



**United States Department of State
and the Broadcasting Board of Governors
Office of Inspector General**

Office of Inspections

**Inspection of
Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign
Assistance**

Report Number ISP-I-11-57, August 2011

~~Important Notice~~

~~This report is intended solely for the official use of the Department of State or the Broadcasting Board of Governors, or any agency or organization receiving a copy directly from the Office of Inspector General. No secondary distribution may be made, in whole or in part, outside the Department of State or the Broadcasting Board of Governors, by them or by other agencies or organizations, without prior authorization by the Inspector General. Public availability of the document will be determined by the Inspector General under the U.S. Code, 5 U.S.C. 552. Improper disclosure of this report may result in criminal, civil, or administrative penalties.~~

PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE INSPECTION

This inspection was conducted in accordance with the Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation, as issued in 2011 by the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, and the Inspector's Handbook, as issued by the Office of Inspector General for the U.S. Department of State (Department) and the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG).

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The Office of Inspections provides the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the BBG, and Congress with systematic and independent evaluations of the operations of the Department and the BBG. Inspections cover three broad areas, consistent with Section 209 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980:

- **Policy Implementation:** whether policy goals and objectives are being effectively achieved; whether U.S. interests are being accurately and effectively represented; and whether all elements of an office or mission are being adequately coordinated.
- **Resource Management:** whether resources are being used and managed with maximum efficiency, effectiveness, and economy and whether financial transactions and accounts are properly conducted, maintained, and reported.
- **Management Controls:** whether the administration of activities and operations meets the requirements of applicable laws and regulations; whether internal management controls have been instituted to ensure quality of performance and reduce the likelihood of mismanagement; whether instance of fraud, waste, or abuse exist; and whether adequate steps for detection, correction, and prevention have been taken.

METHODOLOGY

In conducting this inspection, the inspectors: reviewed pertinent records; as appropriate, circulated, reviewed, and compiled the results of survey instruments; conducted on-site interviews; and reviewed the substance of the report and its findings and recommendations with offices, individuals, organizations, and activities affected by this review.



**United States Department of State
and the Broadcasting Board of Governors**

Office of Inspector General

PREFACE

This report was prepared by the Office of Inspector General (OIG) pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and Section 209 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, as amended. It is one of a series of audit, inspection, investigative, and special reports prepared by OIG periodically as part of its responsibility to promote effective management, accountability and positive change in the Department of State and the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

This report is the result of an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the office, post, or function under review. It is based on interviews with employees and officials of relevant agencies and institutions, direct observation, and a review of applicable documents.

The recommendations therein have been developed on the basis of the best knowledge available to the OIG and, as appropriate, have been discussed in draft with those responsible for implementation. It is my hope that these recommendations will result in more effective, efficient, and/or economical operations.

I express my appreciation to all of those who contributed to the preparation of this report.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "H. W. Geisel".

Harold W. Geisel
Deputy Inspector General

Table of Contents

Key Judgments	1
Context	3
Executive Direction	4
Policy and Program Implementation	6
Advancing Policy Priorities	6
Coordination and Communication	6
Streamlining	7
Reprogramming	8
Strategic Planning and the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review	8
The Centrality of the Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance's Role	8
Managing the Budget Formulation Process with the U.S. Agency for International Development	8
Other Departments and Agencies	9
Resource Management	12
Workforce Planning and Management	12
Challenges of a Hybrid Organization	14
Orientation and Training	14
Administrative Management	16
Budget	17
Information Systems	18
The Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System Program	18
Management Controls	22
List of Recommendations	23
List of Informal Recommendations	25
Principal Officials	26
Abbreviations	27

Key Judgments

- In the 5 years since its creation, the Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance (F) has achieved notable progress in establishing and implementing effective mechanisms for the coordination of foreign assistance programs administered by the Department of State (Department) and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). It is diligent and effective in carrying out its mission to align resources with policy priorities.
- F's mandate includes the responsibility to identify foreign assistance resources needed to support policy goals, both through the annual budget process and in response to new or emerging issues. Action bureaus in the Department sometimes neglect to include F in the initial consideration of possible initiatives involving foreign assistance. F should request a high-level message to Department bureaus and posts explaining its role and underscoring where its involvement is required.
- F is making substantial improvements in the planning, budgeting, and evaluation phases of the foreign assistance budget process. A comprehensive streamlining initiative intended to relieve the burden on overseas posts and improve the quality and consistency of data was well underway at the time of the inspection. The OIG team believes that this initiative is on the right track, but it is too early to assess its effectiveness.
- The proposed internal realignment of F is well conceived to strengthen its overall effectiveness as well as its ability to support implementation of the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR). When the realignment is completed, F management should undertake an overall review of its workforce addressing the appropriate number of Department and USAID personnel, the mix of Foreign Service and Civil Service positions, needed staff skills, and grade structure.
- The creation of the Office of Budget and Resource Management (BRM) and the Bureau of Policy, Planning, and Learning in USAID is changing the planning and budgeting process for foreign assistance. F's leadership and its counterparts in USAID are trying to coordinate their work to reduce the risk of duplication and conflict, but preparations of the FY 2013 budget are already showing signs of strain. F and USAID offices plan to conduct an "after action" assessment. Once completed, they should provide joint written guidance to Department and USAID staff to clarify their respective roles.
- F's Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System (FACTS) Info database effectively supports the Operational Plans, the Performance Plan and Report, and the Congressional Budget Justification, but suffers from significant understaffing and inadequate inventory controls.
- F leadership is addressing shortcomings in its system for internal taskings as well as staff training and orientation.

The inspection took place in Washington, DC, between April 26 and June 22, 2011 (b) (6)



Context

This first inspection of F took place during a period of multiple transitions for the office as it was implementing an internal realignment plan, responding to new mandates, and managing an evolving relationship with USAID.

F coordinates and approves 19 separate streams of foreign assistance funding—totaling some \$31 billion in FY 2011—that are managed by the Department and USAID. These streams fall within three broad categories: Economic and Development Assistance; Security Assistance; and Humanitarian Assistance.

F was established in 2006 to provide strategic direction for all U.S. government foreign assistance and to manage Department and USAID foreign assistance funding. In its short history, F has had a major impact on the way that foreign assistance is managed. F created the Standardized Program Structure and Definitions, which is a common, global framework for organizing resources by program areas and elements. F also developed an annual operational planning process, a reporting system on performance, and a database—FACTS Info—to maintain budget allocation, planning, and performance information by country and program.

The office has had four leaders since it was established. During the previous Administration, F's first two directors held dual roles as Director of Foreign Assistance with the rank of Deputy Secretary of State and as USAID Administrator. When F was created, it absorbed USAID's budget and planning functions. The current Administration changed this arrangement by establishing the position of Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources (D(N)) and restoring the position of USAID Administrator as separate from the Director of Foreign Assistance.

The 2010 QDDR directs that F will become the Office of Foreign Assistance Resources to be led by an assistant secretary-equivalent official who reports to the Secretary and the D(N). The office will continue to manage an integrated Department and USAID foreign assistance budget formulation process, while retaining important roles in budget execution, strategic planning, program planning, and performance management. For the first time since F's establishment, USAID will submit to the Secretary a comprehensive budget for its programs for FY 2013, which F will review and integrate into the overall foreign assistance budget proposal for consideration by the D(N) and the Secretary. The Secretary has assigned F principal roles—along with the D(N) and the Bureau of Resource Management (RM)—in implementing two QDDR objectives: “planning, budgeting, and measuring for results” and “elevating and transforming development to deliver results.” F also has a key role in implementing joint Department-USAID recommendations on streamlining foreign assistance planning and reporting.

The office has more than 100 positions, of which about two-thirds belong to USAID and one-third to the Department. A large majority of staff is Civil Service. The two agencies have different personnel rules, which add a degree of difficulty to managing the staff. The Executive Office of the Secretariat (S/ES-EX) provides management support for the office.

Executive Direction

F is led by the deputy director of U.S. Foreign Assistance pending implementation of the QDDR decision to establish the position of Director of Foreign Assistance Resources, with the rank of assistant secretary. The deputy director took over the leadership of F in January 2010 after a long career in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). He is highly regarded among his counterparts within and outside the Department. They find him exceptionally competent, knowledgeable, helpful, easy to work with, and able to set and elicit high standards of performance. He is viewed as a fair and neutral arbiter. A number of people have called him the perfect match for this position, particularly as F takes on new responsibilities in strategic planning and performance assessment and works out a new relationship with USAID.

The deputy director initiated a realignment of the structure of F, dividing it into four units each led by a senior-level managing director. The four managing directors, two Department and two USAID employees, have substantial experience in F. Like the deputy director, they were rated highly in the OIG survey of F staff. The realignment plan is designed to clarify reporting lines and accountability, better integrate functional and regional priorities, establish a capacity for in-depth policy analysis, and strengthen F's capacity to plan and to assess performance of foreign assistance programs. The realignment is well conceived to achieve its objectives. Although the OIG team found widespread staff support for the plan's design, the early stages of its implementation has led to some confusion, especially about the roles of and boundaries between the proposed new unit for policy analysis and the existing units handling functional bureaus and initiatives and planning and performance management. To some extent this uncertainty stems from the fact that the realignment is not fully implemented, as it awaits final agreement from USAID. The OIG team advised F managers to clarify the role of the policy analysis unit even in advance of finalizing the realignment.

Communication within F is generally very good. The deputy director meets with the managing directors every morning and with all of the managers once a week. He hosts a meeting with all F staff every other week, and the managing director for planning, performance, and information systems chairs a weekly operations meeting for all staff. That same managing director produces the weekly "Foreign Assistance Bulletin" for USAID and Department assistance program staff in Washington and around the world. This vehicle is particularly effective in keeping all F stakeholders up-to-date on the various planning and budgeting processes, including their status in Congress. The managing directors host weekly meetings with their staffs. The OIG team found a very open and informal working environment in which the deputy director and other managers are accessible, receptive to comments and new ideas, and supportive of teamwork. The main communication problem during the inspection was the inability of senior managers to be fully open about the realignment pending agreement by USAID. The deputy director was working to resolve this problem by engaging senior management in both the Department and USAID. The Department has already approved the plan.

The F front office has an executive officer who supervises the staff work and paper flow as well as the management and administrative functions. The executive officer works closely and well with staff in S/ES-EX, which provides some administrative support to F. During the

inspection, the executive officer and the front office staff were working on improvements to the internal tasking and paper flow process and on the development of a more effective orientation and training program, both of which were issues raised with the OIG team.

A challenging leadership issue faced by F during the inspection was the need to work out a relationship with the newly created budget office in USAID. This issue came to the fore in the building of the budget for FY 2013. Where previously this had been a coordinated USAID/Department process managed by F, this year USAID instituted an internal process to formulate a budget request for the programs it manages. To their credit, the deputy director of F and the director of USAID's Office of Budget and Resource Management decided that they would strive for maximum cooperation and transparency to minimize conflict and duplication. They held a combined meeting with staff where the ground rules for communication were laid out. Both are actively monitoring the process. This decision was a good example of forward leaning executive direction. Despite their best efforts, the process is somewhat unwieldy in its early stages.

Policy and Program Implementation

F provides coordination, strategic direction, and leadership to integrate foreign assistance planning and resource management across the Department and USAID and works to align resources with policy priorities. It develops and defends foreign assistance budget requests and allocates Department and USAID foreign assistance funding. F also promotes good stewardship of foreign assistance funds by strengthening oversight, accountability, and transparency.

In coordination with RM, F leads four concurrent processes. F:

- collects performance data on prior fiscal years' foreign assistance programs (FY 2010);
- guides the process of allocating appropriated funds, and reports to Congress their intended uses for the current fiscal year (FY 2011);
- defends before Congress the President's foreign assistance budget request for the coming fiscal year (FY 2012); and
- builds the President's foreign assistance budget request for the following year (FY 2013).

Advancing Policy Priorities

F is diligent and effective in carrying out its mission to align resources with policy priorities across the broad range of its mandate. For example, F's planning guidance to missions sets required funding levels for the three global Presidential initiatives: climate change, food security, and health. The F-designed budget allocation format identifies how much will be spent on each initiative, which requires pulling and regrouping data from different foreign assistance accounts and program elements. F has prepared multiyear funding scenarios and facilitated discussions among program offices in the Department and USAID that are responsible for implementing the initiatives. Chiefs of mission may suggest reallocations of initiative funding to non-initiative programs if there is strong justification. F also developed a format for missions' annual operational plans to track resources devoted to the Presidential initiatives and the Secretary's priorities, several of which cut across accounts and program elements, e.g., gender, biodiversity, and countering violent extremism. Finally, to plan the FY 2013 and out-year budgets, F is analyzing how to make operational the specific goals in the Presidential Policy Directive on Global Development.

Coordination and Communication

F leadership receives high marks for serving as the honest broker in reconciling differences among participants in foreign assistance funding. F allows bureaus to appeal planned allocations of current fiscal year appropriations. F, along with RM, has instituted a process to allow bureaus to appeal proposed budgets for future years before the Secretary makes final decisions. Although some in the Department would like even more transparency, not all aspects of the budget deliberation process at senior levels of the Department or at OMB can or should be shared and not every program can be funded at the level requested.

Stakeholders appreciate the role F has played in both organizing and providing guidance to posts and bureaus to navigate the various stages of the budget process. The weekly Foreign Assistance Bulletin is distributed widely in the field as well as to interested Washington foreign assistance entities. It is very well received as it consolidates and communicates in plain language the relevant foreign assistance-related developments of the week and alerts entities charged with managing foreign assistance resources (operating units) to impending taskings and deadlines.

Streamlining

There is broad support for the efforts of both F and USAID to streamline elements of foreign assistance planning and reporting to make them more efficient and transparent and less burdensome. A Department-USAID streamlining project produced interim recommendations that reduced some requirements for the FY 2011 Operational Plans and the FY 2013 Mission Strategic and Resource Plans (MSRP) for programs below a certain funding threshold. The first actions announced in February 2011 included the reduction in the required and often redundant narrative in the FY 2011 Operational Plans and The President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) Country Operating Plans and the suspension of the collection of foreign assistance performance indicators in the MSRP pending completion of a process to rationalize and dramatically reduce the number of such indicators. The simultaneous submission of draft Congressional Notifications with the FY 2011 Operational Plans telescoped the time involved in gaining Congress' approval to expend FY 2011 resources that were appropriated late in the year.

Overseas posts and Washington bureaus broadly welcomed these changes. However, in response to an OIG survey, some smaller posts, particularly those without a USAID presence, indicated that they still find F's processes burdensome and difficult. There is also frustration with changing instructions from year to year.

The streamlining project made its final recommendations in April 2011. These will change processes again with the intended outcome of a more unified planning and reporting cycle, higher quality and more accessible data, and a goal of saving 20 percent of time spent by Washington and field staff on reporting and data collection.

Although some have expressed concern that the streamlined format could result in the omission of data and other information F needs to maintain the comprehensive data that stakeholders have come to expect, the OIG team believes that streamlining is necessary and that this Department-USAID effort is on the right track. For example, the OIG team found that, among various reporting and data collection requirements, bureaus and overseas missions held a particularly low opinion of the Performance Plan and Report, which reports program performance for the prior fiscal year and sets targets for results in the following 3 years. They felt that the Performance Plan and Report did not communicate useful information for making budgeting decisions. It is appropriate that the Performance Plan and Report will be reengineered first among a series of reforms to be undertaken in the coming year.

Reprogramming

As part of its evolving relationship with USAID, F delegated limited reprogramming authority to USAID in managing its programs. This change is intended to relieve the F director of involvement in reprogramming decisions that affect programs falling within a particular objective in the same country that originally received the funding. These decisions are best made by the implementing organizations. For F to maintain adequate oversight over all foreign assistance programs, it will be important to receive prompt and accurate reporting from USAID of reprogramming actions taken.

Strategic Planning and the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review

The QDDR envisions a greater role for F in foreign assistance planning and performance assessment. Once the reorganization of RM is completed, F will likely have a clearer mandate and a greater capacity to manage foreign assistance planning and performance evaluation. The QDDR generated a list of action items for F and RM, although some items concerned projects that F and RM were already pursuing. During the inspection, F sent two QDDR implementation plans to the D(N), one on “planning, budgeting, and managing for results,” the second on “elevating and transforming development to deliver results,” which responded to the QDDR mandate.

The Centrality of the Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance’s Role

Despite the role F plays in managing foreign assistance, what F does and can do is insufficiently understood throughout the Department. A recurring problem that F encounters is being called upon by Department principals to find resources for initiatives that have not been prepared in consultation with F, and sometimes without a plan for how the funds will be programmed. Although F is responsive when called on to support policy goals, its participation late in the process presents a risk of poor results. F’s ongoing internal realignment and the end of the dual hat arrangement with USAID have added to uncertainty about F’s role and authority, a point that the inspection team heard from many within the foreign assistance community.

Recommendation 1: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should request that the Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources issue a statement emphasizing the Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance’s central role in foreign assistance planning and budgeting and requiring that Department bureaus consult with the office whenever the use of foreign assistance resources is contemplated. (Action: F, in coordination with D(N))

Managing the Budget Formulation Process with the U.S. Agency for International Development

The inspection took place early in the process of developing the FY 2013 foreign assistance budget, as MSRPs and Bureau Strategic and Resource Plans were coming due. This budget will be the first since F’s establishment in 2006 and the end of the dual hat arrangement in 2009, and for which USAID will submit a separate proposal to the D(N) and the Secretary for

programs that it manages. The newly established BRM is managing the development of USAID's budget proposal.

F's leadership is proactively engaging BRM to aim for a smooth transition. The leadership of F and BRM, as well as their staffs, communicate regularly. As noted above, F convened a combined BRM and F staff meeting to set a tone of close collaboration in this first joint effort and to express the hope that these parallel processes could occur without imposing undue demands on regional and functional bureaus. Both the Department and USAID are planning separate high-level reviews of FY 2013 budget proposals for regions and functions, chaired by the D(N) and by the Administrator of USAID, which representatives of both agencies will attend.

Despite best efforts all around, including the strong commitment to full cooperation by the leadership of F and BRM, the process appears somewhat disorderly in its early stages. During the dual-hat arrangement, Department and USAID regional and functional bureaus collaborated, with F's facilitation, on joint budget proposals that were submitted to the Director of Foreign Assistance who was also the USAID Administrator. Multiple, somewhat overlapping channels are developing for the FY 2013 budget process. F has tasked Department and USAID bureaus to prepare proposals for an integrated foreign assistance budget while BRM is developing a separate development budget proposal for the Administrator. Both exercises are consistent with various conclusions of the QDDR. Some staff are understandably overburdened and confused. The situation presents a risk of weakening communication and collaboration between Department and USAID bureaus and imposing redundant or conflicting requirements. This result would constitute an unfortunate setback in efforts to streamline processes.

F's leadership is aware of these problems and the need to clarify lines of authority, reporting, and communication with their counterparts at USAID. Their intention is to maintain continuous communication and coordination with BRM throughout the process and conduct a comprehensive after action review, which should result in a set of agreed procedures. The OIG team believes that any process agreed to with USAID should be recorded, broadly disseminated, and enforced within both agencies. It is too late to agree and record a process for FY 2013. F should seek USAID agreement on a process for FY 2014 on the basis of lessons learned.

Recommendation 2: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should conclude and disseminate a written understanding on the budget process with the U.S. Agency for International Development, including respective roles of the Department's Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance and the U.S. Agency for International Development's Office of Budget and Resource Management and participating bureaus in both organizations, for the preparation of the FY 2014 foreign assistance budget. (Action: F)

Other Departments and Agencies

In spite of the many leadership, organizational, and procedural changes that have occurred over the last 5 years, substantial progress is evident in the coordination of foreign assistance programs managed by the Department and USAID. One aspect of F's envisioned role remains unrealized, however. According to 1 FAM 033, F's responsibilities include to "...implement a mechanism to effectively facilitate interagency collaboration of foreign

assistance programs and policies of other agencies and entities of the U.S. Government...” Most recently, the QDDR notes the growth in the number of civilian agencies engaged in international activity and the desirability of aligning their activities. The annual senior reviews convened in the past by the Department’s Deputy Secretary tried to enlist a whole-of-government approach by bringing all players together to present plans for their agencies’ foreign assistance activities as the President’s budget was being developed. This effort included, among others, the Department of Defense. Over time, participants report that the level of these reviews became less strategic, interagency participation declined, and they were not viewed as cost-effective.

The March 2006 National Security Strategy tasked the Director of Foreign Assistance with developing a “coordinated foreign assistance strategy, including 5-year, country-specific assistance strategies...” F and its counterparts decided to develop a pilot project involving ten countries. This Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) embraced a whole-of-government approach and was implemented in a range of countries (from post-conflict to more stable) with large and small foreign assistance portfolios across the Department’s six regions.

F’s 2009 assessment of the CAS pilot exercise found that a whole-of-government approach to long-term planning was worth continuing but required certain adjustments. The most important among them were that the full commitment of all U.S. government agencies providing foreign assistance—not just the Department and USAID—is required and high-level support among senior managers in Washington is needed if CAS is to succeed as the overarching strategy document guiding foreign assistance decisions. Other key findings were that, if CAS is continued, it should be maintained as a long-term foreign assistance strategy (not a budget exercise) and, as such, should not be merged with the MSRP process. At present, F does not intend to restart the CAS process. However, as part of its QDDR implementation responsibilities, F will work with the D(N) and RM to devise a process to develop integrated, country-level diplomatic and foreign assistance strategies and will incorporate lessons learned from the CAS pilot. USAID’s new Bureau of Policy, Planning, and Learning intends to have in place by FY 2013, Country Development Cooperation Strategies for all countries receiving USAID-funded development assistance, but these strategies will, by definition, be less comprehensive as their focus is limited to those programs administered by USAID.

At this juncture, F is fully engaged in implementing its internal realignment, managing a new relationship with USAID, and implementing streamlining and QDDR mandates. F does facilitate interagency coordination on an ad hoc basis for high-profile, urgent assistance efforts in countries such as Egypt and Tunisia, or for large complex operations such as in Afghanistan. It is also reaching out to other agencies to gather information. For example, F has launched a well-designed and informative Internet site¹—also known as the dashboard—that collects foreign assistance data from U.S. Government agencies in addition to USAID and the Department.

There are, or will be, other examples of information sharing and coordination between the Department and other agencies. The Bureau of Political Military Affairs hosts country assistance roundtable discussions with the Department of Defense, and the QDDR tasked the Assistant Secretary for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement with integrating security and justice sector assistance, including whole-of-government approaches. In addition, the MSRP

¹ www.foreignassistance.gov

process usually includes all agencies represented at overseas posts. Once F has worked through its heavy agenda, it would be appropriate for it to engage more broadly with other U.S. Government agencies that fund and deliver foreign assistance.

Resource Management

Workforce Planning and Management

F is staffed by some 100 Civil Service and Foreign Service employees from USAID and the Department. The staff includes budget analysts, program analysts, country coordinators, and information technology specialists.

As noted above, the proposed internal realignment plan is well conceived to fulfill the role set out for F, to implement the QDDR, and to make the office function more effectively. The OIG team concludes that several factors make the case for a workforce plan to complement the new organizational structure envisaged in the realignment plan.

First, it is likely that USAID will reclaim some positions from F as USAID rebuilds its budgeting and planning capacities. This presents an opportunity to determine the appropriate and achievable balance between Department and USAID positions in F. Currently, F has 65 USAID authorized full-time equivalents, which represent about two-thirds of F's total full-time equivalents.

Without prejudging the outcome of a review of the staffing balance, the OIG team believes that F should remain a hybrid organization. A combined Department and USAID staff brings knowledge of both agencies into the organization, enabling F to manage integrated budgeting and to act as a neutral, credible mediator in reconciling funding disagreements.

Second, the balance between Civil Service and Foreign Service positions warrants review. Currently, the staffing complement is heavily weighted toward Civil Service positions, which outnumber Foreign Service positions (for both the Department and USAID) by a factor of more than six to one. In principle, Civil Service employees ensure continuity and subject matter expertise but there has been considerable turnover among Civil Service employees in F. At the time of the inspection, there were several vacancies in F.

Additional Foreign Service employees would offer field experience and, in the case of the Department, would help to build a cadre of officers skilled in budgeting and managing foreign assistance resources. OIG inspections of U.S. diplomatic missions have found a dearth of Department officers trained in foreign assistance management. The QDDR sets a goal of building development diplomacy as a discipline within the Department (for both Civil and Foreign Service) through expanded training and identifying best practices for managing foreign assistance. An assignment in F offers the opportunity to develop expertise in strategic planning, budgeting, the appropriations process, and performance management. Active recruiting by F management in the larger context of QDDR-mandated activities to raise the profile of development in the Department can make assignments in F more attractive to mid-level Department officers of all cones. In this connection, F intends to follow-up on the OIG team's suggestion that F work with the Bureau of Human Resources to ensure that an assignment in F figures prominently in the Foreign Service Career Development Plan, possibly satisfying both a minor requirement and an out-of-cone assignment.

Third, as F emerges from its realignment exercise, staffing requirements—both overall numbers and composition by skill and grade—are likely to change. The realignment plan moves positions within F but does not change their overall number or grade structure.

The OIG team also expects staffing requirements to change as F's relationship with USAID continues to evolve. F has delegated limited reprogramming authority to USAID and the QDDR calls for further steps to enhance USAID's role in executing the budget for programs that it manages. F's devolution of certain budget execution responsibilities to USAID should reduce its workload in this area. On the other hand, F's reorientation toward a more strategic focus and coordination with USAID in planning the budget are elements which could increase workload.

Several ongoing projects in F entail developing or reforming processes. These include: developing policy analysis tools for budgeting; implementing decisions to streamline foreign assistance planning and reporting; adding features to the FACTS Info database, and meeting other requirements of the QDDR, particularly with respect to strategic planning and performance assessment. The workforce levels required once these projects are completed and additional functions taken on is not yet known.

The grade profile in F is heavily weighted toward higher-level positions. Thirty, or nearly a third, are GS-15/FS-01 or Senior Executive Service/Senior Foreign Service. Under the proposed realignment, eight GS-15 positions carry no supervisory or program management responsibilities. By comparison, the grades of strategic planning and budgeting officers in the Department's regional and functional bureaus typically range from GS-12 to GS-15 and have supervisory responsibilities.

Recommendation 3: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, in coordination with the Bureau of Human Resources, should undertake a review of workforce requirements including the number of staff, grade structure, balance between the Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development, and balance between Civil and Foreign Service. (Action: F, in coordination with DGHR)

Some position descriptions for both Department and USAID employees do not reflect the work the employee actually performs. As part of the proposed realignment, the Bureau of Human Resources is performing a review of Department position descriptions affected by the realignment. A similar review was proposed for USAID's positions affected by the realignment. However, all budget analyst, program analyst, and country coordinator position descriptions in F should be reviewed to ensure they reflect current job responsibilities.

Recommendation 4: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, in coordination with the Bureau of Human Resources, should review all budget analyst, program analyst, and country coordinator position descriptions to determine whether job responsibilities reflect actual work performed. The review should include the expanded use of career ladders, as appropriate. (Action: F, in coordination with DGHR)

Challenges of a Hybrid Organization

The hybrid organization poses challenges for F as it is required to navigate the differing personnel and resource management systems of two agencies, for both Civil Service and Foreign Service employees. Disparate treatment in the granting of awards and promotions was an issue frequently raised by F managers and staff during the inspection. USAID's awards structure and grade span in career ladder positions are more generous than those of the Department. This disparity affects morale as employees doing similar work are treated differently.

Another source of concern is the incompatibility of the Department and USAID information technology systems, and difficulties encountered in gaining access to them. USAID employees in F are unable to log onto some of the USAID systems, such as the Phoenix financial management system, as well as some Department systems, such as the Global Employment Management System and E-Performance system for personnel matters. The lack of access to the systems makes it more difficult for employees to do their jobs and complete routine personnel tasks efficiently. As a result, these tasks must be performed manually. During the inspection, some of F's USAID budget staff received tokens to log onto Phoenix but were unsuccessful in accessing the system. F continues to work with the Bureau of Information Resource Management to resolve these problems.

Staff turnover is a source of concern for F leadership. As noted above, turnover seems high, although the OIG team had insufficient data to determine how the level compares with other offices in the Department and USAID. Some turnover is expected as F leadership seeks to better align staff skills with office priorities. The OIG team's informal feedback from current and former F staff indicated that some had left for promotion opportunities or family relocation. Other employees cited concerns with the prolonged transition, uncertainty about F's future, the inequities caused by the agencies' differing personnel practices, and the lack of a comprehensive training program. With high turnover, F loses the benefit of corporate memory. In addition, new employees require training in internal processes as well as the substance of their jobs, which can be taxing for supervisors who are busy with their own day-to-day work demands.

While F attempts to address some of these challenges, their resolution may be impossible as it is beyond F's authority to eliminate disparate personnel practices between the two agencies. There is an effort underway to educate employees, especially supervisors, about policies and procedures applicable to both agencies and to clarify these for staff.

The OIG team discussed with the Bureau of Human Resources some of the problems F is facing as a result of its hybrid structure. The Bureau of Human Resources is willing to work with F and with USAID to see whether special arrangements can be devised to address some of these problems. The OIG team advised F to follow up with the Bureau of Human Resources.

Orientation and Training

Although S/ES-EX and F provide a check-in process for all new employees, F-specific orientation materials need to be expanded and improved. USAID holds an orientation for USAID employees (including those assigned to F) and staff new to the Department are offered general orientation by the Department. During the inspection, F was in the process of developing its own

F-specific orientation program for new employees. F should develop training materials on office processes and procedures specific to the individual units within F. The OIG team believes that this should be a priority, as it would contribute to a sense of teamwork and enhance staff effectiveness. A number of F staff members raised this issue with the OIG team.

Informal Recommendation 1: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should place a high priority on its efforts to develop orientation and training materials on office processes and procedures for the benefit of new staff.

Recruiting employees with the requisite background, skills, and knowledge is also a challenge in F. Many new hires arrive with little understanding of foreign assistance accounts although they may have had prior budget and program analysis experience. This problem results in frustration on the part of both managers and new employees as there is no formal training program and little time to devote to training staff on the job. While the work is performed well and quality products are delivered, the situation is less than efficient and takes its toll on the staff. Employees across F need to know what their colleagues in other sections do and how the various teams relate to each other. One example involves the distinctions among responsibilities of account analysts on the Regional and Global Issues team and budget analysts on the Resources and Appropriations team.

There is no career development track or training continuum for Civil Service employees in most F position categories. The Foreign Service Institute's continuum for Civil Service employees includes basic training that would be useful for F employees across the board. However, it does not have a continuum for budget analysts, program analysts, or country coordinators. In addition to the lack of promotion opportunities beyond certain grade levels, the lack of a training continuum is among the reasons employees give for leaving F. Five years have passed since F's creation and the OIG team believes that it is time for the Department to develop a training continuum for employees working on budget and foreign assistance issues. A training continuum would be beneficial to F employees as there would be greater clarity in the skills needed to advance in their jobs. It could also help F to retain employees and would be consistent with the conclusions of the QDDR.

Recommendation 5: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, in coordination with the Bureau of Resource Management, the Bureau of Human Resources and the Foreign Service Institute, should develop a training continuum for its budget analysts, program analysts, and country coordinators specific to the budget and foreign assistance work the office performs. (Action: F, in coordination with RM, DGHR, and FSI)

Some senior staff in F are relatively inexperienced as managers or supervisors, adding another layer of challenges to this hybrid organization where knowledge of the policies and procedures of both Department and USAID are needed. F has approached the Bureau of Human Resources and S/ES-EX to request training for supervisors on topics including performance management and appraisals, employee relations, and hiring. The intent is to familiarize supervisors with Department guidelines and processes for carrying out their responsibilities. The same is planned for USAID at a later date.

The OIG team found that several employees did not have performance plans or work requirements statements and some performance appraisals were overdue or had been completed late. These issues are discussed further in the Management Controls section of the report.

Administrative Management

An executive assistant and three full-time staff perform operational and administrative functions full-time for F. Four other front office staff perform some administrative duties but on a lesser scale. This amount of administrative staff time is appropriate but will increase if F takes on additional inventory responsibilities, discussed in the Management Controls section of the report. The administrative staff performs well. They work closely and have a good relationship with S/ES-EX and USAID.

Human resources issues, both routine and those related to the proposed realignment, take up a great deal of the staff's time. The section works closely with S/ES-EX and, recognizing that it serves other customers, does what it can to ease the S/ES-EX workload by doing much of the pre-work and coordination. Hiring actions provide a good example of this collaborative approach. The section is also heavily involved with space issues. There have been three forced moves planned or implemented for F staff over the past year, including moving the information systems staff to an annex in Rosslyn, Virginia. This has added to the "unsettled" feeling in F. The section has been working for months with the Bureau of Information Resource Management to arrange adequate information technology support, to provide in-scope support, as well as finalize a memorandum of understanding with the Bureau of Administration's executive office to provide limited out-of-scope support. Administrative and management initiatives underway include developing standard office-wide policies and procedures for F.

Two officers who are physically located at USAID headquarters but report to the managing director for planning, performance management, and information systems provide the full range of administrative services for F's USAID employees including: staffing and recruitment actions; managing the operating expense budget for USAID employees, including travel and training; providing security services; liaising with USAID security staff to arrange processing and upgrading clearances for USAID staff; issuing Metro checks; and handling other personnel matters. S/ES-EX largely provides these same services for Department employees of F.

A major concern for F leadership is the lengthy period required for recruitment of people to replace departing staff. With considerable turnover, key positions are often left vacant for long periods of time. Mandatory procedures for recruitment in Department and USAID are time-consuming and dealing with the personnel systems of both agencies makes F's job more difficult. The OIG team did not identify shortcomings in F's approach to recruitment, but in view of its unique circumstances, it may have to be more aggressive in moving its individual cases through both systems.

As mentioned earlier, a challenge brought about by the hybrid nature of F is standardizing its administrative procedures. USAID employees follow USAID procedures and Department employees follow Department procedures. There can, however, be confusion about which agency's policy should be used for issues such as performance appraisals, telework, compensatory time, and training. In addition to the lack of clear guidance, there is no central

repository where employees and managers can find this information. In this respect, F's SharePoint site is an available, underutilized resource. F is in the process of preparing standard operating procedures that will direct employees to Department or USAID policies. As discussed in the workforce section of the report, F is working with S/ES-EX to facilitate training sessions for supervisors that will cover policies affecting their subordinates and outline what is expected of them as supervisors.

One outstanding management issue in F is that of clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the executive assistant. The title of this position does not reflect all of its responsibilities. Under F's current deputy director, this position serves as the primary management advisor on operational and management issues, including human resources; F's operating budget; and administration. The incumbent is also the primary liaison with S/ES-EX. This is not the norm for executive assistants in other parts of the Department, who focus more on policy issues. The deputy director should make clear that the incumbent has the lead on operational and administrative matters and will coordinate closely with the senior USAID official on matters related to USAID staff in F. For example, the incumbent should be involved now in all aspects of QDDR implementation that have internal resource implications.

Informal Recommendation 2: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should review the current job responsibilities of the executive assistant, update the position description, and change the job title from executive assistant to executive officer.

Budget

The Department's operating budget for F is about \$3 million excluding staff costs. The total USAID operating budget for F is \$7 million and includes staff costs. Current levels, based on previous year funding, appear to be adequate.

The funding of FACTS is complex. The Department and USAID signed a memorandum of understanding to jointly fund the implementation of the program, reflecting a 50-50 cost sharing agreement. The Department is the system owner, and USAID funding is provided through periodic Interagency Funds Transfer Agreements. As FACTS grows, the variety of funding mechanisms increase, and the budget is more difficult to manage. F is currently working to consolidate the Office of the U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator's (S/GAC) reporting and planning system for PEPFAR into FACTS Info. S/GAC funds that portion of the FACTS program.

Staff in F's information systems office developed a spreadsheet to track the FACTS budget. A contract project manager and a direct-hire information systems specialist in F successfully manage the budget, ensuring that the 50-50 cost sharing agreement between the Department and USAID is honored and that money transferred to the Department for FACTS is indeed spent on FACTS.

Information Systems

The Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System Program

The information systems team develops and manages the FACTS Program, which serves as the central information system for all foreign assistance budgeting, operational planning, and performance management overseen by F. The information systems office succeeds in supporting F's processes, but is plagued by significant understaffing as well as inadequate inventory controls. Since its creation in 2006, the FACTS program has grown from a small, in-house support system to one of the Department's major information technology investments requiring an OMB Exhibit 300 submission. One previous iteration of the FACTS Program, FACTS I, has been retired. The second iteration, FACTS II, will be retired as soon as FACTS Info has fully taken on its functionality.

FACTS Info is one of F's essential products and tools, with 2,281 active user accounts. The system stands at the nexus of F and operating units worldwide and is used to create, store, and analyze budgets, Operational Plans, performance information for Department and USAID analysis, and for reports to OMB and Congress. FACTS Info is a data repository and reporting system with the following goals:

- to support the planning and justification of budgets for upcoming fiscal years;
- to enable a reduction in the number of foreign assistance data calls from Washington to the field;
- to allow F to analyze and report budget, program, and performance data for prior and current fiscal years efficiently, including extensive ad hoc querying capabilities; and
- to track policy issues of importance to the Department principals.

In February 2010, OMB directed F to consolidate PEPFAR reporting and planning functionality into FACTS Info. As a result, F and S/GAC are now employing an iterative consolidation approach that allows the FACTS project team to support incrementally PEPFAR data collection and reporting requirements for FY 2011, and work towards developing full functionality within FACTS Info for the FY 2012 data collection. In addition, F is considering FACTS Info to support other data collection needs, such as those for the President's Food Security Initiative, USAID's Global Development Alliance, the Department's Global Partnership Initiative, and the collection of data on foreign assistance evaluations.

Streamlining and Integration

The streamlining report examined for possible areas of integration five information technology systems: FACTS Info, USAID systems for managing foreign assistance from the planning through obligation and disbursement stages (Phoenix, OPS Master, and Global Acquisition and Assistance System), and the Department's Joint Planning and Performance System (JPPS), used for building the MSRPs and Bureau Strategic and Resource Plans. The report found that these five information technology systems are stovepiped and structured in discordant ways, and that much of the information they require is duplicative. The report further found that, systems integration would reduce the burden of data collection on the field and allow

for increased data analysis and project management ability. The streamlining report recommends, “Make FACTS Info the primary system for FA [foreign assistance] planning and reporting activities and strengthen information technology systems to assist operating units with budget execution and project management.”

The recommendation does not entail integrating data from the Department’s Global Financial Management System. Obtaining this data requires that F staff contact the bureaus managing the funds or RM, or both—a time consuming process. F is working with RM systems staff to obtain more useful reporting information through the Global Financial Management System Data Warehouse.

Having current and reliable information on budget execution, such as expenditures, obligations, and balances, for both Department and USAID programs can help inform decisions on reprogramming, funding urgent priorities, and budget planning, and satisfy requests for information from Congress on the status of program expenditures.

Recommendation 6: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, in coordination with the Bureau of Resource Management, should prepare a study to determine whether there are cost effective solutions for collecting timely data on budget execution and making the data accessible to the Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, its operating units, and stakeholders. (Action: F, in coordination with RM)

The streamlining report project team also recommended that JPPS, now owned by RM, should be linked to FACTS Info in the short-term, and that F should evaluate whether JPPS should be integrated into FACTS Info in the long-term. At the time of the inspection, F and RM had not reached any firm agreements.

Managing Understaffing

There are three concurrent major development efforts for FACTS Info ongoing: the PEPFAR module, building in Operational Plan and Performance Plan and Report functionality from FACTS II, and the budget formulation processes. During the inspection, one information systems specialist and one contract developer left F, leaving two-thirds of FACTS Info functionality dependent on a single contract developer. Four developers, funded by S/GAC, are working on the PEPFAR module. One short-term contract developer joined the information systems staff during the inspection and is responsible for the Performance Plan and Report, and one long-term contractor is responsible for the budget formulation process and the Operational Plan. The current staffing of the software development team in the information systems office is inadequate. The budget formulation module in FACTS Info faces significant risk because one contract developer is responsible for its design, development, and deployment. As the inspection was drawing to a close, the information systems team hired a new developer, who will serve as a back-up for the budget formulation module.

The development team is overwhelmed with work. A key software developer has consistently worked overtime for an extended period. The office does not regularly check security audit logs. This task is critical to F’s continuing operational needs, especially as FACTS Info may take on more functions.

The information systems office does not ensure sufficient redundancy in developer knowledge. Information systems management recently instituted weekly peer reviews to familiarize all the developers with each other's work. This is a step toward increasing the developers' ability to backstop one another, but it does not ensure adequate crosstraining and overlap of developer activities. The code for budget formulation functions within FACTS Info is not documented. Information systems management has not adhered to project management requirements and best practices (as documented in 5 FAM 620 Information Technology Project Management), creating unacceptable risk. The information systems office informed the OIG team that these risks are a function of understaffing. The information systems team lead and senior management are in the process of recruiting additional developers to work on the Operational Plan, Performance Plan and Report, and budget formulation modules in FACTS Info.

Informal Recommendation 3: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should make hiring an additional contract developer with the requisite technical knowledge a high priority.

Informal Recommendation 4: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should formalize and implement a training program and standardized project management methodology to ensure that developers are aware of project management requirements consistent with Managing State Projects, especially those related to system documentation.

Technical Lead

Of particular importance is the hiring of a technical lead. During the inspection, the acting technical lead left F. A permanent technical lead will help the information systems office to reduce its vulnerabilities by coordinating the developers and ensuring cohesiveness and sustainability in software design. The information systems team lead recognizes the importance of hiring a technical lead and has been trying to fill the position for 14 months through two USAID direct-hire job announcements. USAID has not yet referred to the information systems office any candidates with the requisite technical skills. During the inspection, F management continued discussions with USAID and decided to advertise the position for a third time, including the exact specifications of the programming language required by the position. The OIG team discussed with F management the possibility of opening the job to Department candidates if it remains unfilled following the third attempt through USAID recruitment.

Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System Info Documentation

Information systems staff performing information systems security officer (ISSO) responsibilities do not have the required ISSO designation letters. F is responsible for handling certification and accreditation, systems maintenance, and physical security of office-specific applications and systems. Most of these functions are performed in the information systems office, but on an ad hoc basis. In accordance with 12 FAM 622, an ISSO and alternate ISSO must be designated in writing and must take the appropriate training.

Recommendation 7: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should obtain formal designation letters and training for the information systems security officers. (Action: F)

FACTS Info is hosted by an outside network, not by Department or USAID, complicating the security of the system. The information systems office would like to outsource some ISSO duties to experts in the Bureau of Diplomatic Security or in USAID's Office of the Chief Information Security Officer. This possibility was under discussion with those offices at the time of the inspection. The information systems office is also considering contracting out some security responsibilities to the company that hosts FACTS Info servers. Until the information systems office formally agrees on designation of ISSO tasks, the information systems management must ensure that the ISSO duties are being performed in accordance with 5 FAM 824.

Recommendation 8: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, in coordination with the Bureau of Information Resource Management, should rewrite the information systems security officers' work requirements to include all duties outlined for the position in the Foreign Affairs Manual. (Action: F, in coordination with IRM)

The Information Technology Asset Baseline (ITAB) is the Department's official inventory of applications, and is used to meet both internal and external reporting requirements. FACTS Info system documentation has not been fully entered into ITAB as required in 5 FAM 611 and 5 FAM 864. Much of the documentation required in ITAB has been completed by the information systems office, but never entered into the system. Without full FACTS Info documentation in ITAB, other offices such as the Office of Information Assurance do not have ready access to information, including the system interconnections and risk categorizations necessary to make fully-informed risk management decisions.

Recommendation 9: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should submit all necessary documentation on the Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System to the Information Technology Asset Baseline. (Action: F)

Management Controls

The deputy director of F provided a Management Control Statement of Assurance for FY 2010; no management control weaknesses were identified. F is currently working on strengthening controls over its internal administrative processes by developing policies and procedures for the office.

The OIG team found some management control weaknesses in need of attention. Internal controls over F's inventory for equipment used in the FACTS system need strengthening. Since the FY 2010 statement of assurance, F discovered that the FACTS information technology equipment was never entered into the Integrated Logistics Management System/Non-Expendable Property Application systems and, thus, is not included in the S/ES-EX annual inventory certification. This may have occurred because of confusion over which office was responsible. F is making a good faith effort to locate and account for the equipment. The office conducted an independent revalidation of the inventory and is working with S/ES-EX to ensure that the equipment inventory meets guidance outlined in 14 FAM 420, Domestic Personal Property Management. Plans are underway to create a business unit in S/ES-EX for FACTS equipment and to designate F as the custodial office.

Recommendation 10: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, in coordination with the Office of the Secretariat Executive Office and the Bureau of Administration Office of Logistics Management, should establish and implement property management procedures for Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System equipment in accordance with Department regulations. (Action: F, in coordination with S/ES/EX and A/LM)

The OIG team found that several employees did not have performance plans or work requirements statements and had either not received or received overdue performance appraisals. The Office appears to have established follow-up procedures but no systematic compliance monitoring process. The hybrid nature of the office contributes to this deficiency as supervisors do not have access to needed automated performance plan systems. Adding to the confusion are the differing procedures and deadlines of the Civil Service and Foreign Service performance assessment periods of both entities. Supervisors' heavy workloads during the budget cycles that coincide with performance cycles add to the problem. As noted above, not all supervisors have access to the Department's performance management system. Late evaluations and performance plans hinder the performance management program and disadvantage employees.

Recommendation 11: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should establish formal monitoring procedures for performance plans and evaluations and include steps for holding supervisors accountable for failure to adhere to them. (Action: F)

List of Recommendations

Recommendation 1: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should request that the Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources issue a statement emphasizing the Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance's central role in foreign assistance planning and budgeting and requiring that Department bureaus consult with the office whenever the use of foreign assistance resources is contemplated. (Action: F, in coordination with D(N))

Recommendation 2: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should conclude and disseminate a written understanding on the budget process with the U.S. Agency for International Development, including respective roles of the Department's Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance and the U.S. Agency for International Development's Office of Budget and Resource Management and participating bureaus in both organizations, for the preparation of the FY 2014 foreign assistance budget. (Action: F)

Recommendation 3: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, in coordination with the Bureau of Human Resources, should undertake a review of workforce requirements including the number of staff, grade structure, balance between the Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development, and balance between Civil and Foreign Service. (Action: F, in coordination with DGHR)

Recommendation 4: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, in coordination with the Bureau of Human Resources, should review all budget analyst, program analyst, and country coordinator position descriptions to determine whether job responsibilities reflect actual work performed. The review should include the expanded use of career ladders, as appropriate. (Action: F, in coordination with DGHR)

Recommendation 5: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, in coordination with the Bureau of Resource Management, the Bureau of Human Resources and the Foreign Service Institute, should develop a training continuum for its budget analysts, program analysts, and country coordinators specific to the budget and foreign assistance work the office performs. (Action: F, in coordination with RM, DGHR, and FSI)

Recommendation 6: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, in coordination with the Bureau of Resource Management, should prepare a study to determine whether there are cost effective solutions for collecting timely data on budget execution and making the data accessible to the Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, its operating units, and stakeholders. (Action: F, in coordination with RM)

Recommendation 7: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should obtain formal designation letters and training for the information systems security officers. (Action: F)

Recommendation 8: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, in coordination with the Bureau of Information Resource Management, should rewrite the information systems security officers' work requirements to include all duties outlined for the position in the Foreign Affairs Manual. (Action: F, in coordination with IRM)

Recommendation 9: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should submit all necessary documentation on the Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System to the Information Technology Asset Baseline. (Action: F)

Recommendation 10: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, in coordination with the Office of the Secretariat Executive Office and the Bureau of Administration Office of Logistics Management, should establish and implement property management procedures for Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System equipment in accordance with Department regulations. (Action: F, in coordination with S/ES/EX and A/LM)

Recommendation 11: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should establish formal monitoring procedures for performance plans and evaluations and include steps for holding supervisors accountable for failure to adhere to them. (Action: F)

List of Informal Recommendations

Informal recommendations cover operational matters not requiring action by organizations outside the inspected unit and/or the parent regional bureau. Informal recommendations will not be subject to the OIG compliance process. However, any subsequent OIG inspection or on-site compliance review will assess the mission's progress in implementing the informal recommendations.

Informal Recommendation 1: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should place a high priority on its efforts to develop orientation and training materials on office processes and procedures for the benefit of new staff.

Informal Recommendation 2: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should review the current job responsibilities of the executive assistant, update the position description, and change the job title from executive assistant to executive officer.

Informal Recommendation 3: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should make hiring an additional contract developer with the requisite technical knowledge a high priority.

Informal Recommendation 4: The Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance should formalize and implement a training program and standardized project management methodology to ensure that developers are aware of project management requirements consistent with Managing State Projects, especially those related to system documentation.

Principal Officials

	Name	Arrival Date
Deputy Director	Robert Goldberg	01/10
Managing Director – Policy Analysis	Paula Lynch	06/06
Managing Director – Resources and Appropriations	James Painter	08/06
Managing Director – Regional and Functional Issues	Khushali Shah	06/07
Managing Director – Planning, Performance Management, and Information Systems	Wade Warren	03/08

Abbreviations

BBG	Broadcasting Board of Governors
BRM	Office of Budget and Resource Management
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
D(N)	Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources
Department	Department of State
F	Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance
FACTS	Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System
JPPS	Joint Planning and Performance System
MSRP	Mission Strategic and Resource Plan
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
PEPFAR	President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief
QDDR	Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review
RM	Bureau of Resource Management
S/ES-EX	Executive Office of the Secretariat
S/GAC	Office of the U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~

**FRAUD, WASTE, ABUSE,
OR MISMANAGEMENT**
of Federal programs hurts everyone.

Contact the
Office of Inspector General
HOTLINE
to report illegal or wasteful activities:

202-647-3320
800-409-9926

oighotline@state.gov

oig.state.gov

Office of Inspector General
U.S. Department of State
P.O. Box 9778
Arlington, VA 22219

Cables to the Inspector General
should be slugged "OIG Channel"
to ensure confidentiality.

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~