense Hotline 1.800.424.9098

~~SECRET//NOFORN~~