

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY





INSPECTOR GENERAL

U.S. Department of Defense

FEBRUARY 4, 2015

USSOCOM Needs to Consistently Follow Guidance to Revalidate Capability Requirements and Maintain Supporting Documentation for Special Operations-Peculiar Programs



INTEGRITY * EFFICIENCY * ACCOUNTABILITY * EXCELLENCE

Follow Guidance to Revalidate Capability Requirements and Maintain Supporting

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTEGRITY ★ EFFICIENCY ★ ACCOUNTABILITY ★ EXCELLENCE

Mission

Our mission is to provide independent, relevant, and timely oversight of the Department of Defense that supports the warfighter; promotes accountability, integrity, and efficiency; advises the Secretary of Defense and Congress; and informs the public.


Vision

Our vision is to be a model oversight organization in the Federal Government by leading change, speaking truth, and promoting excellence—a diverse organization, working together as one professional team, recognized as leaders in our field.



Fraud, Waste & Abuse
HOTLINE
Department of Defense
dodig.mil/hotline | 800.424.9098

For more information about whistleblower protection, please see the inside back cover.



Results in Brief

USSOCOM Needs to Consistently Follow Guidance to Revalidate Capability Requirements and Maintain Supporting Documentation for Special Operations-Peculiar Programs

February 4, 2015

Objective

We performed this audit to determine whether U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) was effectively validating requirements for its Special Operations-Peculiar (SO-P) programs. To accomplish our objective, we reviewed 6 of 147 SO-P programs.

Findings

~~(FOUO)~~ USSOCOM officials effectively validated capability requirements for the six SO-P programs reviewed. However, USSOCOM officials fielded an All Environment Capable Variant Small Unmanned Aircraft (AECV) system that did not meet key performance parameters (primary performance attributes) during operational testing. This occurred because USSOCOM officials approved the system acquisition without following their established procedures for revalidating programs that did not meet primary performance attributes. As a result, USSOCOM officials acquired 41 AECVs with no assurance that the AECV would be able to fulfill its mission. In September 2014, USSOCOM officials stated that they planned to acquire additional AECVs at a cost of about \$35.4 million through FY 2019.

USSOCOM officials did not consistently upload SO-P program documentation into the Joint Staff's Knowledge Management Decision Support (KM/DS) system as required by Joint Chiefs of Staff guidance. Specifically, KM/DS did not contain

Findings (cont'd)

requirements documentation for 103 of the 147 SO-P programs with equipment delivered between FY 2010 and FY 2013. This occurred because USSOCOM officials did not historically follow Joint Staff guidance. As a result, DoD Components could not review the SO-P capability requirements documents to determine if existing capabilities would fulfill their needs.

Recommendations

We recommend the Vice Commander, USSOCOM, initiate an executive-level review of the AECV program to determine if system attributes that did not meet the minimum standards are acceptable prior to procuring any additional AECVs.

During the audit, the Director, Force Structure, Requirements, Resource, and Strategic Assessments, USSOCOM and Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Capabilities Division took corrective action to upload capability requirement documents into KM/DS; therefore, we did not make recommendations for Finding B.

Management Comments and Our Response

Comments from the Director, Force Structure, Requirements, Resources, and Strategic Assessments (J8), responding for the Vice Commander, USSOCOM, fully addressed all specifics of the recommendation and no further comments are required. Please see the recommendations table on the back of this page.

Recommendations Table

Management	Recommendations Requiring Comment	No Additional Comments Required
Vice Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command	None	A.1



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

February 4, 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, JOINT STAFF
COMMANDER, U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND

SUBJECT: USSOCOM Did Not Always Effectively Validate Capability Requirements or
Maintain Supporting Documentation for Special Operations-Peculiar Programs
(Report No. DODIG-2015-077)

~~(FOUO)~~ We are providing this report for your information and use. U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) effectively validated capability requirements for the six Special Operations-Peculiar programs reviewed. However, USSOCOM officials fielded an All Environment Capable Variant Small Unmanned Aircraft (AECV) System that did not meet primary performance attributes during operational testing. In September 2014, USSOCOM officials stated that they planned to acquire additional AECVs at a cost of about \$35.4 million through FY 2019. In addition, USSOCOM officials did not consistently upload Special Operations-Peculiar program documentation in the required management systems and therefore, DoD components could not review those requirements documents to determine if existing capabilities would fulfill their needs.

We considered management comments on a draft of this report when preparing the final report. Comments from the Director, Force Structure, Requirements, Resources, and Strategic Assessments (J8), responding for the Vice Commander, USSOCOM, conformed to the requirements of DoD Directive 7650.3; therefore, we do not require additional comments.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the staff. Please direct questions to me at (703) 699-^{(b) (6)} (DSN 499-^{(b) (6)}).

Handwritten signature of Carol N. Gorman in black ink.

Carol N. Gorman
Assistant Inspector General
Readiness and Cyber Operations

Contents

Introduction

Objective	1
Background	1
SO-P Validation and Approval Criteria	2
Review of Internal Controls	3

Finding A. USSOCOM Acquired AECVs That Did Not Meet Primary Performance Attributes During Testing

	4
Capability Requirements Effectively Validated	4
AECV Systems Did Not Meet Primary Performance Attributes	5
No Revalidation of AECV System That Did Not Meet Primary Performance Attributes	6
USSOCOM Acquired AECVs That May Not Be Able to Fulfill Their Mission	9
Management Comments on the Finding and Our Response	10
Recommendation, Management Comments, and Our Response	10

Finding B. Documentation Supporting SO-P Programs Was Not Consistently Maintained

	12
Program Documentation Not Always Loaded into KM/DS	12
Records Management Requirements Not Followed	13
Other Components Could Benefit from SO-P Program Capabilities	13
Management Actions Taken To Upload SO-P Documentation into KM/DS	14
Management Comments on the Finding and Our Response	14

Appendix

Scope and Methodology	15
Use of Computer-Processed Data	16
Use of Technical Assistance	16
Prior Coverage	16

Management Comments

U.S. Special Operations Command	17
---------------------------------	----

Acronyms and Abbreviations	19
----------------------------	----

Introduction


Objective

Our audit objective was to determine whether U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) was effectively validating requirements for its Special Operations-Peculiar (SO-P) programs.

Background

SO-P programs provide the equipment, materiel, supplies, and services needed for special operations missions. USSOCOM is responsible for SO-P requirements development and acquisition and, according to USSOCOM; there were 147 SO-P programs with fielded equipment from FY 2010 through FY 2013. Of those 147 SO-P programs, we non-statistically selected and reviewed requirements documentation for 6 programs. The programs reviewed, shown in Figure 1, are described below.

Figure 1. SO-P Programs Reviewed



Source: DoDIG

- ~~(FOUO)~~ **Aircraft Occupant Ballistic Protection System** provides light-weight aircraft ballistic protection for several aircrafts.
- ~~(FOUO)~~ **All Environment Capable Variant Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (AECV)** is a portable unmanned aerial vehicle that can operate in a wide range of harsh environmental conditions and has the ability to land in salt and fresh water.

- ~~(FOUO)~~ **Visual Augmentation System–Binocular** enhances systems with night vision capability in support of Special Operation Forces to maintain a technological advantage over the enemy.
- ~~(FOUO)~~ **Sensitive Site Exploitation** provides Special Operation Forces with the equipment and information-sharing capability necessary to detect, display, and transmit a person’s biometric signature in support of Special Operation Forces operations and national strategic objectives.
- **Security Forces Assistance Craft** provides training on small craft operations and maintenance to international students.
- **Loud Speaker** is a portable loud speaker system that delivers high-quality, recorded- and live-audio messages in various geographical areas and climate conditions.

SO-P Validation and Approval Criteria

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Manual (CJCSM) “Manual for the Operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System,” January 19, 2012,¹ establishes requirements for program validation and approval. The CJCSM defines validation as the review and approval of capability requirement documents by a designated validation authority. The designated authority validates that capability requirements and proposed operation capabilities meet the needs of the Combatant Commands. In February 2009, the Joint Requirements Oversight Council formally delegated authority to USSOCOM to manage and approve all SO-P capability requirements documents.

USSOCOM Directive 71-4, “Special Operations Forces Capabilities Integration and Development System (SOFICIDS),” June 9, 2009, established the USSOCOM requirements for the review, validation, and approval of SO-P capabilities and requirements. USSOCOM Directive 71-4 provides guidance on creating the following capability requirements documents.

- **Initial Capability Document** defines the capability need and required resources;
- **Capability Development Document** defines the capability need and measurable and testable initial primary and secondary performance attributes stated as minimum and desired standards required to fulfill each capability need; and
- **Capability Production Document** defines the capability need and finalized primary and secondary performance attributes stated as minimum and desired standards that guide the acquisition program.

¹ Although the scope of our audit sample preceded the date of the revised CJCSM dated January 10, 2012, a review determined the specific requirements used to support our audit conclusion remained the same in each revision.

The USSOCOM Directive 70-1, "Research, Development, and Acquisition - Acquisition Management System Policy," March 19, 2010, states that the acquisition process is designed to develop, field, and support solutions for the operational commander while effectively mitigating (reducing) risks. USSOCOM must also ensure that SO-P systems, products, and equipment are operationally suitable and effective. These assurances are gained through operational test and evaluation (OT&E). The purpose of OT&E events is to determine the operational effectiveness, operational suitability, and safety of the system under test and to verify the primary performance attributes² have been met.

USSOCOM Directive 71-5, "Force Development - Operational Test and Evaluation," June 26, 2007, establishes the policy and guidelines for OT&E and the fielding and interoperability of SO-P programs. According to the guidance, USSOCOM must ensure the systems, products, and equipment fielded to Special Operation Forces are operationally suitable and effective. OT&E will involve current, qualified, and trained Special Operation Forces operators who represent the intended users, and will be based on the minimum requirements established in the validated capability requirements documents. Results are provided to USSOCOM officials for use in decision making reviews.

Review of Internal Controls

DoD Instruction 5010.40, "Managers' Internal Control Program Procedures," May 30, 2013, requires DoD organizations to implement a comprehensive system of internal controls that provides reasonable assurance that programs are operating as intended and to evaluate the effectiveness of the controls. We identified internal control weaknesses related to revalidating SO-P programs and maintenance of documentation to support SO-P programs. Specifically, USSOCOM officials acquired AECV systems that did not meet primary performance attributes during operational testing. In addition, officials from USSOCOM Force Structure, Requirements, Resources, and Strategic Assessments did not upload SO-P program documentation to the Knowledge Management/Decision Support (KM/DS) system as required. We will provide a copy of this report to the senior official(s) responsible for internal controls in USSOCOM.

² Primary performance attributes are system attributes considered most critical or essential for an effective military capability.

Finding A

USSOCOM Acquired AECVs That Did Not Meet Primary Performance Attributes During Testing

~~(FOUO)~~ USSOCOM officials effectively validated capability requirements for the six SO-P programs reviewed. However, USSOCOM officials fielded AECVs that did not meet primary performance attributes during operational testing. This occurred because USSOCOM officials approved the AECV system acquisition without following their established procedures for revalidating programs that did not meet primary performance attributes. As a result, USSOCOM officials acquired 41 AECVs with no assurance that the AECV would be able to fulfill its mission. In September 2014, USSOCOM officials stated that they planned to acquire additional AECVs at a cost of about \$35.4 million through FY 2019.

Capability Requirements Effectively Validated

USSOCOM effectively validated the capability requirements for the six SO-P programs reviewed—Aircraft Occupant Ballistic Protection System, the AECV, the Visual Augmentation System-Binocular, Sensitive Site Exploitation, Security Forces Assistance Craft, and the Loud Speaker. USSOCOM Directive 71-4 outlines the elements that should be included in the capability requirements documents, to include:

- the operational environment in which the program will be used;
- the missions/functions that cannot be performed or are unacceptably limited;
- performance attributes with minimum and desired objectives that are effective to provide the acquisition community with performance expectations that are operationally effective and suitable to satisfy the capability need,
- any changes in doctrine, operational concepts, tactics, organization, and training that were considered; and
- initial and full operational capability.

We determined that the capability requirements documents for each of the six programs contained all elements required by USSOCOM Directive 71-4. In addition, USSOCOM officials properly reviewed and approved each of the documents.

AECV Systems Did Not Meet Primary Performance Attributes

Although USSOCOM officials adequately validated capability requirements for the AECV program, USSOCOM officials fielded AECV systems that did not meet primary performance attributes during operational testing. USSOCOM Directive 71-5 states an assessment must be made of the operational effectiveness and operational suitability of each program or system as approved in capability requirements documentation. CJCSM states primary performance attributes are key attributes considered most critical or essential for an effective military capability. CJCSM further states that if the system does not meet the primary performance attributes, then the military usefulness of the system becomes questionable.

(FOUO) As shown in Table 1 below, testing results indicated that the AECV program did not meet minimum standards for the following two of eight primary performance attributes during testing: launch and recovery, and weight/size.

(FOUO) Table 1. AECV Primary Performance Attributes Testing Results

Primary Performance Attributes	Primary Performance Attributes Met	Primary Performance Attributes Not Met
Interoperability	X	
Flight Capability	X	
Payload	X	
Launch and Recovery		X
Environmental Conditions Survivability	X	
Endurance	X	
Weight/Size		X
Maximum Time Between Repetitive Launches	X	

(FOUO)

- (FOUO) Launch and Recovery required the AECV to demonstrate consistent repeated landings within 25 meters of a designated landing point in winds up to 20 knots. However, landing accuracy was not met in 11 of 25 flights in winds up to 14.8 knots. In addition, the average landing distance from the designated landing point was about 28 meters, and the farthest distance was 81 meters. Further, the AECV was required to land within the designated area in 20 knots or greater wind conditions at least 80 percent of the time. However, winds never exceeded 14.8 knots during testing. Therefore, the launch and recovery primary performance attribute did not meet requirements even at a reduced wind speed.

- ~~(FOUO)~~ Weight/size required the AECV and support equipment to fit in two water-proof, protective cases with a combined weight of 50 pounds. During testing, the AECV was packed in foam and stored in waterproof bags, which exceeded the weight by one pound. However, a test operator stated that the foam broke during field testing. Another test operator stated that the foam cases need to be protective to secure the AECV during transport. Finally, a third test operator stated that the foam case did not offer realistic protection and was cumbersome during transport. During follow-up testing water-proof protective cases were tested, however the combined weight of the cases was 110 pounds, more than double the weight/size primary performance attribute of 50 pounds.

No Revalidation of AECV System That Did Not Meet Primary Performance Attributes

~~(FOUO)~~ USSOCOM officials approved acquisition of the AECV system without revalidating the system even though the launch and recovery and the weight/size primary performance attributes were not met during OT&E. According to the AECV test plan, if the system does not meet all primary performance attributes, the system is not considered operationally effective or suitable. According to USSOCOM Directive 71-5, USSOCOM officials that certify the AECV effectiveness and suitability were required to notify the acquisition decision authority of system failures. However, testing results erroneously showed that the program met minimum standards and that notification was not made. According to the CJCSM and USSOCOM Directive 71-4³ not meeting the primary performance attributes may result in a reevaluation or reassessment of the program or a modification of the production increments. However, USSOCOM officials did not reassess, reevaluate, nor modify the AECV program prior to system fielding.

~~(FOUO)~~
USSOCOM
officials approved
acquisition of the AECV
system without revalidating
the system even though the
launch and recovery and
the weight/size primary
performance attributes
were not met during
OT&E.

³ USSOCOM Directive 71-4, "Special Operations Forces Capabilities Integration and Development System (SOFICIDS)," June 9, 2009, page GL-7.

AECV Testing Methodology Not Followed

(FOUO) USSOCOM officials did not follow established testing methodology to determine whether the AECV met capability requirements. The AECV test plan established rules for determining whether a primary performance attribute passed testing. Specifically, the test plan identified multiple critical operational issues (COI) to be reviewed. Each COI consists of one or more criteria which are used to evaluate the AECV system and include the primary performance attributes. Each criteria contains one or more measures of performance (MOP) used to test AECV system performance. For example, the section of the test plan dealing with AECV transportability identifies two COIs that have to be met.

(FOUO)
USSOCOM
officials did not
follow established
testing methodology to
determine whether the
AECV met capability
requirements.

One of the COIs was to determine whether the AECV was configured so that one person could transport the AECV in two cases. To determine if the AECV met the COI, the test plan identifies four criteria that must be evaluated. One of the criteria was the primary performance attribute that the cases should not weigh more than 50 pounds combined. The criteria contained a single MOP to verify the weight of the cases.

According to the test plan, the rating of criteria is determined by the MOP results as follows:

- (FOUO) If 50 percent or less of the MOPs are “met” the Criteria must be rated as “not met.”
- (FOUO) If more than 50 percent but not all MOPs are “met” the Criteria must be rated as “met with exceptions.”
- (FOUO) If all MOPs are “met” the Criteria must be rated as “met.”

(FOUO) The test plan also states that if a COI contains any critical criteria that are rated as “not met,” the COI must be rated as “not met.” Finally, the test plan states that the AECV system cannot be considered operationally effective or suitable if any COIs are rated as “not met”, regardless of the status of the other COIs. For the AECV system, USSOCOM officials erroneously concluded that the system passed test and evaluation. Specifically, USSOCOM officials rated COIs as “met” when they should have been rated as “not met.” For example,

- (FOUO) the critical criteria for the primary performance attribute of launch and recovery was rated as “met with exceptions” by the test team even though one of the two MOPs under that critical criteria were

~~(FOUO)~~ rated as “not met.” Specifically, the average landing distance from the designated landing point was about 28 meters, and the farthest distance was 81 meters. However, the test team stated a difference of less than 10 meters was not considered operationally significant. Although the test plan allowed the test team to override the resolution rules by providing adequate justification as to why a specific shortfall was not operationally significant, no such justification was ever provided.

- ~~(FOUO)~~ the critical criteria for the primary performance attribute of weight/size and weight were both rated as “met with exception” by the test team even though the single MOP under each of the critical criteria were rated as “not met.” During testing, the AECV was packed in foam cases and waterproof bags, which exceeded the weight by one pound. However, when the AECV was packed in ruggedized cases during later testing, the combined weight of the cases was 110 pounds, more than double the weight/size primary performance attribute of 50 pounds.

Based on the test plan methodology, each of the critical criteria above should have been rated as “not met.” In addition, the COIs that those critical criteria fall under should also be rated as “not met.” Therefore, because those COIs were not met and justification was not provided to support accepting the shortfalls, the AECV should not have been determined to be operationally effective or suitable.

USSOCOM Certified AECV System That Did Not Meet Primary Performance Attribute Requirements

~~(FOUO)~~ USSOCOM personnel certified the AECV as operationally effective and suitable after the system did not meet all primary performance attributes. According to USSOCOM Directive 70-1, the purpose of OT&E is to determine the operational effectiveness, operational suitability, and safety of the system by verifying that the primary performance attributes have been met. Primary performance attributes need to be tested and evaluated and must meet the minimum standards before a program can be considered operationally effective and suitable. When primary performance attributes do not meet the minimum standards, acquisition personnel must document the performance and actions necessary to mitigate (remedy) not meeting the minimum standard and provide it to the decision authority for review and approval. Overall success of the AECV system relied on how USSOCOM mitigated not meeting minimum standards. According to the CJCSM and USSOCOM Directive 71-4, not meeting the minimum standards may result in a reevaluation, reassessment of the program or a modification of the production increments. A Joint Chiefs of Staff official stated

(FOUO) that “may” grants the validation authority the option to reevaluate, reassess, or modify the system increments. The official clarified the options that USSOCOM officials have when a system does not meet primary performance attributes to include:

- acceptance of current capabilities as sufficient to meet mission requirements by updating and validating the minimum standards to reflect the actual performance;
- modification of production increments to accept the current performance but require the system to meet the minimum standards in future updates to the system; or
- termination of the program.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff official stated that regardless of the option selected, USSOCOM must revalidate the program by reviewing and validating the actions taken to address the system not meeting primary performance attributes. Therefore, the Vice Commander USSOCOM should initiate an executive level review of the AECV program to determine if system attributes that did not meet the minimum standards are acceptable prior to procuring any additional AECVs.

USSOCOM Acquired AECVs That May Not Be Able to Fulfill Their Mission

(FOUO) USSOCOM officials acquired 41 AECVs with no assurance that the AECV will be able to fulfill its mission. Further, according to USSOCOM in September 2014, they may acquire additional AECVs at a cost of about \$35.4 million through FY 2019. According to the AECV capabilities documents, the AECV was designed as an improvement on previous versions of the system, allowing the system to operate in harsher environments. However, during testing, USSOCOM user comments demonstrated some of the shortcomings of the AECV and call into question the usefulness of the AECV in an actual deployed environment. For example, one of the AECV test operators stated that “The AECV works great under most of the conditions we encountered...all except the winds. The gust of winds cause the aircraft to turn and climb uncommanded numerous times during the testing phase.” The test operators also commented on the weight and size of the units, stating that the cases were “cumbersome and lacked durability for employment in realistic operating conditions.” Finally, a test operator provided an overall assessment of the AECV, stating that “Adapters were somewhat chintzy and the pins

~~(FOUO)~~ would fall out creating a fault in the charging process; [infrared] camera has horrible resolution; unable to positively ID targets; needs improvements.” USSOCOM testing results questions whether the current capabilities of the AECV system are sufficient to fulfill its mission and whether the current capabilities represent a significant increase in performance to justify the acquisition of the AECV.

Management Comments on the Finding and Our Response

The Director, Force Structure, Requirements, Resources, and Strategic Assessments (J8), responding for the Vice Commander, USSOCOM, stated that USSOCOM followed the test methodology and correctly fielded the AECVs. However, USSOCOM acknowledged that primary performance attributes were not adequately revalidated by the user.

Our Response

We do not agree that USSOCOM followed the AECV test methodology. As we state in this report, USSOCOM did not appropriately apply the decision criteria outlined in the AECV test plan, and as a result rated two primary performance attributes as “met with exceptions” when the attributes should have been rated “not met.” However, we agree with USSOCOM that the primary performance attributes were not adequately revalidated by the user. In USSOCOM’s response to the recommendation, they state that the Vice Commander, USSOCOM will be briefed on the test results for the new AECV to ensure the program meets primary performance attributes. That action should ensure that the performance attributes are properly rated for the new AECV.

Recommendation, Management Comments, and Our Response

Recommendation

We recommend the Vice Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command initiate an executive-level review of the All Environment Capable Variant Small Unmanned Aircraft system program to determine if system attributes that did not meet minimum standards are acceptable prior to acquiring any additional All Environment Capable Variant Small Unmanned Aircraft systems.

U.S. Special Operations Command Comments

The Director, Force Structure, Requirements, Resources, and Strategic Assessments (J8), responding for the Vice Commander, USSOCOM, disagreed with the recommendation. The Director stated that USSOCOM is not planning to acquire more AECVs with the current test configuration. Instead, a new AECV will be tested in January 2015 to demonstrate compliance with the primary performance attributes. The Director further stated that the Special Operations Research, Development, and Acquisition Center will brief the Vice Commander, USSOCOM, on the test results to ensure the program meets primary performance attributes.

Our Response

Although the Director disagreed with the recommendation, the proposed action to test the new AECV and brief the testing results to the Vice Commander meets the intent of our recommendation, and no further comments are required.


Finding B

Documentation Supporting SO-P Programs Was Not Consistently Maintained

USSOCOM officials did not consistently upload SO-P program documentation into the Joint Staff's Knowledge Management/Decision Support (KM/DS) system as required by Joint Chiefs of Staff guidance. Specifically, KM/DS did not contain requirements documentation for 103 of the 147 SO-P programs with equipment delivered between FY 2010 and FY 2013. This occurred because USSOCOM officials did not historically follow Joint Staff guidance. As a result, the DoD Components could not review the SO-P capability requirements documents to determine if existing capabilities would fulfill their needs. During the audit, USSOCOM requirements personnel began taking action to identify and upload the missing SO-P program documentation to KM/DS. Based on that action, no recommendations were required.

Program Documentation Not Always Loaded into KM/DS

USSOCOM officials did not consistently upload SO-P program documentation into KM/DS. The CJCSM requires that validated SO-P program requirement documents, to include the initial capability document capability development document and capability production document, be uploaded into KM/DS for future reference. However, KM/DS did not contain requirements documentation for 103 of the 147 SO-P programs with equipment delivered between FY 2010 and FY 2013.⁴ According to the CJCSM, the requirement documents in KM/DS describe the mission need in broad terms, the capability gap between what is needed and what is available, and explain why a recommended approach is most appropriate. The manual states that capability requirements documents will be in a standardized format and uploaded to the KM/DS system. While we found capability requirements documents in our nonstatistical sample contained the required information, the documents were not always uploaded into KM/DS.



KM/DS did not contain requirements documentation for 103 of the 147 SO-P programs.

⁴ We did not assess the completeness and accuracy of the documentation for the 44 programs that contained capability documents in KM/DS because it was beyond the scope of the audit.

Records Management Requirements Not Followed

USSOCOM officials did not historically follow the Joint Staff record's management guidance. Although USSOCOM officials believed they were correctly following the guidance since 2009, capability requirements documents were not consistently uploaded to KM/DS until 2011.

Prior to February 17, 2009, the Joint Staff determined whether programs were unique to USSOCOM or would apply to multiple DoD Components. When documents were uploaded into KM/DS, this triggered a review process to determine whether the requirement was specific to USSOCOM or if the need was applicable to other Military Services. If the Joint Staff determined a requirement was unique to USSOCOM, USSOCOM would manage the program. After USSOCOM personnel validated the capability requirements documents, they would upload the documents into KM/DS. If the Joint Staff determined the program could meet the needs of other DoD Components, the Joint Staff would then determine who would manage the program.

On February 17, 2009, the Joint Staff granted USSOCOM the authority to determine whether their programs were specific to USSOCOM or if they could be applicable to other DoD Components; therefore, USSOCOM eliminated the need for a review of capability requirements documents prior to validation. Although USSOCOM personnel follow their process for review and validation of requirements, they are still required to upload the validated requirements documents into KM/DS for DoD Component review.

Other Components Could Benefit from SO-P Program Capabilities

If all SO-P capability requirements documents are not uploaded to KM/DS, then future inquiries of SO-P programs and reviews by DoD Components to prevent duplicate efforts will be limited. While the 2009 decision allowed USSOCOM to determine whether the requirements were specific to USSOCOM, DoD Components use the documents in KM/DS to determine if SO-P capabilities could fulfill their needs.

Management Actions Taken To Upload SO-P Documentation into KM/DS.

During the audit, the Chief, Force Structure, Requirements, Resource, and Strategic Assessments, USSOCOM initiated a review to identify the SO-P programs that did not have capabilities requirements documents uploaded into KM/DS. The Chief provided an update on September 15, 2014, that there were 43 requirements documents still required to be uploaded into KM/DS. The Chief instructed his team to accomplish the uploading of documents to KM/DS by November 1, 2014. The Chief stated on November 12, 2014, they still had about 20 more documents to upload. Further, the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Capabilities Division is working with USSOCOM, to ensure all documents are uploaded and will review actions for those cases where SO-P primary performance attribute reviews were necessary. Therefore, we made no recommendations based on the actions taken by the Chief, Force Structure, Requirements, Resource, and Strategic Assessments, USSOCOM and Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Capabilities Division.

Management Comments on the Finding and Our Response

The Director, Force Structure, Requirements, Resources, and Strategic Assessments (J8), responding for the Vice Commander, USSOCOM, stated that USSOCOM acknowledges that not all requirement documents were uploaded in KM/DS. The Director stated that based on the sample of SO-P programs used by the audit team, there were some documents that still required uploading. The Director stated that the Requirements Division and the Joint Staff Joint Capabilities Division will continue to work towards ensuring that all SO-P capability requirements documents are uploaded in KM/DS.

Our Response

As stated in the Management Actions Taken section in this finding, we acknowledge USSOCOM efforts to ensure all SO-P capability requirements documents are uploaded in KM/DS; therefore, we did not make a recommendation.

Appendix

Scope and Methodology

We conducted this performance audit from January 2014 through December 2014 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective.

To accomplish our objective, we reviewed Public Law, DoD, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and USSOCOM guidance related to the USSOCOM's requirements and acquisition processes to gain an understanding of SO-P program validation. We interviewed officials from USSOCOM and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to determine roles and responsibilities for requirements validation and obtained USSOCOM Directives that documented the SO-P program validation process.

To assess the effectiveness of SO-P program validation procedures, we requested a universe of SO-P programs with deliverables from FY 2010 through FY 2013. USSOCOM provided a universe of 147 programs from six program executive offices. We nonstatistically selected one program from each of those offices to determine whether the programs were effectively validated.

We requested supporting documentation for the six programs selected to assess the effectiveness of USSOCOM's validation and approval process and the completeness of the capability requirements documents. Specifically, we obtained capability requirements documents that were used to initiate the SO-P program and the updated capability requirements documents that were processed through the Special Operations Forces Capabilities Integration and Development System and used to justify program or project continuation. We reviewed the capability requirements documents to determine whether they were validated and properly approved. In addition, we reviewed the testing of the primary performance attributes to determine if USSOCOM officials ensured systems met the minimum standards identified in the requirements or capability requirements documents before fielding the SO-P system.

Finally, we verified that USSOCOM officials submitted the approved capability requirements documents to the KM/DS tool in accordance with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff guidance. Since KM/DS is owned by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we contacted their representative to get an overview and understanding on how SO-P programs are incorporated into their Joint Capabilities

Integration and Development System process. We requested and obtained a list of all the Special Operation Forces–sponsored documents uploaded to KM/DS to verify whether USSOCOM was submitting the approved capability requirements documents to the KM/DS. We compared the list of USSOCOM programs contained in KM/DS to the universe of SO-P programs provided by USSOCOM to verify KM/DS completeness.

Use of Computer-Processed Data

To perform this audit, we used computer-processed data obtained from KM/DS. We determined data reliability by comparing a list of SO-P programs from KM/DS provided by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the universe of SO-P programs provided by USSOCOM to determine whether KM/DS data was complete. Based on that comparison, we determined that KM/DS was not a reliable source for SO-P capabilities requirements documents. The lack of reliability is addressed in Finding B.

Use of Technical Assistance

During the planning phase of the audit, we requested technical assistance from the DoD Office of the Inspector General-Quantitative Methods Division. We coordinated with the Quantitative Methods Division in developing a nonstatistical sampling plan for USSOCOM SO-P programs.

Prior Coverage

During the last 5 years, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued three reports discussing Joint Staff requirements validation process effectiveness. These reports relate to the USSOCOM's validation process because the USSOCOM validation process mirrors the Joint Staff process. Unrestricted GAO reports can be accessed over the Internet at <http://www.gao.gov>.

GAO

Report No. GAO-12-339, "Defense Management: Guidance and Progress Measures Are Needed to Realize Benefits from Changes in DOD's Joint Requirements Process," February 2012

Report No. GAO-11-502, "DOD Weapon Systems: Missed Trade-Off Opportunities During Requirements Reviews," June 2011

Report No. GAO-11-527R, "Defense Management: Perspectives on the Involvement of the Combatant Commands in the Development of Joint Requirements," May 20, 2011

Management Comments

U.S. Special Operations Command



UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND
7701 TAMPA POINT BOULEVARD
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA 33621-5323

J8-R

17 December 2014

MEMORANDUM FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, READINESS & CYBER OPERATIONS, 400 TAMPA STREET, STE 2820, TAMPA, FL 33602

SUBJECT: Special Operations Forces Unique-Equipment Acquisition Requirements Audit (Project No. D2014-D000RE-0096.000) Requests for U.S. Special Operations Command Program Documentation

1. PURPOSE: U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) is providing this memorandum at the request of the Department of Defense (DoD) Inspector General (IG) Audit Team for subject line project. USSOCOM has received the results, findings, and recommendations issued by the audit team.

2. FINDINGS:

a. USSOCOM officials effectively validated capability requirements for the six Special Operations-Peculiar (SO-P) programs reviewed; however, USSOCOM officials acquired the All-Environment Capable Variant Small Unmanned Aircraft System (AECV), that did not meet key performance parameters (KPP) (primary performance attributes), during operational testing. This occurred because USSOCOM officials approved fielding of the AECV system without following their established procedures to revalidate a program that did not meet primary performance attributes. As a result, USSOCOM officials acquired 41 AECVs with no assurance that the AECV would be able to fulfill its mission. In addition, USSOCOM may acquire up to 49 additional AECVs, according to the USSOCOM program baseline, and plans to spend about \$35.4 million on procuring additional AECVs through Fiscal Year (FY) 2019.

Response: USSOCOM followed the AECV test methodology and correctly fielded the AECVs, per acquisition regulations (full Fielding and Deployment Release received without restrictions); however, USSOCOM acknowledges KPPs that were deemed "Met with Exceptions" were not adequately revalidated by the user. USSOCOM is not planning to acquire any more AECVs, in the exact test configuration, due to numerous obsolescence issues; however, the new AECV or PUMA II will be tested in January 2015 to demonstrate compliance with the KPPs. USSOCOM Special Operations Research, Development, and Acquisition Center will brief the USSOCOM Vice Commander (VCDR) on the results of those tests to ensure that the program meets all KPP thresholds. Given the established acquisition plan, USSOCOM does not accept the recommendation that the VCDR initiate an executive-level review of the AECV program.

U.S. Special Operations Command (cont'd)

J8-R

SUBJECT: Special Operations Forces Unique-Equipment Acquisition Requirements Audit (Project No. D2014-D000RE-0096.000) Requests for U.S. Special Operations Command Program Documentation

b. USSOCOM officials did not consistently upload SO-P program documentation into the Joint Staff's Knowledge Management Decision Support (KM/DS) system. Specifically, KM/DS did not contain requirements documentation of 103 of the 147 SO-P programs with equipment delivered between FY 2010 and FY 2013. This occurred because USSOCOM officials did not follow Joint Staff Guidance. As a result, DoD Components could not review the SO-P capability requirements documents to determine if existing capabilities would fulfill their needs. This could limit the use of SO-P programs by other DoD components and could result in duplicate acquisition efforts to meet a similar capability need.

Response: USOCOM acknowledges that not all requirement documents were uploaded into the Joint Staff KM/DS system. Of the 147 SO-P program lines provided to the DoD IG Auditors, there are a total of 61 approved requirement documents associated with that list. Seventy eight program lines are sub-items, which are part of nine separately listed program requirement documents, and 17 program lines are part of on-going modernization program upgrades. There are 27 historical requirements that still require upload into KM/DS. USSOCOM's Requirements Division and the Joint Staff Joint Capabilities Division will continue to work together to ensure all SO-P capability requirements documents are uploaded into the KM/DS system.

3. USSOCOM points of contact for this DoD IG Audit are ^{USSOCOM: (b) (3), 10 USC Sec 130b}

[Redacted]

USSOCOM: (b) (6)

[Redacted]

STEPHEN A. CLARK
Major General, U.S. Air Force
Director, J8

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AECV	All Environment Capable Variant Small Unmanned Aircraft
CJCSM	Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Manual
COI	Critical Operational Issues
GAO	Government Accountability Office
KM/DS	Knowledge Management/Decision Support
MOP	Measures of Performance
OT&E	Operational Test and Evaluation
SO-P	Special Operations-Peculiar
USSOCOM	U.S. Special Operations Command

~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~



~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

Whistleblower Protection

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 requires the Inspector General to designate a Whistleblower Protection Ombudsman to educate agency employees about prohibitions on retaliation, and rights and remedies against retaliation for protected disclosures. The designated ombudsman is the DoD Hotline Director. For more information on your rights and remedies against retaliation, visit www.dodig.mil/programs/whistleblower.

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

Congressional Liaison

congressional@dodig.mil; 703.604.8324

Media Contact

public.affairs@dodig.mil; 703.604.8324

Monthly Update

dodigconnect-request@listserve.com

Reports Mailing List

dodig_report@listserve.com


Twitter

twitter.com/DoD_IG

DoD Hotline

dodig.mil/hotline

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE | INSPECTOR GENERAL

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

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY