



United States Department of State
and the Broadcasting Board of Governors

Office of Inspector General

NOV -6 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: S/GAC – Mr. Eric Goosby
FSI – Ms. Ruth Whiteside

FROM: OIG – Harold W. Geisel 

SUBJECT: Review of President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) Training (ISP-I-13-04)

Summary

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) recommended in 2011 that the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) develop training for Department of State (Department) and other agency personnel on the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). The recommendation was based on problems found by inspections in the coordination and execution of PEPFAR programs overseas. OIG committed to review this issue in the PEPFAR work plan it submitted to Congress for FY 2012.

FSI has successfully developed courses on how U.S. embassies can support PEPFAR and integrate it with other assistance programs in support of overall foreign policy goals. It deals with PEPFAR in a number of different courses rather than a single one, a strategy that helps it focus on specific needs and issues such as policy coordination or administrative support. FSI does not, however, include the subject adequately in its courses for ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission, creating a risk of insufficient oversight of this important program.

Overall Strategy for PEPFAR Training

Rather than treat PEPFAR as a single subject, FSI addresses it in several different courses and divisions. For example, PEPFAR is an important part of the economic training division's course on *Global Health Diplomacy* and its new course on *Partnership in Development and Diplomacy*. The political training division covers PEPFAR funding, monitoring, and evaluation in two new courses: *Managing Foreign Assistance Awards Overseas* and *Foreign Assistance Program Monitoring and Evaluation*. The management training division has developed segments to help support staff understand how PEPFAR employees' needs may differ from those of other embassy personnel. This approach enables FSI to provide specific, need-based training in PEPFAR issues more effectively than trying to combine these different issues in a single course.

Training PEPFAR Coordinators to Work Successfully in Embassies

The Department is considering hiring PEPFAR coordinators on limited, noncareer appointments. Many are current or former USAID employees who are well acquainted with how

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~

embassies function, but others are domestic public health experts or eligible family members with little or no experience in working at an embassy overseas. The problems identified in embassy inspections focused largely on this group. Many coordinators would have benefited from more training in the structure of an embassy, the rules for dealing with host government agencies, and how the different sections of a mission work together to coordinate their programs. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is trying to build a cadre of overseas employees who understand how an embassy works and the role that PEPFAR plays in overall foreign policy. To support this initiative, FSI offers a 2-day, online course on how a diplomatic mission functions and encourages all new PEPFAR coordinators to take it.¹

Training Administrative Staff to Support PEPFAR

Department human resources specialists, particularly overseas, are often unsure how to classify positions for PEPFAR local staff. In many cases, their medical qualifications may not fit the standard diplomatic templates. To remedy this issue, FSI now includes a practice exercise on classifying PEPFAR and other public health positions in its courses on position classification.

Training Chiefs of Mission to Oversee PEPFAR

In 2011, OIG reported that FSI was developing information on PEPFAR to be used in the training of ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission.² This material was supposed to be made available to all ambassadors-designate and deputy chiefs of mission assigned to PEPFAR countries. To date, it does not appear to have taken place. The classes do not contain any modules, exercises, information packages, or specific information on PEPFAR.

Adding a separate module on PEPFAR to the already full agenda of these courses would not be cost effective. Many PEPFAR issues are included in the courses' units on the oversight of foreign assistance programs in general. Others are relevant only to those ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission going to countries with a PEPFAR program. A printed or electronic handbook would provide ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission with an adequate understanding of their responsibilities and authorities for the oversight of this important work and its coordination with other foreign policy goals.

Recommendation 1: The Office of the Global AIDS Coordinator, in coordination with the Foreign Service Institute, should develop a handbook and conduct briefings on the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief for ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission assigned to countries with a President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief program. (Action: S/GAC, in coordination with FSI)

You should advise us on actions taken or planned on the recommendations within 30 days of the date of this memorandum. Actions taken or planned are subject to OIG followup and reporting.

¹ 2011 State 00061347 made the course, *PN113: Introduction to Working in an Embassy*, mandatory for employees posted to an embassy for more than 30 days of temporary duty.

² *Review of President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief in Small Investment Countries*, ISP-I-11-59, August 2011.

I would be happy to meet with you to discuss this matter further, or your staff may contact (b) (6) Assistant Inspector General for Inspections, by email at (b) (6) @state.gov or by telephone on 202-663-(b) (6)

Enclosures:

Compliance Sheet
OIG Resolution Procedures

COMPLIANCE INFORMATION SHEET AND INSTRUCTIONS
FOR OIG INSPECTION REPORTS

Compliance Contacts:

(b) (6)

Office of Inspections, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of State, SA-39, (b) (6)

Response Due Date: 30 days from receipt of this e-transmittal

Below is a list of the reports and recommendations assigned to action and coordinating entities. Instructions on how to submit compliance updates are provided on the following pages.

PRODUCT NAME: REVIEW OF PRESIDENT'S EMERGENCY PLAN FOR AIDS RELIEF (PEPFAR) TRAINING, ISP-I-13-04

Action Entity:

S/GAC

Recommendation(s):

1

Coordinating Entity:

FSI

Recommendation(s):

1

Compliance Instructions for OIG Inspection Reports

Action Entities

1. Action entities should, via a record e-mail, list each recommendation by number and text verbatim along with a detailed discussion indicating agreement or disagreement with the recommended action for each recommendation within 30 days from the receipt of this e-transmittal of the report.
 - a. The record e-mail should indicate the appropriate clearances.
 - b. The ACTION line should be addressed to the ISP compliance contacts on page one—the assigned analyst and the supervisory analyst.
 - c. The SUBJECT line should include the report title and report number.
 - d. The record e-mail must be tagged ASIG, and at a minimum should be captioned sensitive or with the overall highest classification of the applicable text or recommendations issued in the report.
 - e. Action entities are reminded to properly portion mark paragraphs in classified record e-mails.
2. For agreement, include corrective actions taken or planned, and actual or target dates for completion. For disagreement, action entities must include reasons for disagreement, and any alternative proposals for corrective action.
3. Action entities should also indicate in the response that they have sought and received the concurrence of the assigned coordinating entities.
4. If questioned or unsupported costs are identified, state the amount that is determined to be disallowed and the plan to collect the disallowed funds. If funds put to better use are identified, then state the amount that can be put to better use (if these amounts differ from OIG's, state the reason).
5. Implementation of informal recommendations is expected, however, a written response is not required.

Coordinating Entities

1. Coordinating entities are not required to initiate action on recommendations. Coordinating entities are to be consulted by the assigned action entity for concurrence on a proposed action to implement the recommendation.
2. However, in the event that a coordinating entity disagrees with an action entity's proposed plan of action, the coordinating entity is encourage, but not obliged, to submit a response to OIG for consideration in OIG's analysis on whether the cited action meets the intent of the recommendation.

OIG Analysis of Response

1. If OIG concurs with a response to a recommendation, it will note, in the analysis correspondence, that it concurs with the action entity's management decision. And, OIG will indicate whether the recommendation is closed for acceptable implementation or indicate its status as resolved/open if action is still pending and assign a follow-on suspense for a compliance update. Implementation measures will be tracked until final action is accomplished and the recommendation is closed.

2. If OIG does not concur with the action office's proposed corrective action, or if the action office fails to respond to a recommendation or rejects it, OIG will identify the recommendation as unresolved. OIG will attempt to resolve the disagreement at the action office level. However, if OIG determines that an impasse has been reached, it will refer the matter for adjudication as outlined in 1 FAM 056.1, 1 FAM 053.2-2, and 1 FAM 056.2-1(l).

3. In accordance with the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, OIG is required to report to Congress semiannually on April 1 and October 1 of each year, a summary of each OIG report issued for which no management decision was made during the previous 6-month period. Heads of agencies are required to report to Congress on significant recommendations from previous OIG reports where final action has not been taken for more than one year from the date of management decision, together with an explanation of delays.