LEAD INSPECTOR GENERAL MISSION

The Lead Inspector General for Overseas Contingency Operations will coordinate among the Inspectors General specified under the law to:

• develop a joint strategic plan to conduct comprehensive oversight over all aspects of the contingency operation

• ensure independent and effective oversight of all programs and operations of the federal government in support of the contingency operation through either joint or individual audits, inspections, and investigations

• promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness and prevent, detect, and deter fraud, waste, and abuse

• perform analyses to ascertain the accuracy of information provided by federal agencies relating to obligations and expenditures, costs of programs and projects, accountability of funds, and the award and execution of major contracts, grants, and agreements

• report quarterly and biannually to the Congress and the public on the contingency operation and activities of the Lead Inspector General

(Pursuant to sections 2, 4, and 8L of the Inspector General Act of 1978)
FOREWORD

We are pleased to publish the Lead Inspector General (Lead IG) quarterly report on Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR). This is our eighth quarterly report on the overseas contingency operation (OCO), discharging our individual and collective agency oversight responsibilities pursuant to sections 2, 4, and 8L of the Inspector General Act of 1978. OIR is dedicated to countering the terrorist threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) in Iraq, Syria, the region, and the broader international community. The U.S. counter-ISIL strategy includes support to military operations associated with OIR, as well as diplomatic, governance, and security programs and activities, and humanitarian assistance.

This quarterly report provides information on key events involving OIR and an update on the nine Strategic Lines of Effort to Counter ISIL, covering the period from October 1, 2016, through December 31, 2016. This report also features oversight work conducted by the Lead IG Offices of Inspector General and partner oversight agencies, as well as our ongoing and future oversight work.

Working in close collaboration, we remain committed to providing comprehensive oversight and timely reporting on OIR. Collectively, we strive to assist U.S. Government agencies and the U.S. Congress to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of programs supporting this critical mission.

/s/
Glenn A. Fine
Acting Inspector General
U.S. Department of Defense

/s/
Steve A. Linick
Inspector General
U.S. Department of State and the Broadcasting Board of Governors

/s/
Ann Calvaresi Barr
Inspector General
U.S. Agency for International Development
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MESSAGE FROM THE LEAD INSPECTOR GENERAL

I am pleased to present the eighth Lead Inspector General (Lead IG) report on Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR) and the U.S. strategy to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). This report summarizes the quarter’s key events, and describes completed, ongoing, and planned Lead IG and partner agency oversight work relating to this activity.

As our report discusses in more detail, Coalition-backed Iraqi forces this quarter have partially liberated Mosul, ISIL’s last stronghold in Iraq. In Syria, Coalition-backed vetted Syrian forces began a military operation to isolate Raqqah, ISIL’s self-proclaimed capital. Despite progress to degrade ISIL’s military and financial resources, and to target key terrorist leaders, ISIL retained control of parts of Syria as well as western Mosul in Iraq. In addition, an ISIL insurgency was active in parts of previously liberated sections of Iraq such as in Anbar province near Fallujah.

The Department of State (DoS) and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) supported the Iraqi government’s stabilization process, which includes the removal of unexploded ordnance and mines; the establishment of policing forces acceptable to the local populations; work to restore power and other public services to allow people to return to their homes; and the addressing of urgent humanitarian needs.

This quarter, the Lead IG agencies and oversight partners continued their oversight of OIR, releasing 10 reports and conducting 29 ongoing oversight projects. In addition, we released our comprehensive oversight plan for overseas contingency operations, which contains FY 2017 oversight projects related to OIR. The Lead IG agencies also were conducting 50 OIR-related investigations pertaining to alleged procurement or program fraud, corruption, and trafficking in persons.

On November 17, 2016, the Lead IG agencies began joint strategic oversight planning for FY 2018 with a summit of Lead IG agency representatives. During these discussions, the agencies shared their oversight planning processes and identified the strategic oversight areas necessary for FY 2018 oversight planning.

In addition, on December 8, 2016, the IGs for DoS and USAID testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations about their agencies’ top management challenges. Also in December, my office released its top management challenges report, as part of our FY 2017 Oversight Plan.

My Lead IG colleagues and I want to thank our dedicated staff who perform their important oversight of OIR. In recognition of that work, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency awarded one of its top awards, the Glenn/Roth Award for Exemplary Service, to Lead IG employees for their outstanding oversight of overseas contingency operations.

/s/

Glenn A. Fine
Lead Inspector General for Operation Inherent Resolve
Acting Inspector General
U.S. Department of Defense
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is issued pursuant to sections 2, 4, and 8L of the Inspector General Act of 1978, which requires that the designated Lead Inspector General (IG) provide a quarterly report, available to the public, on a contingency operation. The Department of Defense (DoD) Inspector General is the designated Lead Inspector General for Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR). The Department of State (DoS) Inspector General is the Associate Lead Inspector General for OIR. This report contains information from the three Lead IG agencies—DoD, DoS, and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)—as well as from partner oversight agencies. This unclassified report covers the period from October 1 through December 31, 2016. The methodology for obtaining information and drafting this report can be found in Appendix A.

The main goal of the U.S.-led Global Coalition to Counter ISIL remains the liberation of Mosul and Raqqah from ISIL. This would effectively dismantle ISIL’s physical “caliphate.” Mosul is ISIL’s last major stronghold in Iraq, and Raqqah in Syria is ISIL’s self-proclaimed capital.¹

Iraqi forces made progress in neighborhood-by-neighborhood fighting in east Mosul in late 2016 but faced fierce resistance from ISIL. As the quarter ended, Iraqi forces had surrounded Mosul and captured an estimated two-thirds of the eastern half of the city, while ground forces driving from three directions were beginning to converge on the eastern bank of the Tigris River, which splits Mosul.² Meanwhile, the Coalition-backed Syrian Democratic Forces were increasingly isolating Raqqah.³

The Iraqi Counter Terrorism Service initially suffered high casualties in Mosul as ISIL used suicide bombers, snipers, rockets, mortars, and vehicle-borne improvised explosive devices (VBIEDs) against the Iraqi units. DoD officials expect that ISIL will employ similar tactics when Syrian opposition forces enter the city of Raqqah.⁴ DoD officials described VBIEDs as ISIL’s primary weapon; however, the Coalition’s increasing use of road spikes, cratering of roadways, and use of anti-tank munitions significantly reduced the impact of VBIEDs against Iraqi forces as the battle progressed.⁵

The people inside Mosul face “a dire humanitarian situation” with dwindling supplies of food and potable water, according to the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.⁶ It reported that approximately 125,000 civilians had been displaced by the military operations to retake Mosul by the end of 2016. According to the DoS, civilians leaving Mosul were generally escorted by Iraqi Security Forces, giving them assistance and protection. As of the end of the quarter, the displaced...
persons camps and emergency sites to the east and south of Mosul were reported to be nearing their capacity. 7

As the military offensive began in October, Iraqi authorities urged Mosul area residents to rise up against ISIL. ISIL allegedly executed hundreds of residents, according to the United Nations and Human Rights Watch. 8 Villagers described summary executions of former policemen and army officers accused by ISIL of being spies. 9 ISIL also displayed the corpses of the alleged spies in public places as a warning to others. Witnesses said the group had left “dozens of bodies” at intersections, in both eastern and western districts of Mosul, with notes such as: “Used cell phones to leak information to the ISF [Iraqi Security Forces].” 10

Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter warned in December that the eventual defeat of ISIL in Mosul and Raqqah will not be the end of the terrorist threat. He said that ISIL would likely mutate into a global terrorist network, an organization that “lies in wait in the sands of the desert,” or a violent extremist movement that “lives and lurks only in the darkest corners of the Internet.” According to Secretary Carter, some U.S. forces would remain in Iraq after ISIL is defeated. 11 He later emphasized that any such post-ISIL presence would need to be coordinated with the Iraqi government. 12 In addition, U.S. presence would depend on policy decisions by the incoming U.S. Administration.

“We cannot perfectly predict what will happen after the Coalition defeats ISIL in Iraq and Syria,” Secretary Carter said, “so we must be ready for anything.” 13

Showing its resiliency beyond the battlefield, ISIL continued its insurgent activity outside Mosul, particularly in Anbar and Kirkuk provinces. Additionally, the al Qaeda affiliate in Syria was considered a potential threat to succeed a degraded ISIL as the most dangerous terrorist group in Iraq and Syria. 14
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U.S. and Coalition aircraft carried out more than 650 strikes on ISIL targets in Iraq and Syria from October 17, when the ground campaign in Mosul began, to December 31.

COALITION EFFORTS TO DEFEAT ISIL IN IRAQ AND SYRIA

The United States, part of a Coalition of more than 60 countries, has over 5,000 U.S. troops on the ground to implement a strategy of train, advise, assist, and equip local forces.\textsuperscript{15} Coalition support to multiple security forces in Iraq and vetted opposition fighters in Syria includes airstrikes; advisors, including Special Operations Forces; trainers at five Building Partner Capacity sites for Iraqi forces; and surveillance, intelligence gathering, and cyber tools.\textsuperscript{16} In Syria, where there is no government partner, 300 U.S. Special Operations Forces have worked to recruit, train, and advise Syrian fighters, and in December, DoD officials announced an additional 200 troops would be sent to Syria.\textsuperscript{17} By the end of 2016, the Coalition had trained over 66,000 members of the Iraqi Security Forces and over 3,000 members of Syrian partner forces.\textsuperscript{18}

U.S. and Coalition aircraft carried out more than 650 strikes on ISIL targets in Iraq and Syria from October 17, when the ground campaign in Mosul began, to December 31.\textsuperscript{19} The strikes around Mosul targeted ISIL supply routes, key terrain, and excavating equipment to reduce the ability of ISIL to rotate forces, resupply, and launch VBIED attacks against Iraqi Security Forces. Coalition aircraft also destroyed the five bridges across the Tigris River to restrict ISIL movement. Airstrikes further targeted ISIL and al Qaeda leaders and ISIL’s revenue-generating oil infrastructure.\textsuperscript{20}

In Syria, a campaign to isolate Raqqah by the Coalition-backed Syrian Democratic Forces had, as of early December, liberated more than 500 square miles of Syrian land and reached to within 15 miles of the city. At the end of the quarter, the Syrian Democratic Forces were focused on seizing Syria’s largest dam, the Tabqa Dam, where ISIL has a headquarters, a prison for high-profile hostages, and a training and

SYRIA

| NOVEMBER 5 | Syrian regime begins offensive to take east Aleppo from opposition fighters. |
| DECEMBER 9 | Turkey begins offensive to take Al Bab from ISIL. |
| DECEMBER 10 | Defense Secretary Ashton Carter announces 200 more U.S. troops will be sent to Syria to aid rebel groups in effort to liberate Raqqah. |
| DECEMBER 11 | ISIL recaptures Palmyra from Syrian regime forces, who had seized it from ISIL in March. |
| DECEMBER 29 | Syrian regime announces cease fire brokered by Russia and Turkey with some opposition groups, and plans for talks toward a political resolution. |
| DECEMBER 31 | UN Security Council unanimously adopts resolution supporting the efforts of Russia and Turkey to end violence in Syria. |

NOVEMBER 8 | Coalition-backed Syrian Democratic Forces begin offensive to isolate ISIL-held Raqqah. |
THE FIGHT FOR MOSUL IN 2016

Iraqi forces make headway despite ISIL’s stiff resistance

**October 17–October 19**

Iraqi operations to liberate Mosul, ISIL’s last major stronghold in Iraq, began on October 17. The Iraqi assault sought to advance on Mosul from four directions: 1) Iraqi Security Forces—the Iraqi Army and Federal Police—advancing from the south and west; 2) Kurdish Peshmerga moving from the southeast toward Mosul; and 3) the Iraqi Security Forces and Peshmerga advancing northeast of the city. The Peshmerga agreed not to enter the city, and let the Iraqi Counter Terrorism Service flow through their northeastern lines. ISIL responded with stiff resistance in many areas, particularly with vehicle-borne IEDs (VBIEDs).

**November 22–November 28**

Iraq’s elite Counter Terrorism Service made progress in neighborhood-by-neighborhood fighting in Mosul, east of the Tigris River, but Iraqi Army and Federal Police units north and south of the city had not entered the city limits by this time. Also, Popular Mobilization Forces moved west of Mosul toward the city of Tal Afar, along the main road from Mosul to Syria, helping to isolate ISIL in Mosul. ISIL was using snipers, mortars and VBIEDs. Coalition aircraft disabled four of the five bridges over the Tigris River to limit ISIL reinforcements and VBIEDs from west Mosul.
December 27–January 2, 2017

The Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) renewed their offensive in Mosul on December 29, capturing five major neighborhoods along Mosul’s main east-west highway and pushing farther toward the eastern bank of the Tigris River. Iraqi forces paused December 21-28 to regroup and resupply after the Counter Terrorism Service took a high number of casualties. In the renewed operation, the Iraqi Army, Federal Police, and Counter Terrorism Service attacked east Mosul simultaneously from three directions, requiring ISIL to defend multiple locations. The three axes were beginning to converge by the east bank of the Tigris River.
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indoctrination area for leaders. More than 100 Coalition airstrikes were conducted in the vicinity of the dam in late December.21

DoD officials said the Syrian Democratic Forces have approximately 45,000 fighters, mostly Syrian Kurds but also including over 13,000 fighters in a component called the Syrian Arab Coalition, which includes Arabs, Turkmen, Yezidis, and other ethnic groups. More than 1,500 new fighters were in training to join the ranks to liberate Raqqah; more than 90 percent of those finishing training are Arabs—which is particularly important in that they may be needed as a hold force in the majority Sunni Arab city.22

The DoD reported spending a total of $10 billion on the counter-ISIL mission from the start of operations on August 8, 2014, through October 15, 2016, with an average daily cost of $12.6 million over the 2-year duration of the conflict. This information is provided in the DoD Special Report: Inherent Resolve, which has the most current data on OIR.23

STABILIZATION IN IRAQ

U.S. officials stated that stabilization of communities liberated from ISIL is critical to promoting enduring, inclusive self-governance and avoiding a resurgence of violent extremist groups. This stabilization process includes the removal of unexploded ordnance and mines; the establishment of police or military forces acceptable to the local populations; the prioritization of immediate work to allow people to return to

The Iraqi government continued to lead stabilization efforts, supported by the Coalition, the DoS, USAID, the United Nations Development Programme, and other international partners.

Members of the Iraqi Counter Terrorism Service present Gen. Joseph F. Dunford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a flag from Bartilah, a town just outside of Mosul recaptured by the Iraqi Army. (DoD photo)
their homes, such as restoring power and other public services; and the addressing of urgent humanitarian needs. The Iraqi government continued to lead stabilization efforts, supported by the Coalition, the DoS, USAID, the United Nations Development Programme, and other international partners.

According to the DoS, during the past quarter Iraqi Prime Minister Haider al Abadi continued to work with provincial and local governments to pursue service delivery and stabilization, particularly in areas liberated from ISIL’s control. The Iraqi government also worked with provincial officials to recruit and establish local hold forces to maintain security, thus allowing the Iraqi Security Forces to transition away from policing and to return to the fight against ISIL.

Some stabilization work, such as clearing rubble, is expected to employ thousands of Mosul residents as explosives are cleared. USAID reported that it is currently planning to use $30 million for the rehabilitation and stabilization efforts once Mosul is liberated. Ninawa Governor Nawful Agoob appointed local district managers to supervise stabilization and humanitarian services in coordination with his office. Provincial officials also worked with the Iraqi central government, the international community, and non-governmental organizations to establish and maintain camps for persons displaced by the fighting to liberate Mosul.

The DoS reported that to permit immediate demining activities, it had funded a task order for $20 million to a private contracting company to survey, mark, and clear explosives from high-priority public infrastructure in Anbar province. This quarter, the DoS increased the task order to $40 million, to include demining in Ninawa province.
According to the UN Assistance Mission for Iraq, the destruction of ISIL is “just the beginning” of the challenge to rebuild trust among all of Iraq’s communities and “to finally break the cycle of abuses and violations, death and destruction that the people of Iraq have endured.”

CONTINUING DANGER FROM ISIL AND TERRORISTS

DoD officials noted two additional threats regarding the terrorists in Iraq and Syria. First, while fighting in Iraq and Syria centered on the battles for Mosul and Raqqah, ISIL militants continued insurgent activity outside of those areas in both countries. For example, ISIL militants reactivated networks in Anbar province and carried out suicide attacks near Karbala in southern Iraq and at checkpoints leading to Fallujah and Amiriyal al-Fallujah.

Second, Jabhat Fateh al-Sham, the al Qaeda affiliate in Syria, has been a prominent fighting force against the Syrian regime. The group has attempted to portray itself as the defender of Sunnis in Syria and has downplayed its global al Qaeda terrorist ideology. While the group, formerly known as the Nusra Front, announced it no longer is part of al Qaeda, DoD officials have stated that the rebranding is in name only. The DoS amended the designation of the Nusra Front as a terrorist organization on November 10 to add Jabhat Fateh al-Sham as an alias. The U.S. military continued to target Jabhat Fateh al-Sham. Analysts stated that a particular danger would be if the al Qaeda affiliate gained control of ISIL’s network of terrorist operatives in Europe.

SYRIAN CIVIL WAR

During the last two weeks of the quarter, the Syrian regime of Bashar al-Assad agreed to a ceasefire with opposition fighters that allowed opposition fighters and civilians to evacuate eastern Aleppo. The regime then seized the eastern part of Aleppo, thereby taking control of the entire city. Russia, Iran, and Turkey brokered an agreement to “launch negotiations on a political settlement aimed at a comprehensive resolution of the Syrian crisis by peaceful means,” during talks slated for January 2017 in Astana, Kazakhstan.

Despite these developments, Syria remained fractured and mired in violence. The Syrian regime and its allies continued to fight the opposition, primarily in Idlib and Hims provinces and east of Damascus in the Ghouta region, with some targeting of ISIL. Assad has stated that his forces would liberate all of Syria and that all of Syria had to be under state authority.

On December 31, the day after the ceasefire between the regime and opposition forces took effect, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 2336 (2016) welcoming and supporting “the efforts by Russia and Turkey to end violence in Syria and jumpstart a political process” for that country. The UN resolution noted the
The continued fighting across Syria caused destruction, displacement, and growing humanitarian needs.

provisions in the ceasefire agreement about intended negotiations, and tied the planned meeting in Astana to the resumption of UN-sponsored peace discussions, under a process set forth in earlier Security Council resolutions and communiqués.

**HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE**

Humanitarian conditions continued to worsen in Iraq as the Iraqi government’s partial capture of Mosul from ISIL resulted in approximately 125,000 new internally displaced persons (IDPs), and increased civilian casualties. USAID’s Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) and Office of Food for Peace (FFP), and the DoS’s Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) supported sheltering the majority of Mosul IDPs in camps and emergency sites. Some IDPs found shelter in areas recently recaptured from ISIL, which are generally less accessible to humanitarian responders due to ongoing insecurity in these areas. Humanitarian efforts also continued in other areas of Iraq that ISIL once controlled, such as Anbar province, where former IDPs returned to their homes at an increasing rate. Additionally, financial complications within the Iraqi government and Kurdistan Regional Government continued to hinder assistance efforts and increase demands on the international community. The United Nations reported that by the end of the quarter, over 10 million people in Iraq were in need of humanitarian support, with 3.1 million people internally displaced.

The continued fighting across Syria caused destruction, displacement, and growing humanitarian needs. The Syrian regime’s capture of the eastern part of Aleppo from opposition forces was particularly destructive. Regime and allied forces destroyed civilian infrastructure and medical facilities, displacing nearly 110,000 civilians from the city. OFDA, FFP, and PRM provided assistance to IDPs from Aleppo as they moved to other areas of northwestern Syria. In Manbij, a city recently captured from ISIL by the Syrian Democratic Forces, humanitarian conditions improved as the city stabilized and basic services and commercial activity returned to the area. Despite
the end of the siege of east Aleppo, ongoing sieges and hard to reach areas in other parts of Syria continued to impede humanitarian access, with the United Nations reporting 974,080 people living under siege as of mid-December. OFDA and FFP also reported that prepositioning supplies in preparation for the capture of Raqqah from ISIL was a priority during the quarter. The United Nations reported that there were approximately 13.5 million people in Syria in need of humanitarian support, including 6.3 million IDPs.

LEAD IG OVERSIGHT

The Lead IG agencies and their oversight partners released ten reports related directly or in part to oversight of OIR from October 1, 2016, through December 31, 2016. The DoD OIG and the Government Accountability Office issued reports on the U.S. and Coalition efforts related to forces in Iraq and the DoS OIG examined the vetting process for Syrian non-lethal assistance. The DoD OIG and DoS OIG issued reports on contractor oversight and controls in theater and the DoS OIG issued a report on governance and stability initiatives. The Government Accountability Office issued a classified report addressing ISIL messaging and the Department of Homeland Security OIG released three reports on homeland security programs involving airport security, immigration, and drug interdiction. Table 1 lists reports released this quarter.

Lead IG agencies and their oversight partners had 29 ongoing and 22 planned oversight projects, as of December 31, 2016. These projects related to oversight of contracts and grants, military and diplomatic operations, governance, humanitarian assistance, and intelligence activities.

As of December 31, 2016, the Lead IG agencies had 50 ongoing OIR-related investigations, with 70 percent related to procurement or program fraud. The Defense Criminal Investigative Service, the DoD OIG’s investigative component, also initiated a trafficking in persons investigations program and opened five such investigations related to OIR this quarter.

The DoD OIG, the entity that tracks hotline activities among the Lead IG agencies and other OIR-related organizations, received and coordinated 75 contacts related to OIR and opened 140 cases during the quarter. These contacts were referred within the DoD OIG, to the Lead IG agencies, or to other investigative organizations for review and, as appropriate, investigation.

On November 17, 2016, the Lead IG agencies began joint strategic planning for FY 2018 with a summit of Lead IG representatives. These representatives shared their Lead IG agencies’ oversight planning processes and began a discussion to identify the strategic oversight areas necessary for FY 2018 oversight planning. These discussions will continue as the Lead IG agencies decide on the oversight areas and plan projects consistent with these areas.
On December 8, 2016, the IGs for the DoS and USAID testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations about their agency’s top management challenges. The DoD OIG released its top management challenges report in December, as part of its FY 2017 Oversight Plan. Many of the challenges identified by each Lead IG relate to OIR.

For more information on Lead IG and partner oversight, see the Completed Oversight Activities and Ongoing and Planned Oversight sections of this report, beginning on page 77 and page 93 respectively. Appendix B contains detailed information on the Lead IG statutory requirements.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oversight Reports Released, as of 12/31/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF STATE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Department of State Vetting Process for Syrian Non-Lethal Assistance (AUD-MERO-17-01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs Middle East Partnership Initiative (AUD-MERO-17-08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Oversight of Fuel Acquisition and Related Services Supporting Department of State Operations in Iraq (AUD-MERO-17-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combating Terrorism: U.S. Footprint Poses Challenges for the Advise and Assist Mission in Iraq (GAO-17-220C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combating Terrorism: Additional Steps Needed in U.S. Efforts to Counter ISIS Messaging (GAO-17-41C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER LEAD IG PARTNER OVERSIGHT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS Drug Interdiction Efforts Need Improvement (OIG-17-09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPERATION INHERENT RESOLVE

QUARTERLY HIGHLIGHTS OF U.S. COUNTER-ISIL STRATEGY

In September 2014, President Barack Obama announced a comprehensive strategy to degrade and ultimately defeat ISIL, setting out nine Strategic Lines of Effort (LOEs) to destroy the organization. Below is a description of some of the LOE activity reported during the quarter:

SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE IN IRAQ

The DoS continued its diplomatic engagement through the U.S. Mission in Iraq and the Special Presidential Envoy for the Global Coalition to Counter ISIL aimed at supporting democratic, inclusive governance at the national, provincial and local levels in Iraq. The effort focused in part on fostering collaboration between the Iraqi government and Kurdistan Regional Government in the campaign to liberate Mosul.

DENYING ISIL SAFE-HAVEN

On December 16, Coalition aircraft destroyed 14 ISIL tanks and a surface-to-air missile system captured from the Syrian regime’s Tiyas Military Airfield near Palmyra, Syria, a few days after ISIL overran Syrian regime troops.

BUILDING PARTNER CAPACITY

Combined Joint Task Force-Operation Inherent Resolve reported in October that it had provided more than 24,000 protective chemical masks to the Iraqi Security Forces and Peshmerga during training at its five Building Partner Capacity sites in preparation for the Mosul offensive. Training included how to effectively use and fight in the gas masks. DoD officials noted that ISIL has used chemical weapons in the past.

ENHANCING INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION ON ISIL

General David Goldfein, U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff, said that he will recommend the new Administration grant commanders greater flexibility in using cyber-warfare against groups such as ISIL. The FY 2017 DoD budget request includes $7 billion for cyber capabilities such as tools and infrastructure for offensive cyber operations.

DISRUPTING ISIL’S FINANCES

The DoS and the Department of Treasury worked with the Iraqi government, members of the Coalition, and international and interagency partners to disrupt ISIL’s access to international and Iraqi financial systems. These departments and USAID also supported Iraq’s efforts to implement reforms required by the International Monetary Fund as part of its loan conditions. Treasury Assistant Secretary Ronald Glaser met with Iraqi officials to discuss progress on banning salary payments to Iraqi government employees in ISIL-held territories to combat extortion of those funds by ISIL.
EXPOSING ISIL’S TRUE NATURE

The DoS’s Bureau of International Information Programs conducted training camps in India, Kuwait, and Turkey focused on countering violent extremism, and produced training content in English, French, Arabic and Urdu for use by the Coalition, U.S. embassies, and non-government partners.

DISRUPTING THE FLOW OF FOREIGN FIGHTERS

U.S. officials estimate that the flow of foreign fighters into Iraq and Syria dramatically decreased over 2016, a trend that continued during the quarter. DoS-led Interagency Foreign Fighter Surge Teams provided technical assistance to allies in Western Europe and enhanced their capacities to share information and address foreign fighter threats regarding Iraq and Syria. The DoS also launched Bilateral Engagement Teams with Balkan countries to build up their capacities in the same way.

PROTECTING THE HOMELAND

The Inspectors General of the Intelligence Community, and the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security continued work on a review entitled Joint Review on Domestic Sharing of Counterterrorism Information, which seeks to determine whether counterterrorism information is being adequately and appropriately shared with all participating agencies and to identify any gaps or duplication of effort among the entities.

HUMANITARIAN SUPPORT

USAID and the DoS continued to fund humanitarian assistance for IDPs, refugees, and other people in need due to the conflicts in Iraq and Syria. Assistance efforts included shelter, healthcare, emergency food aid, protection, and logistics support. The humanitarian effort in Iraq focused on mitigating the effects of the partial capture of Mosul from ISIL, which resulted in the displacement of approximately 125,000 people.

In Syria, humanitarian assistance efforts centered on providing support to approximately 110,000 civilians displaced by the Syrian regime’s capture of eastern Aleppo, while the DoS and USAID prepared for the impending military offensive to liberate Raqqah. From FY 2014 through December 31, 2016, the U.S. Government has committed nearly $5.98 billion since the start of the Syria crisis and more than $1.11 billion since FY 2014 for the Iraq crisis.

Sources: See endnote 1.
LINE OF EFFORT SPOTLIGHT: PROTECTING THE HOMELAND

This quarter, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) OIG issued two audits potentially affecting efforts to counter ISIL. These include a follow-up audit to review challenges to the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services’ (USCIS) Electronic Immigration System, which manages the issuance of Green Cards, and a summary report of audits performed to assess the Transportation Security Administration’s (TSA) efforts to improve technology security policies at selected airports.

• In the first audit, the DHS OIG determined that better safeguards were needed in the USCIS’s process for issuing Green Cards, which authorize recipients to live and work in the United States on a permanent basis. The audit made recommendations to ensure effective and efficient functioning of the USCIS Electronic Immigration System to avoid producing faulty Green Cards, which, if obtained by terrorists, might enable terrorist-related operations. The DHS OIG also recommended steps for protecting the integrity of the Green Card so that unauthorized cards are rendered unusable. The recommendations came after a previous audit found that the USCIS had produced at least 19,000 Green Cards that included incorrect information or were issued in duplicate.

• In the second report, the DHS OIG compiled a summary of prior audits that had found inadequate physical security for TSA server rooms at selected airports, unpatched software, missing security documentation, and incomplete reporting of information technology costs at these airports—deficiencies which could be exploited by ISIL supporters or other terrorists. The DHS OIG recommended that the TSA upgrade its Business Impact Analyses and Security Technology Integrated Program and establish a plan to conduct recurring reviews of the operational, technical, and management security controls of its information technology systems at airports nationwide.²

• For more information on Line of Effort: Protecting the Homeland, see Appendix C.

• For more information on Completed Oversight, see section on Completed Oversight Activities on page 77.
STATUS OF FUNDS

Department of Defense Funding for Overseas Contingency Operations

On December 15, 2016, the DoD reported having spent a total of $10.7 billion on the counter-ISIL mission since the start of operations on August 8, 2014, with an average daily cost of $12.5 million over that 2-year period. This information is provided in the DoD Special Report: Inherent Resolve, which reports the most current spending data available on OIR.3

Table 2.
Total Cost of DoD Operations for OIR (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extrapolated Total Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost (Aug 8, 2014-Dec 15, 2016)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Flying OPTEMPO</td>
<td>$4,291</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Ship OPTEMPO</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munitions</td>
<td>$2,388</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Support</td>
<td>$4,018</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$10,720</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>$1,810</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>$1,264</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>$6,797</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCOM</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$10,720</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics Support</td>
<td>$2,009</td>
<td>198%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Support</td>
<td>$1,871</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTEMPO</td>
<td>$4,314</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Pay</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munitions</td>
<td>$2,388</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$10,720</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding
As Table 2 shows, the Air Force was responsible for nearly two-thirds of the total cost of operations, due primarily to expenses related to munitions and daily flying operational tempo, or OPTEMPO, which consists of operations, training, maintenance, parts, fuel, and other necessities for sustaining day-to-day air combat operations.4

A more detailed but less current assessment of overseas contingency operation (OCO) spending is available in the Cost of War report, in which the DoD Comptroller details the DoD’s year-to-date spending on OIR. The report’s most current information, as of August 31, 2016, shows $4.1 billion in obligations and $2.6 billion in disbursements for specific FY 2016 appropriations supporting OIR.5

The congressionally mandated Cost of War report is an important oversight resource, as it is the only source for monthly data on the DoD's spending in support of overseas contingency operations. However, according to a June 2016 DoD OIG audit, the Cost of War report for the Air Force is untimely and not fully accurate. For example, the audit found that the reports issued for third quarter of FY 2015 underreported $237.9 million in obligations and $209.9 million in disbursements associated with Air Force Military Personnel and Operation and Maintenance, including the Syria train and equip program. The DoD Comptroller responded to this audit report indicating that steps were being taken to improve the accuracy and timeliness of the Cost of War report.6 The DoD Comptroller also stated that the Cost of War is an estimate of OCO costs and should not be used as an accounting tool.7 Additional audits are planned to address similar issues across the other Services, the next one being a Naval Audit Service assessment of the Navy’s reporting on OCO obligations and disbursements.

The following is the most current available information on FY 2016 spending for the major appropriations categories supporting OIR:

- **Military Personnel:** Provides pay and allowances for service members, including costs related to permanent changes of station.8 As of August 31, 2016, the DoD had obligated and disbursed $124.3 million for Military Personnel.9

- **Operation and Maintenance:** Provides a wide range of services and consumable items to support sustainment of war-related activities, including fuel, training, airlift, base support, ammunition, and civilian and contractor personnel.10 As of August 31, 2016, the DoD had obligated $4 billion and disbursed $2.5 billion for Operation and Maintenance.11

- **Procurement:** Supports acquisition of durable goods, such as aircraft, weapons systems, equipment, and vehicles.12 As of August 31, 2016, the DoD had obligated $172 million and disbursed $107 million for Procurement. While most DoD funding is appropriated for a single year, Procurement funds are made available for a 3-year period.13

- **Iraq Train and Equip Fund:** Provides direct materiel support to the Iraqi Security Forces, Kurdish Peshmerga, and certain tribal elements allied with the Iraqi government engaged in the fight against ISIL.14 As of December 17, 2016, the DoD had committed $551.3 million for the Iraq Train and Equip Fund, including funds
from FY 2016 and FY 2017. For major procurement requests, such as those made under this program, a commitment is an administrative reservation of funds which normally precedes a contractual obligation.

- **Syria Train and Equip Fund:** Provided assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, and other sustainment needs to vetted elements of the Syrian opposition engaged in the fight against ISIL. Congress did not fund the Syria Train and Equip Fund in FY 2016, as the DoD had suspended elements of this program due to significant challenges with its implementation and inability to meet program goals on the ground in Syria. However, the Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY 2016 permitted the DoD to use funding from the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund to provide assistance to appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition.


The National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for FY 2017, signed into law on December 23, 2016, sets forth the programs and priorities for the DoD for the coming fiscal year. The NDAA, enacted independently of the annual appropriations process, authorizes the statutory funding levels and prescribes DoD policy for these national security priorities. However, this act does not allocate the actual funding, which is currently provided under a continuing resolution that funds most government agencies approximately at their FY 2016 spending levels through April 28, 2017.

The NDAA includes several provisions related to OCO. In addition to $543.4 billion in base defense spending, the legislation authorizes $59.5 billion in OCO defense funding. This amount reflects the supplemental OCO request that President Obama submitted to Congress on November 10, 2016, to support several developments abroad, including the decision to limit the drawdown of U.S. troops in Afghanistan.

Within the $59.5 billion OCO authorization, the NDAA includes $8.3 billion to support non-war, base defense budget needs that would otherwise be subject to the spending caps imposed by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015. The $8.3 billion amount includes $5.1 billion requested by the Obama Administration, spread across all areas of defense spending, as well as an additional $3.2 billion added by Congress specifically to prevent the Administration’s planned reduction in total active-duty military force strength. The NDAA sets the total number of active-duty military personnel in FY 2017 at 1,305,900, which is 24,000 more than the Administration’s request. The Act uses OCO funding to pay for the salaries and expenses associated with these additional troops, including those not directly involved in overseas contingency operations.

The Obama Administration’s budget request for FY 2017 sought $920 million for the Iraq Train and Equip Fund and $250 million for the Syria Train and Equip Fund. While the NDAA authorizes the total amount of funding requested, $1.17 billion, it combines the two accounts into a new “Counter ISIL Fund” to be used to support of train and equip operations for both countries. The conference report accompanying this
legislation specifically noted the importance of providing up to $480 million in stipends and sustainment through the Iraqi government to the Peshmerga forces of the Kurdistan Regional Government. It specifically permits assistance through the Iraqi government to “local security forces with a national security mission.” The conferees stated that recipients of this support may include Sunni tribal elements and local security forces in Iraq committed to protecting vulnerable ethnic and religious communities, such as Christians, Yezidis, Assyrians, and Turkmens, against the threat of ISIL.26

**OCO Budget Amendment and Continuing Resolution**

In November 2016, the Obama Administration submitted a revised OCO budget to Congress, requesting an additional $11.6 billion in OCO funding, including $5.8 billion for the DoD and $5.8 billion split between the DoS and USAID. This budget amendment also included requests for certain additional authorities to address emerging issues in OIR and Operation Freedom’s Sentinel in Afghanistan.27

On December 10, 2016, President Obama signed legislation that included a continuing resolution to fund the Federal government through April 28, 2017.28 In the absence of new appropriations for FY 2017, this legislation provides funding for most agencies and operations of the government at approximately their FY 2016 spending levels. Additionally, Division B of this Act, titled “the Security Assistance Appropriations Act, 2017” (referred to here as “the continuing resolution”) makes supplemental OCO funding and authorities available to the DoD, the DoS, and USAID, a detailed account of which is provided in Tables 3 and 4.

**Additional OCO Funding and Authorities Provided to DoD in the Continuing Resolution**

The continuing resolution provided the DoD with the requested additional amount of $5.8 billion in OCO funding above its FY 2016 spending level. The majority of this funding is dedicated to counter-terrorism operations in OIR and Operation Freedom’s Sentinel with a smaller amount set aside for operations in Europe.29

Senior DoD officials have cited numerous challenges to operating under a continuing resolution for an extended period of time. These challenges include a prohibition on contracts for new projects that were not already underway in the prior fiscal year unless explicitly permitted by law.30 In addition to the funding and priorities in the OCO budget amendment, the Obama Administration also transmitted to Congress a list of requests for exemptions to the budgetary restrictions that normally apply under a continuing resolution.31 Through the continuing resolution, Congress provided the DoD with the requested authorizations for increased procurement of certain weapons and systems necessary for operations in support of OIR, including the KC-46A aerial refueling tanker, AH-64 Apache and UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters, Hellfire Missiles, Joint Direct Attack Munitions, and other munitions.32
The Obama Administration’s original budget for FY 2017 requested $3.4 billion in OCO funding for the European Reassurance Initiative, the DoD’s plan to enhance its posture within the borders of European allies “who are now deeply concerned by Russia’s occupation and attempted annexation of Crimea and other provocative actions in Ukraine.” While the OCO amendment did not change this request, it also did not include additional funding for this purpose in its $5.8 billion supplemental request. However, Congress chose to appropriate $650 million for the European Reassurance Initiative out of the $5.8 billion in additional OCO funds included in the continuing resolution.

Table 3 below shows the amounts requested by the DoD in the OCO budget amendment and the enacted funding provided in the continuing resolution.

Table 3.
Department of Defense FY2017 Overseas Contingency Operations Budget Amendment Request and Appropriation by Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations Title</th>
<th>DoD FY 2017 OCO Amendment (requested)</th>
<th>Security Assistance Appropriations Act 2017 (enacted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel</td>
<td>$144,868</td>
<td>$265,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army, counter-terrorism</td>
<td>$94,034</td>
<td>$94,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy, counter-terrorism</td>
<td>$7,354</td>
<td>$7,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps, counter-terrorism</td>
<td>$5,840</td>
<td>$5,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force, counter-terrorism</td>
<td>$37,640</td>
<td>$37,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army, European Reassurance Initiative</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$102,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy, European Reassurance Initiative</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force, European Reassurance Initiative</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$14,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance</td>
<td>$5,100,248</td>
<td>$4,326,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army, counter-terrorism</td>
<td>$2,934,269</td>
<td>$2,734,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy, counter-terrorism</td>
<td>$95,531</td>
<td>$95,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps, counter-terrorism</td>
<td>$168,446</td>
<td>$168,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force, counter-terrorism</td>
<td>$382,496</td>
<td>$382,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense-Wide, counter-terrorism</td>
<td>$412,959</td>
<td>$412,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army, European Reassurance Initiative</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$438,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy, European Reassurance Initiative</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps, European Reassurance Initiative</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force, European Reassurance Initiative</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$45,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense-Wide, European Reassurance Initiative</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$33,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan Security Forces Fund-ANDSF Aviation Modernization</td>
<td>$814,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Health Program</td>
<td>$2,547</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Iraq Train and Equip Fund</td>
<td>$289,500</td>
<td>$289,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues on next page)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army, Missiles</td>
<td>$46,500</td>
<td>$229,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army, Other</td>
<td>$98,500</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force, Ammunition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$201,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force, Missiles</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$83,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy, Other</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund</td>
<td>$99,800</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation</td>
<td>$142,200</td>
<td>$81,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>$139,200</td>
<td>$78,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense-Wide</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$5,775,000</td>
<td>$5,775,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts show in thousands.

*Note: The DoD OCO amendment incorporated amounts for the Iraq Train and Equip Fund into its Operation and Maintenance account. The Amendment also incorporated amounts for the Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund into its Procurement account. The continuing resolution appropriated funding for these requests separately.


**FY 2017 DoS and USAID OCO Funding**

The Obama Administration’s OCO budget amendment also included an additional $5.8 billion for the DoS and USAID to counter ISIL and combat violent extremism. President Obama’s message to Congress accompanying the amendment called for additional funding to support U.S. efforts to carry out the diplomatic engagement, governance, and stabilization components of the President’s counter-ISIL strategy, strengthen embassy security, and respond to relief and recovery needs, as well as provide additional humanitarian assistance for areas liberated from ISIL. The DoS’s Budget Amendment Summary, detailing the requested new overseas contingency operations funding, described the reasons for increased funding requests for Diplomatic Engagement, Counter-ISIL Foreign Assistance, Emerging Countering Violent Extremism and Counterterrorism Needs, Humanitarian Assistance, and USAID Operations and Management. Most, but not all, of the additional $4.3 billion in OCO funding appropriated to DoS and USAID in the continuing resolution was directed to accounts for which the November budget amendment requested increased funding but in amounts that differed from the President’s request. The additional funds are not subject to the 7-month continuing resolution that expires on April 28, 2017, and will remain available through September 30, 2018.

Table 4 contains, by account, the amounts requested in the November budget amendment and relevant country or geographic area for the request when defined, the enacted funding, and the difference between the two amounts.
Table 4.
Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs FY 2017 Overseas Contingency Operations Budget Amendment Request and Appropriation by Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic Engagement</td>
<td>$1,772.1</td>
<td>$1,709.3</td>
<td>$(63.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic and Consular Programs</td>
<td>$746.2</td>
<td>$1,052.4</td>
<td>$306.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>$22.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>$217.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>$293.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>$110.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa*</td>
<td>$79.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Engagement Center</td>
<td>$21.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Envoy for Counter-ISIL</td>
<td>$.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance</td>
<td>$1,024.0</td>
<td>$654.4</td>
<td>$(369.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>$10.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>$98.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>$50.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa*</td>
<td>$165.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>$225.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Global Threats</td>
<td>$475.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State OIG</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Assistance</td>
<td>$4,002.3</td>
<td>$2,433.7</td>
<td>$(1,568.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Support Fund-Counter-ISIL</td>
<td>$2,460.4</td>
<td>$1,030.6</td>
<td>$(1,429.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>$400.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>$570.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>$78.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>$120.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa*</td>
<td>$107.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief and Recovery Fund</td>
<td>$1,000.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues on next page)
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| Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining and Related Programs-Counter-ISIL | $128.0 | $128.0 | — |
|———|———|———|———|
| Iraq | $30.0 | | |
| Syria | $32.0 | | |
| Libya | $39.5 | | |
| Yemen | $11.5 | | |
| West Africa* | $9.3 | | |
| Somalia | $15.0 | | |
| International Narcotics and Law Enforcement | $19.3 | $26.3 | $7.0 |
| Libya-Counter-ISIL | | $10.0 | |
| West Africa* | | $9.3 | |
| Foreign Military Financing | $0.0 | $200.0 | $200.0 |
| Migration and Refugee Assistance | $260.4 | $300.0 | $39.6 |
| Iraq | | $260.4 | |
| Peacekeeping Operations | $90.0 | $50.0 | $(40.0) |
| West Africa* | | $20.0 | |
| Countering Violent Extremism in Africa | | $70.0 | |
| International Disaster Assistance | $953.2 | $616.1 | $(337.1) |
| Assistance to Europe, Eurasia, and Central Asia | $0.0 | $157.0 | $157.0 |
| Transition Initiatives | $73.5 | $50.2 | $(23.3) |
| USAID Operating Expenses | $15.0 | $5.0 | $(10.0) |
| USAID Office of the Inspector General | $0.0 | $2.5 | $2.5 |
| USAID Capital Investment Fund | $0.0 | $25.0 | $25.0 |
| TOTAL | $5,775,000 | $4,300.00 | $(1,474.9) |

Amounts shown in millions. Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.


** COALITION EFFORTS TO DEFEAT ISIL **

As of January 2017, the U.S.-led Coalition was focused on liberating Mosul and Raqqah from ISIL, which would deal a significant strategic setback to ISIL and its physical “caliphate.” Mosul and Raqqah are the most important power centers for the group, its leadership, and its operational capabilities. The campaign to liberate Mosul began on October 17 and, despite stiff resistance from ISIL, the Iraqi Security Forces had seized two-thirds of east Mosul by January 3, 2017, according to the DoD. Meanwhile, Coalition-backed Syrian Democratic Forces increasingly isolated Raqqah.
However, the Iraqi elite Counter Terrorism Service suffered high casualties as ISIL used suicide bombers, snipers, rockets, mortars, and vehicle-born improvised explosive devices (called VBIEDs) in Mosul. DoD officials expect ISIL to use similar tactics in defense of Raqqah.  

The U.S. military and Coalition partners continued their train, advise, assist, and equip mission to enable local forces to fight in Iraq and Syria. In Iraq, the United States and the Coalition have supported the Iraqi Security Forces with airstrikes, Special Operations advisers, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance tools. In Syria, U.S. Special Operations Forces have trained and equipped select, vetted Syrian armed groups and continued to provide air and intelligence support to the Syrian Democratic Forces for counter-ISIL operations.  

Approximately 5,000 U.S. troops are on the ground in Iraq and several hundred in Syria to implement this strategy. Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter stated, in a visit to U.S. troops near Mosul on December 11, that some forces would remain in Iraq after ISIL is defeated. Secretary Carter later emphasized that any such post-ISIL presence would need to be coordinated with the Iraqi government. In addition, the U.S. presence depends on policy decisions by the incoming U.S. Administration.
Unclassified Report on Allegations Relating to U.S. Central Command’s Intelligence Products Nearing Completion

The DoD OIG is scheduled to issue its report next quarter on allegations related to U.S. Central Command’s OIR intelligence products. The objective of this investigation was to address allegations that Central Command senior intelligence officials falsified, distorted, suppressed, or delayed intelligence products regarding Central Command’s efforts to degrade and destroy ISIL. The DoD OIG received the complaint pursuant to the Intelligence Community Whistleblower Protection Act.

In conducting this review, the DoD OIG analyzed the allegations, interviewed the complainants and witnesses, and examined relevant intelligence products. The DoD OIG also analyzed a sample of Central Command intelligence products and examined the management processes followed to produce these products. The OIG investigation, one of the largest in the DoD OIG’s history, will provide the conclusions related to these allegations and the evidence on which those conclusions are based, as well as recommendations for improving management processes.

COALITION TRAIN, ADVISE, ASSIST, AND EQUIP EFFORT

By the end of 2016, the Coalition had trained over 66,000 Iraqi Security Forces and over 3,000 Syrian partner forces, according to the DoD. In Iraq, the U.S.-led Coalition is conducting the counter-ISIL campaign with and through the Iraqi government. In the campaign to liberate Mosul, the DoD stated that the Coalition-supported Iraqi forces include the Iraqi Army, the Counter Terrorism Service, Federal Police, local Iraqi Police, Iraqi government-approved Sunni tribal fighters, and the Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga. The Coalition provided trainers and advisors, supported by personnel providing security, logistical, and medical evacuation support. In addition, the Coalition provided air and artillery support, and a small number of Special Operations Forces.

In Syria, where there is no government partner, the DoD reported that 300 U.S. Special Operations Forces have worked to recruit, train, and advise Syrian opposition fighters. In December, DoD officials announced their intention to send an additional 200 troops to Syria in anticipation of the battle for Raqqah. The U.S. forces in Syria train and advise two groups: vetted Syrian opposition fighters operating largely in northern Syria, and the Syrian Arab Coalition, which is the Arab component of the Syrian Democratic Forces, operating near Raqqah.

Two members of the U.S. Special Operation Forces were killed by IEDs this quarter in Iraq and Syria on October 20 near Mosul and November 24 near Ayn Issa, Syria. In
As ISIL continues to lose control over its physical “caliphate” it is likely to evolve into an insurgency.

In addition, three Green Berets returning to base while on a training mission in Jordan were killed on November 6 when their vehicles came under fire. The U.S. military typically maintains about 2,000 U.S. forces in Jordan to support training with the Jordanian military and operations against ISIL in Iraq and Syria.

DoD officials stated that training and advising would be essential after the liberation of Mosul to ensure that the Iraqi government can retain control over liberated terrain and reestablish authority over the entire country. As ISIL continues to lose control over its physical “caliphate” it is likely to evolve into an insurgency—a pledge made by former ISIL spokesman Abu Muhammed al-Adnani, in 2016, before his death in a targeted airstrike. Continued training of the Iraqi Security Forces would seek to increase the capacity of local security forces to hold hard-earned military gains by protecting and earning the trust of local citizens, ultimately keeping ISIL from regaining control of previously cleared areas.

Runways at the Qayyarah West Airfield south of Mosul were re-opened October 21 to fixed-wing cargo planes after U.S. Air Force engineers removed concrete barriers and filled trenches that ISIL had placed to make the runway unusable. The newly opened runways allowed an increased rate of logistical support for the Iraqi Security Forces currently engaged in the Mosul offensive.

Oversight of Train, Advise, Assist, and Equip Programs

During this reporting period, the Lead IG and partner agencies issued two reports, had three ongoing, and two planned regarding efforts to train, advise, assist, and equip Iraqi and Kurdish security forces. Oversight projects completed or ongoing this quarter include:

Completed:

- **Assessment of U.S. and Coalition Efforts to Train, Advise, Assist, and Equip the Kurdish Security Forces in Iraq.** The DoD OIG team deployed to Kuwait and Iraq; visited U.S., Coalition, and Kurdish Security Forces training and advising bases in and around Erbil in Iraqi Kurdistan; and conducted interviews with U.S. and Coalition trainers and advisors, Kurdish officers and soldiers, and officials from the Ministry of Peshmerga. The DoD OIG determined that U.S. and Coalition train, advise, assist, and equip activities have helped the Kurdish Security Forces to further develop its capability to conduct combat operations against ISIL; however, it identified three program areas requiring improvements. These improvements relate to equipment sustainment, supply-chain management, and training development. (Report issued December 14, 2016.)

- **Combating Terrorism: U.S. Footprint Poses Challenges for the Advise and Assist Mission in Iraq.** The objective of this project undertaken by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) was to determine the extent to which the DoD 1) established a command and control structure for executing its training and advising mission in Iraq; 2) defined missions, goals, and objectives for
U.S. units engaged in the training and advising mission; 3) identified and met personnel, equipment, and training requirements for these U.S. units engaged in the training and advising mission; and 4) has adequate enablers and enabling capacity to support U.S. and Iraqi forces. (Classified report issued November 22, 2016.)

Details of these projects are in the Completed Oversight section, page 77.

Ongoing:

• **Assessment of U.S. and Coalition Plans/Efforts to Train, Advise, Assist, and Equip the Iraqi Counter Terrorism Service and the Iraqi Special Operations Forces:** The objective of this project is to assess U.S. and Coalition efforts to train, advise, assist, and equip the Iraqi Counter terrorism Services and the Iraqi Special Operations Forces in support of operations against ISIL.

• **Audit of DoD Procedures for Securing Iraq Train and Equip Fund Equipment:** The objective of this project is to determine whether DoD has effective procedures for securing Iraq Train and Equip Fund equipment in Kuwait and Iraq. This project is one in a series of audits on property accountability in Kuwait and Iraq.

• **U.S. Efforts to Train and Equip Iraqi Security Forces:** The objective of this GAO project is to understand the U.S. Government plans for training and equipping the Iraqi forces; the extent to which U.S. funds have been allocated, committed, and disbursed for training and equipping the Iraqi forces; and the progress made in implementing the U.S. plans.
In the largest airstrike of its kind to date, the Coalition reportedly destroyed a fleet of 168 ISIL oil tanker trucks near Palmyra, Syria, on December 8, resulting in estimated lost revenue to ISIL of more than $2 million.

### THE COALITION AIR CAMPAIGN AGAINST ISIL

U.S. and Coalition aircraft carried out more than 650 airstrikes on ISIL targets in Iraq and Syria between October 17, when the ground campaign to retake Mosul began, and December 31. More than a quarter of the airstrikes supported Iraqi Security Forces and Peshmerga fighting to retake Mosul. The DoD stated that these airstrikes targeted ISIL VBIEDs, fighting positions, buildings, supply routes, tunnels, bunkers, anti-aircraft artillery and artillery/mortar systems. Coalition aircraft also destroyed the five Mosul bridges across the Tigris River to restrict ISIL’s movement.

Since the start of the Raqqah campaign on November 5, U.S. and Coalition forces have conducted hundreds of airstrikes in support of the Syrian Democratic Forces, delivering 1,780 munitions against ISIL targets as Syrian opposition forces pushed south toward Raqqah, and removing what DoD officials described as a “significant number of fighting positions” created by ISIL to defend that city. Coalition airstrikes under Operation Tidal Wave II continued to reduce ISIL’s ability to finance its operations through the production and sale of oil. Between October 1 and December 31, Coalition forces targeted ISIL-controlled oil infrastructure, focusing primarily in the oil-rich areas around Raqqah, Dayr Az Zawr, and Abu Kamal in eastern Syria.

In addition, in the largest airstrike of its kind to date, the Coalition reportedly destroyed a fleet of 168 ISIL oil tanker trucks near Palmyra, Syria, on December 8, resulting in estimated lost revenue to ISIL of more than $2 million. After ISIL seized Palmyra from Syrian regime and Russian forces in a surprise attack on December 11, Coalition airstrikes also destroyed 14 tanks, 3 artillery systems, and an air-defense artillery system that ISIL had taken from the Syrian regime forces.

Precision Coalition airstrikes in Iraq and Syria continued to attack ISIL and al Qaeda members described as having important leadership roles, including:
• A November 12 airstrike near Raqqah that killed Abd al-Basit al-Iraqi, director of ISIL’s Middle East external terrorist network.

• A November 18 airstrike near Sirmata, Syria, that killed Abu Afghani al-Masri, a senior al Qaeda leader in Syria, who had ties to the core al Qaeda group in Afghanistan.

• A December 4 airstrike in Mosul that killed Falah al-Rashidi, an ISIL leader involved in the use of VBIEDs.

• A December 4 airstrike in Sharqat, Iraq, that killed Abu Turk, an ISIL leader who facilitated the movement of funds for ISIL.

• A December 21 airstrike in Al Qaim, Iraq, that killed Imad Abdullah Hamud al-Mahallawi, an al Qaeda member serving as an ISIL leader conducting operations along the Euphrates River Valley.

• A December 26 airstrike near Tabqa Dam outside Raqqah that killed Abu Jandal al-Kuwaiti, a member of ISIL’s “war committee” involved in ISIL’s retaking of Palmyra and the use of suicide vehicles and chemical weapons against the Syrian Democratic Forces.61

DoD officials stated that, as of the end of 2016, the United States and the Coalition had together conducted 17,211 strikes—mostly airstrikes but also artillery strikes—against ISIL targets in Iraq and Syria since the beginning of OIR in August 2014. Of those, 6,408 were in Syria.62 The United States conducted about 13,000 of the total strikes.63
Investigations Confirm More Deaths from U.S. and Coalition Strikes

The number of civilians confirmed by the United States as killed by Coalition strikes mounted as widespread combat continued in Iraq and Syria. A total of 173 civilians were reported killed by U.S. and Coalition strikes since operations against ISIL began in August 2014, according to the U.S. Central Command and the Combined Joint Task Force-Operation Inherent Resolve (CJTF-OIR).

- On November 9, 2016, the U.S. Central Command announced that investigations found that 24 airstrikes may have killed as many as 64 civilians in Iraq and Syria from November 20, 2015, to September 10, 2016.64
- On December 1, 2016, CJTF-OIR stated that 54 civilians were inadvertently killed in 6 other strikes between March 31, 2016, and October 22, 2016. All were the result of airstrikes, except for three Syrian civilians killed on March 31, 2016, by Coalition artillery.65

The U.S. military and the Coalition investigate all reports of possible civilian casualties by interviewing pilots and witnesses, examining the sites when possible, reviewing strike video when available, and analyzing information provided by government agencies, non-governmental organizations, partner forces, and traditional and social media. In addition, the U.S. Central Command has introduced a new software program that aids officials in reconciling information. In some instances of conflicting death tolls, officials have chosen to use a higher estimate.66

In each of the cases announced in November and December, the investigations by U.S. Central Command and CJTF-OIR determined that all required precautions had been taken, and the strikes complied with the Law of Armed Conflict.67

However, other estimates of civilian casualties are significantly higher. For instance, Amnesty International in October stated that U.S.-led Coalition attacks killed at least 300 civilians from September 2014 to July 2016.68 Airwars.org, a non-profit journalist-run organization based in the United Kingdom that tracks allegations of civilian casualties, estimates that Coalition actions allegedly have caused at least 2,000 civilian casualties since 2014, with recent claims of 73 civilian casualties in November as the Coalition increased airstrikes in support of the Mosul and Raqqah campaigns. However, the group cautions that there are significant challenges to casualty verification.69 Meanwhile, human rights groups say that Russian and Syrian regime airstrikes accounted for the vast majority of deaths in Syria. In October, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights accused the Syrian regime of “crimes of historic
Investigations Confirm More Deaths from U.S. and Coalition Strikes
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proportions” for its siege of eastern Aleppo involving “indiscriminate airstrikes ... responsible for the overwhelming majority of civilian casualties.”

CJTF-OIR stated that it investigated another 12 allegations of civilian casualties and found them not credible, and that it continued to assess reports from late 2016.

During the quarter, the DoD reported the results of investigations into two highly publicized allegations:

- CJTF-OIR found that an airstrike on July 18, 2016, near Manbij, Syria, killed nearly 100 ISIL fighters, destroyed 13 fighting positions, 7 ISIL vehicles, 2 VBIEDS, and a mortar system, but also killed 24 civilians interspersed with the combatants. The report stated that, in the 24 hours prior to the Coalition strike, no civilians had been seen in the area where ISIL fighters were gathering for a counterattack against Coalition-supported forces.

- The U.S. Air Force Central Command stated that Coalition airstrikes mistakenly hit forces aligned with the Syrian regime on September 17, 2016, while targeting what was believed to be ISIL fighting positions near the city of Dayr az Zawr in Syria. Unable to physically visit the attack site, the review could confirm only 15 deaths using full-motion video and overhead intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance resources. The Syrian Observatory for Human Rights had reported 84 killed.

The U.S. investigation of the September 17 incident entailed interviewing more than 70 U.S. and Coalition personnel who participated in airstrike coordination and execution and examining more than 250 pages of written testimony. Air Force Brigadier General Richard Coe said that during the course of the airstrike a Russian official used a previously established flight-safety hotline to notify the Combined Air Operations Center that Syrian military forces were in the targeted personnel vehicles. After the Russian notification, the Coalition stopped the attacks. One factor leading to the misidentification was that the armed personnel on the ground were not wearing recognizable uniforms, and there were no unit flags, insignia or markings on their vehicles.

The investigation found “unintentional, regrettable error, primarily based on human factors in several areas in the targeting process.” Some report information was classified. The report findings included a recommendation for improved information sharing among analysts to guard against human factors such as confirmation bias and invalid assumptions that had led to the airstrike.
IRAQ: THE GROUND CAMPAIGN AGAINST ISIL

According to the DoD, at the end of 2016, ISIL remained in control of territory that is home to an estimated 11 percent of the Iraqi population, or about 3 million people. Once Mosul is liberated, the Iraqi Security Forces will have taken back all major population centers in Iraq. The only major population areas left under ISIL control then would be in Syria.75

The Battle for Mosul

The military offensive against Mosul began on October 17 with a plan for the Kurdish Peshmerga, the Iraqi Counter Terrorism Service, and the Iraqi Army to attack from the north, east, and south.76 The battle plan contemplated striking Mosul from four axes to reduce ISIL’s ability to concentrate its resources on halting one advance, with the Kurdish Peshmerga staying outside the city.77 Meanwhile, Mosul was effectively surrounded when Iraq’s Popular Mobilization Forces moved west of the city toward the city of Tal Afar and linked up with Kurdish Peshmerga forces east of Sinjar.78

ISIL has been creating formidable defenses in Mosul for more than 2 years, digging trenches, berms and tunnels, and preparing IED-belts and booby traps. In addition, according to a December 2016 report from the United Kingdom-based Conflict Armament Research, ISIL has operated six sophisticated weapons production facilities near Mosul as a “complex, centrally controlled industrial production system” with effective quality control, producing weapons to military standard. The report’s findings suggested that ISIL produced tens of thousands of mortar rounds, rockets, and other explosives in the months leading up to the Mosul offensive. ISIL accompanied this production with sophisticated instruction on IEDs and complex weapon systems.79 In its defense of Mosul, ISIL also deployed snipers and VBIEDs, used citizens as human shields, and arrested and executed civilians for having phones for fear that they were providing intelligence to government-backed troops.80

In addition to the defense of Mosul, ISIL fighters in uniform attacked the city of Kirkuk on October 21, engaging in day-long gun battles and suicide bombings. ISIL separately attacked a power station north of Kirkuk using suicide bombers.81

By October 28, Coalition aircraft and artillery had delivered almost 2,500 bombs and missiles on enemy targets and had struck 46 ISIL tunnels in Mosul used for movement and to hide weapons, according to the DoD.82 A few days later on November 1, Iraqi Security Forces breached Mosul’s city limits, despite heavy resistance from ISIL. It was the first time Iraqi government forces had been inside the city since ISIL militants captured it in June 2014.83 Following the initial Iraqi Security Force and Peshmerga assault, contingents of the Iraqi Popular Mobilization Forces in mid-November advanced west of Mosul and took control of the Tal Afar airport, effectively surrounding Mosul and reducing ISIL’s ability to transport fighters and supplies into the city from Syria.84
Iraq’s Counter Terrorism Service took the lead in fighting in east Mosul, making incremental progress in what DoD officials on November 16 described as fierce resistance in neighborhood-by-neighborhood fighting. According to the DoD, over 60 VBIEDs—some described as “Mad Max” vehicles with armored plating to protect the drivers as they maneuvered their bombs toward targets—were destroyed in the first month of combat.

By December 2, the DoD reported that the Counter Terrorism Service and the Iraqi Army had captured and cleared about one-third of the eastern section of Mosul, a city split by the Tigris River. On December 7, Iraqi Security Forces briefly captured the Al Salam hospital complex in the city center, but were forced to retreat the next day after they were attacked by six VBIEDs and came under heavy fire.

While visiting the Qayyarah West Airfield south of Mosul on December 11, Secretary Carter stated that the Iraqi Security Forces had taken “significant losses because it’s a hard fight,” but said that U.S. troops were constantly helping them to “reset their forces after they carry out an operation.” The Institute for the Study of War reported that the Counter Terrorism Service has suffered extensive casualties.

DoD officials described VBIEDs as ISIL’s primary weapon, causing a high number of casualties and having a psychological impact on troops near the tremendous explosions. However, the Coalition’s increasing use of road spikes, the cratering of roadways, and use of anti-tank munitions had significantly reduced the VBIED impact as the battle progressed. In addition, according to Brett McGurk, Special Presidential Envoy for the Global Coalition to Counter ISIL, nearly all of ISIL’s suicide bombers are foreign fighters. The number of VBIEDs has decreased in the Mosul area and is expected to continue to decrease as the numbers of foreign fighters fall.

After pausing the operation to regroup and resupply, Iraqi Security Forces made significant progress upon resuming the assault on December 29 with simultaneous attacks from three axes conducted by the Counter Terrorism Service, the Iraqi Army, and the Iraqi Federal Police. DoD officials stated that the synchronized attacks “present the enemy with more problems than they can solve” and allowed the axes to converge toward the Tigris River. As 2017 began, DoD officials stated that Mosul was surrounded and that ISIL could not resupply its fighters, who were increasingly isolated on the eastern side because of damage to the bridges over the Tigris River. This prevented ISIL from bringing resources and fighters from the western part of the city, which was still under ISIL’s control. (See infographic on the battle for Mosul, pages 6-7.)

Despite estimates by U.S. officials that Iraqi Security Forces had killed or badly wounded more than 2,000 ISIL fighters, Lieutenant General Stephen Townsend estimated on December 11 that 3,000 to 5,000 ISIL militants remained in Mosul, roughly the same amount—3,500 to 6,000— that were estimated to be in the city prior to the beginning of the military campaign.
Tension over Tal Afar

Iraqi leaders appeared to reduce sectarian tensions over who would liberate the strategically important city of Tal Afar, about 40 miles west of Mosul along the main road to Syria. On November 16, units of the Popular Mobilization Forces, including elements of Iranian-backed Shia militias, captured an air base outside of the city, but did not enter the city proper during the quarter.95

Tal Afar’s historic population is a mix of Sunni and Shia Turkmen. The presence of Shia elements of the Popular Mobilization Forces in an area close to the Turkish border alarmed Turkey, which has sought to blunt the influence of Iran and the hard-line Shia militias it supports in northern Iraq.96 Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan had warned in October that Turkey had a “historical responsibility in the region [once part of the former Ottoman Empire],” despite Iraqi Prime Minister Abadi’s repeated calls for Turkey to withdraw Turkish troops deployed near Mosul.97

A spokesman for the Popular Mobilization Forces said in October that its presence in Ninawa province will not be temporary or restricted. Rather, militia leaders see the province as a corridor allowing Shia militias to join the battle in Syria, which is a two-hour drive east from Tal Afar. Those Shia militias could aid the Assad regime against both ISIL and Sunni opposition factions. However, on November 23, Prime Minister Abadi reiterated plans for keeping Shia militias out of Tal Afar, saying the city would be liberated by the Iraqi Army and police forces along with former residents, including both Sunni and Shia Turkmen.98

DoD officials praised the Popular Mobilization Forces for linking up with Kurdish Peshmerga near Tal Afar and for cutting ISIL's line of communication between Mosul and Syria.99 Coalition unmanned aerial vehicles (drones) monitored the location and activities of all forces in northern Iraq, including the Popular Mobilization Forces, to prevent the accidental targeting of anti-ISIL forces by Coalition airstrikes. DoD officials stated that it is important that the forces which eventually enter Tal Afar reflect the diversity of the city and do nothing to heighten sectarian tensions or engage in retribution.100

SYRIA: THE GROUND CAMPAIGN AGAINST ISIL

Syria remains a complex battlefield. The U.S-led Coalition under OIR supports forces assaulting the area surrounding Raqqah, the self-proclaimed capital of ISIL. As of December 31, 2016, Coalition-backed forces had liberated an estimated 30 percent of the territory ISIL controlled at its height in August 2014. In addition, U.S. forces targeted key leadership of Jabhat Fateh al-Sham, the rebranded al Qaeda-affiliate in Syria formerly known as al Nusra Front. Meanwhile, Coalition-partner Turkey launched a military campaign to clear ISIL from the Turkish border and to prevent advances by the Syrian Kurdish People’s Protection Units (YPG) near that border. In November, the government
of Turkey expanded its operation and supported a push by Turkish-supported Syrian opposition forces south to liberate the ISIL-held city of al Bab, in a campaign largely distinct from OIR. For its part, ISIL held al Bab, Raqqah, and key oil and natural gas fields outside Palmyra for the entire quarter, and in early December recaptured Palmyra from Syrian regime and Russian forces. In addition to fighting ISIL, the Russian forces are fighting opposition forces trying to oust President Assad in a protracted civil war.

The Battle for Raqqah
The Syrian Democratic Forces initiated the Raqqah campaign on November 5, 2016. By the end of December, those forces were within 15 miles of ISIL’s self-proclaimed Syrian capital, having liberated more than 500 square miles of territory, and were approaching the Tabqa Dam, west of Raqqah, where since 2013 ISIL has had headquarters, a prison for high-profile hostages, and a training and indoctrination area for leaders. According to the DoD, the Coalition trains, advises and assists the Syrian Arab Coalition, which consists of vetted Arab elements of the Syrian Democratic Forces, a fighting force largely composed of YPG. To that end, more than 300 U.S. Special Operations forces are in Syria as advisers. In December, the U.S. military announced that an additional 200 advisers would be sent to Syria in anticipation of the battle for Raqqah.

Under section 1209 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2015, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, is authorized to provide assistance to appropriately vetted Syrian opposition groups or individuals. DoD officials stated that the Coalition has provided equipment and ammunition to the Syrian Arab Coalition, but has not provided military materiel support directly to Kurdish elements of the Syrian Democratic Forces. The DoD OIG is conducting an evaluation of the Syria Train and Equip Program (Phase II) to review its compliance with section 1209 mandates for appropriately vetting Syrian nationals.

The Coalition has conducted more than 100 airstrikes in the vicinity of the Tabqa dam. As previously mentioned, Coalition aircraft also destroyed weaponry that ISIL had captured from Syrian regime forces near Palmyra in a surprise attack on December 11. ISIL also captured a SAM (surface-to-air missile) site near the regime’s Tiyas Airfield; however, regime forces regained control of the site. DoD officials noted that ISIL previously had captured man-portable-air-defense systems (surface-to-air missiles called MANPADS) from Iraqi and Syrian regime forces.

Recruiting of Local Fighters
The Syrian Democratic Forces have approximately 45,000 fighters, made up largely of Syrian Kurds but also including more than 13,000 fighters in a component called the Syrian Arab Coalition, which includes Arabs, Turkmen, Yezidis, and other ethnic groups. DoD officials stated that the Syrian Arab Coalition will be the main force used to liberate and hold Raqqah. DoD officials also reported that as Raqqah is isolated, the number of Syrian Arab Coalition fighters continues to grow. More than 1,500 new
Liberating territory in northern Syria has freed thousands of civilians who were living under ISIL’s rule.

fighters were in training to join the ranks to liberate Raqqah; more than 90 percent of those finishing training are Arabs—which is particularly important in that they may be needed as a hold force in the largely Sunni Arab city.\(^{110}\)

In addition, an existing Arab unit of more than 1,000 fighters that has been fighting ISIL since its occupation of the city has joined the Syrian Democratic Forces.\(^{111}\) DoD officials state that most recruiting is done by the local partners as towns and villages near Raqqah are liberated. In addition, local forces run basic combat training, with Coalition advisors assisting with specialty courses, weapons training, and leadership courses.\(^{112}\)

Liberating territory in northern Syria has freed thousands of civilians who were living under ISIL’s rule, but many remain displaced, including a large number near Manbij, a town liberated by the Syrian Democratic Forces in August. Along the way, the civilians on the front lines of these clashes have been subjected to ISIL small arms and IED attacks. DoD officials stated that the Syrian Democratic Forces, including the Syrian Arab Coalition, have established a governance structure representative of the local population in Manbij, and local services such as schools were slowly returning to the area.\(^{113}\) The United States, the Coalition, and international partners are working with local actors to support credible and representative local governance for populations in liberated areas.\(^{114}\)

Turkish Forces Fight for Al Bab

Turkish forces, which launched a military operation in northern Syria on August 24, have already ousted ISIL from the town of Jarabulus on its border and were focused on liberating al Bab, the largest town between Aleppo and Raqqah. Seizing al Bab would serve to push ISIL further from the Turkish border, and would separate two Kurdish areas along the Turkish border.\(^{115}\) Turkish President Erdogan has publicly equated the security threat posed by the Syrian Kurds to that of ISIL.\(^{116}\)

The U.S.-led Coalition and Turkey have differing views of the Kurds in Syria. The Coalition-supported Syrian Democratic Forces are composed of the Kurdish YPG and Syrian Arab Coalition. However, Turkey considers the YPG a terrorist organization because of its links to the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK), which leads a Kurdish independence movement in Turkey and has orchestrated terrorist attacks in Turkey. The United States considers the PKK a terrorist organization, but not the YPG.\(^{117}\)

On November 6, General Joseph F. Dunford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, met with his Turkish counterpart in Ankara, Turkey, to discuss Turkey’s objections to Coalition support for Syrian Kurdish involvement in the Raqqah operation.\(^{118}\) Afterward, General Dunford stated that the Coalition would continue to work with Turkey regarding the make-up of forces used to seize and hold Raqqah and that the forces for the operation should be predominately Sunni Arab.\(^{119}\) The U.S. military seeks to deconflict operations between Turkey and the Syrian Democratic Forces with its majority YPG, which are both in the al Bab area. DoD officials noted instances where those two forces have exchanged fire.\(^{120}\)
• For information on the Syrian Civil War, see page 46.
• For information on Humanitarian Assistance to Iraq and Syria, see the section starting on page 55.

STATUS OF ISIL

In 2016, ISIL lost about a quarter of the territory that it had seized, but the terrorist group still controlled an estimated 23,300 square miles in Iraq and Syria (about the size of West Virginia), according to an analysis by IHS Conflict Monitor.

• In Iraq, ISIL held western Mosul and a wide swath of territory leading from Mosul to the Syrian border; a significant pocket of territory west of Kirkuk; and the border town of al Qaim and territory around it, including areas leading toward Fallujah in Anbar province.

• In Syria, ISIL held Raqqah and areas around Raqqah in the north, Palmyra in the center of the country, and portions of western Syria.

ISIL Brutalizes the Population Near Mosul

In October, before Iraq’s military offensive to liberate Mosul began, Iraqi authorities urged Mosul area residents to rise up against ISIL. In response, according to the United Nations and Human Rights Watch, ISIL allegedly executed hundreds of residents viewed as a potential threat. On November 2, Iraqi troops entered the town of Hammam al-Alil, where ISIL allegedly had executed dozens of prisoners on suspicion of aiding the advancing Iraqi troops, in what international observers described as a war crime.

Five days later, Iraqi Security Forces uncovered a mass grave on the town’s outskirts that contained the bodies of what appeared to be about 300 former local police officers executed by ISIL in October.

The U.S. military has accused ISIL fighters of using civilians as human shields to slow the Iraqi Security Forces’ advance into Mosul. Thousands of civilians from villages on the outskirts of Mosul were allegedly rounded up at gunpoint and forced to walk with ISIL militants as they sought refuge inside Mosul from advancing Iraqi troops. Villagers described executions of former policemen and army officers accused of being spies.

Some Mosul residents have provided information to the Iraqi Security Forces on ISIL deployments, despite immense risk. Witnesses said ISIL left “dozens of bodies” at intersections, in both eastern and western districts of Mosul, with notes such as: “Used cell phones to leak information to the ISF.” Having a SIM card (an identifying computer chip in a phone) was punishable by death. In addition, Human Rights Watch reported that ISIL militants in November launched at least three chemical attacks on the town of Qayyarah, south of Mosul, using a chemical that can cause severe blistering. DoD officials stated that ISIL’s chemical usage declined this last quarter, although ISIL likely still retains a chemical capability, including chlorine and sulfur mustard. DoD officials also stated that U.S. service members are trained and equipped to protect themselves from chemical attacks.
ISIL Adds Weaponized Drones to its Arsenal

ISIL has been using small, unmanned aircraft for reconnaissance and for recording video for propaganda purposes. This quarter it began fitting small drones with small bombs. On October 2, an ISIL weaponized drone that fell to the ground exploded, killing two Kurdish Peshmerga and wounding two French special forces.130 According to U.S. military officials, ISIL is using small, commercially available drones that can be purchased online.131

In some instances, Iraqi troops have brought down ISIL drones with direct fire. In addition, the U.S. Air Force shot down a weaponized ISIL drone with an unspecified “electronic weapon” that cut the signal between the drone and the drone operator, causing the device to fall.132 However, few Iraqi or Peshmerga forces have been equipped with devices to detect and disable drones and they currently use their standard weapons to try to shoot down the drones.133

To address this new threat, the Joint Improvised Threat-Defeat Organization, a DoD agency charged with combating the use of improvised explosive devices, has been studying ways to more effectively combat ISIL’s armed drones.

ISIL Propaganda Campaign Faces Setbacks

Despite the Coalition’s targeted killings of high-profile ISIL militants, including some involved in propaganda, ISIL continued this quarter to operate a media campaign intended to highlight the group’s military successes, and its governance, commercial and religious activities, in an effort to promote its brand and inspire new recruits. This quarter, ISIL posted online videos and other media products deeming Mosul “impenetrable” and showing the capture of a Palestinian refugee camp in Syria, among other topics.135 ISIL also called on its followers to launch attacks in Bahrain and to target U.S. military personnel stationed there in a video that showed images of Bahraini fighter jets juxtaposed to footage of an airstrike hitting an ISIL-held area.136

Meanwhile, ISIL stopped calling its magazine Dabiq after Turkish forces captured the Syrian town of Dabiq in early October. The town has symbolic value to the terrorist group, as ISIL leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi cited Islamic lore in suggesting the town would be the site of an apocalyptic battle resulting in the defeat of Western civilization. ISIL’s new magazine name is Rumiyah, which refers to a prophecy foretelling the downfall of Rome.137 The front cover image of the first issue was of ISIL spokesman Abu Mohammad al-Adnani, who was killed by a Coalition airstrike.138

A West Point study of ISIL’s propaganda published this quarter found that the amount of propaganda released by the group had declined as counterterrorism pressure increased. The study found that ISIL released about 700 media items at the peak of its propaganda campaign in August 2015, but by August 2016, the number had dwindled
to less than 200 that month. According to the study, the recent releases focused much more on a military theme, while products with governance, religious, commercial, or other themes declined significantly in frequency.\textsuperscript{139} However, the report stated that the psychological effects of ISIL’s propaganda on Iraqi and Syrian populations were likely to outlast ISIL’s physical control of territory, leaving the group with a ready following as it begins to function without territory. Of particular concern was that ISIL routinely targeted children as the main audience.\textsuperscript{140}

**ISIL Insurgency Active in Iraq and Syria**

While fighting in Iraq and Syria centered on the battles for Mosul and Raqqah, ISIL militants continued insurgent activity outside of those areas in both countries. ISIL militants reactivated networks in Anbar province to carry out suicide attacks near Karbala in southern Iraq, and at checkpoints leading to Fallujah on November 14 and Amiriyal al-Fallujah on November 17. On December 11, ISIL claimed credit for two car bombings in Fallujah that killed 8 people—the first attack in the western Iraqi city since Iraqi Security Forces captured the town in June.\textsuperscript{141} Additional ISIL insurgent activity in Iraq this quarter included:

- **Rutbah.** After conducting “spoiler-type attacks and harassing attacks around Rutbah,” about 60 to 100 ISIL fighters moved into the city, temporarily taking control of some of the government buildings and the city center. Within 36 hours, the Iraqi Security Forces had recaptured the city. Most ISIL fighters were killed in place, some by Coalition airstrikes.\textsuperscript{142}

- **Kirkuk.** ISIL fighters infiltrated and attacked Kirkuk, a large town southeast of Mosul that has been under Kurdish control for two years. At least 84 ISIL

**ISIL Claims Attacks Outside War Zone**

ISIL’s videos, social media, and other propaganda call for attacks on the West. Whether attacks are directed by ISIL, inspired by it, or simply claimed by ISIL, is often unclear. However, two major attacks claimed by ISIL occurred during the quarter, and a third occurred on New Year’s Day:

- On December 18, 4 terrorists attacked police and tourist locations in Karak, Jordan, killing 10 people and wounding 34. Among those killed was Jordan’s head of military special operations. The terrorists were killed by security forces.

- On December 19, a truck rammed a crowd at a Christmas market in Berlin, resulting in 12 deaths and 48 injured. The suspect—a 24-year-old Tunisian who had been a refugee in Europe since 2011—was killed in an exchange of gunfire 4 days later outside Milan, Italy.

- On January 1, 2017, a gunman killed 39 individuals at a New Year’s Eve celebration at a nightclub in Istanbul, an attack claimed by ISIL.
The Institute for the Study of War, a Washington-based think tank, predicted that ISIL would exploit gaps left in security caused by the large deployment of Iraqi troops and Popular Mobilization Forces from other areas of Iraq to the military campaign in Mosul.

- Shirqat. ISIL militants killed seven Sunni tribal fighters and five policemen on November 18 after setting up fake checkpoints in the town, which is located south of Mosul.
- Imam al-Gharbi. ISIL militants attacked Iraqi checkpoints in this town 50 miles south of Mosul; the town had been liberated from ISIL in August.

The Institute for the Study of War predicted that ISIL would exploit gaps left in security caused by the large deployment of Iraqi troops and Popular Mobilization Forces from other areas of Iraq to the military campaign in Mosul. U.S. officials and Iraq analysts suggested that ISIL would continue to undertake insurgent activity over the long term, and would likely increase its insurgent activities as it continues to lose territory in Iraq and Syria.

In December, Secretary Carter said that ISIL was likely to mutate into a global terrorist network, an organization that “lies in wait in the sands of the desert,” or a violent extremist movement that “lives and lurks only in the darkest corners of the Internet.” He stated, “We cannot perfectly predict what will happen after the Coalition defeats ISIL in Iraq and Syria, so we must be ready for anything.”

**GOVERNANCE IN IRAQ**

According to the DoS, U.S. officials continued to urge Iraqi officials to support Prime Minister Abadi’s government in the fight against ISIL and in efforts to address the economic crisis, and to expedite his efforts to implement political and economic reform. In addition, diplomatic engagement focused on the liberation of Mosul and preparation for stabilization efforts there.

The discussions related to the stabilization of Mosul regularly included the Ambassador or other Mission officials; the Special Presidential Envoy for the Global Coalition to defeat ISIL, Brett McGurk; his deputy, General (U.S. Army, Ret.) Terry Wolff; other U.S. officials; and representatives of relevant UN agencies. The details of these efforts and other diplomatic engagement are reported promptly by cable from the U.S. Mission in Iraq to leadership at the DoS in Washington, D.C. The DoS OIG monitors these cables on the agency’s internal classified communications system.

Iraq is fractured by ethnic and sectarian divisions, and the DoS reported working to bridge these gaps during the quarter. The DoS reported that its diplomatic engagement helped bring increased collaboration between the Iraqi government and the Kurdish Regional Government, with Prime Minister Abadi visiting the seat of the Kurdish Regional Government in Erbil in November. The Iraqi government and the Kurdish Regional Government have worked closely together on matters related to the Mosul operation, including funding humanitarian relief efforts. In addition, for the first time the Kurdish Regional Government allowed the Iraqi Army to enter and stage in Peshmerga-controlled territory for the attack on Mosul.
In late 2016, the Iraqi government passed a law establishing the Popular Mobilization Forces as an independent arm of the Iraqi Security Forces, reporting directly to the Prime Minister. This law, which became final in December 2016, codified an executive order issued by Prime Minister Abadi in February restructuring and reorganizing the Popular Mobilization Forces. According to the DoS, the legislation will formalize Popular Mobilization Forces’ command and control structures and help address looming disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration questions regarding these forces. During the reporting period, the DoS further discussed with the Iraqi government options to implement the law and demobilize some members of the Popular Mobilization Forces, including the possible integration of some members into the understrength Iraqi Army and Police.152

The DoS cited one occasion where the Iraqi government appeared to have upheld Prime Minister Abadi’s pledge to hold Popular Mobilization Force members accountable for unlawful acts. On December 19, the Iraqi government announced that the country’s courts had convicted 18 members of the Popular Mobilization Forces of committing atrocities against civilians, and sentenced them to death. However, a promised government report on alleged Popular Mobilization Forces atrocities following the liberation of Fallujah has not been issued.153

According to the DoS, the Iraqi government continued efforts to implement economic and fiscal policies designed to mitigate the economic shocks caused by the cost of the fight against ISIL and low oil prices. The government continued attempts to curtail inefficient expenditures while maintaining social programs and maintained the peg of its currency to the U.S. dollar. The Iraqi government also continued to work with the international community to gain financial support.154

In December, the International Monetary Fund Executive Board completed its first quarterly review under the $5.3 billion Stand-By Arrangement of July 2016. This arrangement is a financing program under which the International Monetary Fund agreed to disburse loans to the Iraqi government over the course of three years, provided that Iraq implemented certain economic reforms.155 This first review resulted in a satisfactory assessment and the release of $617.8 million to the Iraqi government.156 In announcing the completed review, the International Monetary Fund pointed out several areas in which the Iraqi government’s fiscal policy required further improvement, specifically citing the need to increase non-oil revenue, reduce expenditures, reform the electricity sector and state-owned enterprises, improve financial management, implement measures to prevent money laundering, and implement a revenue-sharing agreement with the Kurdistan Regional Government. The International Monetary Fund Executive Board stated that “understandings have been reached on sufficient corrective actions to keep the program on track. Resolute implementation, along with strong international support, will be key.”157

Also in December, the World Bank announced a new $1.4 billion package “to support reforms to improve public service delivery and transparency, stimulate private sector growth and support job creation.” The project may address some of the shortcomings...
identified by the International Monetary Fund. According to the World Bank, the program’s key objectives will focus on supporting expenditure rationalization, improving energy efficiency, and enhancing the transparency and governance of the state-owned enterprises.158

**STABILIZATION IN IRAQ**

DoD and DoS officials agree that stabilization of communities liberated from ISIL is critical to promoting enduring, inclusive self-governance and avoiding a resurgence of violent extremist groups. The process of immediate stabilization includes the removal of unexploded ordnance and mines; the establishment of police or other security forces acceptable to local populations; the prioritization of immediate work to allow people to return to their homes once they are ready to do so, such as restoring power and other public services; the re-establishment of local governance and security; and addressing urgent humanitarian needs.159 The Iraqi government continued to lead stabilization efforts, working with provincial and local governments, and supported by the DoS, USAID, the Coalition, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and other international partners.160

The UNDP administers two funds that support stabilization programs in areas cleared of explosives: the Funding Facility for Immediate Stabilization (FFIS), for services over roughly the first 6 months; and the Funding Facility for Expanded Stabilization (FFES), for projects over roughly the first 2 years. USAID is a major contributor to this fund.161

According to the DoS, during this quarter Prime Minister Abadi continued efforts to decentralize government by empowering provincial governors to pursue service delivery and stabilization, particularly in areas liberated from ISIL control. The Iraqi government worked with provincial officials to recruit and establish local hold forces to maintain security, thus allowing the Iraqi Security Forces to transition away from policing and to return to the fight.162

**Stabilization Plans for Mosul**

According to DoS, the planning for stabilization for Mosul has been an intensive and challenging process, requiring reaching consensus among many Iraqi stakeholders, supported by the DoS, the Coalition, the United Nations, USAID, and international partners.163 The planning continued this quarter, according to the DoS.164 In general, because the military campaign is still proceeding intensively along several fronts, it was premature to implement stabilization activities in Mosul such as the re-establishment of services, transition to local policing, and building of local governance structures. Stabilization work, such as clearing rubble, is expected to employ thousands of Mosul residents as explosives are cleared. USAID reported that it is currently planning to use $30 million of its funding contribution to the UNDP for the rehabilitation and stabilization efforts once Mosul is liberated.165

Ninawa Governor Nawful al Agoob divided Mosul into eight sectors, and appointed local district managers to supervise stabilization and humanitarian services for these sectors,
in coordination with his office. Provincial officials worked with the Iraqi central government, the international community, and non-governmental organizations to establish and maintain camps for persons displaced by the fighting to liberate Mosul.\textsuperscript{166} While the advancing troops faced the dangers of explosive devices, there has been no opportunity to survey liberated areas around Mosul for explosives and to proceed with demining. The DoS reported that it had earlier funded a task order for $20 million to permit immediate demining activities such as surveying, marking, and clearing explosives from high-priority infrastructure in Anbar province. The DoS increased the task order to $40 million, to include demining in Ninawa province. The private contractor and the UN Mine Action Service are expected to coordinate their efforts and also train additional teams for demining activities.\textsuperscript{167}

In anticipation of the attack on Mosul, the Iraqi government counseled the civilian population of Mosul to remain in place as long as possible to avoid the mass exodus and humanitarian crisis that occurred in Fallujah.\textsuperscript{168} However, ISIL has used civilians in Mosul as human shields in its fight to retain control of territory, and has restricted civilian access to food and water. The isolation of Mosul by Iraqi forces has further diminished access to food and water, and according to the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the people inside Mosul face “a dire humanitarian situation.”\textsuperscript{169} According to the DoS, where possible the Iraqi Security Forces and international partners have distributed aid to civilian populations in areas under Iraqi military control. However, the Coalition bombing which collapsed all five bridges over the Tigris River has complicated the delivery of assistance to western Mosul.\textsuperscript{170}

USAID noted that significant challenges were anticipated in Mosul stabilization efforts, and predicted that these challenges would be similar to other areas of Iraq but more intense due to Mosul’s large and diverse population, extensive damage to infrastructure, the expectation of booby-traps left by ISIL, and long-standing claims to territory and resources by local, provincial, and federal actors.\textsuperscript{171}

The UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs reported that, as of January 1, 2017, approximately 125,000 civilians had been displaced by the military operations to retake Mosul, and the rate of departures had increased by 50 percent since December 29, when the Iraqi forces launched an intensified and renewed military campaign. According to the DoS, civilians leaving Mosul were generally escorted by Iraqi Security Forces, giving them assistance and protection.\textsuperscript{172} The UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs also reported that about 14,000 people have returned to their homes in recently liberated areas, including east of Mosul. Markets in those areas were reopening as of December 31.\textsuperscript{173}

**Stabilization in Other Liberated Areas in Anbar Province**

In Anbar province, which includes Ramadi and Fallujah, units from four divisions of the Iraqi Security Forces remain as hold forces along with local Popular Mobilization Forces and local police, many trained by the Coalition. The DoS anticipates that as sufficient local forces are trained and available, these forces will replace the combat units...
of the Iraqi Security Forces, which will in turn be freed to return to the battleground.\textsuperscript{174} According to the International Organization for Migration, as of December 2016, over 82,000 families, or almost 495,000 persons, had voluntarily returned to the province.\textsuperscript{175}

- **Ramadi:** According to the DoS, by the end of this quarter approximately 1,652,000 square meters had been cleared by the demining contractor, including about 21,500 kg of explosive materials from critical infrastructure sites (power, health, sewage, water, and schools).\textsuperscript{176} USAID noted that while progress has been made, stabilization in Ramadi has been slowed by the high rate of explosive hazards.\textsuperscript{177} According to data from the International Organization for Migration, over 245,000 displaced persons have returned to Ramadi. Both the Iraqi government and the UNDP are undertaking stabilization projects with the mayor of Ramadi, the governor of Anbar province, and other local leaders. The FFIS has 91 projects completed or underway, including restoring electricity, water and sewage, and improving livelihoods.\textsuperscript{178} For example, USAID supported the UNDP with $9 million to fund 6 water projects and provide 50 generators to Ramadi. USAID estimated that 300,000 people will gain access to increased and safe water supplies through the projects and that approximately 50,000 people have already benefited from electricity supplied by the generators.\textsuperscript{179}

- **Fallujah:** The UN Mine Action Service stated that it had cleared about 597,000 square meters of explosives in and near Fallujah, including 230 IEDs. The International Organization for Migration reported that over 158,000 displaced persons have returned to the area. The Iraqi government and the UNDP, working with the mayor of Fallujah, the governor of Anbar province, local officials and the central Iraqi government, were undertaking stabilization projects. The FFIS has 32 projects completed or underway, including restoring electricity, water and sewage, and improving livelihoods.\textsuperscript{180} USAID reported that while it does not fund any stabilization efforts in Fallujah, it is planning on dispatching Iraqi field monitors to UNDP project sites to assist in monitoring and evaluation activities.\textsuperscript{181}

**Difficult Reconciliation and Post-Conflict Governance Issues**

The atrocities inflicted by ISIL on civilian populations and the long-standing ethnic, sectarian, and religious tensions in Iraq have contributed to concerns by many parties throughout Iraq about possible retribution and threats to reconciliation in the wake of ISIL’s defeat. Reports of acts of retribution by and against Shias, Sunnis, Kurds and other groups have been widespread, including violence, seizure of lands, the building of berms to keep civilians from returning to their lands, and the destruction of homes and villages. However, those reports are often unverified and may be unreliable, or even part of a propaganda campaign by one faction or another, according to DoS and UN officials. cited by them.\textsuperscript{182} The DoS continued to support the Iraqi government in its efforts to promote peaceful reconciliation given the complex history, culture and tribal structures in the country.\textsuperscript{183} According to the UN Assistance Mission to Iraq, repairing the destruction caused by ISIL is “just the beginning” of the challenge to rebuild trust among all of Iraq’s communities,
and “to finally break the cycle of abuses and violations, death and destruction that the people of Iraq have endured.”\textsuperscript{184}

One reconciliation issue involves Kurdish expansion into areas that fall outside the territory traditionally administered by the Kurdistan Regional Government, such as Kirkuk and Ninawa province. By some estimates, the Kurdistan Regional Government has increased its area of governance by as much as 40 percent.\textsuperscript{185} While the Iraqi government and the Kurds are united for now in their fight against ISIL, when that fight to regain territory proves successful, lands now occupied by the Kurds may become disputed. The Kurds now control Kirkuk and surrounding territory, and reportedly intend to keep those lands which they assert were held by the Kurdish people before former Iraqi president Saddam Hussein drove them out. The Iraqi government has rejected such territorial ambitions.\textsuperscript{186} Prime Minister Abadi maintained that an agreement exists for the Peshmerga to withdraw from areas it has captured from ISIL, but Kurdish President Masoud Barzani and other Kurdish leaders have suggested they do not plan to give up hard-won territory captured from ISIL.\textsuperscript{187}

These conflicts add to the challenges facing local governance systems. Post-conflict governance arrangements for Ninawa, municipalities, districts and sub-districts remain undefined. Mosul, for instance, is much larger, more populous, and more diverse than other areas of Iraq liberated from ISIL. While the provincial government has divided the city into eight sectors for the post-liberation recovery period, this may not be the permanent administrative structure.\textsuperscript{188}

**SYRIAN CIVIL WAR**

Several significant developments occurred in Syria in the last two weeks of 2016. First, Syrian opposition fighters evacuated the last rebel-held positions in eastern Aleppo, effectively ending a 5-year struggle for control of the city and leaving it in the hands of pro-regime forces. Second, Turkey, Russia, and Iran adopted a declaration setting out principles for a peace agreement. The next set of talks were scheduled to take place in Astana, the capital of Kazakhstan.\textsuperscript{189}

Despite these developments, Syria remained fractured and at war.\textsuperscript{190} Assad has stated that his forces would liberate all of Syria, and all of Syria had to be under state authority.\textsuperscript{191} However, the degree to which he will be restrained in that ambition by his main outside sponsor, Russia, or other forces, such as Turkey, remains to be seen.\textsuperscript{192} The Syrian regime and its allies were continuing to fight opposition fighters primarily in Idlib and Hims provinces and east of Damascus in the Ghouta region, with some targeting of ISIL, mainly near Palmyra.\textsuperscript{193}

**Syrian Regime Captures All of Aleppo**

Aleppo was Syria’s most populous city before the civil war, and was divided for years after the rebellion began in 2011 between a regime-held western sector and an opposition-held eastern portion. According to the Institute for the Study of War,
an unrelenting ground and aerial bombing campaign by regime forces and allied Russian, Iranian, Lebanese Hezbollah, and Iraqi Shia militias intensified in October and overwhelmed opposition forces in east Aleppo by early December, resulting in a ceasefire and opposition evacuation of the last rebel-held areas of the city. The urban ground combat and massive air attacks resulted in many civilian casualties and left a landscape of bombed out and collapsed buildings, rubble-strewn streets, and no basic services. The United Nations expressed concern about reports that Syrian soldiers and allied Iraqi Shia militia fighters had summarily executed 82 people in recaptured east Aleppo districts.

The evacuation in Aleppo was a stop-and-start affair over several days, with the Syrian Observatory for Human Rights reporting at one point that 60 buses ready to evacuate 3,000 people were held up in freezing temperatures for hours. The Syrian regime’s decision to allow opposition fighters to evacuate eastern Aleppo was coupled with opposition forces’ allowing the evacuation of two besieged pro-regime towns in Idlib province. On December 22, according to press reports, the last civilians and fighters left eastern Aleppo, leaving the entire city in the hands of the Syrian regime.

Many evacuees and opposition fighters went from Aleppo to Idlib province. According to UN Special Envoy for Syria Staffan de Mistura, “Idlib…could be in theory the next Aleppo.” Opposition fighters and the terrorist group Jabhat Fateh al-Sham, already had a strong presence in the province, where Syrian regime and allied forces continue to attack them.

- For more information on OIR-related military activity in Syria, see page 35.
Al Qaeda-affiliate in Syria Positioned to Gain from Potential ISIL Defeat

Jabhat Fateh al-Sham has been a prominent fighting force among anti-Assad opponents and is considered the main jihadist rival to ISIL in Syria, and best positioned to benefit from ISIL’s demise.202 The group has downplayed its al Qaeda global terrorist vision and instead has portrayed itself as the defender of Sunnis, gaining the support of many Syrians by fighting in coordination with other opposition groups against Assad and at times providing food and water.203

While Jabhat Fateh al-Sham, formerly known as the Nusra Front, announced it no longer is part of al Qaeda, DoD officials stated that the rebranding is in name only. The DoS amended the terrorist designation of the Nusra Front on November 10 to add Jabhat Fateh al-Sham as an alias. According to the U.S. military, it continues to target Jabhat Fateh al-Sham aggressively.204 According to a December 12 report from the U.S. Institute of Peace, Jabhat Fateh al-Sham was al Qaeda’s most successful franchise, with the same goals as ISIL. The report estimated that Jabhat Fateh al-Sham had 10,000 fighters by the end of 2016, with members from Russia, Europe, and elsewhere in the Middle East making up at least 30 percent of its ranks.205 The report noted the danger that the al Qaeda affiliate would gain control of ISIL’s network of terrorist operatives in Europe.206

Ceasefire and Peace Prospects in Syria

At midnight on December 29-30, a ceasefire agreement brokered by Russia and Turkey took effect between the Syrian regime and northern Syrian armed opposition groups. On December 31, 2016—just as the reporting period ended—the UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 2336 (2016), which welcomed and supported “the efforts by Russia and Turkey to end violence in Syria and jumpstart a political process” for that country.207 The ceasefire followed days of discussion, and came immediately after the collapse of the opposition’s resistance to the Russian-Syrian regime onslaught on eastern Aleppo; the evacuation of opposition groups and civilians had been negotiated between Turkey and Russia.208

The UN resolution, changed at the insistence of the United States and other western powers from an endorsement of the ceasefire,209 stopped short of doing so, but rather “[welcom[ed] and support[ed]” Russian and Turkish efforts to end violence. The resolution “[took] note of” the documents issued by Russia and Turkey about the agreements brokered by the two countries,210 including a nationwide ceasefire and a plan to convene political talks in Kazakhstan’s capital, Astana, between the Syrian regime and opposition groups, in January.

The UN Security Council tied the planned meeting in Astana to the resumption of UN-sponsored peace discussions, under a process set forth in earlier Security Council resolutions and communiqués. The UN News report stated in part:
UN Security Council Resolution 2336 also called on “the parties to allow humanitarian agencies rapid, safe and unhindered access throughout Syria, as provided for in its relevant resolutions.”

- The Council “looks forward to” the meeting in Astana, viewing it as “an important part of the Syrian-led political process” and “an important step ahead of the resumption of negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations in Geneva on 8 February 2017 [quoting Resolution 2336 (2016)].”

- The Council stressed the importance of fully implementing all relevant Security Council resolutions, particularly [those of 2015 and 2016], which endorsed an inclusive and Syrian-led political process based on the Geneva Communiqué of 30 June 2012 as the only sustainable solution to the current Syrian crisis, now in its sixth year.  

Excluded from the coverage of the ceasefire are territories in which ISIL and Jabhat Fateh al-Sham are operating. Syrian groups were negotiating their agreement or signing up as the reporting period ended. However, it was unclear to what degree Turkey would apply the terms of the ceasefire to the YPG, which was not explicitly excluded from the ceasefire and thus could be said to have been included. However, the Syrian army said that al Qaeda affiliate Jabhat Fateh al-Sham and groups linked to it were explicitly excluded from ceasefire agreement.

UN Security Council Resolution 2336 also called on “the parties to allow humanitarian agencies rapid, safe and unhindered access throughout Syria, as provided for in its relevant resolutions.” This resolution came on the heels of two UN resolutions passed in December: Resolution 2328, adopted on December 19, “Demanding Immediate, Unhindered Access for Observation of Monitoring [sic] Civilian Evacuations from Aleppo,” and expressing grave concern about actions amounting widespread to violations of human rights; and Resolution 2332, adopted on December 21, renewing previous decisions “authorizing United Nations humanitarian agencies … to cross conflict lines and establish a mechanism to monitor the loading of all humanitarian relief consignments,” and expressing, among other sentiments, its “outrage” about the escalating violence resulting from the Syrian conflict.

This December ceasefire followed a previous ceasefire in September and early October 2016 between the Syrian regime and opposition forces, brokered by Russia and the United States. That ceasefire lasted only a few days. During that time, Russia and the Assad regime struck a UN convoy and intensified attacks on Aleppo. Prior to that airstrike, a U.S. airstrike mistakenly struck Syrian forces. The results of the investigation into this airstrike is discussed in the section entitled “Investigations Confirm More Deaths from U.S. and Coalition Strikes,” on pages 31 and 32.

On October 3, as the reporting period began, the United States said it was suspending its participation in diplomatic activities established to support the ceasefire, and was withdrawing its personnel from a planned United States-Russia “Joint Implementation Center” which was meant to have had the United States “working with Russia to carry out strikes against Nusrah and al-Qaeda.” As of October 7, the DoS agreed that the September ceasefire was “extinct.”
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The December 29-30 ceasefire was ultimately reached without the direct participation of the United States.223

Stabilization and Governance in Syria

The DoS reported that, during the quarter, it continued to provide assistance to the moderate Syrian opposition, with a focus on local and provincial councils, community security providers, civil society groups, and independent media to provide services and information to their communities. This support was intended to enable moderate civilians to counter the influence of violent extremists by providing the public services, legitimate, responsive governance, independent media, and accountability through public watchdogs. Jabhat Fateh al-Sham and ISIL otherwise could fill the vacuum created by the withdrawal of a prior governing force. Among the types of support reported were small grants, in-kind assistance, training, and efforts to bolster the organizational and technical capabilities of the groups. The DoS also provided funds for independent Syrian media to counter violent extremist (and regime) narratives and lay the foundation for inclusive, tolerant debate that would undermine support for extremist responses. The DoS reported also providing funds for community policing services to establish public order responsive to local governance structures and allow for economic activity by preempting ISIL and Jabhat Fateh al-Sham, which also seek to establish legitimacy by providing for order.224

In addition, the DoS reported that it provided non-lethal assistance to vetted units of the armed opposition as they “fight to expel extremist groups from the country” (as well as “fight to counter the Syrian regime”). The support, it noted, focused on providing food, medical supplies, and winterization gear for fighters and their families.225

According to DoS, beneficiaries and implementers of DoS programs in Syria were reported killed or injured by Syrian regime bombardments and summary executions during the last quarter. Equipment and facilities supported by the United States were damaged and destroyed by the war, employees were prevented from going to work by the security situation, and other employees went on strike to protest the failure of the international community to respond to the situation in Aleppo. Nevertheless, the DoS reported that it continued to distribute stipends and provide for the weatherization of schools outside of Aleppo.226

The DoS’s programs in northern Syria are coordinated by the Syria Transition Assistance Response Team and in southern Syria by the South Syria Assistance Platform. The U.S. Army’s civil information mapping technology operated by military units has allowed “data mining,” extracting additional perspectives for both military and civilians, to produce a variety of routine information as well as special reports required by civilians. Information of important tactical use to the military was extracted from databases allowing, for instance, the compilation of a no-strike list for the northern Syria. Coordination with military units in the United States allowed 24 hour-per-day operations.227
Oversight of Syrian Assistance

Audit of the Department of State Vetting Process for Syrian Non-Lethal Assistance
AUD-MERO-17-01, November 2016

During the reporting period, the DoS OIG completed an audit of the vetting process for non-lethal assistance provided to the moderate Syrian opposition. Since 2011, the U.S. Government has committed more than $400 million in non-lethal assistance for training, equipment, and various services to enhance the stability of targeted communities or groups of people in Syria. Department policies require vetting of award recipients (including implementing partners’ key personnel) to ensure that the funds are not used to provide support to entities or individuals deemed to be a risk to U.S. national security. The vetting process screens individuals primarily for terrorist or extremist affiliations.

The DoS OIG found that these bureaus did not always follow Federal or DoS regulations and policies for vetting the moderate Syrian opposition. The lack of proper vetting increased the risk that U.S. Government assistance could have been inadvertently delivered to terrorists or their supporters.

This report, discussed in more detail on page 83, was issued in November 2016.
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In Iraq, humanitarian conditions continued to decline as the Iraqi government’s military offensive to retake the city of Mosul and ISIL attacks against Iraqi Security Forces resulted in the killing and displacement of civilians.1 As Iraqi Security Forces pushed into the city, military conflict intensified and caused a rise in the rate of civilian casualties and displacement.2 The majority of displaced civilians found shelter in IDP camps and emergency sites supported by USAID’s Office Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA), Office of Food for Peace (FFP), and the Department of State’s Bureau of Populations, Refugees, and Migration (PRM). Other IDPs and returnees found shelter in areas recently recaptured from ISIL, where humanitarian responders reportedly had less access, primarily due to security concerns.3

The Iraqi government’s Ministry of Migration and Displacement provided IDPs with assistance, however funding shortfalls within the Iraqi government and the Kurdistan Regional Government also hindered assistance efforts.4 By the end of the quarter, more than 125,000 people were newly displaced by the military offensive.5 Additionally, humanitarian responders continued to support assistance efforts in other areas of Iraq, such as Anbar province.6 By the end of the quarter, approximately 10 million people were in need according to the UN, including 3.1 million who were internally displaced.7

In Syria, armed conflict continued to cause civilian death and displacement and drive humanitarian needs. The Syrian regime’s military offensive in Aleppo was particularly devastating, as it killed and injured thousands of civilians, destroyed critical civilian infrastructure, and increased the need for humanitarian assistance.8 Civilian medical infrastructure was almost entirely destroyed during the offensive, leaving thousands without access to desperately needed treatment.9 By the end of the quarter, the Syrian regime and allied forces had recaptured eastern Aleppo from opposition forces, displacing more than 110,000 from the city and hindering thousands from accessing humanitarian assistance and basic services.10

OFDA and FFP partners provided assistance to those near conflict areas, as well as in other areas of Aleppo governorate, including the town of Manbij, where conditions reportedly improved during the quarter.11 Additionally, OFDA and FFP reported that preparing for the humanitarian response to the impending recapture of Raqqah from ISIL was a priority during the quarter.12 By the end of the quarter, approximately 13.5 million people were in need, according to the UN, including 6.3 million IDPs.13

The U.S. Government implements humanitarian assistance activities in Syria and Iraq as distinct and separate from military operations through three operating units:

- USAID/OFDA works with implementing partners to provide support to IDPs in Syria and Iraq and other conflict-affected peoples within those two countries.
- USAID/FFP provides food assistance to IDPs, refugees, and others in need who have been affected by the crises in Syria, Iraq and other countries in the region.14
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- **DoS/PRM** works with partners primarily to assist refugees, as well as IDPs and conflict victims associated with the complex crises in these countries.\(^\text{15}\)

U.S. Government financial commitments since the start of the Syria crisis totaled approximately $5.98 billion as of December 31, 2016.\(^\text{16}\) U.S. Government financial commitments for the Iraq crisis totaled approximately $1.11 billion since FY 2014.\(^\text{17}\) Commitments are funds that are publicly announced. Some amounts of the funding figures listed below may not have been obligated by the end of the reporting period.\(^\text{18}\)

Table 5.
**Status of Cumulative FY 2015, FY 2016, and FY 2017 U.S. Government Humanitarian Assistance Funds for the Syria and Iraq Crises, as of 12/31/2016**
($ Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Syria Obligated</th>
<th>Syria Disbursed</th>
<th>Iraq Obligated</th>
<th>Iraq Disbursed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRM</td>
<td>$1,564.9</td>
<td>$1,813.7</td>
<td>$494.0</td>
<td>$497.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFP</td>
<td>$927.3</td>
<td>$1,017.9</td>
<td>$113.5</td>
<td>$78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFDA</td>
<td>$591.5</td>
<td>$293.5</td>
<td>$263.1</td>
<td>$84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,083.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,125.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$870.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$660.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** USAID, OFDA/FFP response to USAID OIG request for information, 12/31/16.

**Notes:** USAID and DoS reported disbursements which may exceed obligations because disbursements may have been made against obligations from a prior fiscal year. In OIR reports prior to March 31, 2016, DoS reported disbursements only from funds obligated from FY2015 forward. This accounts for the difference seen in figures reported here and in past reports. Data on disbursements can provide valuable information about how much money has been spent on activities as well as the amounts of funding that remain available for expenditure. Provided a letter of credit from the U.S. Government, however, humanitarian assistance implementing partners may accrue expenses before drawing down on agency funds. For this reason, expenditures on humanitarian assistance activities sometimes exceed disbursements. Figures may not sum due to rounding.

USAID and PRM receive appropriations for humanitarian assistance activities that are not designated for use in responding to a particular humanitarian crisis, which enables them to exercise flexibility in responding to ongoing and emerging crises. OFDA and FFP primarily use International Disaster Assistance funds, as well as Title II funds, which are base funds appropriated to USAID to support humanitarian assistance activities associated with the Syria and Iraq complex crises, while PRM uses Migration and Refugee Assistance funds for this purpose.\(^\text{19}\) Each office allocates awards to implementing partners, which include various UN agencies such as the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the World Food Programme (WFP), and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), as well as private non-government organizations (NGOs), to carry out specified assistance programs on the ground in Syria, Iraq, and surrounding countries hosting Syrian refugees.”.\(^\text{20}\)
OFDA, FFP, and PRM rely on several types of personnel to execute their work, including U.S. Government direct hires, contractors, and personnel on long-term temporary duty assignments. For a breakout of the 68 personnel assigned to the Iraq-Syria crisis, by operating unit, and location, see Table 6.

Table 6.  
**OFDA, FFP, and PRM Personnel Assigned to Iraq-Syria Crisis Response Efforts, by Location, as of 12/31/2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Unit</th>
<th>Washington D.C.</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFDA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One OFDA employee based in Budapest, Hungary.

**Sources:** USAID, OFDA/FFP response to USAID OIG Request for information, 12/31/16, and Department of State, response to State OIG request for information, 12/31/2016.

**UN Appeals for Humanitarian Funding in Syria and Iraq Remain Underfunded**

Despite significant contributions by U.S. Government offices, including OFDA, FFP, and PRM, UN appeals for Syria remained significantly underfunded and the needs in Iraq were only partially addressed as of December 31, 2016. OFDA noted that funding has not kept pace with the growing needs in Syria and this has forced OFDA and FFP to prioritize programming that addressed the most urgent needs. The UN appeal for Syria was less than 50 percent funded by the end of 2016. In Iraq, by December 31, approximately 84 percent of the UN’s Humanitarian Response plan had been funded. However, according to PRM, the Iraq appeal did not try to address the full range of needs in the country, so despite being close to fully funded there were gaps in assistance efforts for the more than 3.1 million IDPs in Iraq, and some programs were shut down. As Table 7 shows, the UN’s appeals for support for displaced persons in the region had received only partial support.

Table 7.  
**UN Appeals and Funding Received for the Syria and Iraq Crises, as of 12/31/2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN Response Plan</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Syria Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan</td>
<td>$4.5 billion</td>
<td>$2.71 million (60% of request)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Syria Humanitarian Response Plan</td>
<td>$3.19 billion</td>
<td>$1.56 million (47% of request)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Iraq Humanitarian Response Plan</td>
<td>$861 million</td>
<td>$727.4 million (84% of request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Department of State response to State OIG Request for Information, 1/13/17.*
To support the humanitarian response for Mosul, the UN issued a flash appeal in July 2016 to solicit funds from international donors. The appeal set the funding requirements and the scope of several assistance sectors including shelter and non-food items; food assistance; water, sanitation, and hygiene assistance; health care; and other types of assistance. By the end of the quarter, contributions to the Mosul Flash Appeal reached $273.3 million, equating to 96.2 percent of the total $284 million appeal. Of the $273.3 million, $163.1 million had not yet been assigned to a specific sector by the end of the quarter.26

IRAQ CRISIS

During the quarter, humanitarian conditions in Iraq continued to deteriorate as the military offensive undertaken by the Iraqi government and allied forces to retake the city of Mosul coupled with ISIL attacks displaced thousands of civilians and increased the need for humanitarian assistance throughout many areas of the country.27 As the military offensive reached the city and pushed deeper into ISIL-held territory, the rate of civilian casualties and displacement increased significantly, with thousands injured or killed and people displaced from the city and surrounding areas to IDP camps or recently retaken areas within the region.28 According to the United Nations, nearly 50 percent of the 5,063 deaths recorded during the quarter in Iraq were civilians, representing a significant increase from the previous quarter not only in civilian deaths, but also in overall deaths.29

By the end of the quarter, the UN reported that the Mosul offensive had displaced more than 125,000 people.30 Of those displaced, approximately 112,000 resided in camps where they received assistance from UN and partner organizations, while other IDPs, in addition to returnees, found other forms of shelter in recently retaken areas.31 In those locations, conditions were difficult as security and other issues limited humanitarian access and many lacked basic services.32 Furthermore, financial constraints on the Iraqi government and Kurdistan Regional Government were said to have hindered response efforts.33 In Anbar province, humanitarian responders continued to meet the needs of IDPs and others as 1.86 million people were still in need. More than 570,000 people had returned to the province by the end of the quarter.34 Table 8 provides an overview of the types of assistance provided by the U.S. agencies:

Conditions on the Ground

During the reporting period, the UN reported that approximately 10 million people in Iraq were in need.35 Among the 10 million, specific needs and conditions varied. This group included the following:

- 4.7 million children were in need of assistance36
- 2.4 million people were in need of food assistance37
- 8.5 million people were in need of health assistance38
Table 8.
Overview of U.S. Implementing Agencies and Types of Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Number of Implementers</th>
<th>Types of Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFDA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Shelter, protection, water, sanitation, and hygiene needs; humanitarian coordination; healthcare; and logistics support and relief commodities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emergency food assistance to Iraqi IDPs and other conflict affected people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Emergency shelter support; protection assistance; water, sanitation, and hygiene needs; healthcare; education; emergency livelihoods and social cohesion; and camp coordination and camp management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the end of the quarter, there were approximately 3.1 million IDPs in Iraq according to the UN. While conflict in the Mosul area was the primary driver of new displacement during the quarter, conflict in other areas contributed to displacement figures. However, the total number of IDPs in Iraq declined during the quarter, dropping from 3.3 million during the previous quarter. OFDA and FFP reported that needs among IDPs increased in all sectors during the quarter due to the Mosul offensive. According to OFDA and FFP, medical needs, protection, and shelter assistance were especially in demand, particularly for those in recently retaken areas or substandard emergency shelters.

IDPs from Mosul

The UN estimated that the Iraqi government offensive to liberate Mosul from ISIL had resulted in the displacement of more than 125,000 people by the end of the quarter. After a pause to resupply, Iraqi forces resumed the offensive on December 29, and rates of displacement increased by 50 percent compared to rates seen in November, and that more than 9,000 people had fled the city within 4 days.

The UN reported that approximately 130,000 people were already displaced by conflict in the Mosul area, although not from the city itself, at the beginning of the quarter as Iraqi forces moved toward Mosul. Approximately 70,000 people were displaced to the south to Salah ad-Din province, while an additional 60,000 IDPs were displaced southeast of Mosul near Kirkuk and the Debaga IDP camp. According to the UN, conditions in these locations varied. Many who were displaced to Salah ad-Din settled in the provincial capital of Tikrit with host communities, where conditions were reportedly favorable. However, others resided at camps such as Debaga camp, where overcrowding stretched partner capacity to meet all humanitarian needs. OFDA and FFP reported that they continued to provide assistance to approximately 100,000 people in areas south of Mosul affected by conflict during the previous quarter, including Hawijah, Bayji, and al-Shirqat.

The UN reported that humanitarian access to locations throughout the Mosul area was difficult as the conflict hindered humanitarian efforts, especially in locations near...
frontlines.\textsuperscript{48} As first line responders gained access to newly retaken areas, the UN reported that ISIL, after more than 2 years of occupation, left major roadways lined with bombs and IEDs and destroyed key infrastructure.\textsuperscript{49} Yet by November 1, UN agencies, of which OFDA, FFP, and PRM are key donors, were able to reach thousands of IDPs with several types of assistance. They reached nearly 52,000 people with 30-day food rations and more than 25,000 people with rapid response mechanisms.\textsuperscript{50}

Following the push by Iraqi Security Forces into Mosul city on November 4, the number of IDPs began to increase as people fled the city.\textsuperscript{51} Within the first 10 days of conflict in Mosul, more than 30,000 IDPs were displaced from Mosul and nearby areas.\textsuperscript{52} As the offensive pushed deeper, the rate of displacement varied from week to week, but continued to result in an average of 11,500 new IDPs a week.\textsuperscript{53} By early December, there were more than 80,000 new IDPs from Mosul.\textsuperscript{54}

The UN predicted that as many as one million people could be displaced by the offensive. However, OFDA and FFP reported that displacement was less or slower than expected due to several factors. These included the targeting by ISIL of civilians attempting to flee, the reluctance of some to abandon their homes and property, and instructions issued by the Iraqi government to shelter in place.\textsuperscript{55}

The UN reported that IDPs fled Mosul through the eastern suburb of Gogachly, where they continued to face significant threats from the conflict and other dangers as they attempted to reach safer areas outside the city.\textsuperscript{56} While authorities were reportedly providing some transportation to camps, other IDPs risked the several days’ trip to reach the camps on their own, facing threats from local authorities, the onset of freezing winter conditions, ISIL sniper fire, and explosives.\textsuperscript{57}

According to the UN, IDPs going through screening processes at camps and emergency centers often lacked access to basic services, such as food and water, and protection concerns were prevalent as authorities reportedly placed restrictions on movements, and confiscated personal documentation.\textsuperscript{58} Family and child protection issues were of particular concern as males were frequently separated from their families during screening processes. This practice reduced the numbers of young males in the camps and led to unusually high numbers of female-led households.\textsuperscript{59}

The UN also reported that some IDPs chose to take shelter in recently recaptured areas, despite their lack of basic services, out of fear of screening processes.\textsuperscript{60} OFDA reported that, according to international organizations, screening sites in Kurdistan Regional Government-controlled areas were being monitored and were found to be operating in an acceptable manner.\textsuperscript{51} However, the sites around Mosul were under Iraqi government control and reportedly more difficult to observe, and there were reports that informal screening occurred before populations reached front lines.\textsuperscript{62}

The UNHCR reported significant concern about the reported confiscation of identification papers and documents from IDPs by authorities during screening processes.\textsuperscript{63} PRM reported that protection monitors have documented and intervened
on behalf of IDPs when authorities have attempted to take their documentation in certain cases. According to PRM, the seizure of civil documentation papers can discourage IDPs from settling into areas of displacement and has restricted IDP movement and access to basic services. In Kirkuk, UNHCR documented widespread instances of identity documentation confiscation and of IDPs being arrested for lacking documentation. UNHCR and other partners continue to advocate that mechanisms be established to issue new documentation for displaced individuals whose papers have been confiscated. Re-issuing new documentation would increase the likelihood of reuniting separated families, and it would increase freedom of movement for IDPs.

OFDA reported that it allotted a portion of its shelter funds for Mosul IDPs to the International Organization for Migration (IOM) for the establishment of emergency camps and to UNICEF and other international NGOs to support the installation of water and sanitation facilities in these and other camps. By the end of the quarter, with funding from OFDA and other humanitarian partners, five new camps and emergency sites with the capacity to receive nearly 40,000 IDPs were completed.

At the camps, the international organizations and NGOs, with support from OFDA, FFP, and PRM, reached IDPs with a variety of services and assistance, including the provision of Rapid Response Mechanism kits; shelter; water, sanitation, and hygiene; healthcare; protection; education; and food aid. From October 17 to December 16, OFDA and FFP partners provided 130,000 people with these kits, nearly 164,000 people with household items, and approximately 185,000 people with 30-day food rations. Healthcare partners also reached nearly 50,000 people with medical care. Much of this assistance reached IDPs in camps throughout the Mosul area.

While camps and emergency sites were able to accommodate the majority of IDPs from Mosul, many challenges still complicated relief efforts. High rates of unexploded ordnance contamination in areas near camps and land permission issues slowed the development of new camps in the Mosul area, especially at the beginning of the offensive. OFDA reported that challenges were particularly acute at recently established emergency camps. These camps were designed as temporary shelters and they were established rapidly with minimal services. Harsh weather conditions caused flooding in some emergency camps and IDPs in them experienced temporary gaps in services. During a visit to emergency camps, OFDA representatives said they found rudimentary facilities for water, sanitation, and hygiene needs, minimal fuel supplies for heating and cooking, a lack of electricity or solar panels to ensure nighttime safety, and little access to advanced healthcare and psychosocial services, particularly for children who are in desperate need of such care.

Compounding these issues, people displaced from conflicts in the Hawiga area in Kirkuk province sought shelter at camps already housing IDPs from Mosul and increased demands on humanitarian responders in the region. The UN reported that to mitigate these issues, it and its partners were constructing new camps and improving existing camp capacity.
As displacement figures rose throughout the reporting period, the UN reported that camps began to reach their capacity.

Nearly 90 percent of the more than 125,000 displaced by the Mosul offensive were residing in IDP camps and emergency centers throughout the area at the end of the quarter. As displacement figures rose throughout the reporting period, the UN reported that camps began to reach their capacity. Hasansham U3, Khazer M1, and Qaymawa (Zelikan) were full by December, while recently established camp extensions and emergency centers were receiving new IDPs. The UN and OFDA noted that scaling up assistance efforts at the same pace that new camps were being established was challenging, and that at times services were unable to keep up, especially in areas south of Mosul. Following the intensification of military
operations on December 29, further camps and emergency sites to the south and east of Mosul were reaching capacity, according to the UN.\textsuperscript{82} By the end of the reporting period, there were 7,524 remaining available spaces at camps and emergency sites for new IDPs.\textsuperscript{83} Figure 2 shows the flow of IDPs from Mosul and other areas of Ninawa province during the quarter.

**Conditions in Areas Recently Retaken from ISIL**

The UN, with the support of OFDA, FFP, and PRM, reported that they led more than 20 humanitarian missions during the reporting period to newly retaken areas in Mosul and other areas in Ninawa province to assess security conditions and humanitarian needs.\textsuperscript{84} The UN identified several acute needs for IDPs and residents of host communities in recently retaken areas, primarily for basic goods and services such as food, water, and healthcare, but also specific medical needs as well as winterization support.\textsuperscript{85} This was especially true in Mosul, where electricity and water services were cut and food supplies dwindled as conflict increased.\textsuperscript{86}

The UN reported high rates of traumatic injuries among civilians both inside and outside of Mosul and civilian casualties overwhelmed the capacity of hospitals in eastern Mosul.\textsuperscript{87} From December 5, 2016, to January 1, 2017, more than 3,100 people were transferred from Mosul to hospitals in Erbil for trauma injuries, which were primarily due to gunshots.\textsuperscript{88}

Environmental issues also affected the welfare of those in recently retaken locations. As winter conditions set in during November and December, IDPs and residents faced heavy rains and freezing conditions in northern Iraq and were in need of weatherproof shelters, blankets, fuel for heating, and other winter items.\textsuperscript{89} Furthermore, exposure to high rates of industrial pollution, particularly in Qayyarah, from burning oil wells and a sulfur factory that were set ablaze by ISIL caused over 1,500 people to seek healthcare assistance for respiratory issues.\textsuperscript{90}

OFDA, FFP, and PRM partners provided assistance in Ninawa province, including Mosul:

- In late November, partner organizations distributed multi-sectoral emergency response packages—which included ready-to-eat food, bottled drinking water, and hygiene items—to approximately 63,000 people in Ninawa province’s Nimrud district and bottled drinking water or hygiene kits to nearly 5,000 households in al-Shura district.\textsuperscript{91}
- In recently retaken areas in eastern Mosul, the UN and partner organizations delivered relief items to people in need. OFDA partner UNICEF began water-trucking services to an estimated 300,000 people in and around eastern Mosul, delivering approximately 10 liters of clean drinking water to each person each day.\textsuperscript{92}
Humanitarian responders lacked access to ISIL controlled areas within Mosul and other parts of Ninawa province, where an estimated one million people remained in dire need of assistance.

– UN, December 25, 2016

More than 27,000 of the displaced people are school-age children

- On December 8, the UN distributed ready-to-eat food assistance, dignity and hygiene kits, water purification tablets, water containers, and other relief items to approximately 42,000 people in eastern Mosul. The delivery was the single largest distribution of humanitarian assistance since the start of the Mosul military campaign.93

- The UN, with OFDA support, delivered two mobile medical clinics to frontlines in eastern Mosul, coordinated medical supply delivery to the area, and worked to establish three primary healthcare units in the area.94

- With support from PRM and OFDA, UNHCR and UNICEF have provided winterization assistance to IDPs in recently retaken areas. In mid-December, UNHCR coordinated the delivery of thermal blankets and quilts to 5,000 families and 11,200 individuals, and provided cash assistance for winter needs, while UNICEF provided winterization kits for children.95

- According to PRM, as of November 4, more than 27,000 of the displaced people are school-age children forced out of school since October 17, when the Mosul military offensive began. More than 9,000 children in 13 camps have been provided with support to re-start school. With PRM support, UNICEF and its partners are also working to set up temporary learning spaces in camps.96

However, OFDA and FFP reported that despite the delivery of assistance, access to these areas remained challenging. While several locations were “liberated” from ISIL, their proximity to the frontlines and frequent attacks by ISIL left many insecure and prevented humanitarian responders from accessing beneficiaries.97 This was especially the case in Mosul, as the conflict trapped many people in the city, making it exceedingly difficult for responders to reach them or accurately prioritize their needs.98 ISIL apparently targeted civilians attempting to flee the conflict, resulting in serious trauma cases that healthcare providers reportedly struggled to address.99

At some distribution sites, OFDA and PRM partners also encountered chaotic conditions compounded by acts of violence, including gunfire and VBIEDs.100 In the eastern suburb of Gogachly in Mosul, mortar fire killed community-based aid workers and beneficiaries waiting in line for assistance. On December 22, three VBIEDs were detonated, hindering aid operations in the area.101 Outside of Mosul, in the town of Hamam al Alil, security concerns prevented the provision of chlorine for local water treatment plants, leaving populations dependent on polluted river water to meet their needs.102 Limitations on the movement of goods by authorities also hindered assistance efforts. In the town of Nimrud, water, sanitation, and hygiene, and food assistance efforts were hindered by security constraints and bureaucratic limitations on the passage of cargo in the week following the town’s capture from ISIL militants in mid-November.103
Fallujah Lessons Learned Applied to Mosul Assistance

The humanitarian community has taken lessons learned from the liberation of Fallujah in late June and applied them to the Mosul response, according to OFDA and FFP. Flaws from the Fallujah efforts included a lack of standardized screening procedures, problems with civil-military coordination, and inadequate planning. While the Mosul crisis had not reached the higher anticipated levels of displacement by the end of the quarter, OFDA and FFP stated that, “despite some flaws, the Mosul response has been much better organized than the response to Fallujah.”

OFDA and FFP reported that improvements made in Mosul response efforts included enhanced civil–military cooperation in the lead up to the offensive. An operations center was established to strengthen coordination between humanitarian agencies and military actors, and the UN has worked to maintain close communication with the Iraqi Security Forces, Kurdish Peshmerga, and Coalition forces on behalf of the humanitarian community. For example, some health agencies have coordinated with military entities for assistance regarding humanitarian access and quick acquisition of supplies for trauma injuries.

However, some issues remain, such as the lack of transparency in the Iraqi government and Kurdistan Regional Government screening procedures. OFDA reported that international organizations have been permitted access to some screening sites in the Kurdistan region; however, access to screening sites in Iraqi government controlled areas remained tenuous. Moreover, humanitarian responders were not permitted contact with individuals being detained, and detailed information concerning the informal screening activities taking place behind and along frontlines remained unavailable to humanitarian organizations. OFDA stated that it was not possible for humanitarian organizations to locate or monitor these activities due to security concerns and a general lack of access to the areas where they

IDPs Returning in Anbar Province

During the quarter, the number of returnees in Iraq continued to increase. As of late December, approximately 1.3 million people had returned to their places of origin in Iraq since the beginning of the crisis.

The number of IDPs returning to Anbar province continued to increase, following a rapid uptick in the rate of returnees to the province at the end of the previous quarter. By December 22, approximately 575,000 people had returned to Anbar province, including more than 256,000 to Ramadi district and 225,000 to Fallujah and the surrounding area. Almost 90 percent of the returnees to Fallujah went home during this quarter, as basic services returned to some areas of the city. However, tens of thousands of people displaced in Anbar had not returned to their place of origin by the end of the quarter, and Anbar remained the province with the second highest number of people in need (following Ninawa province), according to the UN.
occurred. However, OFDA noted that the screening of Mosul IDPs has appeared to be more organized and open compared to screening activities during the Fallujah operation.\textsuperscript{112}

Additionally, some NGOs initially reported difficulties in obtaining information on military planning that could have affected humanitarian assistance planning.\textsuperscript{113} OFDA reported that the UN Humanitarian Civil-Military Coordination, which is charged with relaying information between humanitarian responders and military planners, was able to address these issues at the field level and that they did not appear to be the result of resistance on the military’s part.\textsuperscript{114}

Another issue affecting the Mosul response was the capacity of the Iraqi government and the Kurdistan Regional Government to address the crisis.\textsuperscript{115} Ongoing oil revenue shortages combined with continued military campaigns against ISIL significantly affected the ability of these governments to address the needs of their people.\textsuperscript{116} As displacement has grown in major cities, all public services have been strained and competition for employment has grown, increasing tensions between IDPs and host communities.\textsuperscript{117} While the Iraqi government and the Kurdistan Regional Government have provided some assistance to IDPs, including tents, medical supplies, food, and non-food items, OFDA and FFP report that it would not be possible for either the Iraqi government or Kurdistan Regional Government to address the massive needs in Iraq without international assistance.\textsuperscript{118} In the case of Mosul, trauma needs were so immense that the country’s existing medical infrastructure could not cope with demands and thousands of people would have died were it not for assistance from the World Health Organization and other healthcare responders.\textsuperscript{119} Also, Iraq’s public distribution system, an Iraqi government-run social safety net that delivers a monthly food ration to all Iraqis, is not functioning in Ninawa province, further increasing the burden on humanitarian responders.\textsuperscript{120}

Many Fallujah district residents returned and found that their homes were damaged or destroyed. Many were forced to live in the remaining functional portions of their homes, or find other means of shelter, such as tents, and were in need of humanitarian assistance to subsist.\textsuperscript{126} As reconstruction continued, the UN reported that humanitarian partners were planning to help returnees living in damaged houses, by providing tents, potable water, and essential cooking items.\textsuperscript{127} In addition, the UN reported that food availability and other essential services were still inadequate in Fallujah. Markets lacked sufficient food stocks and commodities, and residents were resorting to emergency coping strategies, including reducing the number of meals consumed per day or buying less food. Healthcare, while available, was being provided using both mobile and fixed clinics because the city’s main hospital was only partially functioning.\textsuperscript{128}

The UN and its partners continued to provide humanitarian services to those residing in camps.\textsuperscript{129} In addition, while OFDA and FFP did not support assistance in camps, the
IRAQ: QUARTERLY FOCUS OF HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

ERBIL
Health facilities in Erbil are treating trauma cases resulting from the Mosul fighting. In the one week period from December 26, 2016 to January 1, 2017, 816 trauma cases from Mosul and the surrounding IDP camps were referred to health centers in Erbil. There have been reports of hospitals being full to capacity, however, as patients had to wait in hallways for treatment.

SALAH AL-DIN
Salah al-Din’s 80,000 IDPs have mostly settled in the Tikrit district, where local capacity to provide for the IDPs is overstretched. Additionally, roughly 250 IDP families from the Salah al-Din district living in Kirkuk were forced to leave the area and returned to Salah al-Din.

ANBAR
Anbar province continued to stabilize after its recapture from ISIL control. Although 268,000 IDPs reside in the province, returnees now outnumber IDPs. Those who remain displaced cite damaged property and risks associated with unexploded ordinance, along with a lack of opportunities to earn a livelihood, as common reasons for not returning to their place of origin.

KIRKUK
Residents of Kirkuk’s Hawiga district continue to flee the ISIL controlled area, with 25,000 leaving in December 2016 alone, straining the capacity of Kirkuk’s IDP camps to provide for those in need. Roughly 70,000 people continue to live in the Hawiga district amidst a steadily declining humanitarian situation. IDPs from Hawiga have reported that the lack of food and medical supplies is particularly severe.

Sources: Lead IG analyses from OCHA; OFDA; UNHCR.
The targeting of civilian medical facilities by the Syrian regime in eastern Aleppo resulted in civilian deaths and left thousands in need of medical treatment.

programs they funded did support the provision of out-of-camp services in the area, including emergency shelter supplies; food assistance; water, sanitation, and hygiene needs; and primary health care services. OFDA reported that its partners provided, in addition, non-food items and cash support to meet the basic needs of families residing outside of camps. FFP stated that it continued to support the provision of in-kind food parcels through the UN World Food Programme (WFP) to those in need in the Hit-Fallujah corridor. PRM continued to support protection monitoring and other services in the province. However, OFDA and FFP also asserted that their partners continued to face challenges when operating in the Fallujah area. Security concerns were prominent, as unexploded ordnance remained in the area and ISIL militants periodically waged attacks in an effort to distract from the military offensive in Mosul. Furthermore, security checkpoints, the lack of basic infrastructure, and delivering assistance over lengthy distances on poor roads slowed assistance efforts.

SYRIA CRISIS

Conflict throughout Syria continued to cause civilian deaths and displacement and immense humanitarian needs. The non-profit Syrian Network for Human Rights documented 3,335 civilian deaths during the quarter, including more than 2,400 civilians killed by the Syrian regime and its allied Russian forces. By the end of the quarter, the Syrian regime and its allied forces recaptured eastern Aleppo from opposition forces, displacing more than 110,000 people and limiting basic services, driving up the price of basic goods, and increasing humanitarian needs throughout northern Syria. In particular, the targeting of civilian medical facilities by the Syrian regime in eastern Aleppo resulted in civilian deaths and left thousands in need of medical treatment. Meanwhile, conditions improved in the town of Manbij, which was liberated from ISIL in August by Coalition-backed forces. Commercial activity, basic services, and civilians continued to return to the city. OFDA and FFP also reported that preparing for the humanitarian response to the eventual fall of Raqqah was a priority.

OFDA, FFP, and PRM partners, including several UN agencies, worked to provide multi-sectoral assistance throughout Syria and the region. Table 9 provides an overview of the types of assistance provided by the U.S. agencies.

Conditions on the Ground

During the reporting period, the UN reported that there were approximately 13.5 million people in need of assistance in Syria. Among the 13.5 million, needs and conditions varied and included the following:

- 6 million children were in need of assistance
- 9 million people were in need of food assistance
- 13 million people were in need of emergency healthcare
Table 9.
Overview of Assistance to Syrian IDPs and Refugees, by Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Number of Implementers</th>
<th>Types of Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFDA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Shelter, protection, water, sanitation, and hygiene needs; humanitarian coordination, healthcare, agriculture and food security; economic recovery and market systems support; and logistics support and relief commodities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Emergency food assistance to Syrian IDPs and Syrian refugees in neighboring countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Food assistance, healthcare, protection, shelter, relief commodities, and provisions of safe drinking water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the reporting period, the number of IDPs in Syria increased by approximately 200,000 people, growing to 6.3 million people, according to the UN.148 OFDA, FFP, and PRM partners noted their concern that as territorial control in Syria continued to change, the international community needed to know where IDPs were going, how they were being screened, and what was happening to them. Detention, conscription, forced relocation, and executions were reported.149 As displacement numbers rose, OFDA, FFP, and PRM partners reported that the greatest needs among IDPs continued to be access to healthcare and basic services. For example, in eastern Aleppo city, airstrikes destroyed all the remaining hospitals, leaving 250,000 people without access to static medical care. Access to besieged areas of Damascus remained limited, as deliveries of assistance were intermittent at best.150

Humanitarian Access: Hard to Reach and Besieged Areas

Humanitarian access continued to be challenging throughout Syria, particularly in remote and besieged areas.151 The UN pursued multiple methods to reach people in both hard-to-reach and besieged areas, including air and ground deliveries.152 OFDA, FFP, and PRM were key contributors to these efforts as they supported several UN agencies providing assistance to these areas, including the World Food Programme (WFP), World Health Organization (WHO), and UNHCR.153 According to the UN’s mid-December reporting, there were approximately 4.9 million people residing in hard-to-reach areas, including 974,080 people in besieged areas.154 The number of people in besieged areas increased by 147 percent over the past year, according to the UN.155 As of December 14, the UN reported reaching nearly 1.3 million people in these areas, including 413,650 in besieged areas reachable principally by truck convoys and by air deliveries.156

The Battle for Aleppo – Humanitarian Impact

By December 22, the Syrian regime and its allied forces captured the remaining portions of eastern Aleppo. Evacuations had ended and the UN and its partners were accessing areas that had recently been retaken to assess conditions and respond to
By the end of December, the UN or its partners had access to most of eastern Aleppo, and the UN reported immense destruction to the city. The UN further reported that more than 110,000 people had been displaced by the fighting in eastern Aleppo.

In late December, people started returning to their homes in eastern Aleppo. The most urgent needs included shelter, protection assistance, and warm clothing, heaters, and fuel due to winter conditions. In December, there were reports of children in Aleppo city dying due to severe cold weather and substandard shelter conditions. In eastern Aleppo, the UN and partners were assessing the needs of returnees and providing assistance including shelter support, food aid, non-food items, health, nutrition, and water, sanitation, and hygiene assistance.

The Offensive
At the end of the previous quarter, the UN officially declared the city of Aleppo besieged by the Syrian regime and its Russian, Iranian, Lebanese Hezbollah, and
Iraqi Shia militias’ allies. The siege hindered commercial activity and humanitarian assistance to eastern Aleppo, where fighters opposed to the Syrian government were located. Conditions there were grim, as an estimated 250,000 people had not received any significant delivery of humanitarian assistance since early July and food stocks and other critical supplies were limited, according to the UN. Aerial bombardments, which inflicted increasing civilian casualties and devastated key infrastructure, were so heavy that the UN issued a statement labeling the growing offensive and siege “crimes of historic proportions.”

The damage to eastern Aleppo’s health infrastructure was especially severe. During the quarter, OFDA reported that the constant airstrikes on health facilities destroyed or rendered facilities partially or completely inoperable, and made service delivery and restocking essential supplies nearly impossible. By the end of October, the UN reported that the area’s health infrastructure was close to collapsing as there were fewer than 30 doctors working in only six partially functioning hospitals, equating to only one doctor for every 9,000 civilians in eastern Aleppo. The last facilities had critically low supplies of medicines, anesthetics, intravenous fluids, vaccines, trauma supplies, beds, and blankets. By late November, the civilian medical infrastructure was almost completely destroyed as there were no longer any functioning hospitals left in eastern Aleppo.

Humanitarian needs increased in Syrian regime-held western Aleppo, where mortar and rocket fire from opposition forces created civilian casualties. During the first 15 days of November, 67 people were reported killed, including 15 women and 10 children, and 360 were injured by mortar and rocket fire. Medical infrastructure in west Aleppo was also severely damaged during the reporting period. In addition to medical assistance, IDPs and residents in west Aleppo were in need of many other types of assistance, including food aid, non-food items, and water, sanitation, and hygiene aid.

**Invasion of Eastern Aleppo**

On November 24, the humanitarian crisis escalated as Syrian regime and allied ground forces moved into opposition-held areas of eastern Aleppo. Incidents of IDPs being shot while attempting to flee into Syrian regime-controlled western Aleppo were reported. Additionally, there were reports that some men and boys were detained and their IDP documents were confiscated when they crossed into Syrian government territory. Oppositions groups also allegedly sought to prevent civilians from leaving eastern Aleppo. By early December, Syrian regime forces had captured much of eastern Aleppo and IDPs continued to flee. Humanitarian responders’ access to the area was severely limited at that time. The price of goods increased dramatically while medical and water services were almost non-existent. In western Aleppo, a new influx of IDPs from the eastern section overstretched shelter capacities, with poor conditions prompting some IDPs to begin returning to their neighborhoods.

Providing humanitarian assistance in conflict zones posed serious concerns for humanitarian responders, with some humanitarian workers resigning. Nevertheless, the UN, with OFDA, FFP, and PRM support, provided significant assistance to those displaced from or affected by the conflict in eastern Aleppo.
• OFDA partner World Heath Organization (WHO) delivered 92 tons of medical supplies, sufficient to provide more than 70,000 medical treatments to those in western Aleppo, including IDPs from eastern Aleppo, while prepositioning supplies for an additional 31,800 treatments.\textsuperscript{182}

• OFDA partner WHO reportedly also donated mobile medical clinics to the Syrian regime’s Department of Health and Al-Ihsan NGO (supported by WHO).\textsuperscript{183} Within the first 10 days of December, the Al-Ihsan clinic provided more than 1,600 treatments in a former opposition-controlled neighborhood in eastern Aleppo.\textsuperscript{184}

• FFP partner WFP and other humanitarian responders provided ready-to-eat rations for people in Jibreen, Mahalej, and Hanano, while WFP alone also provided bulk food in support of the communal kitchens run by the Syrian Arab Red Crescent and International Committee of the Red Cross in the same areas.\textsuperscript{185}

• WFP also provided bread for an average of 14,500 people in western Aleppo.\textsuperscript{186}

• According to PRM, its implementing partner UNHCR provided assistance in several areas by deploying shelter experts to help identify opportunities to create improvised spaces suitable for use as shelters. UNHCR also distributed shelter kits that could be used by IDPs in rehabilitating structures. UNHCR also helped to increase IDP access to utilities, humanitarian supplies, such as winter clothing, healthcare, and other needed services.\textsuperscript{187}

In mid-December, following requests agreed to by parties involved in the conflict, the UN began medical evacuations out of eastern Aleppo.\textsuperscript{188} As evacuations ended, the Syrian regime and its allied forces recaptured the remaining portions of eastern Aleppo.\textsuperscript{189} At the end of the quarter, the UN reported more than 110,000 people had been displaced by the fighting in eastern Aleppo, including nearly 75,000 displaced to areas in and around Aleppo city and more than 36,000 in Idlib and rural western Aleppo.\textsuperscript{190} People started returning to their homes if conditions permitted. The most urgent needs included shelter, protection assistance, warm clothing, heaters, and fuel due to winter conditions.\textsuperscript{191}

**Southern Syria Assistance Platform**

The Southern Syria Assistance Platform is an interagency team based in the U.S. Embassy in Amman, Jordan, that seeks to assist communities in southern Syria and consists of offices from USAID, including OFDA and FFP, as well as entities from the DoS and DoD.\textsuperscript{192} The team supports southern Syrian communities by working to reduce the effects of long-term conflict by promoting stability through restoration of essential services and assistance to moderate Syrian organizations, and assisting moderate groups against extremists and the Syrian regime.\textsuperscript{193} According to OFDA and FFP, the team works with more than 60 local councils and leaders and delivers assistance to approximately 300,000 people a month in southern Syria.\textsuperscript{194} During the quarter, OFDA reportedly continued funding programs for health, relief items, protection, and water, sanitation, and hygiene sectors, while FFP provided
IDLIB GOVERNorate
Regime bombings of education facilities in several towns resulted in suspensions of school activities due to safety concerns. One of the worst attacks occurred in Kafr Nobol in early December, killing 26 people including women and children. There were also reports of regime forces using cluster and incendiary munitions on towns in Idlib province, as well as health centers being destroyed by airstrikes.

RIF DAMASCUS GOVERNorate
Water was cut for the approximately 5.5 million residents of the capital Damascus in late December after pipes from a spring that feeds the capital’s water system were damaged in Wadi Barada, a besieged opposition-controlled suburb of the capital. The city’s water authority has been able to provide for about 30% of the area’s daily needs with water pumped from ground wells while instituting an emergency rationing system.

BERM
Limited humanitarian access, security issues related to crowd control, and inclement weather have made aid deliveries difficult to the estimated 77,500 IDPs living in informal settlements on the Jordanian border in an area known as the Berm. While the UN has aimed to reach over 1,100 households per day with aid deliveries, due to persistent access problems, deliveries were not complete at the end of the quarter, more than five weeks after the start of the distributions on November 22.”

Sources: Lead IG analyses from OCHA and OFDA.
HASAKA GOVERNORATE

Although Hasaka did not see significant fighting during the quarter, refugees fleeing the fighting in Mosul arrived from neighboring Iraq. In late November, the al-Hol Camp reported the presence of over 7,000 Iraqi refugees alongside nearly 900 Syrian IDPs.

HIMS GOVERNORATE

Humanitarian conditions worsened in the besieged al-Wa’er neighborhood, the last section of Hims city still controlled by opposition forces. The deterioration is attributable to heavy shelling by regime forces in November and December 2016, which damaged schools, a health center, and an NGO warehouse. A UN convoy that reached the area in late October 2016 lacked medical supplies which are now running out in the neighborhood.

flour to bakeries and direct food assistance to communities in southern Syria. OFDA noted that these efforts are not without challenges, such as funding not keeping pace with the growing number of people in need in Syria and the suspension of an OFDA implementing partner which limited access and capability to assist those in southern Syria.

Manbij

By late December, outside of the Aleppo city area, conditions in northern Aleppo governorate had improved. In the city of Manbij, markets had reopened, commercial trucks were accessing the town from Aleppo’s Jarabulus district, and the prices of staple items had declined, including a 50 percent decline in the price of vegetables. The UN estimated that 70,000 people had returned to the city after Coalition-backed Syrian Democratic Forces recaptured the town from ISIL in August. OFDA and FFP reported that the USAID Disaster Assistance Relief Team continued to monitor the situation in Manbij to assess the humanitarian needs, and partners were supporting the emergency water, sanitation, and hygiene, and food needs of IDPs and returnee populations in the city. Despite recent improvements, OFDA and FFP reported that the area remained contaminated with explosive remnants of war and some services were only partially functional. More than half of the city’s population was still relying on personal or neighborhood generators for electricity, and four of the city’s nine hospitals were non-functional. The city remained in urgent need of medical supplies, ambulances, and qualified medical personnel.

The Raqqah Offensive

In early November, the Coalition offensive to recapture the town of Raqqah from ISIL began, along with planning for the humanitarian response that would be required. OFDA reported that the USAID Disaster Assistance Relief Team coordinated with the Syria Transition Assistance Response Team in Turkey and DoD in Kuwait during the planning process. Also, in conjunction with the U.S. consulate in Adana, Turkey, OFDA worked to preposition vital non-food items for Raqqah, such as plastic sheeting and other goods at Turkey’s Incirlik Airbase. In addition, OFDA reported that it was examining additional programming options to ensure readiness and flexibility once access to the city is possible.
Sailors work around a variety of ordnance in the hangar bay of the aircraft carrier USS Dwight D. Eisenhower (CVN 69) (Ike) October 27, 2016. (U.S. Navy photo)
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COMPLETED OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

As required by Section 8L of the Inspector General Act, the Lead IG is responsible for planning, conducting, and reporting on oversight of overseas contingency operations. This section of the report provides information on Lead IG staffing approaches to perform these oversight functions; outreach efforts by Lead IG agencies; completed Lead IG oversight work related to audits, inspections, and evaluations during the past 3-month period, October 1, 2016, through December 31, 2016; Lead IG investigative activity; and the OIGs’ hotline activities.

LEAD IG STAFFING

The Lead IG agencies use dedicated, rotational, and temporary employees to conduct oversight projects, investigate fraud and corruption, and perform various operational activities, such as strategic planning and reporting. Each Lead IG agency has hired new staff through the special hiring authority provided within 5 U.S.C. § 3161, and the re-employment of annuitants provided within 10 U.S.C. § 9902, and has assigned existing permanent staff to perform Lead IG work.

The Lead IG agencies have adopted an expeditionary workforce model to support audit, evaluation, and inspection efforts. The DoD OIG has field offices in Kuwait and Qatar to support its regional activity with a small contingent of oversight staff assigned to each office on 6-month rotations. The DoS OIG has a field office in Iraq, with a small contingent of oversight staff on 1-year assignments. Oversight teams from the Lead IG agencies, both from these offices and from offices in the United States, travel to Jordan, Kuwait, Qatar, Turkey, Iraq, and other locations in the region on a temporary basis to conduct the field work for their projects.

For their investigative work, the Lead IG agencies use deployed investigators in the region, and from the United States, to investigate fraud and corruption related to OIR and associated humanitarian assistance. The Defense Criminal Investigative Service (DCIS), which is the DoD OIG’s investigative component, has deployed special agents in Kuwait and Qatar. The DoS OIG has special agents in Germany, along with its audit staff, and Iraq, and USAID OIG has special agents in Germany.
Lead IG Agencies Recognized for Exemplary Service

On October 20, 2016, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency recognized employees of the DoD OIG, the DoS OIG, and USAID OIG with one of its top awards, the Glenn/Roth Award for Exemplary Service, for their outstanding work on Lead IG oversight of overseas contingency operations. The Glenn/Roth Award for Exemplary Service recognizes the work of the individual or group that has provided demonstrated value to the Congress as it relates to Congress’ ability to enact legislation or perform oversight that improves the effectiveness and efficiency of Government programs.

The Glenn/Roth award recognized the combined efforts of OIG personnel from the DoD, the DoS, and USAID to provide independent, relevant, timely, and effective oversight of overseas contingency operations, and the programs and operations which support those contingency operations. This whole of government model enabled each inspector general to plan and conduct oversight of overseas contingency operations and related programs with less duplication of effort and an improved application of resources. The structure has enabled the Lead IG agencies to provide more comprehensive oversight of the nation’s overseas contingency operations.

The Glenn/Roth Award was named after the late Senator John Glenn of Ohio and the late Senator William Roth of Delaware. The Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency is an independent entity established within the Executive branch to address integrity, economy and effectiveness issues that transcend individual Government agencies and aid in the establishment of a professional, well-trained and highly skilled workforce in the Offices of Inspectors General.

OUTREACH

Outreach and coordination continue to be important aspects of Lead IG work. Keeping the Congress informed on critical issues, travel into the theater of operation, and coordination with oversight partners and agency officials contribute to the Lead IG agencies’ understanding of the issues affecting OIR and support oversight efforts. The DoS IG and USAID IG testified before a Senate subcommittee on agency management challenges, as discussed on the next page.

During the quarter, the Acting DoD IG continued to highlight Lead IG efforts and common audit issues in his quarterly meetings with the Service Inspector Generals and the Service Auditors General. Senior Lead IG officials regularly meet with policy officials, collect information, and conduct research related to OIR’s military activities, governance activities, and humanitarian assistance. Investigative briefings and the OIGs’ hotlines are other avenues for outreach that are discussed later in this section.
Next quarter, the Acting DoD IG, in his role as Lead IG, the DoS IG and the USAID IG are traveling into the OIR theater of operations to meet with military commanders, embassy officials, and USAID administrators. The purpose of these meetings is to discuss the Lead IG responsibilities, activities, and challenges, as well as learn about the challenges and environment facing the commanders and Coalition officials involved with OIR. This is the first time that all three IG’s responsible for Lead IG reporting have travelled in theater together, and it reflects our commitment to a coordinated and whole of government approach to OIR oversight.

**COMPLETED AUDIT, INSPECTION, AND EVALUATION PROJECTS**

Lead IG agencies and partners released ten reports relating to OIR from October 1, 2016, through December 31, 2016. These projects examined U.S. and Coalition efforts related to forces in Iraq; contractor oversight and controls; governance and stability initiatives; ISIL messaging; and homeland security programs.

**Final Reports**

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OVERSIGHT**

*Assessment of U.S. and Coalition Efforts to Train, Advise, Assist, and Equip the Kurdish Security Forces in Iraq*

DODIG-2017-033, December 14, 2016

The DoD OIG conducted an assessment of U.S. and Coalition efforts to train, advise, assist, and equip the Kurdish Security Forces to conduct operations against ISIL and found that these activities have helped the Kurdish Security Forces in Iraq to further develop their capability to conduct combat operations against ISIL. However, the DoD OIG identified three areas for improvement and offered recommendations in these three areas. Management agreed with these recommendations.

First, the U.S. did not have a comprehensive written plan to sustain the two brigade equipment sets that the U.S. intended to provide to the Kurdish Security Forces, which could result in equipment deterioration. The DoD OIG recommended that U.S. Central Command determine the requirements to sustain the functioning of the brigade equipment sets, issue a written sustainment plan that includes those requirements, and execute the plan.

Second, U.S. units lacked visibility of U.S.-transported equipment (both U.S.-purchased and Coalition-donated) within the U.S.-managed supply chain to be supplied to the Kurdish Security Forces, which could lead to duplicate acquisition as well as potential loss of accountability. The DoD OIG recommended that U.S. Central Command, in coordination with the 1st Theater Sustainment Command,
IGs Discuss Management Challenges

On December 8, 2016, the IGs for the DoS and USAID testified before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on State Department and USAID Management, International Operations, and Bilateral International Development about their top management challenges. During the hearing, DoS IG Linick and USAID IG Calvaresi Barr described the close cooperation among the three Lead IG agencies in the oversight of overseas contingency operations and the challenges evident in such high-risk environments.

IG Linick testified about several of the issues of paramount importance to DoS operations in a contingency environment, including the security of embassies and their personnel, the need for proper emergency action plans, and the safeguarding of information. IG Linick described some of the challenges noted in prior OIR quarterly reports in the effective management of high-value, critical contracts and grants, and highlighted the audits of contracts in Iraq which revealed millions of dollars in questioned, unsupported, or unallowable costs. Similarly, IG Linick addressed the difficulties of managing grants in conflict areas, focusing on the inspection of DoS’s Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor discussed in a prior OIR report.

In her testimony, IG Calvaresi Barr addressed issues relating to overseas contingency operations, including USAID’s efforts to coordinate and implement assistance programs with multiple stakeholders, the lack of local and skilled personnel capable executing USAID projects, and weak project design, monitoring, and internal controls on the behalf of USAID. IG Calvaresi Barr noted that these concerns were especially prevalent regarding assistance programs in Syria, highlighting investigative work by USAID OIG that exposed fraud schemes involving collusion between vendors and implementers, product substitution, inflated billing, and false claims. Noting that USAID has taken steps to remedy the situation, IG Calvaresi Barr emphasized that these abuses raise serious concerns about USAIDs contracting and oversight of such processes.

The DoD OIG released the FY 2017 management challenges report, as part of its FY 2017 Oversight Plan. Several of these challenges, in particular countering the terrorist threat, relate to overseas contingency operations. The DoD OIG identified these challenges based on oversight work, research, and judgment; oversight work done by other components within the DoD; input from DoD leaders; and oversight projects by the Government Accountability Office.
ensure all equipment items, including both Coalition-donated, and Iraqi Train and Equip Fund-purchased, are tracked and monitored through the supply chain to ensure accountability throughout the distribution process.

Finally, U.S. units initiated and performed informal advise and assist activities with the Kurdish Security Forces in the areas of training development, logistics, and ministry professionalization that needed to be established as an official requirement to sustain their positive effects. The DoD OIG recommended that the Combined Joint Task Force-Operation Inherent Resolve, in coordination with Combined Joint Force Land Component Command–Operation Inherent Resolve, formalize and continue the current advise and assist missions being conducted in training development, logistics, and resource management. In addition, the DoD OIG recommended that Office of Security Cooperation-Iraq formalize and expand the current advise and assist mission being conducted at the Minister of Peshmerga.

The Army Did Not Have Assurance That Heavy Lift Contractors in Kuwait Complied With Contract Requirements

The DoD OIG conducted an audit of the Army’s Heavy Lift contracts in Kuwait in support of OIR. These contracts provide commercial transportation services for moving Army equipment, cargo, and personnel throughout Kuwait. The Army uses four contractors under separate contracts to fulfill its heavy lift transportation requirements. Because the Heavy Lift program is in its seventh iteration, these contracts are referred to as the Heavy Lift VII contracts.

The DoD OIG found that the Army did not effectively oversee or administer these contracts. Specifically, the DoD OIG found that the official contract file was incomplete and did not contain critical documentation, such as contract amendments and task orders, approved quality control plans, monthly reports, and surveillance results; contracting officer representatives were not properly trained or appointed; and procurement contracting officers did not officially evaluate the performance of two contractors as required by the Federal Acquisition Regulation. As a result, the Army did not have adequate evidence to support contractor performance, which could affect the Government’s position in the case of a contractual dispute.

The DoD OIG recommended that the Army Contracting Command–Rock Island coordinate to develop a process for routinely monitoring the official contract file and contracting officer’s representative working file for completeness and ensure the timely rating of all contractors with the contracting officer’s representative surveillance results incorporated in the overall rating. The DoD OIG also recommended that the Army Contracting Command–Rock Island and affected commanders coordinate to establish formal procedures for training contracting officer’s representatives and managing Heavy Lift VII oversight.
During the audit, the DoD OIG communicated its findings and recommendations to the Army officials, who agreed with the DoD OIG observations and immediately initiated corrective actions. The Heavy Lift VII contracts expire in August 2017 and the Army is expected to award the Heavy Lift VIII contracts at that time. The DoD OIG noted that it is critical that the recent oversight and administrative improvements initiated on Heavy Lift VII contracts be carried forward to the Heavy Lift VIII contracts, and management agreed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OVERSIGHT

Audit of the Department of State Vetting Process for Syrian Non-Lethal Assistance
AUD-MERO-17-01, November 15, 2016

The DoS OIG completed an audit of the vetting process for non-lethal assistance provided to the moderate Syrian opposition. According to the DoS, the U.S. Government has committed more than $400 million in such assistance since the start of the Syrian crisis in 2011. The DoS uses non-lethal assistance to provide training, equipment, and various services to enhance the stability of targeted communities or groups of people. DoS policies require vetting for the recipients of the awards (including implementing partners’ key personnel) to ensure that the funds are not used to provide support to entities or individuals deemed to be a risk to national security. The vetting process screens individuals for derogatory information such as terrorist or extremist affiliations. The DoS OIG reviewed the vetting process for cooperative agreements and grants awarded by the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs and the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

The DoS OIG found that these bureaus did not always follow Federal or DoS regulations and policies for vetting the moderate Syrian opposition. The DoS OIG found that the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, before issuing an award, did not ensure that its implementing partners submitted information on their key personnel to the DoS for vetting. The DoS OIG also found that both bureaus did not always ensure that implementing partners submitted information on their program staff or participants to the DoS for vetting prior to the start of work or participation in program activities. The lack of proper vetting increased the risk that U.S. Government assistance could have been inadvertently delivered to terrorists or their supporters.

Bureau officials and implementing partners identified several challenges to the current vetting process. For example, officials stated that the DoS does not have personnel on the ground in Syria to monitor and oversee non-lethal assistance programs. As a result, a bureau must rely on its implementing partners to carry out its program objectives and ensure that non-lethal assistance reaches its intended recipients. In addition, beginning in November 2015, the amount of time the DoS needed to complete the vetting processing significantly increased, in part because an intelligence agency the
DoS relies on to obtain vetting information experienced an increased workload and a reduction in staff. According to the implementing partners, the delays in the vetting process have impeded the delivery of Syrian non-lethal assistance.

To address the deficiencies identified in this report, the DoS OIG offered nine recommendations. On the basis of responses received from the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs; the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor; the Bureau of Administration, Office of the Procurement Executive; and the Office of Management Policy, Rightsizing, and Innovation, the OIG considers eight recommendations resolved and one recommendation unresolved.

**Audit of the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, Middle East Partnership Initiative**

AUD-MERO-17-08, November 29, 2016

The DoS OIG completed an audit of the performance of the DoS Middle East Partnership Initiative and the DoS’s oversight of that program. The DoS Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs is responsible for managing the Middle East Partnership Initiative program. During fiscal years 2013 and 2014, the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs managed 400 separate Middle East Partnership Initiative awards, with total Federal funding of $461.3 million. The Middle East Partnership Initiative provides funding to non-governmental organizations, civil society organizations, educational institutions, local governments, and private businesses to implement projects that promote political, economic, and social reform. The DoS OIG conducted this audit to determine whether the goals and objectives of the Middle East Partnership Initiative program were being achieved and whether the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs effectively monitored the Middle East Partnership Initiative grants and cooperative agreements. To do this, the DoS OIG reviewed 30 Middle East Partnership Initiative awards executed during fiscal years 2013 and 2014.

Countries with Middle East Partnership Initiative awards audited by the DoS OIG included countries directly or indirectly affected by the fight against ISIL, such as Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Syria, and Tunisia. In the past, the DoS has implemented Middle East Partnership Initiative programs in Iraq, although no Iraq programs were included in the audited sample. Among its objectives, the program promotes stable and inclusive governance, which is critical to combating violent extremism.

The DoS OIG found that the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs could not systematically demonstrate that the Middle East Partnership Initiative was achieving its goals and objectives to promote political, economic, and social reform in the Middle East and North Africa. The DoS OIG found that the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs created performance indicators that did not facilitate decision making or lacked baseline data and performance targets. Although the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs cited anecdotal successes for the Middle East Partnership Initiative program, it could not provide systematic evidence of the Middle East Partnership Initiative program’s success or provide useful information to decision makers managing the multimillion-dollar program. The DoS OIG also found that the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs did not sufficiently monitor the 30 Middle East Partnership Initiative awards. The DoS
OIG identified shortcomings in monitoring plans, site visits, and review-of-program quarterly reporting. As a result of insufficient monitoring, Middle East Partnership Initiative program objectives may not be met and opportunities to correct performance challenges may be missed.

The DoS OIG made five recommendations to the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs to improve the performance management and oversight of Middle East Partnership Initiative awards. The Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs concurred with all five recommendations, which the OIG considered resolved, pending further action.

*Audit of the Oversight of Fuel Acquisition and Related Services Supporting Department of State Operations in Iraq*
AUD-MERO-17-16, December 14, 2016

Fuel is a mission-critical item for Iraq because each DoS site in Iraq operates and maintains its power sources independently from the local power grid. The DoS OIG conducted this audit to determine whether Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs oversight personnel implemented adequate controls to ensure that the contractor responsible for providing fuel and related services for DoS facilities in Iraq performed fuel acquisition, fuel distribution, equipment maintenance, and other fuel-related activities in accordance with contract terms and Federal regulations.

The DoS OIG found that the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs did not ensure that fuel acquired for DoS operations in Iraq complied with fuel quality standards because the bureau did not require the contractor to implement a fuel inspection system in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulations and the contract terms. The DoS OIG also found that the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs did not adequately plan for or conduct comprehensive oversight of fuel task orders. These deficiencies occurred, in part, because the bureau did not implement Federal Acquisition Regulation requirements and DoS policies. As a result, the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs did not hold the contractor accountable for identified performance weaknesses. Finally, although the DoS OIG found that the invoice review process implemented by the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs for fuel-related invoices generally complied with Federal and DoS guidance for conducting invoice reviews, the process did not include an independent verification of domestic fuel prices. As a result, the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs overpaid the contractor $2.4 million for domestic fuel, all of which had been recovered by the DoS as of October 2016.

The DoS OIG made 14 recommendations to the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs intended to improve the oversight of fuel acquisition and related services. In addition, the DoS OIG made four recommendations to the Bureau of Administration, Office of Logistics Management, to seek adjustment for any nonconforming fuel included in the $64 million paid through January 2016 and to recover $2.3 million in overpayments to the contractor. Based on responses from the relevant bureaus, the DoS OIG considers 1 recommendation closed; 16 recommendations resolved, pending further action; and 1 recommendation unresolved.
GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE OVERSIGHT

Combating Terrorism: Additional Steps Needed in U.S. Efforts to Counter ISIS Messaging
GAO-17-41C, December 8, 2016

This report is classified. No unclassified summary is available.

Combating Terrorism: U.S. Footprint Poses Challenges for the Advise and Assist Mission in Iraq
GAO-17-220C, November 22, 2016

This report is classified. No unclassified summary is available.

OTHER LEAD IG PARTNER OVERSIGHT

Drug Interdiction Efforts Need Improvement (DHS)
OIG-17-09, November 8, 2016

The DHS OIG conducted an audit to determine if the DHS’s oversight of its drug interdiction efforts aligned with the Office of National Drug Control Policy’s strategy for national drug control. The Office of National Drug Control Policy’s strategy sets goals and objectives for the drug control agencies to reduce illicit drug use, manufacturing and trafficking, drug-related crime and violence, and drug-related health consequences.

In its audit, the DHS OIG determined that due to a lack of formal oversight roles and responsibilities, the DHS did not: (1) comply with legislative mandates for reporting data on drug seizures and drug interdiction resource hours to the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and (2) ensure that its components developed and implemented adequate performance measures to assess drug interdiction activities. Regarding the second finding, seven of the nine DHS drug interdiction performance measures did not effectively assess the impact of its drug interdiction efforts. The DHS OIG also observed that joint operations between, for example, U.S. Customs and Border Patrol and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement resulted in duplicate recording of drug seizure data so the amount of total drugs seized could not be reliably determined.

The DHS OIG made two recommendations for better aligning DHS drug interdiction efforts with the Office of National Drug Control Policy’s strategy. The first was to develop and implement a plan to ensure compliance with reporting mandates, and the second was for DHS to develop and implement a plan to ensure components develop outcome-based performance measures that adequately assess the success of drug interdiction efforts. The DHS concurred with both recommendations.
Better Safeguards Are Needed in USCIS Green Card Issuance (DHS)
OIG-17-11, November 16, 2016

The DHS OIG conducted a follow-up audit to review challenges in U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services’ (USCIS) Electronic Immigration System. The objective of the audit was to (1) assess the extent to which the USCIS has inappropriately issued Green Cards, (2) evaluate its actions to recover any inappropriately issued cards, and (3) assess its actions and plans to prevent similar incidents in the future. Improperly issued Green Cards pose significant risks and burdens for the DHS as Green Cards in the wrong hands may enable terrorists and illegal aliens to remain in the United States.

In the prior audit, the DHS OIG reported that the USCIS produced at least 19,000 cards that included incorrect information or were issues in duplicate, and the efforts to address issuance errors had been inadequate and efforts to recover inappropriately issued cards were not fully successful. The USCIS provides approximately 90 different types of immigration benefits and services, including lawful permanent residence.

In the follow-up audit, the DHS OIG recommended steps the USCIS should take to ensure the effective and efficient functioning of the Electronic Immigration System so as to avoid producing faulty Green Cards. In addition, the DHS OIG recommended steps for protecting the integrity of the Green Card so that unauthorized cards are made unusable. The USCIS Director concurred with all seven of the recommendations.

Summary Report on Audits of Security Controls for TSA Information Technology Systems at Airports (DHS)
OIG-17-14, December 30, 2016

The DHS OIG compiled a summary report based on its prior audits to address the effectiveness of the Transportation Security Administration’s (TSA) actions to implement improved information technology security policies at selected airports. These previous reports identified numerous deficiencies, such as inadequate physical security for TSA server rooms at airports, unpatched software, missing security documentation, and incomplete reporting of information technology costs, at these airports.

The DHS OIG audits examined three security control areas: (1) Operational Controls, which are mechanisms primarily implemented and executed by people; (2) Technical Controls, which are security controls executed by information systems; and (3) Management Controls, which are strategies for managing system security controls and system risk. The objective of the summary report was to determine whether reported operational, technical, and management security control vulnerabilities for TSA’s information technology systems have increased or decreased over time. The DHS OIG also sought to determine whether TSA’s actions to resolve the reported deficiencies have been effective and addressed underlying causes.
The summary report noted that 40 of the 56 original recommendations from the prior audits have been resolved and closed. The TSA is continuing to work to resolve all but one of the remaining 16 recommendations. The TSA disagreed with the recommendation regarding closed circuit TVs, including cameras, being placed in the screening area at JFK airport.

In the summary report, the DHS OIG made two additional recommendations. The first is for the TSA to upgrade its Business Impact Analyses and Security Technology Integrated Program. The second is that the TSA establish a plan to conduct recurring reviews of the operational, technical, and management security controls for its information technology systems at airports nationwide. The TSA concurred with both recommendations.

INVESTIGATIONS

The investigative components of the Lead IG agency, and their partner agencies, conduct investigative activity related to OIR. During the quarter, the Lead IG agencies used deployed investigators in Kuwait, Qatar, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and United Arab Emirates, as well as in Germany and Washington, D.C., to conduct these investigations.

These Lead IG agency components and representatives from the military criminal investigative organizations form the Fraud and Corruption Investigative Working Group. The Federal Bureau of Investigation is a collaborating agency.

The members of the Working Group coordinate and deconflict their investigations of fraud and corruption in OIR-related programs and operations. During the quarter, the representatives coordinated on 50 open investigations.

A consolidated look at the activities of these investigative components during this quarter can be found in the dashboard on the opposite page.

Investigative Activity

During the quarter, the Lead IG investigative components and the military investigative organizations initiated six new OIR-related investigations, involving allegations of procurement or program fraud, corruption, theft, and trafficking in persons. One investigation was closed during this period.

As of December 31, 2016, 50 investigations involving OIR-related programs and operations remained open. These investigations involved allegations of procurement, grant, and other program fraud; corruption involving U.S. Government officials; theft and diversion of Government funds or equipment; and other offenses, including trafficking in persons. These open investigations do not include “legacy cases” that DCIS and the DoS OIG special agents are continuing to pursue related to actions committed during Operation Iraqi Freedom and its immediate successor, Operation New Dawn.
ACTIVITY BY FRAUD AND CORRUPTION INVESTIGATIVE WORKING GROUP

OPERATION INHERENT RESOLVE
As of December 31, 2016

OPEN INVESTIGATIONS
50

FY 2017 RESULTS

Arrests —
Criminal Charges 2
Criminal Convictions —
Savings/Recoveries —
Suspensions/Debarments 1
Other Administrative 2

Q1 FY 2017 BRIEFINGS

No. of Briefings 13
No. of Attendees 402

* Some investigations are joint with more than one agency and some not joint with any other agency. Therefore, the total number of Joint Open Cases may not equal the total number of Open Cases, Open Cases as of Dec. 31, 2016. Note: Cumulative since Jan. 1, 2015.
DCIS Leads New Trafficking in Persons Initiative
In December 2016, DCIS published new policy guidance for all DCIS agents on the conduct of Trafficking in Persons investigations. The DCIS Trafficking in Persons Investigations Program is responsible for and addresses allegations of trafficking in persons that relate to or affect a DoD contract, subcontract (any tier), contractor, subcontractor (any tier), or a U.S. military installation. Trafficking in persons includes forced labor, involuntary servitude, debt bondage, document tampering, and sex trafficking. DCIS opened five Trafficking in Persons investigations this quarter.

Ongoing USAID OIG Investigation Yields More Results
The USAID OIG continued its investigation into bid rigging, collusion, bribery, and kickbacks between Turkish vendors and procurement staff from four NGOs in southeast Turkey. During the quarter, USAID debarred a procurement officer from one NGO and continued to suspend $239 million in program funds among three NGOs under investigation. A senior employee of another NGO resigned. USAID OIG continues to work this investigation jointly with the DoS OIG.

Fraud Awareness Briefings Continue
During this reporting period, each of the Lead IG investigative components and the military investigative organizations conducted fraud awareness briefings to educate individuals on the investigative mission and how to identify indications of fraud. In total, investigators led over 13 fraud awareness briefings attended by over 400 government, civilian, and military personnel; contractors; law enforcement personnel; and foreign officials. These briefings promote fraud awareness, help develop relationships, and uncover information about potential fraud and corruption in Government programs.

Of particular note, USAID OIG investigators conducted five of these briefings for USAID Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance employees responsible for implementing humanitarian programs globally. These briefings include best practice and fraud trend data gleaned from investigative and fraud prevention activities in Turkey and Jordan.
HOTLINE ACTIVITY

The OIGs’ hotlines provide a confidential, reliable means for individuals to report violations of law, rule or regulation; mismanagement; gross waste of funds; and abuse of authority for independent review.

Each Lead IG agency maintains its own hotline to receive complaints and contacts specific to its agency. Hotline representatives process the complaints they receive and refer these complaints to the appropriate entity in accordance with their respective protocols. Any hotline complaint that merits referral is sent to the responsible organization for investigation or informational purposes.

The DoD OIG has an investigator to coordinate the hotline contacts received among the Lead IG agencies and others as appropriate. During the reporting period, the investigator received and coordinated 75 contacts related to OIR and opened 140 cases, which were referred within the DoD OIG, to other Lead IG agencies, or to other investigative organizations. As noted in Figure 4, the majority of the complaints received during this quarter related to personal misconduct and other personal matters, criminal allegations, and procurement or contract administration irregularities.

Figure 4.
Hotline Activity
A U.S. Army M109A6 Paladin waits to be fired in support of day-one of the Iraqi security forces’ advance toward Mosul to retake the city from the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant at Qayyarah West, Iraq, Oct. 17, 2016. (U.S. Army photo)
ON GOING AND PLANNED OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

This section of the report discusses the ongoing Lead IG strategic planning process as well as ongoing and planned audit, inspection, and evaluation work. The ongoing and planned oversight projects, as of December 31, 2016, are listed in separate tables.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

As required by Section 8L of the Inspector General Act of 1978, the Lead IG must develop, update, and provide to Congress an annual joint strategic plan to guide comprehensive

Military Service Auditors General Have Long Served as Oversight Partners

Since 2005, the Military Service Auditors General, as members of the DoD oversight community, have conducted audits of military operations in theater. The U.S. Army Audit Agency, Naval Audit Service, and Air Force Audit Agency are continuing their work to contribute to the Lead IG oversight efforts.

The Air Force Audit Agency has deployed expeditionary audit teams bi-annually to Southwest Asia in support of U.S. Air Forces Central Command contingency operations. Over 300 Air Force Audit Agency auditors have deployed to Air Force and joint locations in Afghanistan, Iraq, Qatar, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates, Kyrgyzstan, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and Jordan, and issued 383 Air Force-wide and installation-level audit reports to help ensure Air Force commanders achieve operational effectiveness, and promote compliance and appropriate resource levels. These reports cover topics, such as asset management, contracting, requirements, logistics, readiness, security, and quality of life programs.

During FY 2017, the Air Force Audit Agency will conduct follow-on audits to verify that Air Force leaders implemented audit recommendations and close-out audits to determine if previous conditions still exist, if recommendations and internal controls are preventing a repeat of conditions, and if management realized any potential monetary benefits. The Air Force Audit Agency has three ongoing projects related to infrastructure planning, integrated defense, and consumable items. (See Ongoing Projects list, on page 96.)

The U.S. Army Audit Agency has deployed auditors to Afghanistan, Iraq, Kuwait and other countries located in Southwest Asia. Since June 2014, the Army Audit Agency has used an
oversight of programs and operations for each OCO. This effort includes reviewing and analyzing completed oversight, management, and other relevant reports to identify systemic problems, trends, lessons learned, and best practices to inform future oversight projects.

**FY 2017 Plan Issued**

During the last 6 months of FY 2016, Lead IG representatives coordinated with partner oversight agencies to examine major oversight areas, identify oversight gaps, and decide how to allocate oversight resources to identified oversight priorities. These representatives considered many factors to identify the relevant strategic oversight objectives, including Coalition objectives; congressional appropriations that support military, diplomatic, and humanitarian activities; major departmental management expeditionary team structure, which allows Army Audit Agency staff to conduct requested work by deployed Commanders in the logistics, contracting, financial management, property accountability, and readiness areas.

To support OIR, the Army Audit Agency completed two audits in FY 2016 on the Syrian Train and Equip Program. One audit examined DoD’s controls and processes over funding used to support vetted Syrian opposition forces and the other audit looked at the accountability and reporting of equipment used to support these vetted opposition forces. In FY 2017, the Army Audit Agency is planning to audit the financial accuracy and timeliness of OIR financial data (obligations and disbursements) that supports the Cost of War Report. (See Planned Projects list, on page 101.)

The Naval Audit Service has been conducting audits of naval operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, Kuwait and other countries located in Southwest Asia, in various functional areas, such as logistics, financial management, property accountability, and readiness. For example, the Naval Audit Service issued an audit in April 2015 on the Navy’s real property inventory, which identified that the Navy’s Class 2 real property records were inaccurate and incomplete. In May 2016, the Naval Audit Service completed a report on the Navy’s overseas suitability screening and civilian overseas processing programs, which concluded that the programs were not being monitored properly.

During FY 2017, the Naval Audit Service is planning an audit of the Department of the Navy’s obligations and disbursements supporting OCOs, including OIR. (See Planned Projects list, on page 101.)
challenges in each agency; and feedback from departmental and congressional stakeholders. In the planning process, the representatives considered the practical challenges that conducting oversight of an overseas contingency operation presents to both oversight agencies and implementing agencies, including the limited size of the U.S. footprint, the dynamic nature of the conflict, the security situation, and the availability of transportation into and within the theater.


The FY 2017 Joint Strategic Oversight Plan organized OIR-related oversight projects into five strategic oversight areas:

1. Contracts and Grants
2. Operations
3. Governance
4. Humanitarian Assistance
5. Intelligence

FY 2018 Planning Began

On November 17, 2016, the DoD OIG convened a summit of Lead IG agency representatives to begin FY 2018 comprehensive joint strategic planning for OIR. The Lead IG welcomed the representatives to the summit and emphasized the challenges involved in coordinating a multi-agency effort and the importance of Lead IG oversight of OIR. During the summit, the representatives shared their Lead IG agencies’ oversight planning processes and began a discussion to identify the strategic oversight areas necessary for FY 2018 oversight planning. Part of this discussion involved exploring whether the current strategic oversight areas are appropriate for FY 2018 and possibilities for complementary projects. The Lead IG representatives will continue meeting over the next few months to decide on the FY 2018 strategic oversight areas and begin planning projects consistent with these areas.
ONGOING PROJECTS

As of December 31, 2016, the Lead IG agencies and their partner agencies have 29 ongoing projects directly related to OIR. Figure 5 describes the ongoing projects by strategic oversight area. The discussion that follows highlights some of the ongoing projects by the five strategic areas. Table 10 lists the project title and objective for each of these projects.

• **Contracts and Grants:** The DoD OIG has three ongoing projects examining the Army’s heavy lift contracts, contracts supporting web-based military information support operations, and contractor performance in support of facilities in Kuwait. The DoS OIG is conducting two audits related to contractor oversight in Iraq and Afghanistan. USAID OIG is auditing selected obligations and costs incurred related to USAID’s humanitarian assistance in Syria and neighboring countries.

• **Operations:** Over half of the 29 ongoing projects this quarter are related to operations. The DoD OIG projects are assessing the U.S. and Coalition train, advise, assist, and equip activities and acquisition cross servicing agreements. The DoS OIG is inspecting the Middle East Broadcasting Networks and auditing the visa applicant terrorist screening efforts. The GAO has five ongoing projects examining the Iraq and Syria train and equip programs, U.S. military enabler support efforts, refugee screening, and use of OCO funds. The Air Force Audit Agency has three ongoing projects evaluating infrastructure planning, integrated defense, and consumable item demilitarization at its facilities in the region. The Army Audit Agency is auditing overtime pay and entitlements for deployed civilians.

• **Governance:** The DoS OIG is auditing the Tunisia emergency action plan and the armored vehicle program, both of which support DoS governance operations in OCO environments.

• **Humanitarian Assistance:** The DoS OIG is auditing the overall programs and operations of the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, which supports humanitarian relief around the world, including areas affected by ISIL. USAID OIG is conducting an audit of the agency’s basic education program in Lebanon, which has been greatly strained by the inflow of Syrian refugee children.

• **Intelligence:** The DoD OIG has three ongoing intelligence-related projects. One project involves allegations that USCENTCOM senior intelligence officials falsified, distorted, suppressed, or delayed intelligence products and the other two projects relate to DoD’s intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capability in support of OIR.
Table 10.
Ongoing Oversight Projects, as of 12/31/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARMY AUDIT AGENCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of Overtime Pay and Entitlements for Deployed Civilians</td>
<td>To verify that overtime was effectively managed and downrange entitlements (including danger and post differential pay) were accurately paid to civilians deployed in support of OIR and Operation Freedom’s Sentinel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIR FORCE AUDIT AGENCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFCENT AOR Installation Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>To determine whether implementation plans for installation, development, and sustainment adequately address mission requirements. Specifically, to determine whether personnel accurately identify and plan civil engineering infrastructure and sustainment support to meet combatant commanders’ requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFCENT AOR Integrated Defense</td>
<td>To determine whether Air Force personnel effectively planned and executed integrated defense at U.S. Air Force central locations. Specifically, to determine if personnel properly identified critical assets, assessed risks, implemented security plans, and tested mitigation strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumable Item Demilitarization</td>
<td>To determine whether Air Force personnel properly disposed of consumable parts requiring demilitarization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of ISR Capability Allocation Process for OIR</td>
<td>To evaluate if decisions on ISR capability allocations for OIR were supported by a comprehensive cost-benefit assessment of USCENTCOM’s priority intelligence and cost-benefit analysis tools used in the capability generation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Airborne ISR Processing, Exploitation, and Dissemination for OIR</td>
<td>To evaluate whether the Combined Joint Task Force-OIR Commander’s intelligence requirements are being satisfied by the current airborne ISR processing, exploitation, and dissemination process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of U.S. and Coalition Plans/Efforts to Train, Advise, Assist, and Equip Iraqi Counterterrorism Service and the Iraqi Special Operations Forces</td>
<td>To assess U.S. and Coalition efforts to train, advise, assist, and equip the Iraqi Counter terrorism Services and the Iraqi Special Operations Forces in support of operations against ISIL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of Controls over Kuwait Base Operations Support Services</td>
<td>To determine whether the U.S. Army Contracting Command developed adequate controls to effectively monitor contractor performance for the Kuwait Base Operations Support Services contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of the Syria Train and Equip Program (Phase II)</strong></td>
<td>To evaluate and determine Special Operations Joint Task Force-Operation Inherent Resolve compliance with legal mandates for appropriately vetting Syrian nationals being supported under the Syria Train and Equip Program; and evaluate the Special Operations Joint Task Force-Operation Inherent Resolve processes and procedures for recruiting, processing, training, equipping, and supporting forces authorized for support in the fight against ISIL in Syria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of Contracts Supporting Web-Based Military Information Support Operations</strong></td>
<td>To determine whether DoD Components provided proper oversight for contracts supporting web-based Military Information Support Operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of DoD Procedures for Securing Iraq Train and Equip Fund Equipment</strong></td>
<td>To determine whether DoD has effective procedures for securing Iraq Train and Equip Fund equipment in Kuwait and Iraq. This project is one in a series of audits on property accountability in Kuwait and Iraq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of Oversight of the Army Heavy Lift Contracts</strong></td>
<td>To determine whether the Army properly managed the requirements of the contracts for Heavy Lift VII transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of the DoD Acquisition Cross Servicing Agreements</strong></td>
<td>To determine whether U.S. Africa Command is effectively managing acquisition cross servicing agreement transactions for logistics, supplies, and services to support OIR and other operations in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investigation Relating to USCENTCOM (OIR) Intelligence Products</strong></td>
<td>To address allegations that USCENTCOM senior intelligence officials falsified, distorted, suppressed, or delayed intelligence products regarding USCENTCOM’s efforts to degrade and destroy ISIL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection of the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration</strong></td>
<td>To inspect the overall programs and operations of the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, which funds and supports humanitarian assistance efforts throughout the world, including the current humanitarian efforts focused on the Iraq and Syria crises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection of the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Inc.</strong></td>
<td>To review obligations, expenditures, and program goals for OCO funds appropriated to the Broadcasting Board of Governors and allotted to Middle East Broadcasting Networks, which broadcasts throughout the Middle East, including into Iraq and Syria, and includes countering violent extremism programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of Contracting Officer Representatives’ Responsibility for Overseeing Invoices for Overseas Contingency Operations Contracts</strong></td>
<td>To determine if Contract Officers’ Representatives were adequately overseeing invoices for contracts carried out in Iraq and Afghanistan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of All Native, Inc.</strong></td>
<td>To determine the extent to which 1) the Bureau of Administration, Office of Logistics Management, Office of Acquisitions Management is managing and overseeing contracted foreign assistance support in Iraq in accordance with Federal and DoS regulations and guidelines; and 2) the contractor, All Native, Inc., is complying with contract terms, conditions, and invoice requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of Department of State Visa Applicant Terrorist Screening Efforts</strong></td>
<td>To determine whether the DoS is 1) obtaining terrorism-related information, 2) reporting that information for watch-listing purposes, and 3) properly screening visa applicants for ties to terrorism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of Tunisia Emergency Action Plan</strong></td>
<td>To determine whether U.S. Mission Tunisia had comprehensive, up-to-date, and adequately tested Emergency Action Plans. The U.S. Mission in Tunisia provides direct and indirect support to U.S. personnel conducting activities in support of OIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of the Bureau of Diplomatic Security’s Administration of the Armored Vehicle Program</strong></td>
<td>To determine whether the Bureau of Diplomatic Security is administering the armored vehicle program in accordance with DoS policy and guidelines, and whether overseas posts obtain, use, and dispose of armored vehicles in accordance with applicable policy and guidelines. A large percentage of DoS armored vehicles are procured for and deployed to OCO environments, including Iraq and Afghanistan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugee Screening Process</strong></td>
<td>To determine 1) what the data indicates about the characteristics of refugee resettlement applications to the United States; 2) how the DHS determines admissibility for refugees seeking resettlement in the United States; 3) to what extent the DHS and DoS have implemented policies and procedures for conducting security checks of applicants for refugee resettlement; and 4) how, if at all, the DHS and DoS coordinate with other U.S. agencies in conducting such security checks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Efforts to Train and Equip Iraqi Security Forces</strong></td>
<td>To understand the U.S. Government plans for training and equipping the Iraqi Security Forces; the extent to which U.S. funds have been allocated, committed, and disbursed for training and equipping the Iraqi Security Forces; and the progress made in implementing the U.S. plans to train and equip the Iraqi Security Forces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DoD’s Use of Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) Funds</strong></td>
<td>To determine 1) the amount of obligated war funds DOD has authorized or appropriated with the OCO/Global War on Terror or emergency designation and the extent to which DOD has identified and reported these obligations; 2) the extent to which Congress has appropriated war funds for non-war purposes; 3) the extent to which DOD has applied the Office of Management and Budget or other criteria in identifying costs for inclusion in its war funding requests, and (4) the extent to which DOD has established and implemented guidance and a plan with milestones for transitioning enduring OCO costs to its base budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Title | Objective
---|---
**U.S. Military Enabler Support within Operation Inherent Resolve** | To evaluate how 1) U.S. military enablers support coalition airstrikes, 2) enabler resource allocation decisions are made within Operation Inherent Resolve, 3) the United States determines the types of enabler support to provide, and 4) the United States ensures that groups, such as Iranian-backed Shia militias or Iranian military forces, do not benefit from U.S. military enabler support.

**Accountability of Iraq Train and Equip Fund (ITEF)-funded Equipment** | To determine 1) DoD’s policies, procedures, and processes for tracking ITEF-funded equipment, and 2) to what extent DoD is using recommended systems to track ITEF-funded equipment from procurement through delivery to Iraqi Security Forces.

**U. S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

**Audit of USAID/Lebanon’s Quality Instruction Toward Access and Basic Education Improvement** | To determine 1) what actions USAID’s Lebanon’s Quality Instruction Toward Access and Basic Education Improvement program has taken to overcome the challenges related to expanding equitable access and improving learning outcomes for early learners in Lebanon’s public schools; and 2) the most appropriate actions to take to alleviate strains to Lebanon’s education system, including strains from the continuing inflow of Syrian refugee children.

**Audit of USAID/Jordan’s Community Engagement Project** | To determine if USAID’s Jordan’s Community Engagement Project was achieving its goal of strengthening community engagement in the context of regional volatility and transition.

**Audit of Selected Obligations and Costs Incurred Under USAID’s Overseas Contingency Operations Relating to USAID’s Humanitarian Assistance in Syria and Neighboring Countries** | To determine whether 1) USAID awarded, obligated, modified, monitored, and reported funds according to established requirements and 2) the costs incurred were supported, allowable, allocable, and reasonable in accordance with established requirements and award provisions.

**Other Ongoing OIR-Related Projects**

The DHS OIG has 11 ongoing and planned projects examining programs and activities to protect the homeland against terrorist activities. While DHS OIG efforts are focused more broadly, many of these DHS OIG projects relate to the U.S. efforts to counter ISIL.

Similarly, the Department of Justice (DOJ) OIG is currently conducting four projects that are assessing the DOJ’s overall counterterrorism and national security efforts, which contribute to efforts to protect the homeland and may include efforts to counter ISIL as a part of an expansive counterterrorism effort.

Appendix D provides a listing of the DHS and DOJ OIG efforts, including the project title and objectives.
PLANNED PROJECTS

Lead IG agencies and partners are planning to start 22 oversight projects related to OIR during FY 2017. Figure 6 describes the planned projects by strategic oversight area. The discussion that follows highlights some of these planned projects by the five strategic areas. Table 11 lists the project title and objective for each of these projects.

- **Contracts and Grants:** The DoS OIG plans to audit fuel acquisition and distribution at facilities in Jordan that directly support OIR. The DoD OIG plans to conduct an audit of the Defense Logistics Agency’s disposition of equipment at facilities in Kuwait.

- **Operations:** Ten of the 22 planned projects relate to operations. The DoD OIG planned to conduct six of these projects, including inspections of military facilities in Iraq and the UAE that support the OIR mission; an assessment of U.S. efforts to train, advise, assist, and equip the Iraq Federal Police; and audits of operational contracting support integration, the Army’s emergency management program in Kuwait, and counternarcotic activities. The DoS OIG plans to audit food operations at Embassy Baghdad and conduct a follow-on review of the explosive detective dog program in Iraq. The Naval Audit Service is planning a project to verify that the Navy’s obligations and disbursements in support of OCO are in compliance with applicable laws and regulations, and the Army Audit Agency is planning to conduct a similar project related to the Army.

- **Governance:** The DoS OIG is planning an audit of contracts within the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, including humanitarian support for Syrian refugees in Turkey and Europe. The DoD OIG will assess whether the DoD and DoS effectively planned and coordinated stabilization effort in Iraq and Syria.

- **Humanitarian Assistance:** USAID OIG is planning three audits related to humanitarian assistance that will address different aspects of oversight during humanitarian crises, including those related to OIR. The DoS OIG will audit controls on U.S. funds supporting internally displaced persons in Iraq.

- **Intelligence:** The DoD OIG is planning four projects to examine the use of biometric enabled intelligence, geospatial intelligence collection, social media exploitation, and implementation of recommendations from prior OIG intelligence evaluations in support of OIR.
### Table 11.
Planned Oversight Projects, as of 12/31/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARMY AUDIT AGENCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Army’s Reporting of Obligations and Expenditures for Operation Inherent Resolve</td>
<td>To verify the accuracy of the Army’s obligations and disbursements reported in the Cost of War report for Operation Inherent Resolve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of Controls Over the Disposition of Equipment at the Defense Logistics Agency Disposition Services in Kuwait</td>
<td>To determine whether Defense Logistics Agency Disposition Services is properly disposing of equipment at Camp Arifjan in Kuwait.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report of Recommendations from OCO Intel Evaluations</td>
<td>To determine if recommendations from DoD OIG intelligence evaluations affecting OIR and OFS have been implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Social Media Exploitation for OIR</td>
<td>To determine whether DoD is effectively employing social media analytics in support of OIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of DoD Biometric Enabled Intel Ops for OIR</td>
<td>To determine whether Biometric Enabled Intelligence effectively supports the OIR Commander’s requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of U.S. and Coalition Train, Advise, Assist and Equip Support to the Iraqi Federal Police</td>
<td>To assess U.S. and Coalition efforts to train, advise, assist, and equip the Iraq Federal Police in support of operations against ISIL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Facilities Inspection - Iraq</td>
<td>To determine whether U.S. military-occupied facilities supporting OCO operations comply with DoD health and safety policies and standards regarding electrical and fire protection systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Facilities Inspection - Al Dhafra, UAE</td>
<td>To determine whether U.S. military-occupied facilities supporting OCO operations comply with DoD health and safety policies and standards regarding electrical and fire protection systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the DoD Plan for Reconstruction and Stabilization in Iraq</td>
<td>To determine whether the DoD and DoS effectively planned and coordinated for stabilization efforts in Iraq and Syria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Compartmented Geospatial Intelligence Collection for OIR Intelligence Requirements</td>
<td>To determine whether compartmented geospatial intelligence collection is being effectively used to satisfy existing collection gaps in OIR intelligence requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of DoD Components’ Integration of Operational Contracting Support</td>
<td>To determine whether the Combatant Commands effectively integrated operational contracting support into ongoing operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Army’s Emergency Management Program in Kuwait</td>
<td>To determine whether the DoD established and maintained a comprehensive emergency management program for Army installations in Kuwait.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of U.S. Central Command and U.S Africa Command Counternarcotic Activities</td>
<td>To determine whether U.S. Central Command and U.S. Africa Command effectively provided oversight for counternarcotic activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF STATE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of Selected Contract and Grants within the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs</strong></td>
<td>This audit will focus on the administration and oversight of contracts within the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs. The OCO aspect of this audit will be humanitarian support to Syrian refugees in Turkey and/or Europe and grants/contracts supporting security screening of refugees and other travelers coming to the United States via Europe. This is one in a series of audits related to DoS's administration of contracts and grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons in Iraq</strong></td>
<td>To determine whether the Bureau of Population, Migration, and Refugees has effective controls to ensure that U.S. funds provided for internally displaced persons in Iraq are used for their intended purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of Baghdad Life Support Services Food Operations</strong></td>
<td>This audit will focus on risk areas in food operations, such as cost and food handling and safety at Embassy Baghdad, Iraq, and compare contract requirements to Federal Acquisition Regulations and the Foreign Affairs Manual and Foreign Affairs Handbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-Up Review of Explosive Detection Dogs in Iraq and Afghanistan</strong></td>
<td>To follow up on the DoS OIG recommendations made in a 2010 report where the OIG found that the Bureau of Diplomatic Security could not verify the detection abilities of its explosive detection canines under three programs: the Baghdad Embassy Security Force, the Kabul Embassy Security Force, and Personal Protective Services in Kabul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of Jordan Fuel Acquisition and Distribution</strong></td>
<td>To determine whether 1) fuel acquisition, storage, and distribution are performed in accordance with contract terms and Federal regulations, and 2) the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs is adhering to policies and procedures to ensure the safety and security of Post personnel. This audit is one in a series of audits designed to assess the oversight of DoS fuel operations at locations directly supporting OIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAVAL AUDIT SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of the Navy Overseas Contingency Operations</strong></td>
<td>To verify that the Department of the Navy's obligations and disbursements supporting overseas contingency operations are in compliance with applicable laws and regulations, and that internal controls were in place and functioning as intended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-up Audit of USAID Humanitarian Assistance Implementers Under</strong></td>
<td>To examine 1) what oversight USAID performs, 2) what improvements were made to implementer policies and procedures in response to agency demands, and 3) whether findings are potentially problematic in other implementer programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investigation to Assess Oversight and Review Agency and Implementer</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of USAID’s Funding Decisions and Oversight of Public</strong></td>
<td>To determine 1) what assessment of risk USAID offices are conducting before awarding funds to public international organizations, 2) how the risks associated with awards to these organizations are mitigated, 3) how public international organization programs and funds are overseen by USAID offices, and 4) to what extent vulnerabilities exist within USAID’s assistance provided to the organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Organizations for Humanitarian Disasters</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of the USAID Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and</strong></td>
<td>To examine the roles of the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance and its independent offices in conducting oversight and their effectiveness at monitoring and addressing program implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanitarian Assistance’s Oversight During a Humanitarian Crisis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX A:
Methodology for Preparing Lead IG Quarterly Report

This report is issued pursuant to sections 2, 4, and 8L of the Inspector General Act of 1978, which requires that the designated Lead IG provide a quarterly report, available to the public, on an overseas contingency operation. The DoD Inspector General is the designated Lead Inspector General for OIR. The DoS Inspector General is the Associate Lead Inspector General for the operation. This report contains information from the three Lead IG agencies—DoD, DoS, and USAID—as well as from partner oversight agencies. This unclassified report covers the period from October 1 through December 31, 2016.

To fulfill its congressional mandate to produce a quarterly report on OIR, the Lead IG gathers data and information from federal agencies and open sources. All data and information used in this report are attributed to their source in endnotes to the text or notes to the tables and figures. Except for references to Lead IG and oversight partner agency audits, inspections, evaluations, or investigations in the report, the Lead IG has not independently verified and assessed all the data included in this report.

Data Call
Each quarter, the Lead IG agencies direct a series of questions, or data calls, to federal agencies about their programs and operations related to OIR. The Lead IG agencies use the information provided by their respective agencies for quarterly reports and to determine where to conduct future audits and evaluations.

The agencies that responded to the data call for this quarter included the following:

- Department of Defense
- Department of State
- U.S. Agency for International Development
- Department of Homeland Security OIG
- Department of Justice OIG
- Department of the Treasury OIG

Open-Source Research
This report also draws on current, publicly available information from reputable sources. Sources used in this report include the following:

- Information publicly released by U.S. agencies
- Congressional testimonies
- Press conferences, especially DoD and DoS Briefings
- United Nations (and relevant branches)
- Reports issued by non-governmental or research organizations
- Media reports

Materials collected through open source research provide information to describe the status of the operation, and help the Lead IG agencies assess information provided in their respective agency data call. However, in light of the operational realities and dynamic nature of OIR, the Lead IG agencies have limited time and ability to test, verify, and independently assess the assertions made by these agencies or open sources. This is particularly true where the Lead IG agencies have not yet provided oversight of these assertions through audits, inspections, or evaluations.

**Report Production**

The Lead IG is responsible for assembling and producing this report. The DoD OIG coordinates with the DoS OIG and the USAID OIG, which draft sections of the report related to the activities of their agencies. Every Lead IG agency participates in reviewing and editing the entire quarterly report.

The Lead IG provides the agencies who have responded to the data call with two opportunities to verify and comment on the content of the report. During the first review, the Lead IG asks agencies to correct any inaccuracies and provide additional documentation. The Lead IG incorporates agency comments, where appropriate, and sends the report back to the agencies for a final review. Each OIG coordinates the review process with its own agency.
# APPENDIX B:
## Lead Inspector General Statutory Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 8L, Inspector General Act of 1978, as Amended</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appoint, from among the offices of the other Inspectors General specified in subsection (c), an Inspector General to act as associate Inspector General for the contingency operation who shall act in a coordinating role to assist the lead Inspector General in the discharge of responsibilities under this subsection.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and carry out, in coordination with the offices of the other Inspectors General specified in subsection (c) a joint strategic plan to conduct comprehensive oversight over all aspects of the contingency operation and to ensure through either joint or individual audits, inspections, and investigations, independent and effective oversight of all programs and operations of the Federal government in support of the contingency operation.</td>
<td>75-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and ascertain the accuracy of information provided by Federal agencies relating to obligations and expenditures, costs of programs and projects, accountability of funds, and the award and execution of major contracts, grants, and agreements in support of the contingency operation.</td>
<td>17-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ, or authorize the employment by the other Inspectors General specified in subsection (c), on a temporary basis using the authorities in section 3161 of title 5, United States Code, such auditors, investigators, and other personnel as the lead Inspector General considers appropriate to assist the lead Inspector General and such other Inspectors General on matters relating to the contingency operation.</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit to Congress on a biannual basis, and to make available on an Internet website available to the public, a report on the activities of the lead Inspector General and the other Inspectors General specified in subsection (c) with respect to the contingency operation, including:</td>
<td>1-127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status and results of investigations, inspections, and audits and of referrals to the Department of Justice; and</td>
<td>10-11;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall plans for the review of the contingency operation by inspectors general, including plans for investigations, inspections, and audits.</td>
<td>75-90; 91-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit to Congress on a quarterly basis, and to make available on an Internet website available to the public, a report on the contingency operation.</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The Inspectors General specified in subsection (c) are the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, Inspector General of the Department of State, and the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development.
APPENDIX C: Departments of the Treasury, State and Justice Support for Line of Effort: Protecting the Homeland

Treasury Sanctions Senior ISIL Financier and Two Currency Exchange Businesses

On December 13, 2016, Treasury took action to disrupt ISIL’s financial facilitation network by designating Iraq-based Selselat al Thahab Money Exchange, ISIL financier Fawaz Muhammad Jubayr al-Rawi, and his company, the Hanifa Currency Exchange in Albu Kamal, Syria, pursuant to Executive Order 13224, which targets terrorists and those providing support to terrorists or acts of terrorism. Al-Rawi and the two money services businesses have played an important role in ISIL’s financial operations by helping the terrorist group move its money. As a result of this action, all property and interests in property of Selselat al Thahab, al-Rawi, and the Hanifa Currency Exchange’s branch in Albu Kamal subject to U.S. jurisdiction are blocked, and U.S. persons are generally prohibited from engaging in transactions with them.

In a related action, the Iraqi government took steps under its domestic authorities to bar al-Rawi and the two money services businesses from accessing the Iraqi financial system and freeze any assets they may have subject to Iraq’s jurisdiction. Furthermore, Iraqi authorities, with the support of Treasury, are implementing a stronger anti-money laundering and counter terrorist financing regime, which has enhanced Iraq’s ability to protect its financial system from exploitation by terrorist groups such as ISIL.

According to Treasury, as of April 2016, al Thahab was facilitating the movement of funds on behalf of ISIL. From early 2015 to early 2016, it received financial transfers amounting to millions of U.S. dollars from various Kirkuk-based financial institutions. In many cases, these transfers were received into accounts belonging to an ISIL financier’s company. Between April 2015 and March 2016, it conducted over 100 financial transfers into ISIL territory.

Al-Rawi was designated for providing financial, material, or technological support to ISIL. As of May 2016, al-Rawi was a senior ISIL financier who owned and operated Hanifa Currency Exchange’s Albu Kamal branch near his residence in Albu Kamal, Syria. This money exchange business was used exclusively for ISIL-related transactions. Additionally, as of spring 2016, al-Rawi stored large amounts of cash for ISIL in Albu Kamal.

The Hanifa Currency Exchange branch in Albu Kamal, Syria, was designated for being owned or controlled by al-Rawi. When ISIL took control of Albu Kamal in 2014, the terrorist group conducted weapons and ammunition deals with the help of al-Rawi and the branch of Hanifa Currency Exchange in Albu Kamal.1

State Sanctions ISIL Facilitators

During the quarter, the DoS designated three ISIL external operations officials as Specially Designated Global Terrorists: Abdullah Ahmed al-Meshedani, Basil Hassan, and Abdelilah Himich. These designations carry similar financial sanctions.2
Al Nusra Front Also Sanctioned

On November 10, 2016, in coordination with the DoS, Treasury designated four al Nusra Front leaders under Executive Order 13224: Abdallah Muhammad Bin-Sulayman al-Muhaysini, Jamal Husayn Zayniyah, Abdul Jashari, and Ashraf Ahmad Fari al-Allak. At the same time, the DoS amended its terrorist organization designation of al Nusra to include Jabhat Fateh al-Sham as an alias.3

Justice Prosecutes Individuals With Alleged Links to Terrorism

Since 2013, Federal prosecutors have publicly charged approximately 120 individuals for Foreign Terrorist Fighter (FTF), Homegrown Violent Extremist (HVE), or ISIL-related conduct. This number includes approximately 85 FTF-related cases and approximately 30 HVE-related cases to date. Among recent cases: 4

- On October 28, in the Northern District of Indiana, Marlonn Hicks pleaded guilty to distributing information regarding the manufacture and use of explosives, intending that that such information be used for, or in furtherance of, an activity that constitutes a federal crime of violence, in violation of 18 § U.S.C. 842(p)(2)(A). According to documents in this case, Hicks communicated online with multiple individuals who were cooperating with the government. During these communications, Hicks expressed a desire to travel to territory under the control of ISIL. On June 21, 2016, Hicks discussed his desire to conduct simultaneous attacks in different cities. During this conversation, Hicks sent a cooperating witness two manuals, which contained instructions on the manufacturing of homemade and improvised explosives devices; sections such as “homemade poisons,” “chemical poisons,” “poisonous elements,” and “poisonous gases;” and instructions for mixing or manufacturing poisons and estimates of lethal doses.

- On October 17, in the Southern District of Texas, Omar Faraj Saeed Al Hardan, 24, a Palestinian born in Iraq, pleaded guilty to attempting to provide material support and resources to a designated foreign terrorist organization, ISIL, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2339B. He faces a maximum sentence of 20 years’ imprisonment. Al Hardan had been charged with this offense in a January 6, 2016, indictment, along with unlawful procurement of citizenship or naturalization, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1425; and making false statements, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001. Al Hardan entered a guilty plea to the charge that he attempted to provide material support and resources, including training, expert advice and assistance, and personnel – specifically himself – to ISIL. The indictment also alleged that Al Hardan knowingly and falsely swore on his citizenship application that he was not associated with a terrorist organization, and falsely stated in a Federal interview that he had not received any type of weapons training.
APPENDIX D:
Ongoing DHS and DoJ OIG Oversight Programs Related to Efforts to Counter ISIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Review on Domestic Sharing of Counterterrorism Information</td>
<td>To determine 1) how DHS component representatives contribute to the counterterrorism mission of field-based entities such as fusion centers; 2) what requirements DHS places on fusion centers receiving funding for counterterrorism activities; 3) DHS’ process for sharing counterterrorism information with field-based entities; 4) how DHS components receive and process counterterrorism information from field-based entities; and 5) how DHS ensures the proper safeguarding of its shared counterterrorism information with field-based entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS’ Use of Force</td>
<td>To determine if DHS and its components have controls to minimize risk of improper use of force by law enforcement officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Air Marshal Service’s Oversight of Civil Aviation Security</td>
<td>To determine whether the Federal Air Marshal Service adequately manages its resources to detect, deter, and defeat threats to the civil aviation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE’s Screening of Aliens from Specially Designated Countries</td>
<td>To determine whether Immigration and Customs Enforcement ensures the proper screening of aliens from specially designated countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Security Update</td>
<td>To conduct research and analysis of completed reports and studies to evaluate the U.S. Customs and Border Protection actions taken in response to the 1993 Sandia National Laboratory study, Systematic Analysis of the Southwest Border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Air Marshals Service’s Policies and Procedures Covering Employee Misconduct and Misuse of Government Resources</td>
<td>To determine whether the Transportation Security Administration has policies and procedures in place to identify and address employee misconduct and misuse of government resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Stonegarden Grants</td>
<td>To determine whether the Federal Emergency Management Agency and U.S. Customs and Border Protection have sufficient oversight of Operation Stonegarden grants to ensure that the awarded funds are properly administered and spent effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS Joint Task Forces</td>
<td>To determine if the Joint Task Force framework is designed to effectively coordinate the assets and personnel of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Coast Guard, and other resources of the Department; and is the Joint Task Force achieving expected results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Security Administration Carry-On Baggage Penetration Testing</strong></td>
<td>To determine the effectiveness of Transportation Security Administration's carry-on baggage screening technologies and checkpoint screener performance in identifying and resolving potential security threats at airport security checkpoints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of IT Security Controls over Cargo Areas at Airports and Ports</strong></td>
<td>To determine how DHS has implemented computer security controls for their systems in the cargo areas at DHS airports and ports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit of DHS' Oversight of Cruise Ship Passenger and Baggage Screening</strong></td>
<td>To determine whether DHS provides effective oversight of cruise ship passenger/crewmember and baggage/cargo security screening, and how DHS assesses and mitigates risks posed by terrorists to cruise ships operating out of U.S. ports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DoJ's Handling of Known or Suspected Terrorists Admitted into the Federal Witness Security Program</strong></td>
<td>To review the DoJ's handling of known or suspected terrorists admitted into the program, practices for watch-listing and processing encounters with this group of program participants, and procedures for mitigating risks to the public through restrictions placed on this high-risk group of program participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Bureau of Investigation's Efforts to Protect Seaports and Maritime Activity</strong></td>
<td>To review the FBI's roles and responsibilities for 1) assessing maritime terrorism threats, 2) preventing and responding to maritime terrorist incidents, and 3) coordinating with the DHS components to ensure seaport security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Review on Domestic Sharing of Counterterrorism Information</strong></td>
<td>To 1) identify and examine the federally supported field-based intelligence entities engaged in counterterrorism information-sharing to determine their overall missions, specific functions, capabilities, funding, and personnel and facility costs; 2) determine whether counterterrorism information is being adequately and appropriately shared with all participating agencies; and 3) identify any gaps and/or duplication of effort among the entities. The Inspectors General of the Intelligence Community, DoJ, and DHS initiated a coordinated, joint review focusing on domestic sharing of counterterrorism information in response to a congressional request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bulk Telephony Review</strong></td>
<td>To review the FBI's use of information derived from the National Security Agency's (NSA) collection of telephony metadata obtained from certain telecommunications service providers under Section 215 of the Patriot Act. The review will examine the FBI’s procedures for receiving, processing, and disseminating leads that the NSA develops from the metadata, and any changes that have been made to these procedures over time; how FBI field offices respond to leads, including the scope and type of information that field offices collect as a result of any investigative activity that is initiated; and the role the leads have had in FBI counterterrorism efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Acronyms and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBP U.S. Customs and Border Patrol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTCOM U.S. Central Command</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJTF-OIR Combines Joint Task Force-Operation Inherent Resolve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCIS Defense Criminal Investigative Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS U.S. Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD Department of Defense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD OIG Department of Defense Office of Inspector General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoJ U.S. Department of Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoS U.S. Department of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoS OIG U.S. Department of State Office of Inspector General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFES Funding Facility for Expanded Stabilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFIS Funding Facility for Immediate Stabilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFP U.S. Agency for International Development, Office of Food for Peace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTF Foreign Terrorist Fighter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY Fiscal Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO Government Accountability Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVE Homegrown Violent Extremist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP Internally Displaced Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IED Improvised Explosive Device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG Inspector General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISF Iraq Security Forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISIL Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRG Kurdistan Regional Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead IG Lead Inspector General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead IG agencies Refers to the DoD OIG, DoS OIG, and USAID OIG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANPAD Man-portable-air-defense system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDAA National Defense Authorization Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Non-governmental organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCO Overseas Contingency Operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFS Operation Freedom's Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIR Operation Inherent Resolve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTEMPO Operational tempo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM Department of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM Surface-to-air missile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury U.S. Department of the Treasury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSA Transportation Security Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN United Nations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID United States Agency of International Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID OIG U.S. Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCIS U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBIED Vehicle-borne-Improvised Explosive Device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPG Syrian Kurdish People's Protection Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Department of Treasury response to a Lead IG request for information, 1/6/2017.

*Iraqi security forces soldiers disassemble their M-16A2 rifles during a class on weapons maintenance at the Besmaya Range Complex, Iraq, Nov. 13, 2016. (U.S. Army photo)*
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