

SIGAR

Special Inspector General for
Afghanistan Reconstruction

APR 30
2019

— QUARTERLY REPORT TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS —





The National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2008 (Pub. L. No. 110-181) established the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR).

SIGAR's oversight mission, as defined by the legislation, is to provide for the independent and objective

- conduct and supervision of audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the reconstruction of Afghanistan.
- leadership and coordination of, and recommendations on, policies designed to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the administration of the programs and operations, and to prevent and detect waste, fraud, and abuse in such programs and operations.
- means of keeping the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense fully and currently informed about problems and deficiencies relating to the administration of such programs and operation and the necessity for and progress on corrective action.

Afghanistan reconstruction includes any major contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism entered into by any department or agency of the U.S. government that involves the use of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the reconstruction of Afghanistan.


As required by the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2018 (Pub. L. No. 115-91), this quarterly report has been prepared in accordance with the Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation issued by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency.

Source: Pub.L. No. 110-181, "National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2008," 1/28/2008, Pub. L. No. 115-91, "National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2018," 12/12/2017.

(For a list of the congressionally mandated contents of this report, see Appendix A.)

Cover photo:

An Afghan Air Force UH-60A Black Hawk practices landing at Kandahar Airfield Afghanistan.
(U.S. Air Force photo by Senior Airman Maygan Straight)



■ Provinces where SIGAR has conducted or commissioned audit, inspection, special project, and/or investigation work as of March 31, 2019.



SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR
AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION

I am pleased to submit to Congress, and to the Secretaries of State and Defense, SIGAR's 43rd quarterly report on the status of reconstruction in Afghanistan.

This quarter, SIGAR released its 2019 *High-Risk List*. Unlike SIGAR's two previous high-risk lists, this one analyzes not only the most pressing current risks to the United States' \$133 billion reconstruction investment in Afghanistan, but also those that might arise in the event of a peace deal. The report stresses the importance of planning for "the day after" any peace deal in eight areas: security, civil policing, corruption, economic growth, counternarcotics, women's rights, the reintegration of ex-combatants, and oversight.

This quarter, the U.S.-commanded NATO Resolute Support (RS) mission in Afghanistan formally notified SIGAR that it is no longer assessing district-level insurgent or government control or influence. The RS mission said the district-level stability assessments were "of limited decision-making value to the [RS] Commander." RS added that there is currently no other product or forum through which district-level control data is communicated to the command. The last district-stability data RS produced was for its October 22, 2018, assessment; SIGAR reported on that assessment in its January 2019 *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*.

The latest data from the few remaining publicly available measures of the security situation in Afghanistan—enemy-initiated attacks, general ANDSF casualty trends, and security incidents—show that Afghanistan experienced heightened insecurity over the winter months while the United States and the Taliban held talks in Qatar, thus far without the participation of the Afghan government.

SIGAR issued one performance audit report this quarter. It examined the \$775 million, 15-year effort by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Department of Defense (DOD) to increase electric power generation capacity at the Kajaki Dam in Helmand Province to 51.5 megawatts, provide short-term diesel-fueled power generation, and improve the delivery of power to customers in Helmand and Kandahar Provinces through the Southeast Power System (SEPS). SIGAR found that USAID and DOD have not finished SEPS, which is needed to transmit power from the Kajaki Dam, and Afghans in southern Afghanistan have not yet received the intended benefits from these projects.

SIGAR completed seven financial audits of U.S.-funded contracts to rebuild Afghanistan. These audits covered a range of topics including USAID's Afghanistan University Support and Workforce Development Program, USAID's Women's Leadership Development Project, and the Department of the Army's Law Enforcement Professionals Program. These financial audits identified more than \$7 million in questioned costs as a result of internal-control deficiencies and noncompliance issues. To date, SIGAR's financial audits have identified more than \$425.6 million in questioned costs, interest, and other amounts payable to the U.S. government.

SIGAR also issued two inspection reports. These reports examined the construction, use, and maintenance of USAID's \$56.7 million Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity project transmission line between Arghandi and Ghazni, and of DOD's \$5.2 million Kang Border Patrol headquarters compound.

This quarter, SIGAR's Office of Special Projects issued six reports on topics including USAID-supported health facilities in Faryab and Bamiyan Provinces, USAID-funded schools in Paktika and

Bamyan Provinces, Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP)-funded bridges in Ghazni Province, and theft of contractor-owned property by the ANDSF.

Additionally, DOD completed its cost-benefit analysis of the operational suitability and cost effectiveness of using a proprietary camouflage pattern for future uniforms purchased for the ANDSF, as required by Section 344 of H.R. 2810, the FY 2018 National Defense Authorization Act. The DOD analysis confirmed the findings of SIGAR's June 2017 report, *Afghan National Army: DOD May Have Spent Up To \$28 Million More Than Needed To Procure Camouflage Uniforms That May Be Inappropriate For The Afghan Environment* (SIGAR 17-48-SP). The analysis concluded that the camouflage pattern selected was the most expensive of the seven patterns tested and the second-most detectable. Moreover, SIGAR reported that the U.S. military spent \$28 million more than necessary to procure uniforms with a proprietary pattern for the Afghan National Army, rather than using an existing U.S. pattern that would not have required extra payment. SIGAR also found that CSTC-A recommended using a sole-source (noncompetitive) award to purchase the rights to the pattern, despite concerns from DOD's contracting office, and without testing the pattern's effectiveness for use in Afghanistan.

During the reporting period, SIGAR investigations resulted in two guilty pleas, one sentencing, and \$1 million in criminal fines and forfeitures. In addition, the civil investigation of Hikmatullah Shadman, an Afghan national, resulted in a forfeiture of \$25 million to the United States. SIGAR initiated 14 new cases and closed 11, bringing the total number of ongoing investigations to 168. Further, on March 29, 2019, following a joint investigation by SIGAR and the USAID Office of Inspector General, the heavily U.S.-funded American University of Afghanistan signed an agreement with USAID to deal with long-standing management and accountability issues identified by the oversight agencies.

This quarter, SIGAR's suspension and debarment program referred 15 individuals and 26 entities for suspension or debarment based on evidence developed as part of investigations conducted by SIGAR in Afghanistan and the United States. These referrals bring the total number of individuals and companies referred by SIGAR since 2008 to 969, encompassing 530 individuals and 439 companies.

SIGAR work has to date identified approximately \$2.6 billion in savings for the U.S. taxpayer. My staff and I expect to work with the 116th Congress to achieve even greater savings in the coming years.

Respectfully,



John F. Sopko

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes SIGAR’s oversight work and updates developments in the five major areas of reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan from January 1 to March 31, 2019.* It includes an essay highlighting the concerns raised in SIGAR’s recently published 2019 *High-Risk List* on safeguarding the U.S. investment in Afghanistan’s reconstruction. This reporting period, SIGAR issued 16 audits, inspections, reviews, and other products assessing U.S. efforts to build the Afghan security forces, improve governance, facilitate economic and social development, and combat the production and sale of narcotics. During the reporting period, SIGAR criminal investigations resulted in two guilty pleas, one sentencing, \$1 million in criminal fines and forfeitures, and a civil forfeiture of \$25 million to the United States.

SIGAR OVERVIEW

AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS

This quarter, SIGAR issued one performance audit, seven financial audits, and two inspection reports.

The **performance audit report** examined

- the \$775 million, 15-year effort by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Department of Defense to increase electric power generation capacity at the Kajaki Dam in Helmand Province to 51.5 megawatts, provide short-term diesel-fueled power generation, and improve the delivery of power to customers in Helmand and Kandahar Provinces through the Southeast Power System.

The **financial audit reports** identified more than \$7 million in questioned costs as a result of internal-control deficiencies and noncompliance issues.

The **inspection reports** found:

- Four deficiencies in the construction of the Arghandi-Ghazni transmission line of USAID’s Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project have created safety hazards and could disrupt the flow of electricity through the national transmission grid.
- In addition to four identified construction deficiencies, the \$5.2 million Kang Border Patrol headquarters building has never been used, and the Ministry of the Interior does not currently have any plans to use it in the future.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

This quarter, SIGAR’s Office of Special Projects issued six reviews concerning:

- theft of contractor-owned property by the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF)
- USAID-supported health facilities in Bamyan Province
- USAID-supported health facilities in Faryab Province

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- USAID-funded schools in Bamyan Province
- USAID-funded schools in Paktika Province
- CERP-funded bridges in Ghazni Province

LESSONS LEARNED

SIGAR's Lessons Learned Program has four projects in development: U.S. and Coalition responsibilities for security-sector assistance; U.S. government support to elections; monitoring and evaluation of reconstruction contracting; and reintegration of ex-combatants.

INVESTIGATIONS

During the reporting period, SIGAR investigations resulted in two guilty pleas, one sentencing, and \$1 million in criminal fines and forfeitures. In addition, a civil investigation resulted in a forfeiture of \$25 million to the United States. SIGAR initiated 14 new cases and closed 11, bringing the total number of ongoing investigations to 168. SIGAR's suspension and debarment program referred 15 individuals and 26 entities for suspension or debarment based on evidence developed as part of investigations conducted by SIGAR in Afghanistan and the United States.

Investigations highlights include:

- A joint investigation by SIGAR and the USAID Office of Inspector General resulted in the heavily U.S.-funded American University of Afghanistan signing an agreement with USAID to deal with long-standing management and accountability issues identified by the oversight agencies.
- The SIGAR investigation of Hikmatullah Shadman, an Afghan national, resulted in a civil forfeiture of \$25 million to the United States. Shadman illegally acquired these assets while a subcontractor for the delivery of food, water, and other supplies to U.S. military members at various locations in Afghanistan.
- A SIGAR investigation resulted in the implementation of new policies at NATO's Resolute Support mission to minimize the occurrence of fuel theft, including installing fuel gauges in tanks, providing fuel cards for each vehicle, and improving oversight policy for fuel delivery and consumption.

* As provided in its authorizing statute, SIGAR may also report on products and events occurring after March 31, 2019, up to the publication date of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS



SECTION 1

1 HIGH RISKS: PLANNING FOR PEACE IN THE MIDST OF WAR

- 3 A Break in the Clouds?
- 4 Risks to the Reconstruction Effort
- 5 Nature and Scope of Reconstruction
- 6 Risks to Reconstruction Success
- 17 Conclusion



SECTION 2

21 SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

- 22 Audits
- 28 Inspections
- 31 Special Projects
- 35 Lessons Learned
- 35 Investigations
- 40 New Rules for American University of Afghanistan
- 43 Other SIGAR Oversight Activities
- 45 SIGAR Budget
- 45 SIGAR Staff



SECTION 3

49 RECONSTRUCTION IN BRIEF

- 51 Status of Funds
- 71 Security
- 107 Governance
- 135 Economic and Social Development
- 161 Counternarcotics

TABLE OF CONTENTS



SECTION 4

181 OTHER AGENCY OVERSIGHT

- 182** Completed Oversight Activities
- 183** Ongoing Oversight Activities



APPENDICES AND ENDNOTES

- 192** Appendix A: Cross-Reference of Report to Statutory Requirements
- 196** Appendix B: U.S. Funds for Afghanistan Reconstruction
- 198** Appendix C: SIGAR Written Products
- 203** Appendix D: District-Level Stability Assessment Data Call Response
- 205** Appendix E: SIGAR Investigations and Hotline
- 212** Appendix F: SIGAR Data Call Questions That Received Classified or Unclassified but Not Publicly Releasable Responses
- 216** Appendix G: Abbreviations and Acronyms
- 222** Endnotes

“There can only be peace if Afghanistan stays free from international terrorists. And for peace to be sustainable it must build on our achievements ... bringing education and human rights to women and girls. Their rights must be preserved.”

—*NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg*

1 HIGH RISKS: PLANNING FOR PEACE



ESSAY CONTENTS

A Break in the Clouds?	3
Risks to the Reconstruction Effort	4
Nature and Scope of Reconstruction	5
Risks to Reconstruction Success	6
Conclusion	17

Photo on previous page

Afghan children playing at Arzu Studio Hope women's community center in Bamyan Province.
(U.S. Army photo by Sgt. Ken Scar)

HIGH RISKS: PLANNING FOR PEACE IN THE MIDST OF WAR

A BREAK IN THE CLOUDS?

The return of spring heralds renewal and, in Afghanistan, resumption of the traditional fighting season between the Afghan government and the Taliban insurgency.¹

But spring 2019 may see the opening of a break in the clouds of war. Repeated U.S. contacts with Taliban representatives found U.S. Special Representative for Afghanistan Reconciliation Zalmay Khalilzad traveling to Afghanistan, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Jordan, and Qatar in late March and early April. The State Department described the diplomatic rounds as “part of the overall effort to facilitate a peace process that brings all Afghan parties together in inclusive intra-Afghan negotiations.”²

From numerous accounts, it appears the process so far is not wholly inclusive. Afghanistan’s ambassador to the United States, Roya Rahmani, said in a February interview with *Foreign Policy*, “The United States is making an effort to bring the Taliban to the negotiating table so that they can talk to the government. If the government is excluded, we do not think there are any negotiations.”³ Also, in a February 24, 2019, roundtable discussion organized by the political advisor to the NATO Senior Civilian Representative in Kabul, Afghan women expressed concern, given the threat to their hard-won rights, that women have not had a seat at the negotiating table or in the larger peace process with the Taliban.⁴

If Taliban leaders can be persuaded to negotiate with the Afghan government, and if intra-Afghan negotiations can yield a peace agreement, then some four decades of war in Afghanistan—and the United States’ longest war—might come to an end. But no matter how welcome peace would be, it can carry with it the seeds of unintended and unforeseen consequences.

Those risks and others were highlighted in late March with the release of SIGAR’s 2019 *High-Risk List*.⁵ Like its predecessors, issued in December 2014 and January 2017, the 2019 edition calls attention to areas of the \$133.0 billion U.S. reconstruction effort in Afghanistan that are at serious risk of waste, fraud, abuse, mismanagement, and even program failure.



Cover of the 2019 SIGAR *High-Risk List* report. (U.S. Army photo by Sgt. Ken Scar)



SIGAR auditors interview ANA soldiers in the 207th corps. (SIGAR photo)

The new 2019 version has an added dimension. With negotiations underway that could lead to the end of America’s longest war, this report expands upon its predecessors by identifying risks to the reconstruction effort that might persist or arise in the event of a hoped-for peace agreement.⁶

RISKS TO THE RECONSTRUCTION EFFORT

Congress has appropriated approximately \$133.0 billion for Afghanistan reconstruction since 2002, of which approximately \$9.9 billion remains to be disbursed. Given U.S. statements of policy over three administrations and the very limited financial capacity of Afghanistan’s government, it appears likely that billions more will follow in the years ahead.

The Afghan people and Afghanistan’s international partners would certainly welcome a peace agreement. But such an agreement could lead to unintended challenges for the reconstruction efforts made over the past 17 years by the United States, Coalition partners, and the Afghan government. These “day after” risks could threaten U.S. taxpayers’ investment in Afghanistan, set back humanitarian and development programs, undermine Afghan government support, or even lay the grounds for new or resumed discord. In short, they could frustrate the shared goal of a stable Afghanistan at peace with itself and its neighbors, and which respects the rule of law and human rights.

In issuing the 2019 *High-Risk List*, SIGAR takes no position on whether a peace agreement is achievable, imminent, or practicable. Nor does SIGAR predict how a peace deal might emerge, or what provisions it would include. But SIGAR’s decade of oversight work in Afghanistan suggests that

several forms of high risk to reconstruction success could continue past the date of a peace settlement.

An old maxim says failing to plan is planning to fail. Lawmakers, policymakers, and implementing agencies should be aware of risks that might continue or arise in wake of any peace agreement and consider plans to avert, counter, or mitigate them. The goal of the 2019 *High-Risk List*, in other words, is to help planning for “the day after.”

The new *High-Risk List* focuses on program areas and elements of the reconstruction effort that are: (1) essential to success; (2) at risk of significant and large-scale failure due to waste, fraud, or abuse; and (3) subject to the control or influence of the U.S. government.

Applying these criteria, SIGAR identified eight high-risk areas:⁷

- » Widespread Insecurity
- » Underdeveloped Civil Policing Capability
- » Endemic Corruption
- » Sluggish Economic Growth
- » Illicit Narcotics Trade
- » Threats to Women’s Rights
- » Reintegration of Ex-Combatants
- » Restricted Oversight

Three of these areas—economic growth, women’s rights, and reintegration—are new to the *High-Risk List*. Additionally, the critical issue of sustainability appears as a facet of each high-risk area. Sustainability is a long-standing concern in reconstruction: shortcomings in finance, staffing, institutional capacity, technology and technical skills, political will, and other issues individually or in combination can undermine the Afghan government’s ability to maintain programs once foreign support has been withdrawn or substantially reduced.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF RECONSTRUCTION

The concept of “reconstruction” is expansive and nonspecific. The nearest thing to a definition of Afghanistan reconstruction is the federal law that tasks SIGAR with reporting on projects and programs using “any funding mechanism” that supports “any of the following purposes: (A) To build or rebuild physical infrastructure of Afghanistan. (B) To establish or reestablish a political or societal institution of Afghanistan. (C) To provide products or services to the people of Afghanistan.”⁸ The statute adds that SIGAR is to report on the “operating expenses of agencies or entities receiving amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the reconstruction of Afghanistan.”⁹

As the statutory language suggests, U.S. reconstruction programs in Afghanistan encompass a wide variety of activities, including supporting

HIGH RISKS: PLANNING FOR PEACE

Afghan security forces, bolstering the government's institutional capacity, expanding energy and transportation infrastructure, building schools and clinics, training teachers and health-care workers, and promoting business development and the country's export potential. Total appropriations for reconstruction and related costs since FY 2002 stood at roughly \$133 billion as of March 31, 2019.

Of that amount, about 63% of all reconstruction funding, or \$83.3 billion since 2001, has gone to build up the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF). The funds have been mostly used to provide salaries, infrastructure, equipment, and training for the approximately 309,000 members of the ANDSF.¹⁰

Another \$34.5 billion in U.S. funds has been appropriated since FY 2002 for governance and economic development, or 26% of reconstruction spending. One goal of the U.S. mission in Afghanistan remains to promote economic development by advancing private-sector-led export growth and job creation, and by bolstering gains in health, education, and women's empowerment.¹¹

As a subset of security, governance, and development funding, about \$9.0 billion has been appropriated for counternarcotics programs since 2002 or nearly 7% of total reconstruction funds. Most of the remaining reconstruction spending has gone to support civilian operations, humanitarian initiatives, and anticorruption activities.

Congress and the Administration will decide to what extent reconstruction will continue if a peace settlement is reached in Afghanistan. Continuing reconstruction requires outside aid: Afghanistan is nowhere near to being able to fund its current government—in particular, its military and police—with its own resources. Donor countries are expected to finance approximately 51% of Afghanistan's 2019 national government spending of \$5.0 billion, mostly by providing grants (overall, foreign grants finance more than 70% of public spending, including spending not channeled through the Afghan government's core budget).¹² At the November 2018 Geneva Conference on Afghanistan, international donors including the United States reaffirmed their intent to provide \$15.2 billion for Afghanistan's development priorities up to 2020, and to direct continuing, but gradually declining, financial support to Afghanistan's social and economic development up to 2024.¹³

RISKS TO RECONSTRUCTION SUCCESS

The scope of Afghanistan reconstruction is broad, the financial investment by the United States and other international donors is large, and the implications for peace and progress are weighty. Risks to the success of the reconstruction effort therefore demand careful consideration and prudent precautions.

The full text of SIGAR's 2019 *High-Risk List* provides extensive detail on the high-risk areas of Afghanistan reconstruction. Brief summaries follow. Note that the order of presentation does not necessarily indicate SIGAR's judgment of relative importance: each of the high-risk areas poses a potentially critical threat to the success of Afghanistan reconstruction.

High-Risk Area: Widespread Insecurity

Since 2001, the main goal of the U.S. intervention in Afghanistan has been to prevent the country from reverting to a safe haven for al-Qaeda and other extremist groups that threaten the United States and other countries.¹⁴ To that end, the United States has sought over the past 17 years to build up the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces so that they can protect the Afghan population and expel terrorist groups. Of the \$133.0 billion the United States has appropriated for Afghanistan reconstruction since FY 2002 (as of March 31, 2019), \$83.3 billion (63%), has gone toward building, equipping, training, and sustaining the ANDSF, with the ultimate goal of creating a more effective and sustainable security force.

The most enduring threat to the Afghan reconstruction effort, and to the U.S. taxpayer's investment in that effort, has been an ongoing and resilient insurgency and the presence in Afghanistan of terrorist groups such as Islamic State-Khorasan (IS-K). According to the NATO Resolute Support (RS) mission, control of Afghanistan's districts, population, and territory has become more contested over the last two years, resulting in a stalemated battlefield environment between the ANDSF and the insurgency.¹⁵

With or without a sustainable peace settlement or a local or nationwide ceasefire between the Taliban and the ANDSF, Afghanistan will continue to need a security force to protect the Afghan population from internal and external threats, provide a policing function to respond to criminal activity, and control its borders. Any political settlement entails the risk that not all subordinate groups will abide by an agreement made by their organization's leadership.

The ANDSF will also continue to be constrained by capability and sustainability challenges. In a post-settlement environment, depending on the terms of an agreement, there may also be the challenge of integrating former Taliban fighters into the national security forces and society. These issues could become more acute should international financial and military support decline sharply before, during, or after peace talks between the Afghan government and the Taliban. When asked in a congressional hearing on March 7, 2019, whether the ANDSF could independently secure Afghanistan without a peace deal between the Afghan government and the Taliban, then-commander of United States Central Command, General Joseph Votel said, "My assessment is the Afghan forces are dependent upon the Coalition support that we provide to them."¹⁶

HIGH RISKS: PLANNING FOR PEACE

Since the previous *High-Risk List* in January 2017, SIGAR has published numerous oversight products on Afghanistan's security institutions and has reported new developments in its quarterly reports to Congress. Of those, SIGAR's most comprehensive effort is the Lessons Learned Program report, *Reconstructing the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces: Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*. That 2017 SIGAR product presented key findings, including that the U.S. government was not properly prepared from the outset to help build an Afghan army and police force capable of protecting Afghanistan from internal and external threats and preventing the country from becoming a terrorist safe haven.¹⁷

SIGAR found that the U.S. government lacked a comprehensive approach to security-sector assistance and a coordinating body to successfully implement whole-of-government programs that were necessary to develop a capable and self-sustaining ANDSF.¹⁸

The 2019 *High-Risk List* reported that according to DOD, RS, and U.S. Forces-Afghanistan (USFOR-A), the ANDSF currently face critical capability gaps in key areas that hinder the force's effectiveness and readiness and may continue to do so in the future, including:

Force manning: recruiting, retention, and attrition: As of October 31, 2018, the Afghan National Army (ANA) was 36,621 personnel below its authorized strength of 227,374, and the Afghan National Police (ANP) was 6,686 personnel below its authorized strength of 124,626.¹⁹

With insufficient personnel, the ANDSF are less able to provide security to the Afghan population, are increasingly vulnerable to enemy attacks, and are at risk of incurring higher casualties. These issues make the force less sustainable in the long term and less capable of conducting its mission successfully.

Personnel accountability and pay systems: The ANDSF also struggles to accurately pay and account for its personnel. Since the beginning of the RS mission in January 2015, U.S. and Coalition personnel had scant presence at the lower tactical levels of the ANDSF, forcing the mission to rely on unverifiable Afghan personnel reporting.²⁰ Over the past two years, RS advisors have worked to reduce their reliance on manual Afghan personnel reporting by implementing the Afghan Personnel and Pay System (APPS), in which ANDSF personnel are biometrically enrolled. The system is designed to integrate personnel data with compensation and payroll data to process authorizations, record unit-level time and attendance data, and calculate payroll amounts, among other uses.²¹ According to USFOR-A, as of December 2018, the APPS system has been delivered to and is fully capable for use by both the ANA and the ANP, but only 84% of ANA personnel (including civilians) and 60% of ANP personnel were enrolled into the system, matched to authorized positions, and met the minimum data-input requirements to be paid. Both forces' enrollment rates in APPS have been improving, but slowly.²²

HIGH RISKS: PLANNING FOR PEACE



Afghan National Police officers march in a drill outside the Ministry of Interior in Kabul. (U.S. Army photo by Staff Sgt. Richard Andrade)

Logistics and maintenance: The Ministry of Defense (MOD) and Ministry of Interior (MOI) face key logistics and maintenance challenges, one of which is the implementation and maintenance of their electronic equipment-inventory and repair-status system, Core Inventory Management System (CoreIMS). According to DOD in December 2018, overall, MOD and MOI logisticians require persistent RS advisor attention, and their problems conducting national logistics planning remain “a vulnerability to the mission.”²³

Institutional training: DOD reported in December 2018 that institutional and professional training for ANDSF personnel, coordinated at the national and regional levels (above corps or zone levels), are at a relatively nascent phase. DOD reports that despite RS advisory efforts, strong training institutions have not emerged, particularly within MOI, which controls the national police.²⁴

Persistent terrorist threat from Islamic State: Although U.S. officials have consistently asserted that Islamic State Khorasan, the Islamic State affiliate in Afghanistan, has been degraded on multiple fronts, the group poses a greater security threat to the Afghan people and security forces than it did in 2016.²⁵ As the terrorist group has not been defeated, is not a party to peace negotiations, and continues to execute high-casualty attacks in major Afghan population centers, it remains potent.

Stalemate control of districts, population, and territory: The stalemate battlefield situation between the ANDSF and the Taliban is another risk, as the intensity of fighting has increased and both sides have incurred more casualties as they seek greater leverage at the negotiating table.²⁶ If negotiators fail to secure a peace agreement, the ANDSF will be hard

pressed to increase its control over Afghanistan's population, districts, and territory. From November 2016 through October 2018, Afghan government control and influence over its districts ranged between 54% and 60%. Over the same period, the Afghan government controlled or influenced between 64% and 66% of the population.²⁷

These issues indicate the importance of considering questions regarding the U.S. role in training, advising, and assisting the ANDSF following a peace agreement; preserving the capability gains of the Afghan Air Force and special forces; assisting the ANDSF in adapting to peacetime security functions and sustaining its systems and equipment; and integrating former Taliban fighters into the national security forces.

High-Risk Area: Underdeveloped Civil Policing Capability

Based on its work and analysis, SIGAR has found there is no comprehensive strategy for how the United States and Coalition partners will align its nationwide police advising mission to support Afghan rule of law and civil policing.²⁸ Throughout the reconstruction effort, the United States has placed more emphasis on reconstructing the Afghan National Army (ANA) than the Afghan National Police (ANP). For years, the ANP were used to provide paramilitary support to ANA counterinsurgency rather than performing core police functions.²⁹

This presents a problem and a serious risk: Following a political settlement, Afghan police, rather than the army, are likely to be the element responsible for everyday security and will serve as a direct link between the Afghan government's authority and the Afghan people. The U.S. Department of Justice has a program to train foreign police forces—the International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Program—but that program has no independent funding or operational authority and must fully rely on State or DOD.³⁰ NATO itself does not have a police advising capability, although efforts are underway to create a capability to deploy professional police advisors in future NATO operations. The concept is pending review and approval.³¹

The need to revise the role and raise the normal policing capabilities of the ANP raises questions about the U.S. strategy going forward with allies and the Afghan government to improve civil policing, provide funding, potentially integrate former Taliban fighters into the force, promote observance of the rule of law, and counter the impacts of corruption and narcotics trafficking.

High-Risk Area: Endemic Corruption

Corruption remains an enduring risk to the U.S. mission in Afghanistan. SIGAR's September 2016 Lessons Learned Program report on corruption found that corruption substantially undermined the U.S. mission in Afghanistan from the very start. SIGAR concluded that failure to effectively

address the problem means U.S. reconstruction programs, at best, will continue to be subverted by systemic corruption and, at worst, will fail.³² Despite many anticorruption efforts, the problem persists. According to the Department of Defense, “corruption remains the top strategic threat to the legitimacy and success of the Afghan government.”³³

In May 2018, SIGAR released its congressionally requested assessment of the Afghan government’s implementation of a national anticorruption strategy, and of the action plans of five ministries. SIGAR found that the Afghan government has made some progress in implementing its anticorruption-related commitments since 2017. For example, the United Nations recognized the Afghan government’s implementation of several key anticorruption reforms in 2017 and early 2018, including: the launch of an anticorruption strategy in October 2017, strengthened anticorruption measures in the new penal code, increased capacity of the Anti-Corruption Justice Center (ACJC), and a more transparent national budget.³⁴

However, SIGAR also found that Afghanistan’s anticorruption strategy did not meet international standards and best practices. Specifically, the strategy’s authors did not sufficiently engage Afghan civil-society organizations and ministries in the creation of the strategy, even though some of them will be responsible for implementing it. In addition, the strategy’s goals are not fully aligned with the benchmarks set to measure progress toward implementation,³⁵ complicating assessments of progress toward the goals. More importantly, SIGAR has identified serious problems with the implementation of this strategy against government and military officials, as well as key political figures and powerbrokers.³⁶

Given the long-standing, pervasive, and corrosive effects of corruption in Afghanistan, policymakers contemplating reconstruction operations after a peace deal should address questions about reasonable expectations for anticorruption efforts, the best way to structure and promote future programs, the impact of Taliban participation in Afghan governance, the effects of reduced foreign troop presence and funding, and the challenge of setting useful benchmarks for progress, as well as the issue of consequences for lack of progress.

High-Risk Area: Sluggish Economic Growth

The U.S. government’s current Integrated Country Strategy (ICS) for Afghanistan states that no U.S. efforts in Afghanistan—including the fundamental objective of preventing further attacks by terrorists on the U.S. homeland—can be sustained without a growing licit Afghan economy.³⁷

While a sustainable peace agreement could boost business confidence and investment, and therefore improve growth prospects substantially, peace also carries its own set of challenges.³⁸ For example, according to USAID, a significant number of Afghan refugees could return from Pakistan. If that occurs, they will have to be integrated—along with former Taliban

fighters—into a labor market that already struggles to provide sufficient job opportunities for Afghanistan’s youth.³⁹

A peace agreement would also neither inherently nor immediately reduce major enduring barriers to growth, including limited skilled labor, a significant infrastructure deficit, corruption, and heavy reliance on foreign donor support.⁴⁰

Despite its centrality to U.S. objectives—and its continued importance even if a peace agreement is reached—licit economic growth remains relatively low and Afghanistan remains heavily reliant on donor support. This raises questions about whether Afghanistan will be able to achieve the long-term stability and economic self-reliance that are key reconstruction goals.⁴¹

In its 2018 Lessons Learned Program report on private-sector development and economic growth, SIGAR found that despite significant U.S. effort, estimated poverty, unemployment, and underemployment had not been reduced substantially; further, corruption had undermined the legitimacy of the Afghan state.⁴²

While a lasting peace agreement could fundamentally improve Afghanistan’s prospects, its greatest economic challenge today remains identifying sustainable sources of growth, according to the World Bank.⁴³ Moreover, as donors emphasized at the November 2018 Geneva Conference on Afghanistan during coordination on future efforts, peace would not be cost free, and would have to be underpinned by inclusive economic and social programs (though donor commitments are still scheduled to gradually decline).⁴⁴

According to USAID, more than two million Afghans residing in Pakistan could return after a peace settlement, potentially because of political pressure from the Pakistani government.⁴⁵ Upon their return to Afghanistan, a weak licit labor market would then have to absorb those returnees. The need to reintegrate former insurgent and militia fighters into the economy would introduce additional challenges. In September 2018, Afghan President Ashraf Ghani said that providing former fighters with jobs following a peace agreement represented the “greatest problem for peace.”⁴⁶

Afghanistan’s economic weakness and challenging prospects suggest policymakers should ponder questions including the need to adjust U.S. economic-development programming for the aftermath of a peace settlement, easing the integration of returnees and former Taliban fighters into the economy, sustaining the impact of past programming, and encouraging Afghan policy changes to foster growth.

High-Risk Area: The Illicit Narcotics Trade

Since 2002, the United States government has provided \$9.0 billion to thwart narcotics production and trafficking in Afghanistan. Yet Afghanistan remains the global leader in poppy cultivation—a distinction it has held since the late 1990s, according to poppy cultivation data from the United

HIGH RISKS: PLANNING FOR PEACE



Scarring poppy pods releases sap for opium production. (UN photo)

Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).⁴⁷ Afghan opium-poppy cultivation levels reached an all-time high in 2017—and managed to reach the second-highest level even in drought-affected 2018—since UNODC began collecting data in 1994.⁴⁸

The illicit opium trade hinders the Afghan government's efforts across numerous sectors, including security, governance, and economic and social development.⁴⁹ The production and trafficking of illicit drugs finances drug-trafficking organizations and antigovernment groups, undermines the government's legitimacy, and feeds corruption,⁵⁰ benefiting insurgent groups and corrupt government officials alike.⁵¹

A SIGAR lessons-learned report published in June 2018 found that U.S. counternarcotics programs have not resulted in long-term reductions in opium-poppy cultivation or production. Likewise, crop-eradication programs had no lasting impact, and were not consistently conducted in the same locations as development-assistance programs that aimed to give farmers economic alternatives to growing poppy. Alternative-development programs were often too short term, failed to provide sustainable alternatives to poppy, and sometimes even contributed to increased poppy production. The lack of a stable security environment greatly hindered efforts to curtail poppy cultivation and production, and the government failed to develop and implement counternarcotics strategies that outlined or effectively directed U.S. agencies toward shared goals.⁵²

The findings in SIGAR's lessons-learned report prompted the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control to request that SIGAR conduct a thorough review of the U.S. government's current counternarcotics efforts in Afghanistan. That review is ongoing.

With or without a peace agreement, Afghanistan runs the risk of becoming a “narco-state” and has already been described as such by former officials from the U.S. government and international organizations.⁵³

Afghanistan’s position as a leading producer of illegal drugs raises questions involving the prospects for U.S. counternarcotics efforts after a peace accord, building Afghan institutions to counter the danger of devolving into a narco-state, accounting for the effects of Taliban participation in governance, promoting alternative livelihoods for farmers drawn to raising opium poppy, and the possibility of targeting groups that rely on narcotics revenues to support insurgency.

High-Risk Area: Threats to Women’s Rights

A 2017 U.S. law expressed the sense of Congress that (1) the meaningful participation of women in conflict-prevention and conflict-resolution processes helps to promote more inclusive and democratic societies and is critical to the long-term stability of countries and regions; and (2) the political participation and leadership of women in fragile environments, particularly during democratic transitions, is critical to sustaining lasting democratic institutions.⁵⁴ Since 2002, the United States has committed at least \$1 billion for gender-related programs in Afghanistan and spent another \$1 billion on programs for which the advancement of women was a component.⁵⁵

Despite increased roles for women in Afghan civic, social, and economic life, the United Nations has ranked Afghanistan 153rd out of 160 countries for gender equality—despite a constitution that nominally protects women’s rights.⁵⁶ Deep-rooted cultural traditions and a persistent insurgency continue to threaten the physical safety and health of Afghan women and hold them back from entering public life, particularly in the rural areas where some 75% of women live.⁵⁷

The prospect of a peace agreement with the Taliban raises new concerns about the sustainability of the gains Afghan women have made over the past 17 years. The Taliban regime from 1996 to 2001 was notorious for its brutality against women. Some experts believe that a precipitous withdrawal of U.S. forces could lead to the deterioration of political and economic freedoms, however limited, currently enjoyed by women in Afghanistan.⁵⁸

Questions for policymakers would encompass matters such as U.S. options to protect women’s rights in a political system including the Taliban, available steps to comply with U.S. statutory requirements for promoting women’s participation in Afghan society, and tracking the outcomes of gender-advancement programs.

High-Risk Area: The Challenge of Reintegration

The U.S. and Afghan governments agree that the best way to ensure lasting peace and security in Afghanistan is to achieve reconciliation and a

sustainable political settlement with the Taliban.⁵⁹ While current estimates for the number of active Taliban fighters vary, the current commander of U.S. Central Command, Lieutenant General Kenneth McKenzie Jr., recently put the figure at 60,000 fighters.⁶⁰

If a comprehensive peace agreement is reached, these ex-combatants will need to transition to a sustainable livelihood and peacefully reintegrate into Afghan society. There may also be efforts to demobilize and reintegrate members of other illegal armed groups. Successfully reintegrating these tens of thousands of former fighters into society—a complex and long-term process with social, economic, political, security, and humanitarian dimensions—will be critical for Afghanistan to achieve lasting peace and stability.⁶¹

The mixed record of reintegration efforts undertaken in dozens of countries since the late 1980s suggests that similar efforts in Afghanistan will likely face significant challenges.⁶² SIGAR assesses that the nature and extent of those challenges will depend largely on the peace process itself, its level of inclusivity, trust among the parties, the degree to which reintegration issues are decided in an agreement or deferred, and numerous other factors. For example, a weak economy with few job opportunities would complicate reintegration. SIGAR is currently making a thorough investigation of reintegration issues for a forthcoming Lessons Learned Program report to be published later this year.

The challenge of reintegrating former Taliban fighters into national life requires questioning what lessons can be drawn from earlier reintegration efforts, what role international donors would have in shaping and funding reintegration activities, how employment opportunities can be promoted, and related matters.

High-Risk Area: Restricted Oversight

With or without a peace settlement, the U.S. mission in Afghanistan and the reconstruction effort will continue to require vigorous oversight. Even if the United States were to withdraw most of its remaining troops from Afghanistan, SIGAR would still work under its legal mandate to provide the oversight of U.S. taxpayer funds necessary to maintain the reconstruction program.

However, oversight of the U.S. reconstruction effort in Afghanistan, already difficult, may become even more challenging if substantial numbers of U.S. military and civilian personnel withdraw following an Afghan peace settlement.⁶³ Accessing reconstruction project sites and programs in Afghanistan is already difficult due to deteriorated security. Site access would continue to be challenging should a potential peace agreement not actually lead to a cessation of hostilities—a possible outcome about which several experts have written in recent months.⁶⁴ Moreover, a reduced footprint for U.S. agencies operating in Afghanistan could exacerbate ongoing

HIGH RISKS: PLANNING FOR PEACE



Inspector General Sopko and SIGAR staff on a recent inspection of the U.S.-funded Marshal Fahim Defense University in Kabul. With the IG are members of his movement team from the State Department's Diplomatic Security Service, which provides vital support for SIGAR's oversight work in Afghanistan. (SIGAR photo)

problems with contract oversight, such as spotty compliance, documentation and accountability, as well as institutional memory loss.⁶⁵

In Afghanistan's conflict setting, where rules are not rigorously observed and documentation is often incomplete and unverifiable, having personnel physically present and able to move about the country is essential for effective oversight. Otherwise, it is difficult to determine whether training is effective, equipment is operable, clinics are stocked with medicines, schools are open, or buildings are safe and functional.

With nearly \$10 billion of already appropriated U.S. funds awaiting disbursement for Afghanistan reconstruction, the need for effective oversight is as great as ever. The already daunting challenges to oversight may grow after a peace settlement that could entail further reductions in U.S. and Coalition security personnel and reduced visibility into Afghan institutions' use of assistance funds.

These concerns should raise questions about the levels of U.S. military and civilian personnel needed and practicable should a peace settlement be reached, oversight mechanisms to monitor use of funds provided directly to the Afghan government, U.S. agency options to use third-party or other monitoring techniques, and focusing on outcomes rather than simple measures of activities and outputs, among other issues.

The issue of oversight of on-budget aid is particularly salient. If more U.S. funds are to be disbursed on-budget—either directly to the Afghan government or through multilateral trust funds—it will be vitally important that the ministries have strong accountability measures and internal

controls in place. At the request of President Ghani, SIGAR currently is conducting a financial audit of Afghanistan's power utility, Da Afghanistan Breshna Sherkat (DABS). SIGAR also has a strategy in place for looking at the internal controls of other ministries if the United States continues to provide substantial amounts of assistance on-budget to Afghan ministries. One example of previous SIGAR investigative work was the discovery of vendor collusion to rig bids and attempted bribery in a nearly \$1 billion fuel contract with the Ministry of Defense that was funded with U.S. aid provided on-budget.⁶⁶

CONCLUSION

After 40 years of war, peace would be a blessing for the long-suffering people of Afghanistan. But as the topical sections of SIGAR's 2019 *High-Risk List* indicate, even a broadly popular agreement might present risks to Afghanistan's reconstruction and to its long-term viability as a nation-state.

If large-scale withdrawals of U.S. operational and oversight personnel occur, the stewardship of U.S. taxpayer funds and achievement of reconstruction goals could suffer. If widespread corruption is not adequately addressed, the effectiveness of programs, the perceived legitimacy of the Afghan state, and the willingness of donors to continue their assistance could all suffer. If economic development stalls, accommodating new entrants to the labor force, including returning refugees and former government and insurgent fighters, could prove a daunting task. If women's rights and progress are not respected, and if the rule of law is not upheld, equitable and effective governance could fail. And if new security arrangements do not provide for fair and effective policing while standing ready to quash any resurgence of terrorism, then all other aspects of reconstruction could ultimately fail.

As discussions progress, members of the U.S. Congress and of executive agencies should consider the "day after" a peace agreement and be on the alert for unexamined assumptions, overlooked details, unintended consequences, concealed agendas, and other issues that could turn a wished-for peace deal into another sort of conflict.

An opportunity for peace exists. How it is embraced, shaped, and nurtured will determine if Afghanistan is to continue progressing in economic and social development, and avoid new conflicts that might result in its once again becoming a danger to the international community.

“Congressional oversight has a long history of providing tangible, real world benefits for our warfighters serving on the front lines.”

—*U.S. Representative Stephen Lynch*

2 SIGAR OVERSIGHT



SIGAR OVERSIGHT CONTENTS

Audits	22
Inspections	28
Special Projects	31
Lessons Learned	35
Investigations	35
Quarterly Highlight: New Rules for AUAF	40
Other SIGAR Oversight Activities	43
SIGAR Budget	45
SIGAR Staff	45

Photo on previous page

Inspector General John Sopko, joined by hosts Anthony Cordesman (right) and Seth Jones (left), discusses SIGAR's 2019 *High-Risk List* at a launch event at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, DC, on March 28, 2019.

(SIGAR photo by Kathleen Umphlett)

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

This quarter, SIGAR issued 17 products. SIGAR work to date has identified approximately \$2.6 billion in savings for the U.S. taxpayer.

On March 28, 2019, SIGAR released its 2019 *High-Risk List* for Congress, emphasizing the need to begin planning to address the risks to the United States' \$133 billion investment in Afghanistan's reconstruction that might persist or arise after any peace agreement is signed. The special report identified eight high-risk areas: widespread insecurity, underdeveloped policing capacity, endemic corruption, sluggish economic growth, the illicit narcotics trade, threats to women's rights, the reintegration of ex-combatants, and restricted oversight.

SIGAR issued one performance audit report this quarter, examining the \$775 million, 15-year effort by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Department of Defense (DOD) to increase electric power generation capacity at the Kajaki Dam in Helmand Province to 51.5 megawatts, provide short-term diesel-fueled power generation, and improve the delivery of power to customers in Helmand and Kandahar Provinces through the Southeast Power System (SEPS).

SIGAR completed seven financial audits of U.S.-funded contracts to rebuild Afghanistan. These financial audits covered a range of topics including USAID's Afghanistan University Support and Workforce Development Program, USAID's Women's Leadership Development Project, and the Department of the Army's Law Enforcement Professionals Program. These financial audits identified more than \$7 million in questioned costs as a result of internal-control deficiencies and noncompliance issues. To date, SIGAR's financial audits have identified more than \$425.6 million in questioned costs, interest, and other amounts payable to the U.S. government.

SIGAR also issued two inspection reports. These reports examined the construction, use and maintenance of USAID's \$56.7 million Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project (PTEC) transmission line between Arghandi and Ghazni, and DOD's \$5.2 million Kang Border Patrol headquarters compound.

This quarter, SIGAR's Office of Special Projects issued six reports on topics including USAID-supported health facilities in Faryab and Bamyan Provinces, USAID-funded schools in Paktika and Bamyan Provinces, Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP)-funded bridges in

COMPLETED PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORTS

- Audit 19-37-AR: Afghanistan's Energy Sector: USAID and DOD Did Not Consistently Collect and Report Performance Data on Projects Related to Kajaki Dam, and Concerns Exist Regarding Sustainability

COMPLETED FINANCIAL AUDIT REPORTS

- Financial Audit 19-23-FA: Department of the Army's Law Enforcement Professionals Program: Audit of Costs Incurred by Engility Corporation
- Financial Audit 19-30-FA: USAID's Afghanistan University Support and Workforce Development Program: Audit of Costs Incurred by FHI 360
- Financial Audit 19-26-FA: USAID's Women's Leadership Development Project in Afghanistan: Audit of Costs Incurred by ARD Inc.
- Financial Audit 19-27-FA: USAID's Technical Assistance Provided to the Afghan Ministry of Public Works: Audit of Costs Incurred by Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions Inc.
- Financial Audit 19-19-FA: USAID's Afghanistan Agriculture Extension Project-II: Audit of Costs Incurred by University of California, Davis
- Financial Audit 19-28-FA: USAID's Helping Mothers and Children Thrive Program: Audit of Costs Incurred by Jhpiego Corporation
- Financial Audit 19-31-FA: Department of State's Afghan Civilian Advisor Support Program: Audit of Costs Incurred by DynCorp International LLC

Continued on the next page

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

Continued from previous page

COMPLETED INSPECTION REPORTS

- Inspection Report 19-35-IP: USAID's Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project: Arghandi-Ghazni Transmission Line Was Generally Built to Contract Requirements, but Four Deficiencies Create Safety Hazards and Could Disrupt Electrical Power
- Inspection Report 19-36-IP: Kang Border Patrol Headquarters: Construction Generally Met Contract Requirements, but Four Deficiencies Exist, and the \$5.2 million Project Has Not Been Used or Maintained

COMPLETED SPECIAL PROJECTS REPORTS

- Review 19-20-SP: USAID Supported Health Facilities in Faryab Province, Afghanistan: Observations from 17 Site Visits
- Review 19-21-SP: Schools in Paktika Province, Afghanistan: Observations from Site Visits at Six Schools
- Review 19-22-SP: Afghan National Defense and Security Forces Facilities: Action Needed to Address Confiscation of Contractor-Owned Property and Contractor Mistreatment
- Review 19-24-SP: Bridges in Ghazni Province, Afghanistan: All Eight Bridges SIGAR Visited Were In Good Condition
- Review 19-33-SP: Schools in Bamyan Province, Afghanistan: Observations from Site Visits at 16 Schools
- Review 19-34-SP: USAID Supported Health Facilities in Bamyan Province, Afghanistan: Observations from 44 Site Visits

Ghazni Province, and theft of contractor-owned property by the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF).

Additionally, DOD completed its cost-benefit analysis of the operational suitability and cost effectiveness of using a proprietary pattern for future purchases of uniforms for the ANDSF, as required by Section 344 of H.R. 2810, the FY 2018 National Defense Authorization Act. The analysis was directed by Congress as a result of SIGAR's June 2017 report, *Afghan National Army: DOD May Have Spent Up To \$28 million More Than Needed To Procure Camouflage Uniforms That May Be Inappropriate For The Afghan Environment* (SIGAR 17-48-SP), and validated its findings. The analysis concluded that the camouflage pattern selected was the most expensive of the seven patterns tested and the second-most detectable. SIGAR reported that the U.S. military spent \$28 million more than necessary to procure uniforms with a proprietary pattern for the Afghan National Army (ANA). SIGAR's review also found that CSTC-A recommended using a sole-source award to purchase the rights to the pattern, despite concerns from DOD's contracting office and without testing the pattern's effectiveness for use in Afghanistan.

During the reporting period, SIGAR investigations resulted in two guilty pleas, one sentencing, and \$1 million in criminal fines and forfeitures. In addition, the civil investigation of Hikmatullah Shadman, an Afghan national, resulted in a forfeiture of \$25 million to the United States. SIGAR initiated 14 new cases and closed 11, bringing the total number of ongoing investigations to 168. Further, on March 29, 2019, following a joint investigation by SIGAR and the USAID Office of the Inspector General, the heavily U.S.-funded American University of Afghanistan (AUAF) signed an agreement with USAID to deal with long-standing management and accountability issues identified by the oversight agencies.

This quarter, SIGAR's suspension and debarment program referred 15 individuals and 26 entities for suspension or debarment based on evidence developed as part of investigations conducted by SIGAR in Afghanistan and the United States. These referrals bring the total number of individuals and companies referred by SIGAR since 2008 to 969, encompassing 530 individuals and 439 companies.

AUDITS

SIGAR conducts performance and financial audits of programs and projects connected to the reconstruction effort in Afghanistan. Since its last report to Congress, SIGAR has issued one performance audit and seven financial audits. This quarter, SIGAR has nine ongoing performance audits and 36 ongoing financial audits.

Performance Audit Reports Issued

SIGAR issued one performance audit report this quarter. This audit examined the \$775 million, 15-year effort by USAID and DOD to increase electric power generation capacity at the Kajaki Dam in Helmand Province to 51.5 megawatts, provide short-term diesel-fueled power generation, and improve the delivery of power to customers in Helmand and Kandahar Provinces through the Southeast Power System. A list of completed and ongoing performance audits can be found in Appendix C of this quarterly report.

Performance Audit 19-37-AR: Afghanistan's Energy Sector USAID and DOD Did Not Consistently Collect and Report Performance Data on Projects Related to Kajaki Dam, and Concerns Exist Regarding Sustainability

The United States has spent about \$775 million on 17 infrastructure projects since 2004 to increase electric power generation capacity at the Kajaki Dam in Helmand Province to 51.5 megawatts, provide short-term diesel-fueled power generation, and improve the delivery of power to customers in Helmand and Kandahar Provinces through the Southeast Power System (SEPS).

SIGAR found that USAID and DOD have not finished SEPS, which is needed to transmit power from the Kajaki Dam, and Afghans in southern Afghanistan have not yet received the intended benefits from these projects. As of December 2018, 12 of 17 infrastructure projects that USAID and DOD implemented to increase power generation and transmission from the Kajaki Dam were three to 40 months behind their original planned schedules due to a high level of nearby insurgent activity, as well as poor contractor performance, issues involving the Afghan government, and delays in delivering necessary equipment. As of December 2018, there were two projects left to complete SEPS.

SIGAR also found that USAID did not collect complete performance data on their infrastructure projects to increase power generation and transmission from the Kajaki Dam due to challenges with Afghanistan's unique and difficult operating environment, changes in USAID's internal policies over time, and frequent turnover in project staff. In addition, SIGAR found that DOD did not collect or report strategic-level performance data for its projects because it had no requirements to do so.

Finally, SIGAR found that although USAID and DOD complied with requirements to assess the capacity of Da Afghanistan Breshna Sherkat (DABS), Afghanistan's electric-power utility, challenges remain regarding DABS's ability to sustain U.S.-funded infrastructure projects. After completing an energy-sector assessment in July 2018, USAID determined that DABS was commercially unviable and a poorly functioning utility,

COMPLETED PERFORMANCE AUDITS

- Audit 19-37-AR: Afghanistan's Energy Sector: USAID and DOD Did Not Consistently Collect and Report Performance Data on Projects Related to Kajaki Dam, and Concerns Exist Regarding Sustainability

ATTESTATION ENGAGEMENT OF DABS ANNOUNCED

SIGAR discussed the need for greater transparency of Da Afghanistan Breshna Sherkat (DABS), Afghanistan's power utility, with President Ghani in February 2018. That discussion led to a memorandum of understanding with the Afghan government that allows SIGAR to review DABS's use and management of past and current donor funds in an attempt to improve internal controls to help ensure that donor funds are being properly managed, accounted for, and used as intended. At the request of President Ghani, SIGAR currently is conducting an attestation engagement of DABS. An attestation engagement is an arrangement with a client where an independent third party investigates and reports on subject matter created by a client.

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

citing concerns with DABS’s procurement abilities, commercial viability, integrity, and management and oversight of construction activities.

SIGAR made two recommendations to USAID and DOD: adhere to requirements to collect and report baselines, targets, and results for each strategic level performance indicator and evaluate the extent to which its projects are contributing to USAID’s strategic objectives for its energy projects in Afghanistan, and work with DABS to complete and begin implementing the capacity-development roadmap discussed in USAID’s July 2018 technical assessment by June 30, 2019.

TABLE 2.1

SIGAR’S FINANCIAL AUDIT COVERAGE (\$ BILLIONS)	
134 completed audits	\$7.43
36 ongoing audits	0.87
Total	\$8.30

Note: Numbers have been rounded. Coverage includes auditable costs incurred by recipients of U.S.-funded Afghanistan reconstruction contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements.

Source: SIGAR Audits and Inspections Directorate.

Financial Audits

SIGAR launched its financial-audit program in 2012, after Congress and the oversight community expressed concerns about oversight gaps and the growing backlog of incurred-cost audits for contracts and grants awarded in support of overseas contingency operations. SIGAR competitively selects independent accounting firms to conduct the financial audits and ensures that the audit work is performed in accordance with U.S. government auditing standards. Financial audits are coordinated with the federal inspector-general community to maximize financial-audit coverage and avoid duplication of effort.

SIGAR has 36 ongoing financial audits with \$871 million in auditable costs, as shown in Table 2.1 A list of completed and ongoing financial audits can be found in Appendix C of this quarterly report.

This quarter, SIGAR completed seven financial audits of U.S.-funded contracts to rebuild Afghanistan. These audits help provide the U.S. government and the American taxpayer reasonable assurance that the funds spent on these awards were used as intended. The audits question expenditures that cannot be substantiated or are potentially unallowable.

SIGAR issues each financial-audit report to the funding agency that made the award(s). The funding agency is responsible for making the final determination on **questioned amounts** identified in the report’s audit findings. Since the program’s inception, SIGAR’s financial audits have identified more than \$425 million in **questioned costs** and \$364,907 in unremitted interest on advanced federal funds or other revenue amounts payable to the government. As of March 31, 2019, funding agencies had disallowed \$26.6 million in questioned amounts, which are subject to collection. It takes time for funding agencies to carefully consider audit findings and recommendations. As a result, final disallowed-cost determinations remain to be made for several of SIGAR’s issued financial audits. SIGAR’s financial audits have also identified and communicated 449 compliance findings and 476 internal-control findings to the auditees and funding agencies.

Questioned amounts: the sum of potentially unallowable questioned costs and unremitted interest on advanced federal funds or other revenue amounts payable to the government.

Questioned costs: costs determined to be potentially unallowable. The two types of questioned costs are (1) ineligible costs (violation of a law, regulation, contract, grant, cooperative agreement, etc. or an unnecessary or unreasonable expenditure of funds), and (2) unsupported costs (those not supported by adequate documentation or proper approvals at the time of an audit).

Financial Audits Issued

This quarter, SIGAR completed seven financial audits of U.S.-funded contracts to rebuild Afghanistan. These audits identified more than \$7 million in questioned costs because of internal-control deficiencies and noncompliance issues, such as using incorrect foreign currency conversion rates and improperly supporting amounts invoiced.

Financial Audit 19-23-FA: Department of the Army's Law Enforcement Professionals Program

Audit of Costs Incurred by Engility Corporation

On March 27, 2013, the Army Contracting Command awarded a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract worth \$121,505,386 to Engility Corporation (Engility) to support the Law Enforcement Professionals (LEP) program. The objectives were to advise, assist, mentor, and train U.S. and Coalition forces, provide experienced law-enforcement personnel, and help the U.S. and Coalition forces identify and target criminal insurgent networks. After 28 modifications, the total funding decreased to \$94,301,244, and the period of performance was extended from June 30, 2014, to June 30, 2019.

SIGAR's financial audit, performed by Conrad LLP (Conrad), reviewed \$19,401,379 in costs charged to the contract from January 1, 2016, through June 30, 2018. Conrad identified one significant deficiency and one deficiency in Engility's internal controls, and two instances of noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the contract and applicable regulations. Because of these internal-control deficiencies and instances of noncompliance, Conrad identified \$6,054,235 in total questioned costs.

Financial Audit 19-30-FA: USAID's Afghanistan University Support and Workforce Development Program

Audit of Costs Incurred by FHI 360

On January 1, 2014, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) awarded FHI 360 a five-year, \$91.9 million cooperative agreement to implement the Afghanistan University Support and Workforce Development Program. The program's objectives were to increase the skills and employability of Afghan men and women in the public and private sectors. USAID modified the agreement 12 times, extending the period of performance by nine months to September 30, 2019. The funding amount did not change.

SIGAR's financial audit, performed by Crowe LLP (Crowe), reviewed \$43,283,444 million charged to the cooperative agreement from October 1, 2015, through December 31, 2017. Crowe identified one material weakness and three significant deficiencies in FHI 360's internal controls, and two instances of noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the cooperative agreement. Because of the internal-control deficiencies and instances of noncompliance, Crowe identified \$656,218 in questioned costs.

COMPLETED FINANCIAL AUDITS

- Financial Audit 19-23-FA: Department of the Army's Law Enforcement Professionals Program: Audit of Costs Incurred by Engility Corporation
- Financial Audit 19-30-FA: USAID's Afghanistan University Support and Workforce Development Program: Audit of Costs Incurred by FHI 360
- Financial Audit 19-26-FA: USAID's Women's Leadership Development Project in Afghanistan: Audit of Costs Incurred by ARD Inc.
- Financial Audit 19-27-FA: USAID's Technical Assistance Provided to the Afghan Ministry of Public Works: Audit of Costs Incurred by Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions Inc.
- Financial Audit 19-19-FA: USAID's Afghanistan Agriculture Extension Project-II: Audit of Costs Incurred by University of California, Davis
- Financial Audit 19-28-FA: USAID's Helping Mothers and Children Thrive Program: Audit of Costs Incurred by Jhpiego Corporation
- Financial Audit 19-31-FA: Department of State's Afghan Civilian Advisor Support Program: Audit of Costs Incurred by DynCorp International LLC

Financial Audit 19-26-FA: USAID’s Women’s Leadership Development Project in Afghanistan

Audit of Costs Incurred by ARD Inc.

On September 23, 2014, USAID awarded a \$41,959,377 cost-plus-fixed-fee task order to ARD Inc. (ARD) to implement the Women’s Leadership Development (WLD) project under the Promoting Gender Equity in National Priority Programs. The intent of WLD is to enable Afghan women to apply advanced management and leadership skills in Afghanistan’s public, private, and civil-society sectors. The period of performance is from September 23, 2014, through September 22, 2019. USAID modified the task order eight times, but did not change its amount or period of performance.

SIGAR’s financial audit, performed by Crowe LLP, reviewed \$19,368,120 in expenditures and fixed fees charged to the task order from October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2017. Crowe identified one significant deficiency and one material weakness in ARD’s internal controls, and one instance of noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the task order and applicable laws and regulations. Because of these internal-control deficiencies and instance of noncompliance, Crowe identified a total of \$338,061 in questioned costs.

Financial Audit 19-27-FA: USAID’s Technical Assistance Provided to the Afghan Ministry of Public Works

Audit of Costs Incurred by Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions Inc.

On August 2, 2014, USAID awarded a \$21,366,222 cost-plus-fixed-fee contract to AMEC Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure Inc. (AMEC) to give technical assistance to the Afghan Ministry of Public Works. The purpose of the contract was to improve the management, financing, and efficiency of the country’s roads. USAID modified the contract nine times, increasing the obligated amount to \$25,486,058. On April 16, 2018, AMEC changed its name to Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions Inc. (Wood).

SIGAR’s financial audit, performed by Crowe LLP, reviewed \$12,979,139 in costs and fixed fees that Wood reported from January 1, 2016, through August 2, 2017. Crowe identified one significant deficiency and two deficiencies in Wood’s internal controls, and three instances of noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the contract or applicable regulations. Because of the internal-control deficiencies and instances of noncompliance, Crowe identified \$11,718 in total questioned costs.

Financial Audit 19-19-FA: USAID’s Afghanistan Agriculture Extension Project–II

Audit of Costs Incurred by University of California, Davis

On November 13, 2014, USAID awarded the University of California, Davis (UC Davis) a three-year, \$19,814,702 cooperative agreement to support the

Afghanistan Agriculture Extension Project–II. The project’s objective was to increase the capacity of Afghanistan’s Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation, and Livestock. UC Davis worked with four other universities on the project to direct and promote agricultural, environmental, and social sustainability through research, teaching, and public engagement. USAID modified the cooperative agreement 10 times, increasing the obligated amount for the project to \$20,229,770 and shortening the period of performance by two months from September 30, 2017, to July 31, 2017.

SIGAR’s financial audit, performed by Crowe LLP, reviewed \$16,608,074 in costs incurred on the cooperative agreement from July 1, 2015, through July 31, 2017. Crowe identified three material weaknesses and one significant deficiency in UC Davis’s internal controls, and three instances of noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the cooperative agreement. Because of the internal-control deficiencies and instances of noncompliance, Crowe identified \$8,590 in total questioned costs.

Financial Audit 19-28-FA: USAID’s Helping Mothers and Children Thrive Program

Audit of Costs Incurred by Jhpiego Corporation

On January 7, 2015, USAID awarded Jhpiego Corporation (Jhpiego) a \$60 million cooperative agreement to support the Family Planning, Maternal, Newborn, and Child Health program. The agreement’s objective was to increase the use of high-quality maternal and child health services by strengthening existing primary-care services provided through the private sector and the Afghan Ministry of Public Health. As of December 2017, USAID had modified the agreement nine times, with no change in the total funding or period of performance. On July 16, 2015, the program’s name was changed to Helping Mothers and Children Thrive.

SIGAR’s financial audit, performed by Crowe LLP, reviewed \$28,437,143 in costs charged to the cooperative agreement from July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2017. Crowe identified two deficiencies in Jhpiego’s internal controls, one of which was a significant deficiency, and two instances of noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the cooperative agreement and applicable regulations. Because of the significant deficiency and instance of noncompliance, Crowe identified \$3,301 in total questioned costs.

Financial Audit 19-31-FA: Department of State’s Afghan Civilian Advisor Support Program

Audit of Costs Incurred by DynCorp International LLC

On December 29, 2014, the Department of State’s Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs awarded a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract worth \$15,150,364 to DynCorp International LLC (DynCorp) to support the Afghan Civilian Advisor Support Program.

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

The purpose of this contract was to increase the Afghan government's abilities to improve public security and support the rule of law. DynCorp was required to provide qualified personnel to support U.S. foreign-assistance programs to mentor and train the Afghan National Police and the Afghan Ministry of Interior. After seven modifications, the total funding increased to \$21,246,089, and the period of performance was extended from June 30, 2015, through February 29, 2016.

SIGAR's financial audit, performed by Davis Farr LLP (Davis Farr), reviewed \$18,401,542 in costs charged to the contract from December 29, 2014, through February 29, 2016. Davis Farr did not identify any material weaknesses or significant deficiencies in DynCorp's internal controls, or any instances of noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the contract. Accordingly, Davis Farr did not identify any questioned costs.

INSPECTIONS

Inspection Reports Issued

This quarter, SIGAR issued two inspection reports. These reports examined USAID's \$56.7 million Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project (PTEC) transmission line between Arghandi and Ghazni, and DOD's \$5.2 million Kang Border Patrol headquarters compound. A list of completed and ongoing inspections can be found in Appendix C of this quarterly report.

Inspection Report 19-35-IP: USAID's Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project

Arghandi-Ghazni Transmission Line Was Generally Built to Contract Requirements, but Four Deficiencies Create Safety Hazards and Could Disrupt Electrical Power

On December 5, 2012, USAID issued an implementation letter to fund the PTEC project in Afghanistan. Da Afghanistan Breshna Sherkat (DABS), the Afghan government's electrical utility, is responsible for implementing PTEC in collaboration with Afghanistan's Ministry of Finance. As part of the project, on March 26, 2014, DABS awarded KEC International Ltd. a \$56.7 million contract to design, supply, and construct a 76-mile-long, 220-kilovolt double-circuit transmission line between Arghandi and Ghazni. After four contract amendments, the component's completion date was extended from December 31, 2016, to August 31, 2017, and the contract's value increased to \$59.2 million. KEC International completed the project on August 31, 2017.

SIGAR found that KEC International generally built the PTEC towers and transmission line between the Arghandi and Ghazni substations according to contract requirements and technical specifications. However, SIGAR found four deficiencies that have created safety hazards and could

COMPLETED INSPECTION REPORTS

- Inspection Report 19-35-IP: USAID's Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project: Arghandi-Ghazni Transmission Line Was Generally Built to Contract Requirements, but Four Deficiencies Create Safety Hazards and Could Disrupt Electrical Power
- Inspection Report 19-36-IP: Kang Border Patrol Headquarters: Construction Generally Met Contract Requirements, but SIGAR Identified Five Deficiencies, and the \$5.2 million Project Has Not Been Used or Maintained

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

disrupt the flow of electricity through the national transmission grid. First, KEC International did not clear all trees close to the transmission line as required. Second, the foundations of two of the 18 towers SIGAR inspected were experiencing soil settlement. Based on SIGAR's observations, it is not certain that KEC International backfilled the foundations of these two towers to eight inches as the contract required. Third, the foundations of five of the 18 towers were vulnerable to soil erosion because KEC International did not provide backfill or riprap—a pile of broken stones used as a foundation or to stabilize an easily eroded bank or slope. Finally, KEC International added a layer of concrete on top of the originally placed concrete to the foundations of four of the 18 towers inspected, resulting in a honeycomb finish that could allow water to enter the concrete foundation.

The four deficiencies were added to an updated punch list of items for KEC International to address before the final warranty inspection occurs. However, KEC International has not yet corrected the punch-list items due to security concerns along the transmission-line route.

SIGAR found that the transmission line between Arghandi and Ghazni is used and maintained. Although the line has the capacity to transmit the energy associated with 300 megawatts of power, it transmits only about three megawatts' worth of energy to approximately 12,000 customers in Ghazni and Wardak Provinces because there is insufficient electric generation in Afghanistan.

SIGAR recommends that the USAID Mission Director for Afghanistan work with Afghan Ministry of Finance and DABS officials to have KEC International check all transmission tower locations and, where necessary, correct the deficiencies SIGAR identified.

Inspection Report 19-36-IP: Kang Border Patrol Headquarters Construction Generally Met Contract Requirements, but Four Deficiencies Exist, and the \$5.2 million Project Has Not Been Used or Maintained

In August 2011, the U.S. Air Force's 772nd Enterprise Sourcing Squadron, in support of the Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment, now the Air Force Civil Engineer Center (AFCEC), awarded a \$26.9 million cost-plus-fixed-fee task order to United Research Services Group Inc. (URS) to design and construct four compounds for the Afghan Border Police, one of which was the Kang Border Patrol headquarters. On February 28, 2013, the Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan transferred the completed Kang Border Patrol headquarters compound, which cost \$5.2 million to construct, to the Afghan Ministry of Interior (MOI), which oversees the border police.

SIGAR found that URS built the buildings, facilities, and utility systems required by the task order, but SIGAR could access only 18 of the 29 buildings and support facilities, plus the three utility systems, to assess their construction. For these 21 buildings, facilities, and systems, SIGAR



Transmission towers along the 76-mile-long Arghandi-Ghazni transmission line funded by USAID. (SIGAR photo)

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

identified four instances where URS did not comply with the contract requirements. Specifically, URS did not place native crushed stone around the Kang Border Patrol headquarters buildings; apply finishing coats of paint to the entry gates, guard towers, and fuel storage tank canopy; install trenches for the storm-water system; or install safety components on the fuel-storage tanks. Additional deficiencies might exist in the 11 buildings and facilities that could not be accessed.

In addition, SIGAR could not fully assess the extent of AFCEC's project oversight because neither it nor its contractors maintained contract documents. Moreover, Henningson Durham Richardson Environment Operations and Construction Inc. (HDR), the contractor responsible for oversight, acknowledged that it did not effectively oversee the project because of security concerns near the Kang headquarters compound. Since its completion in February 2013, the newly constructed Kang Border Patrol headquarters compound has never been used, and the MOI currently has no plans to use it in the future, which could result in a waste of \$5.2 million in U.S. taxpayers' money. Further, the new construction at the Kang headquarters compound is starting to deteriorate due to the lack of maintenance.

Because the Afghan government is now responsible for operating and maintaining the Kang headquarters compound, SIGAR did not make any recommendations in this report.

Status of SIGAR Recommendations

The Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, requires SIGAR to report on the status of its recommendations. This quarter, SIGAR closed 43 recommendations contained in 18 audits, inspections, and financial reports. These reports contained recommendations that resulted in the recovery of \$132,924 in ineligible or unsupported contract costs paid by the U.S. government.

From 2009 through March 2019, SIGAR issued 333 audits, alert letters, and inspection reports, and made 952 recommendations to recover funds, improve agency oversight, and increase program effectiveness.

SIGAR has closed 823 of these recommendations, about 86%. Closing a recommendation generally indicates SIGAR's assessment that the audited agency has either implemented the recommendation or has otherwise appropriately addressed the issue. In some cases where the agency has failed to act, SIGAR will close the recommendation as "Not Implemented"; this quarter SIGAR closed seven recommendations in this manner. In some cases, these recommendations will be the subject of follow-up audit or inspection work.

SIGAR is also required to report on any significant recommendations from prior reports on which corrective action has not been completed. This quarter, SIGAR continued to monitor agency actions on 129 open

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

recommendations. Sixty-four of these recommendations have been open more than 12 months; these remain open because the agency involved has not yet produced a corrective-action plan that SIGAR believes would resolve the identified problem, or has otherwise failed to appropriately respond to the recommendation(s).

For a complete list of open recommendations see www.sigar.mil.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

This quarter, SIGAR's Office of Special Projects issued six reports with four recommendations on topics including USAID-supported health facilities in Faryab and Bamyan Provinces, USAID-funded schools in Paktika and Bamyan Provinces, CERP-funded bridges in Ghazni Province, and theft of contractor-owned property by the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF). A list of completed and ongoing Special Projects can be found in Appendix C of this quarterly report.

Review 19-20-SP: USAID Supported Health Facilities in Faryab Province, Afghanistan

Observations from 17 Site Visits

This report is the ninth in a series that discusses findings from site visits at health facilities supported by USAID across Afghanistan. The facilities reviewed were supported by USAID through the World Bank-administered System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition (SEHAT) program. SIGAR found that all 17 facilities were open and operational, however, several facilities had minor structural issues such as cracked walls and leaking roofs; five facilities did not have access to reliable electricity.

SIGAR also found that the geospatial coordinates USAID provided for the facilities were generally accurate. Specifically, nine facilities were located less than one kilometer away from the coordinates USAID provided; seven facilities were between one and five kilometers from the coordinates USAID provided; and one facility was more than 10 kilometers (approximately 13 kilometers) from the USAID-provided location.

Review 19-21-SP Schools in Paktika Province, Afghanistan

Observations from Site Visits at Six Schools

This report is the ninth in a series that discusses findings from site visits at schools across Afghanistan that were either built or rehabilitated by USAID. SIGAR found that four of the six schools were open and in generally usable condition, and that two of the schools were closed and not in a condition suitable for use. One school was never completed and one was destroyed by the Taliban. SIGAR also found that the schools that were open had structural deficiencies, including some deficiencies that potentially put the safety of students and teachers at risk. Specifically, SIGAR found two schools with

COMPLETED SPECIAL PROJECTS REPORTS

- Review 19-20-SP: USAID Supported Health Facilities in Faryab Province, Afghanistan: Observations from 17 Site Visits
- Review 19-21-SP: Schools in Paktika Province, Afghanistan: Observations from Site Visits at Six Schools
- Review 19-22-SP: Afghan National Defense and Security Forces Facilities: Action Needed to Address Confiscation of Contractor-Owned Property and Contractor Mistreatment
- Review 19-24-SP: Bridges in Ghazni Province, Afghanistan: All Eight Bridges SIGAR Visited Were In Good Condition
- Review 19-33-SP: Schools in Bamyan Province, Afghanistan: Observations from Site Visits at 16 Schools
- Review 19-34-SP: USAID Supported Health Facilities in Bamyan Province, Afghanistan: Observations from 44 Site Visits

DOD Cost Benefit Analysis Validates SIGAR Report

In 2018, as a result of SIGAR's review of ANA proprietary camouflaged uniforms (SIGAR 17-48-SP), Congress included Section 344 in H.R. 2810, the FY 2018 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), which required the Secretary of Defense to determine whether there is a more effective alternative uniform specification for the Afghan National Army, the efficacy of the existing pattern compared to other alternatives, and the costs and feasibility of transitioning the uniforms of the Afghan military to a pattern owned by the United States. The study conducted by DOD found that the current ANA camouflage pattern being procured is both the most expensive and the second-most detectable of the seven patterns tested.

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES



Livestock cross a CERP-funded bridge in Ghazni Province. (SIGAR photo)

roofs that appeared structurally unsound and leaked, and two schools with broken windows. Finally, SIGAR found that the four schools that were open lacked electricity.

SIGAR made one recommendation to USAID to share the results of this review with the Ministry of Education so that structural and other deficiencies can be remedied.

Review 19-22-SP: Afghan National Defense and Security Forces Facilities

Action Needed to Address Confiscation of Contractor-Owned Property and Contractor Mistreatment

This report is a follow-up to a previously issued SIGAR report, *Allegations Related to USACE Operations and Maintenance Contract for Afghan Security Forces' Facilities* (SIGAR 18-12-SP). During the course of that review, SIGAR was made aware of concerns by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) staff who were overseeing three operations and maintenance (O&M) contracts valued at over \$1 billion serving Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF) facilities in Afghanistan, regarding the theft of contractor-owned property and abuses to contract staff.

SIGAR found that ANDSF personnel confiscated contractor-owned property totaling about \$780,000. USACE has paid over \$325,000 to compensate the contractor of the two completed contracts for confiscated property that it could not recover at six sites. USACE reported that it is reviewing documentation to support payment to the current O&M contractor for 17 sites in which USACE was unable to reclaim the contractor's property in the amount of \$454,900.

SIGAR also found that the ANDSF mistreated or abused contractor staff, and had reportedly detained staff against their will and threatened

or intimidated them into completing work that was outside the scope of the O&M contract requirements. Between August 2011 and November 2013, USACE identified 296 serious-incident reports (SIRs) reported across approximately 500 supported ANDSF sites that the O&M contractor filed with USACE. Of this total, 71 regarded abuses, threats, intimidation, and confiscated property. According to USACE officials, USACE takes steps to address these SIRs and prevent contractor mistreatment and theft. However, USACE reported that it does not have an official system in place to record actions it has taken to resolve incidents reported by contractor staff.

According to USACE personnel, they routinely work with the Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan (CSTC-A) to address these issues. CSTC-A has several mechanisms for holding the ANDSF accountable, including engaging on-site advisors for assistance and using financial penalties to ensure that the Afghan government understands the terms and conditions for proper utilization of CSTC-A funds (including purpose, time, and amount) and the possible consequences of improper use of funds. However, CSTC-A has not assessed any financial penalties against the ANDSF for confiscated property or the mistreatment of contractor personnel.

SIGAR made one recommendation to USACE to develop a process to track actions taken to resolve SIRs and coordinate with CSTC-A to ensure all resolutions to SIRs are captured.

Review 19-24-SP: Bridges in Ghazni Province, Afghanistan

All Eight Bridges SIGAR Visited Were In Good Condition

This report discusses the results of SIGAR's review of eight DOD-funded bridges in Ghazni Province, Afghanistan that were constructed using Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP)-funds between 2009 and 2012. SIGAR found that the location information maintained in DOD systems was accurate, with all the bridges within one kilometer of their recorded coordinates. All the bridges were in good condition and local community members regard them as very useful to their communities.

Review 19-33-SP: Schools in Bamyan Province, Afghanistan

Observations from Site Visits at 16 Schools

This report is the tenth and final in a series that discusses findings from site visits at schools across Afghanistan that were either built or rehabilitated by USAID. SIGAR found that all 16 schools were open and that 14 schools were in generally usable condition. Two of the schools that remained open, however, had major structural issues that could pose risks to the school's students and staff.

In addition, SIGAR found that all schools have structural deficiencies (e.g. cracked or crumbling walls or broken windows) that could potentially

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES



Broken windows and doors at a USAID-funded girls' high school in Bamyan Province. (SIGAR photo)

impact safety and the delivery of education. Specifically, SIGAR found two schools with deteriorated foundations, three schools with roofs that appeared structurally unsound, and nine schools with roofs that leaked. All 16 schools had damaged walls, eight schools had damaged doors, and five schools had broken windows. In addition, SIGAR found that 12 of the 16 schools visited did not have access to electricity in the classrooms or offices, and six schools did not have access to water.

SIGAR made one recommendation to USAID to share the results of this review with the MOE so that structural and other deficiencies can be remedied.

Review 19-34-SP: USAID-Supported Health Facilities in Bamyan Province, Afghanistan

Observations from 44 Site Visits

This report is the tenth and final in a series that discusses SIGAR's findings from site visits at health facilities supported by USAID across Afghanistan. The facilities reviewed were supported by USAID through the World Bank-administered System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition (SEHAT) program. SIGAR found that all of the facilities were operational and perceived as beneficial by community members, and most were in good condition. However, SIGAR inspectors did observe health and safety concerns at some facilities that may warrant closer attention; further, some facilities lacked access to electricity or clean drinking water. Specifically, 40 facilities had electricity, but 28 noted that they had only intermittent electricity or wiring issues. Thirty-seven facilities reported having access to clean drinking water on site; the remaining seven reported well

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

malfunctions, or needing to bring water in from other sources including nearby rivers and streams.

SIGAR also found that the geospatial coordinates USAID provided for the facilities were not accurate. However, geospatial coordinates provided by the Ministry of Public Health (MOPH) were generally accurate.

SIGAR made one recommendation to USAID to update its geospatial coordinates and share this review with the MOPH so the structural and other deficiencies identified can be brought to the attention of those responsible for addressing them.

LESSONS LEARNED

SIGAR's Lessons Learned Program was created to identify lessons and make recommendations to Congress and executive agencies on ways to improve current and future reconstruction efforts. To date, the program has issued five reports. Four projects are currently in development: U.S. and coalition responsibilities for security-sector assistance; U.S. government support to elections; monitoring and evaluation of reconstruction contracting; and reintegration of ex-combatants.

The issued lessons-learned reports and their companion interactive versions are posted on SIGAR's website, www.sigar.mil.

INVESTIGATIONS

SIGAR's Investigations Directorate produced significant outcomes during the reporting period. Criminal investigations resulted in two guilty pleas, one sentencing, and \$1 million in criminal fines and forfeitures. In addition, a civil investigation resulted in a forfeiture of \$25 million. SIGAR initiated 14 new cases and closed 11, bringing the total number of ongoing investigations to 168.


To date, SIGAR investigations have resulted in a cumulative total of 135 criminal convictions. Criminal fines, restitutions, forfeitures, civil settlements, and U.S. government cost savings and recoveries total over \$1.5 billion.

Investigation Results in \$25 Million Civil Forfeiture and Guilty Plea of Afghan Corporation

On March 5, 2019, in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, a settlement was reached in a SIGAR-led civil forfeiture case against assets owned by Hikmatullah Shadman, an Afghan national. Shadman illegally acquired these assets while a subcontractor in Afghanistan. Approximately \$25 million will be forfeited to the United States under the settlement terms. The civil forfeiture is part of a global settlement involving the resolution of a criminal case and False Claims Act allegations.

FIGURE 2.1

SIGAR INVESTIGATIONS: NUMBER OF OPEN INVESTIGATIONS, AS OF APRIL 4, 2019



Source: SIGAR Investigations Directorate, 4/4/2019.

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

In rem civil forfeiture: a civil judicial forfeiture in which the action brought in court is against the property (“in rem” is Latin for “against the thing”). The property is the defendant and no criminal charge against the owner is necessary.

Qui tam lawsuit: a suit filed by an individual on behalf of the government, as permitted by the False Claims Act (FCA), 31 U.S.C. § 3729 - 3733. (“Qui tam” is part of a Latin expression for one who brings a claim for the state as well as one’s self.) The person bringing the action is referred to as a “relator.”

Source: DOJ, “Types of Federal Forfeiture,” 2/1/2017, <https://www.justice.gov/afp/types-federal-forfeiture>, accessed 4/7/2019; False Claims Act (FCA), 31 U.S.C. § 3729-3733.

On November 20, 2012, an **in rem civil forfeiture** action against approximately \$57 million in Shadman’s assets was filed in U.S. District Court, District of Columbia. The complaint alleged that these assets are the proceeds of a conspiracy to commit wire fraud.

Hikmatullah Shadman was formerly an interpreter for U.S. Army Special Forces units serving in and near his native Kandahar. Largely through the tutelage of some U.S. soldiers, Shadman founded several companies, including Hikmat Shadman Logistics Services Company (HSLSC), also known as the Hikmat Shadman Supply and Construction Company (HSCC). HSLSC subcontracted with the U.S. government for the delivery of food, water, and other supplies to U.S. military members at various locations in Afghanistan. From November 2010 to March 2012, Shadman charged the United States more than \$77 million for his services.

The forfeiture was the result of Shadman’s fraudulent receipt of a disproportionate number of subcontracts and the inflated prices he charged the United States. The investigation uncovered thousands of falsified documents submitted by Shadman’s companies for payment for work never performed and for work other than that described in the documentation submitted. For example, between May 2011 and August 2011, HSLSC submitted documentation which reflected that 114 fuel trucks were used to deliver fuel to U.S. military units. The U.S. government paid HSLSC approximately \$1.1 million for the deliveries when, in fact, the fuel was never delivered to any military units and was instead sold on Kandahar’s black market. The incident resulted in the convictions of several U.S. soldiers in the Eastern District Court of North Carolina for their involvement in the fuel theft scheme.

Shadman’s companies also charged rates which exceeded the average rate of competing subcontractors. The investigation revealed that Shadman overcharged the United States millions of dollars.

As part of the global settlement, several Shadman-owned companies, including HSLSC, entered into a separate agreement with the United States to resolve False Claims Act allegations declared in a **qui tam lawsuit** pertaining to kickbacks the companies paid from November 2010 to May 2012 to two U.S. military members to secure the subcontract awards. According to the terms of the agreement, \$1.5 million of the forfeited funds will be paid to the U.S. government.

Apart from the civil and False Claims Act actions pursued in this investigation, HSLSC was criminally prosecuted in the Eastern District of North Carolina. On January 3, 2019, HSLSC pleaded guilty to a criminal information charging two counts of paying bribes to two U.S. military members, and one count of conspiracy for the purpose of influencing the awarding of subcontracts to HSLSC and ensuring favorable treatment in the contracting process. HSLSC was sentenced to pay \$810,000 in criminal fines, a forfeiture of \$190,000, and \$1,200 in special assessments. In addition, HSLSC was

ordered to serve a five-year probation with special conditions agreed upon: HSLSC is not to seek to engage in business with the U.S. government; not to contest debarment; and its corporate officers are not to seek or apply for visas with the United States.

On February 26, 2019, five corporate officers and eight corporate entities associated with the fraud identified in the investigation were debarred from doing business with the U.S. government until February 26, 2039.

SIGAR led the investigation, with assistance from the FBI, DCIS, the U.S. Army Major Procurement Fraud Unit, and the U.S. Air Force Office of Special Investigations.

Investigation Influences Policy Changes to Reduce Fuel Theft at Resolute Support

A SIGAR investigation resulted in the implementation of new policies at NATO's Resolute Support (RS) mission to minimize the occurrence of fuel theft.

A former Nordic Camp Supply (NCS) employee informed SIGAR that NCS employees were stealing fuel from RS by dispensing only partial fuel loads and billing for full loads. Upon review of the internal management controls of the transfer of fuel and subsequent invoicing, SIGAR agents identified a number of vulnerabilities and informed the NATO Support and Procurement Agency's senior representative of RS of how the theft was occurring.

RS officials were advised of the issues SIGAR had identified and ultimately implemented solutions to address the problem. New procedural requirements were put in place, including installing fuel gauges in storage tanks, providing fuel cards for each vehicle, and improving oversight policy for fuel delivery and consumption. Such measures will significantly reduce the potential for fuel theft and fraud.

Suspensions and Debarments

This quarter, SIGAR's suspension and debarment program referred 15 individuals and 26 entities for suspension or debarment based on evidence developed as part of investigations conducted by SIGAR in Afghanistan and the United States. These referrals bring the total number of individuals and companies referred by SIGAR since 2008 to 969, encompassing 530 individuals and 439 companies to date.

As of the end of March 2019, SIGAR's efforts to utilize suspension and debarment to address fraud, corruption and poor performance in Afghanistan have resulted in a total of 141 suspensions and 555 finalized debarments/special entity designations of individuals and companies engaged in U.S.-funded reconstruction projects. An additional 24 individuals and companies have entered into administrative compliance agreements with the U.S. government in lieu of exclusion from contracting since the

initiation of the program. During the second quarter of FY 2019, SIGAR's referrals resulted in 13 finalized debarments and on administrative compliance agreement. One additional company is currently in proposed debarment status, awaiting final adjudication of a debarment decision.

Suspensions and debarments are an important tool for ensuring that agencies award contracts only to responsible entities. SIGAR's program addresses three challenges posed by U.S. policy and the contingency contracting environment in Afghanistan: the need to act quickly, the limited U.S. jurisdiction over Afghan nationals and Afghan companies, and the vetting challenges inherent in the use of multiple tiers of subcontractors. SIGAR continues to look for ways to enhance the government's responses to these challenges through the innovative use of information resources and investigative assets both in Afghanistan and the United States.

SIGAR makes referrals for suspensions and debarments—actions taken by U.S. agencies to exclude companies or individuals from receiving federal contracts or assistance because of misconduct—based on completed investigations that SIGAR conducts or participates in. In most cases, SIGAR's referrals occur in the absence of acceptance of an allegation for criminal prosecution or remedial action by a contracting office and are therefore the primary remedy to address contractor misconduct.

In making referrals to agencies, SIGAR provides the basis for a suspension or debarment decision by the agency as well as all of the supporting documentation needed for an agency to defend that decision should it be challenged by the contractor at issue. Based on the evolving nature of the contracting environment in Afghanistan and the available evidence of contractor misconduct and/or poor performance, on occasion SIGAR has found it necessary to refer individuals or companies on multiple occasions for consideration by agency suspension and debarment officials.

Debarment of Hikmatullah Shadman, Hikmat Shadman Logistics Services Company and Eleven Affiliated Companies and Individuals

On February 26, 2019, the Department of the Army debarred Hikmatullah Shadman, Hikmat Shadman Logistics Services Company, Hikmat Shadman Construction and Supply Company, Hekmat Shadman General Trading LLC, Hekmat Shadman Ltd., Hikmat Himmat Logistics Services Company, Saif Hikmat Construction Logistic Services and Supply Company, Faizy Elham Brothers Ltd, Everest Faizy Logistics Services, Yaser Elham, Rohullah Faizy, Henry Omonobi-Newton, and Paul Hele based on the entry of a guilty plea by Hikmat Shadman Logistics Services Company in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina on January 3, 2019.

The basis for this plea was the indictment of Shadman on August 11, 2016, and a subsequent filing of criminal information against Hikmat Shadman Logistics Services Company on December 4, 2018, on one count

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

of conspiracy, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371, and two counts of payment of gratuities to a public official, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 201(c). In exchange for an agreement not to further prosecute Shadman and Hikmat Shadman Logistics Services Company, the company agreed to pay a forfeiture of \$190,000 and a criminal fine of \$810,000, submit to five years' probation, and accept any debarment decision made to exclude it from contracting with the U.S. government. In addition, Shadman agreed to not apply for a visa to enter the United States.

Previously, on October 30, 2013, (based upon the November 20, 2012, filing of a complaint in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia for forfeiture *in rem* by the Department of Justice, Money Laundering and Asset Forfeiture and Recovery Section) the Army suspended Hikmatullah Shadman, Hikmat Shadman Logistics Services Company, six affiliated companies, and two business partners of Shadman, Yaser Elham, and Rohullah Faizy, from contacting with the government. The forfeiture complaint, based on a SIGAR investigation, alleged that Shadman and his coconspirators paid kickbacks to facilitate the award of transportation subcontracts valued at \$77,920,605 to Hikmat Shadman Logistics Services Company and also submitted inflated invoices to the U.S. government with the assistance of Henry Omonobi-Newton and Paul Hele, employees of TOIFOR, the prime contractor for the transportation of military cargo within Afghanistan.

The civil-forfeiture complaint that was the basis for the suspension resulted in the seizure of approximately \$57.3 million in correspondent accounts held by companies owned by Shadman, Elham, and Faizy by the Department of Justice in May 2013. This seizure was subsequently contested by Shadman, Elham, and Faizy in a civil proceeding in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. As part of the plea agreement with Shadman unsealed on January 3, 2019, and a subsequent settlement agreement regarding the asset-forfeiture complaint entered into on March 5, 2019, this civil proceeding was terminated, resulting in the forfeiture of \$24.5 million to the U.S. Treasury and \$1.5 million distributed to the Department of Justice Civil Division as payment of its fees associated with the civil action.

Based on the findings of fact, conclusions, and the aggravating factors in the administrative record, the Army suspension and debarment official determined that all parties would be debarred for a period of 20 years, ending on February 26, 2039.

NEW RULES FOR AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF AFGHANISTAN

A joint investigation by SIGAR and the U.S. Agency for International Development's Office of Inspector General (USAID OIG) has led the heavily U.S.-funded American University of Afghanistan (AUAF) to sign an agreement with USAID to deal with long-standing management and accountability issues identified by the oversight agencies.

The 19-page "Administrative Agreement" executed on March 29, 2019, gives the university an opportunity to demonstrate that it can be entrusted with additional U.S. government funding.⁶⁷ Since its chartering in 2004 through July 2018, the AUAF had received some \$132 million in U.S. funding, largely through USAID, but also from the State Department, the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations formerly operated by the Department of Defense, and grants to U.S. universities that provided support to the AUAF.⁶⁸

USAID support for the AUAF has so far exceeded \$100 million. USAID's first cooperative agreement with the AUAF, running from August 2008 through July 2013, provided \$42.1 million for expanding academic programs and facilities, and for recruiting faculty and administrators to help the university become a self-sustaining institution.⁶⁹ The second cooperative agreement began in August 2013; USAID had disbursed another \$59.6 million for the AUAF per that agreement as of January 12, 2019.⁷⁰

The American University of Afghanistan occupies a unique position. It is, according to the AUAF website, "Afghanistan's only nationally accredited, private, not-for-profit, non-partisan and co-educational university." Since admitting an initial 50 students in 2006, it now enrolls more than 1,700 full- and part-time students.⁷¹ Former First Lady Laura Bush and then U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan Zalmay Khalilzad were early supporters. In its short existence, AUAF has endured several tragedies, including the kidnapping of two of its professors, an American and an Australian, and a 2016 attack on the university that left more than a dozen people dead.

Despite the substantial U.S. assistance, AUAF records obtained by SIGAR and USAID OIG investigators indicated that the university was not sustainable: it had lost more than \$63 million since 2012, it depended on U.S. aid for 86% of its funding, and as of February 2018 it had money for only another month's expenses.⁷² To avoid a failure of the university, USAID extended the 2013 cooperative agreement and raised its total value to \$72.8 million, enough to keep the AUAF open through at least May 2019.⁷³

WHAT WENT WRONG?

SIGAR Investigations and USAID OIG opened their joint investigation of the AUAF in November 2016 after receiving allegations that the university was unable to provide accurate information on its use of U.S. funds and could not properly account for its required contributions to total costs.⁷⁴

The joint investigators' work was reinforced by several other performance assessments. In particular, The Asia Foundation, a nonprofit international-development organization working under contract with USAID, produced a September 2017 report on the AUAF that cited internal-control

QUARTERLY HIGHLIGHT



Afghan women graduating from the American University of Afghanistan. (U.S. Embassy Kabul photo)

weaknesses; widespread deficiencies in financial, procurement, and compliance procedures, and policies; missing documents in personnel and student files; continued noncompliance with terms of the USAID cooperative agreement; failure to address violations promptly; and a culture of resistance to change by management and the board of trustees.⁷⁵

The investigation resulted in the issuance of a SIGAR Inspector General subpoena to AUAF and its fundraising arm, the Friends of the American University of Afghanistan, related to accounting records, cost-sharing contributions, staff timesheets and compensation, expenditure of USAID funds, procurements, student enrollment figures, and agreements between the AUAF and the Friends on construction of a women's economic-development center and development of a business-innovation hub.

At the same time, USAID's Afghanistan Mission issued a corrective-action letter to AUAF requiring that the university address the results of these performance assessments and provide revised budget, program description, and cost-share documentation. AUAF resistance to these requirements led USAID to notify the university in February 2017 that it would suspend funding unless the university cooperated. The additional documents handed over following USAID's notice raised additional questions regarding AUAF's financial responsibility and managerial capabilities.

In March 2018 SIGAR's Suspension and Debarment Program, supported by SIGAR's Investigations Directorate and USAID OIG Investigations began preparing a referral of AUAF to the USAID Suspension and Debarment Official. The joint SIGAR/USAID OIG referral was based on the information contained in 28 financial statements, external audits and assessments, and internal audits, spanning eight years, 2010 to 2018. The documents had common themes:⁷⁶

- The AUAF had a history of mismanagement, lack of controls, and financial instability.
- The university consistently failed to adopt recommendations for improvement or reform per USAID regulations.

- AUAF was failing to adhere to its obligations to safeguard U.S. government funds.
- The university was not sustainable in its present form, financially or programmatically, due to poor governance and management.
- The AUAF board of trustees was not properly overseeing the university and had a significant conflict of interest problem with its fundraising partner, the Friends of the American University of Afghanistan.

The diagnostic work on AUAF performance has not stopped. SIGAR's Audits and Inspections Directorate is conducting a performance audit of the university that is expected to be issued late this year or early in 2020.⁷⁷

HOW ARE PROBLEMS BEING ADDRESSED?

Management deficiencies at AUAF were so compelling that SIGAR Inspector General John Sopko and USAID Inspector General Ann Calvaresi Barr brought them to the attention of USAID Administrator Mark Green in a meeting on July 23, 2018. SIGAR and USAID OIG formally submitted to USAID the joint referral reflecting that AUAF posed a clear and present risk to taxpayer funds.

Since then, SIGAR and USAID OIG have continued to monitor the work done by USAID to address the problems identified at AUAF. Under the oversight of the USAID Mission in Afghanistan and the USAID Office of Afghanistan and Pakistan Affairs, AUAF has begun addressing several of its issues. USAID modified the August 2013 cooperative agreement with AUAF to add additional funding conditions as well as sections enhancing reporting requirements and provisions regarding cost share, allowable costs, and other areas of concern.

On March 28, 2019, the USAID Suspension and Debarment Official entered into a three-year Administrative Agreement with AUAF. The agreement incorporates many of the concerns raised with Administrator Green by SIGAR and USAID OIG, and contains an admission by AUAF that it “accepts and acknowledges the need to continue to make improvements in the areas identified by SIGAR and USAID OIG.” Requirements include AUAF’s full compliance with any U.S. government investigative or audit requests; that conflict-of-interest policies be applied to trustees; that reviews be conducted to determine the requisite experience or skills of Board members for overseeing a university and managing U.S. funds; that an integrity and compliance program be established; and that a remediation plan be drafted to address concerns over AUAF’s ethics, compliance, and fraud prevention programs, and reforms to its financial and management controls.

WHY IT MATTERS

The new Administrative Agreement signed between USAID and the AUAF is intended to solve two important problems.

First, corrective action by the AUAF and effective oversight by USAID, USAID OIG, and SIGAR are needed to address conditions that invite the waste, fraud, and abuse of U.S. taxpayers’ money.

Second, if the agreement succeeds in putting the university on a path to sustainability, AUAF can help remedy the lack of higher educational facilities that SIGAR, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and other observers have long noted is a serious barrier to Afghanistan’s development.

OTHER SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

Launch of *High-Risk List* at the Center for Strategic and International Studies

On March 28, 2019, Inspector General John F. Sopko unveiled SIGAR's 2019 *High-Risk List* for Congress at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington, DC. In his remarks, IG Sopko acknowledged the ongoing peace process and emphasized the need to begin planning to address the risks to the United States' \$133 billion investment in Afghanistan's reconstruction that might persist or arise after any peace agreement is signed. In particular, he highlighted the Afghan government's dependence on foreign financial assistance; the potential need to reintegrate former Taliban fighters; the possible risks to the gains in the area of women's rights in Afghanistan that have been made since the fall of the Taliban regime; and the risks of increasing the amount of U.S. assistance that is provided directly to the Afghan government or through multilateral trust funds. Following his remarks, he joined in a question-and-answer session with Anthony Cordesman, the Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy, and Seth Jones, the Harold Brown Chair and Director of the Transnational Threats Program at CSIS.


Inspector General Sopko Testifies Before Congress

On April 3, 2019, Inspector General Sopko testified before the National Security Subcommittee of the House Oversight and Reform Committee at a hearing entitled "Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction's 2019 High-Risk List." IG Sopko spoke of the need to plan for the "day after" any potential peace agreement to end the war in Afghanistan is reached, highlighting eight areas that will likely require continued U.S. government attention and support. He also emphasized the need for Congress to think not only about how much money is appropriated for Afghanistan, but how that money is administered and monitored.

The subcommittee, led by Chairman Stephen Lynch (D-MA), and Ranking Member Jody Hice (R-GA), inquired about a number of issues, including the amount of waste, fraud, and abuse of U.S. taxpayer dollars in Afghanistan; SIGAR's UH-60 Black Hawk helicopter audit findings; the current security situation; SIGAR's past work looking at Afghan soldiers who go absent without leave after entering the United States for military training; and camouflage patterns purchased by the U.S. government for the Afghan military that were inappropriate for the combat environment there.

OTHER SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

- Launch of *High-Risk List* at the Center for Strategic and International Studies
- Inspector General Sopko Testifies Before Congress
- Inspector General Sopko Submits Testimony to Senate Appropriations Committee
- Inspector General Sopko Speaks at Munich Security Conference
- Inspector General Sopko Presents at Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, Middle East Conference
- Deputy IG Aloise Speaks at Naval Post-Graduate School



Inspector General John F. Sopko testifies before Congress on the findings of SIGAR's 2019 *High-Risk List*. (SIGAR photo)

Inspector General Sopko Submits Testimony to Senate Appropriations Committee

On April 8, 2019, Inspector General Sopko submitted written testimony entitled “Challenges to Effective Oversight of Afghanistan Reconstruction Grow as High-Risk Areas Persist,” requested by the Subcommittee on the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The statement explains SIGAR’s fiscal year 2020 budget request, as well as SIGAR’s successes, challenges to accomplishing its mission, and the steps the agency has taken to overcome or mitigate those challenges. Additionally, the statement described key management and program challenges facing the Department of State, U.S. Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense in the Afghanistan reconstruction effort. The testimony also lists the eight risk areas to the reconstruction effort identified in SIGAR’s 2019 *High-Risk List*, and recommends that Congress be mindful of those risks as developments unfold in Afghanistan.

Inspector General Sopko Speaks at the Munich Security Conference

On February 16, 2019, Inspector General Sopko spoke on a panel entitled “Stabilizing States and Combating Corruption—Consequences from Afghanistan, Iraq, and Mali,” hosted by Transparency International at the Munich Security Conference. IG Sopko discussed how corruption had impaired the effectiveness of the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces, and fueled the illicit narcotics trade in Afghanistan, and how corrupt activity by Afghan civilian and military government officials undermined domestic confidence in both the Afghan government and in the international donor nations from which the government receives much of its funding. He was joined on the panel by H.E. Falih Al-Fayyadh, National Security Advisor to the Prime Minister of Iraq; H.E. Martin Jäger, State Secretary in the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development; and Ambassador Hadiza Mustapha, Adviser on Peace, Security, and Governance to the Chairperson of the African Union.

Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, Middle East Conference

On February 24 and 25, 2019, Inspector General Sopko presented at the Middle East Conference of the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. His presentation, entitled “Oversight in Conflict: Detecting Fraud in Challenging Environments,” focused on innovative techniques used by SIGAR investigators to combat waste, fraud, and abuse in the midst of an active insurgency. IG Sopko highlighted how SIGAR had adjusted its techniques following the reduction in U.S. forces

SIGAR OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

and managed to maintain visibility and cultivate sources in spite of security restrictions that limit the ability of SIGAR's investigators to move around the country as freely as they once did. He also discussed best practices that the attendees might consider using to combat fraud in nonpermissive environments like Afghanistan.

Deputy IG Aloise Speaks at Naval Postgraduate School

On April 3, 2019, Deputy Inspector General Gene Aloise spoke at the Defense Resource Management Institute at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California. Deputy IG Aloise's remarks focused on the scale of the reconstruction effort in Afghanistan, the challenges the United States and Coalition partners had faced in rebuilding the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces, the dangers of corruption and how U.S. and Coalition funding had contributed to Afghanistan's corruption problem, and egregious cases of waste, fraud, and abuse that SIGAR had identified in recent years.



SIGAR's Senior Visual Information Specialist, Olivia Paek, is leaving the Research and Analysis Directorate this quarter after seven years with the agency. Olivia has been responsible for the design, layout, photographs, and many other visual aspects of SIGAR's reports, including the *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*.

SIGAR BUDGET

SIGAR is funded through September 30, 2020, under the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019, H.R. 648, which provides the agency full funding based on the FY 2019 amount of \$54.9 million. The budget supports SIGAR's oversight activities and products by funding SIGAR's Audits and Inspections, Investigations, Management and Support, and Research and Analysis Directorates, as well as its Office of Special Projects and the Lessons Learned Program.

SIGAR STAFF

SIGAR's staff count remained steady since the last report to Congress, with 183 employees on board at the end of the quarter: 24 SIGAR employees were at the U.S. Embassy Kabul and one was at Bagram Airfield. SIGAR employed five Afghan nationals in its Kabul office to support the Investigations and Audits Directorates. In addition, SIGAR supplements its resident staff with personnel assigned to short-term temporary duty in Afghanistan. This quarter, SIGAR had 12 employees on temporary duty in Afghanistan for a total of 123 days.

“If the need for oversight is ignored or sidelined, both the American taxpayer and the Afghan people will suffer even with a successful peace agreement.”

—*Inspector General John Sopko, SIGAR*

3 RECONSTRUCTION UPDATE



RECONSTRUCTION UPDATE CONTENTS

Reconstruction in Brief	49
Status of Funds	50
Security	70
Governance	106
Economic and Social Development	134
Counternarcotics	160

Photo on previous page

Packaging spaghetti at a women's cooperative in Mazar-e Sharif to sell in local markets. (UNDP photo)



RECONSTRUCTION IN BRIEF

Section 3 of this quarterly report summarizes the key events of the reporting period as well as programs and projects concerning Afghanistan reconstruction across five sectors: Funding, Security, Governance, Economic and Social Development, and Counternarcotics.

NO MORE DISTRICT-STABILITY ASSESSMENTS

- Resolute Support formally notified SIGAR it is no longer producing its **district-stability assessments** (which included district, population, and territorial control data) because the command no longer believes the data has decision-making value.

ANDSF CASUALTIES RISE

- From December 2018 to February 2019, Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF) casualties were about **31%** higher year-on-year. Almost half of these casualties were inflicted during checkpoint security operations.

PROGOVERNMENT FORCES CAUSE MORE CIVILIAN DEATHS THAN ANTIGOVERNMENT FORCES

- UNAMA reported that the ANDSF and international forces caused more **civilian deaths** from January 1–March 31, 2019, than antigovernment elements. This was attributed to substantial increases in civilian casualties caused by progovernment aerial (41%) and search operations (85%) compared to the same period last year.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION DELAYED TO SEPTEMBER 28, 2019

- The election was originally scheduled for April 20, 2019.
- The Independent Election Commission said the new delay was necessary to implement **voting-system reforms**.

SEVERE FLOODING AFFECTS 14 PROVINCES

- Following a significant drought in 2018, severe flooding affected at least 14 provinces and more than 163,000 Afghans this quarter, contributing to already high levels of **food insecurity** and **displacement**.

GROWTH ESTIMATES REVISED

- The IMF revised upward its GDP growth estimate for 2018 to **2.7%**; in contrast, the World Bank said growth in 2018 was just **1%**.

POPPY CULTIVATION AND OPIUM PRODUCTION DECLINE

- For 2018, U.S. government estimates are 221,000 hectares, a 33% decrease from 2017's 329,000 hectares. Potential opium production decreased 42% from 9,140 metric tons in 2017 to 5,330 metric tons in 2018. The decline in cultivation and production are attributed to large areas of **drought** and **low opium prices** stemming from 2017's record crop.

PLANNED APRIL MEETING IN QATAR POSTPONED

- Representatives of the Taliban along with a 250-strong delegation of Afghan politicians, representatives of the Afghan government, and civil society members planned to meet informally to express their views on peace.
- On April 18, the hosting organization announced that the event was postponed due to “lack of agreement around participation and representation.”

RECONSTRUCTION FUNDING AS OF MARCH 31, 2019

- **Cumulative appropriations** for reconstruction and related activities in Afghanistan since FY 2002 totaled approximately **\$133.0 billion**.
- **\$114.67 billion**, or 86.2%, was appropriated to the nine largest active reconstruction funds.
- Of the amount appropriated to the **nine largest active funds** since FY 2002, approximately \$9.92 billion remained to be disbursed.
- The Department of Defense (DOD) reported in its latest *Cost of War Report*, dated December 2018, that cumulative obligations for Afghanistan including warfighting had reached **\$744.9 billion**. The cost of Afghanistan reconstruction equaled approximately **16%** of this amount at that date.

STATUS OF FUNDS CONTENTS

U.S. Reconstruction Funding for Afghanistan	52
U.S. Cost of War and Reconstruction in Afghanistan	54
Afghanistan Reconstruction Funding Pipeline	55
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	56
Commander's Emergency Response Program	60
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities	61
Economic Support Fund	62
Food for Peace: Title II and IDA Programs	63
Foreign Disaster Assistance: IDA Programs	64
International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement	65
Migration and Refugee Assistance	66
Non-Proliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining, and Related Programs	67
International Reconstruction Funding for Afghanistan	68

STATUS OF FUNDS

STATUS OF FUNDS

In accord with SIGAR’s legislative mandate, this section details the status of U.S. funds appropriated, obligated, and disbursed for reconstruction activities in Afghanistan. As of March 31, 2019, the United States had appropriated approximately \$133.0 billion for reconstruction and related activities in Afghanistan since FY 2002. Total Afghanistan reconstruction funding has been allocated as follows:


- \$83.27 billion for security (including \$4.69 billion for counternarcotics initiatives)
- \$34.45 billion for governance and development (\$4.31 billion for counternarcotics initiatives)
- \$3.63 billion for humanitarian aid
- \$11.64 billion for civilian operations

Figure 3.1 shows the nine largest active U.S. funds that contribute to these efforts. SIGAR previously reported on seven major funds, but has updated its reporting to reflect current appropriations that have placed significant amounts in other funds.

- ASFF:** Afghanistan Security Forces Fund
- CERP:** Commander’s Emergency Response Program
- DICDA:** Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities
- ESF:** Economic Support Fund
- TITLE II:** Public Law No. 480 Title II
- IDA:** International Disaster Assistance
- INCLE:** International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement
- MRA:** Migration and Refugee Assistance
- NADR:** Non-Proliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining, and Related Programs

FIGURE 3.1


U.S. FUNDS SUPPORTING AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION EFFORTS (\$ BILLIONS)



Note: Numbers have been rounded.

Source: Details of accounts, including sources of data, are provided in Appendix B to this report.

STATUS OF FUNDS



U.S. RECONSTRUCTION FUNDING FOR AFGHANISTAN


As of March 31, 2019, cumulative appropriations for reconstruction and related activities in Afghanistan totaled approximately \$132.99 billion, as shown in Figure 3.2. This total can be divided into four major categories of reconstruction and related funding: security, governance and development, humanitarian, and oversight and operations. Approximately \$9.01 billion of these funds support counternarcotics initiatives that crosscut the security (\$4.69 billion) and governance and development (\$4.31 billion) categories. For complete information regarding U.S. appropriations, see Appendix B.

The amount provided to the nine largest active U.S. funds represents more than 86.2% (over \$114.67 billion) of total reconstruction assistance in Afghanistan since FY 2002. Of this amount, over 90.0% (more than \$103.23 billion) has been obligated, and nearly 86.5% (nearly \$99.19 billion) has been disbursed. An estimated \$5.57 billion of the amount appropriated for these funds has expired and will therefore not be disbursed.

President Donald J. Trump signed the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019 into law on September 28, 2018, providing appropriations for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF), the Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP), and the Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities (DICDA) accounts for FY 2019. In the current quarter, President Trump signed the Consolidated Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019 into law on February 15. The joint resolution includes the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and

FIGURE 3.2

CUMULATIVE APPROPRIATIONS BY FUNDING CATEGORY AS OF MARCH 31, 2019 (\$ BILLIONS)



Note: Numbers have been rounded.

Source: Details of accounts, including sources of data, are provided in Appendix B to this report.

STATUS OF FUNDS

Related Programs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019, providing appropriations for the Department of State and USAID. The U.S. Congress and State have not yet agreed on final allocations to specific countries, including Afghanistan, for the global foreign-assistance accounts, principally the International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) account and the Economic Support Fund (ESF). The FY 2019 appropriation amount shown in Figure 3.3 will increase when this process is completed.

Since 2002, the United States has provided nearly \$14.84 billion in on-budget assistance to the government of Afghanistan. This includes about \$9.49 billion to Afghan government ministries and institutions, and about \$5.35 billion to three multinational trust funds—the World Bank’s Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF), the United Nations Development Programme’s Law and Order Trust Fund (LOTFA), and the Asian Development Bank’s Afghanistan Infrastructure Trust Fund (AITF). Table 3.2 shows U.S. on-budget assistance disbursed to the Afghan government and multilateral trust funds.

TABLE 3.2


U.S. ON-BUDGET ASSISTANCE TO AFGHANISTAN, SINCE 2002 (\$ MILLIONS)	
Government-to-Government	
DOD	\$8,706
State	85
USAID	696
Multilateral Trust Funds	
LOTFA	\$1,669
ARTF	3,528
AITF	154

Note: Numbers have been rounded. Figures reflect amounts the United States has disbursed in on-budget assistance to Afghan government entities and multilateral trust funds.

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019; State, response to SIGAR data call, 10/18/2018; DOD, response to SIGAR data call, 4/8/2019 and 10/19/2018; World Bank, ARTF: Administrator’s Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019 (end of 1st month of FY 1398), accessed 4/18/2019; UNDP LOTFA Receipts 2002–2019, 4/17/2019.

FIGURE 3.3

ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS BY FUNDING CATEGORY (\$ BILLIONS)



Note: Numbers have been rounded.

Source: Details of accounts, including sources of data, are provided in Appendix B to this report.

STATUS OF FUNDS


U.S. COST OF WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION IN AFGHANISTAN

Reconstruction costs for Afghanistan equal approximately 16% of all funds obligated by the Department of Defense for Afghanistan since 2001. DOD reported in its *Cost of War Report* as of December 31, 2018, that it had obligated \$744.9 billion for Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Freedom's Sentinel in Afghanistan, including the cost of maintaining U.S. troops in Afghanistan.⁷⁸

The comparable figures for Afghanistan reconstruction, consisting of obligations (appropriated funds committed to particular programs or projects for disbursement) of the DOD, Department of State, USAID, and other agencies was \$119.7 billion at that date. Note that the DOD contribution to the reconstruction of Afghanistan is contained in *both* the \$744.9 billion Cost of War and \$119.7 billion Cost of Reconstruction figures. Figure 3.4 presents the annual and cumulative costs for war and reconstruction in Afghanistan.

FIGURE 3.4

AFGHANISTAN COST OF WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION, ANNUAL AND CUMULATIVE OBLIGATIONS FY 2002 TO FY 2019 Q1 (\$ BILLIONS)



Note: Numbers have been rounded. Cumulative obligations through December 31, 2018, differ markedly from cumulative appropriations through March 31, 2019, because the former figures do not include unobligated appropriations and DOD reporting lags one quarter.

Source: DOD, *Cost of War Monthly Report*, "Total War-related Obligations by Year Incurred," data as of December 31, 2018. Obligation data shown against year funds were obligated. SIGAR analysis of annual obligation of reconstruction accounts as presented in SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019. Obligation data shown against year funds were appropriated.

STATUS OF FUNDS

AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION FUNDING PIPELINE

Since 2002, Congress has appropriated nearly \$133.0 billion for reconstruction and related activities in Afghanistan. Of this amount, \$114.67 billion (86.2%) was appropriated to the nine largest active reconstruction accounts, as shown in Table 3.3.

As of March 31, 2019, approximately \$9.92 billion of the amount appropriated to the nine largest active reconstruction funds remained for possible disbursement, as shown in Figure 3.5. These funds will be used to train, equip, and sustain the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF); complete on-going, large-scale infrastructure projects, such as those funded by the AIF and ESF; combat narcotics production and trafficking; and advance the rule of law, strengthen the justice sector, and promote human rights.

TABLE 3.3


CUMULATIVE AMOUNTS APPROPRIATED, OBLIGATED, AND DISBURSED FY 2002–2019 (\$ BILLIONS)				
	Appropriated	Obligated	Disbursed	Remaining
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF)	\$77.75	\$69.60	\$68.89	\$5.86
Economic Support Fund (ESF)	20.50	19.23	16.68	3.04
International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE)	5.25	4.97	4.28	0.78
Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP)	3.70	2.29	2.29	0.01
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities (DICDA)	3.38	3.25	3.25	0.13
Migration and Refugee Assistance (MRA)	1.35	1.34	1.32	0.02
Public Law 480 Title II (TITLE II)	1.10	1.10	1.10	0.00
International Disaster Assistance (IDA)	0.83	0.80	0.72	0.08
Non-Proliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining, and Related (NADR)	0.80	0.67	0.67	0.00
Total Nine Largest Accounts	114.67	\$103.23	\$99.19	\$9.92
Other Reconstruction Funds	6.68			
Civilian Operations	11.64			
Total	\$132.99			

Note: Numbers have been rounded. The amount remaining reflects the total disbursement potential of the nine largest active reconstruction accounts after deducting approximately \$5.57 billion that has expired. Expired funds equal the amount appropriated but not obligated after the period of availability for obligation has ended and thereafter reflects deobligated and canceled balances.


Source: SIGAR analysis of appropriation laws and obligation and disbursement data provided by DOD, State, and USAID, 4/17/2019.

FIGURE 3.5

STATUS OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS,
NINE LARGEST ACTIVE ACCOUNTS (\$ BILLIONS)



STATUS OF FUNDS



ASFF FUNDS TERMINOLOGY

Appropriations: Total monies available for commitments

Obligations: Commitments to pay monies

Disbursements: Monies that have been expended

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

Congress created the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) to provide the ANDSF with equipment, supplies, services, training, and funding for salaries, as well as facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction.⁷⁹ The primary organization responsible for building the ANDSF is the Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan (CSTC-A).⁸⁰ A Financial and Activity Plan (FAP) must be approved by the Afghanistan Resources Oversight Council (AROC), concurred in by the Department of State, and prior notification provided to the U.S. Congress before ASFF funds may be obligated.⁸¹

President Donald J. Trump signed into law the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019, on September 28, 2018, providing an appropriation for the ASFF of \$4.92 billion for FY 2019, as shown in Figure 3.6. As of March 31, 2019, cumulative appropriations for ASFF reached \$77.75 billion, with \$69.60 billion in funding having been obligated, and \$68.89 billion having been disbursed, as shown in Figure 3.7.⁸² DOD reported that cumulative obligations increased by more than \$0.65 billion during the quarter ending March 31, 2019, and that cumulative disbursements increased by more than \$0.26 billion.⁸³

FIGURE 3.6

ASFF APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY FISCAL YEAR (\$ BILLIONS)





FIGURE 3.7

ASFF FUNDS, CUMULATIVE COMPARISON (\$ BILLIONS)



Note: Numbers have been rounded. Data reflect reprogramming actions and rescissions. DOD reprogrammed \$1 billion of FY 2011, \$1 billion of FY 2012, and \$178 million of FY 2013 out of the ASFF to fund other DOD requirements. DOD reprogrammed \$230 million into FY 2015 ASFF. Pub. L. No. 115-141 rescinded \$100 million from FY 2017. Pub. L. No. 115-31 rescinded \$150 million from FY 2016. Pub. L. No. 113-6 rescinded \$1 billion from FY 2012. Pub. L. No. 113-235 rescinded \$764.38 million from FY 2014. Pub. L. No. 114-113 rescinded \$400 million from FY 2015.

Source: DFAS, "AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019," 4/12/2019; DFAS, "AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts December 2018," 1/17/2019; Pub. L. Nos. 115-141, 115-31, 114-113, 113-235, 113-76, and 113-6; OSD Comptroller, 16-22 PA: Omnibus 2016 Prior Approval Request, 6/30/2016.

STATUS OF FUNDS

ASFF Budget Activities

DOD budgeted and reported on ASFF by three **Budget Activity Groups** (BAGs) through the FY 2018 appropriation. These BAGs consisted of:

- Defense Forces (Afghan National Army, ANA)
- Interior Forces (Afghan National Police, ANP)
- Related Activities (primarily Detainee Operations)

Funds for each BAG are further allocated to four **subactivity groups** (SAGs): Sustainment, Infrastructure, Equipment and Transportation, and Training and Operations.⁸⁴ The AROC must approve the requirement and acquisition plan for any service requirements in excess of \$50 million annually and for any nonstandard equipment requirement in excess of \$100 million.⁸⁵

As of March 31, 2019, DOD had disbursed \$68.61 billion from the ASFF appropriations for FY 2005 through FY 2018. Of this amount, nearly \$47.13 billion was disbursed for the ANA, and more than \$21.11 billion was disbursed for the ANP.

As shown in Figure 3.8, the largest portion of the funds disbursed for the ANA—nearly \$23.20 billion—supported ANA troop and equipment sustainment. Of the funds disbursed for the ANP, the largest portion—more than \$9.32 billion—also supported sustainment of ANP forces, as shown in Figure 3.9.⁸⁶

Budget Activity Groups: categories within each appropriation or fund account that identify the purposes, projects, or types of activities financed by the appropriation or fund

Subactivity Groups: accounting groups that break down the command's disbursements into functional areas

Source: DOD, *Manual 7110.1-M Department of Defense Budget Guidance Manual*, accessed 9/28/2009; Department of the Navy, *Medical Facility Manager Handbook*, p. 5, accessed 10/2/2009.

FIGURE 3.8

ASFF DISBURSEMENTS FOR THE ANA BY SUBACTIVITY GROUP, FY 2005 TO FY 2018 APPROPRIATIONS THROUGH MARCH 31, 2019 (\$ BILLIONS)





FIGURE 3.9

ASFF DISBURSEMENTS FOR THE ANP BY SUBACTIVITY GROUP, FY 2005 TO FY 2018 APPROPRIATIONS THROUGH MARCH 31, 2019 (\$ BILLIONS)



Note: Numbers have been rounded.

Source: DFAS, "AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019," 4/14/2019.

STATUS OF FUNDS

New ASFF Budget Activity Groups for FY 2019

DOD revised its budgeting and reporting framework for ASFF beginning with its ASFF budget request for FY 2019, submitted to Congress in February 2018, and with its reporting beginning on October 1, 2018. In FY 2018 and previous years, all costs associated with the Afghan Air Force (AAF) fell under the ANA BAG and costs for the Afghan Special Security Forces (ASSF) were split between the ANA and ANP BAGs. Beginning with the FY 2019 ASFF appropriation, the ANDSF consists of the ANA, ANP, AAF, and ASSF BAGs.

Table 3.5 on the opposite page presents the ASFF FY 2019 budget revised to align budgeted spending with the FY 2019 appropriation of \$4.92 billion. Next to it appears the ASFF FY 2020 budget request of \$4.80 billion presented to Congress in March 2019. Table 3.4 below presents the components of the Sustainment SAG for the ANA, ANP, AAF, and ASSF for the FY 2020 budget request.

NATO ANA Trust Fund

The NATO ANA Trust Fund (NATF) has received contributions of more than \$2.69 billion from 29 NATO members, including the United States, and from six other Coalition partners to support the ANDSF through ASFF and its own NATO Support and Procurement Agency (NSPA).⁸⁷ The NATF has contributed more than \$1.52 billion to ASFF for specific projects funded by donor nations, and DOD has obligated, disbursed and returned to donor nations approximately \$824.79 million, \$671.56 million and \$381.00 million, respectively, of these funds through March 31, 2019.⁸⁸ These amounts are not reflected in the U.S. government-funded ASFF obligation and disbursement numbers presented in Figures 3.6 and 3.7.

TABLE 3.4

ASFF FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST—SUSTAINMENT (\$ MILLIONS)					
Sustainment Budget Categories and Line Items	Afghan National Army	Afghan National Police	Afghan Air Force	Afghan Special Security Forces	Total
Vehicles and Aircraft ¹	\$116.1	\$108.3	\$729.3	\$150.3	\$1,104.0
Personnel ²	539.8	12.8	31.4	115.6	699.7
Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricants	170.9	88.8	26.5	9.9	296.1
Communications & Intelligence	116.6	49.0	N/A	73.8	239.3
Ammunition	93.9	16.6	95.8	N/A	206.3
Facilities	109.6	72.4	4.5	13.6	200.0
All Other	166.1	75.0	6.3	74.8	322.1
Total	\$1,313.0	\$422.8	\$893.8	\$437.9	\$3,067.6

Note: Numbers have been rounded. N/A = Not available.

¹ Vehicles and Aircraft consists of the Vehicles and Transportation budget category for the four BAGs and the Aircraft Sustainment budget category for AAF and ASSF, less the Ammunition budget line item in AAF Aircraft Sustainment.

² Personnel excludes \$273.3 million budgeted by LOTFA for its contribution to ANP and ASSF personnel requirements.

Source: DOD, *Department of Defense Budget Justification for FY 2020 Overseas Contingency Operations, Afghanistan Security Forces Fund*, 3/2019.

STATUS OF FUNDS


TABLE 3.5

ASFF FY 2019 BUDGET AND FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST (\$ MILLIONS)		
	FY 2019 Appropriated	FY 2020 Budget Request
Total	\$4,920.0	\$4,804.0
Afghan National Army, Total	1,764.4	1,589.7
Sustainment, Total	1,399.7	1,313.0
Personnel	609.0	539.8
Ammunition	158.2	93.9
Communications and Intelligence	187.6	116.6
Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricants	92.2	170.9
All Other	352.7	391.8
Infrastructure, Total	137.7	37.2
Equipment and Transportation, Total	61.9	120.9
Training and Operations, Total	165.1	118.6
Afghan National Police, Total	726.3	660.4
Sustainment, Total	497.6	422.8
Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricants	105.5	88.8
All Other	392.1	334.0
Infrastructure, Total	43.0	2.4
Equipment and Transportation, Total	14.6	127.1
Training and Operations, Total	171.2	108.1
Afghan Air Force, Total	1,727.3	1,825.5
Sustainment, Total	892.5	893.8
Ammunition	98.3	95.8
Rotary-Wing Contract Support	516.8	542.3
Fixed-Wing Contract Support	175.5	174.6
All Other	101.9	81.1
Infrastructure, Total	30.4	8.6
Equipment and Transportation, Total	537.3	567.0
Rotary-Wing Aircraft (UH-60s)	419.6	463.3
All Other	117.7	103.7
Training and Operations, Total	267.2	356.1
Afghan Special Security Forces, Total	702.0	728.4
Sustainment, Total	353.7	437.9
Aircraft Sustainment	132.9	134.4
Personnel	142.7	115.6
All Other	78.2	188.0
Infrastructure, Total	43.1	21.1
Equipment and Transportation, Total	151.8	153.8
Training and Operations, Total	153.4	115.6

Note: Numbers have been rounded.

Source: DOD, Department of Defense Budget, Fiscal Year 2020, Justification for FY 2020 Overseas Contingency Operations, Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, 3/2019. The amounts presented in the column labeled "FY 2019 Appropriated" are based on the adjustments in the ASFF Financial and Activity Plan dated October 22, 2018 (FAP 19-1) that distributed congressional marks of \$279.5 million to conform the FY 2019 budget request to the FY 2019 ASFF appropriation but not the adjustments that realigned \$124.7 million from the ANA to the new AAF and ASSF BAGs.

STATUS OF FUNDS



CERP FUNDS TERMINOLOGY

Appropriations: Total monies available for commitments

Obligations: Commitments to pay monies

Disbursements: Monies that have been expended

COMMANDER'S EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM

The Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP) enables U.S. commanders in Afghanistan to respond to urgent humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements in their areas of responsibility by supporting programs that will immediately assist the local population. Funding under this program is intended for small projects estimated to cost less than \$500,000 each.⁸⁹ CERP-funded projects may not exceed \$2 million each.⁹⁰

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, appropriated \$5.00 million for CERP for FY 2018; the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019, doubled the appropriation to \$10.00 million for FY 2019, increasing total cumulative funding to more than \$3.70 billion. Of this amount, DOD reported that nearly \$2.29 billion had been obligated and disbursed as of March 31, 2019.⁹¹ Figure 3.10 shows CERP appropriations by fiscal year. Figure 3.11 provides a cumulative comparison of amounts appropriated, obligated, and disbursed for CERP projects.

FIGURE 3.10

CERP APPROPRIATIONS BY FISCAL YEAR
(\$ MILLIONS)





FIGURE 3.11

CERP FUNDS, CUMULATIVE COMPARISON
(\$ BILLIONS)




Note: Numbers have been rounded. Data may include interagency transfers. Analysis includes data from a draft DOD financial report because the final version had not been completed when this report went to press.

Source: DOD, response to SIGAR data call, 4/16/2019 and 1/15/2019; OMB, response to SIGAR data call, 1/4/2013; Pub. L. Nos. 115-141, 115-31, 114-113, 113-235, 113-76, 113-6, 112-74, 112-10.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

The Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (DICDA) appropriation provides funding for efforts intended to stabilize Afghanistan by combating the drug trade and related activities. The DOD Counter-Drug group allocates this funding to support the Counternarcotics Police of Afghanistan units (mentored by the DEA and U.S. Army Special Forces unit) who investigate high-value targets and conduct drug-interdiction operations. Funding is also provided to the Afghanistan Special Mission Wing (SMW) to support their fleet of rotary- and fixed-wing aircraft. The SMW's aircraft provide air mobility to conduct intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance operations aimed at counterdrug and counter-terrorism operations in country.⁹²

DOD Counter-Drug reprograms appropriated DICDA funds from the Central Transfer Account (CTA) to the military services and defense agencies, which track obligations of the transferred funds. The group allocated funding to Afghanistan programs and transferred \$132.36 million to the CTA in the quarter ending March 31, 2019, bringing cumulative DICDA funding to more than \$3.38 billion since FY 2004.⁹³ Figure 3.12 shows DICDA appropriations by fiscal year. Figure 3.13 provides a cumulative comparison of amounts appropriated and transferred from the CD CTA.⁹⁴



DICDA FUNDS TERMINOLOGY

Appropriations: Total monies available for commitments

Obligations: Commitments to pay monies

Disbursements: Monies that have been expended

FIGURE 3.12

DICDA APPROPRIATIONS BY FISCAL YEAR
(\$ MILLIONS)





FIGURE 3.13

DICDA FUNDS, CUMULATIVE COMPARISON
(\$ BILLIONS)




Note: Numbers have been rounded. DOD reprogrammed \$125.13 million out of FY 2015 DICDA due to several requirements for the Afghanistan Special Mission Wing being funded from the ASFF instead of DICDA.

^a DOD reprograms all DICDA funds to the military services and defense agencies for obligation and disbursement.

Source: DOD, response to SIGAR data call, 4/9/2019 and 10/8/2018; OSD Comptroller, 15-23 PA: Omnibus 2015 Prior Approval Request, 6/30/2015, p. 42.

STATUS OF FUNDS



ESF FUNDS TERMINOLOGY

Appropriations: Total monies available for commitments

Obligations: Commitments to pay monies

Disbursements: Monies that have been expended

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

Economic Support Fund (ESF) programs are intended to advance U.S. interests by helping countries meet short- and long-term political, economic, and security needs. ESF programs support counterterrorism; bolster national economies; and assist in the development of effective, accessible, independent legal systems for a more transparent and accountable government.⁹⁵

The ESF was allocated \$500.00 million for Afghanistan for FY 2018 through the Section 653(a) consultation process between Congress and the Department of State concluding in the quarter ending September 30, 2018. The allocation to Afghanistan for the FY 2019 appropriation enacted in the quarter ending March 31, 2019, has not been completed. Cumulative funding for the ESF stands at nearly \$20.50 billion, of which nearly \$19.23 billion had been obligated and more than \$16.68 billion had been disbursed as of March 31, 2019.⁹⁶ Figure 3.14 shows ESF appropriations by fiscal year, and Figure 3.15 shows cumulative appropriations, obligations, and disbursements as of December 31, 2018, and March 31, 2019.

FIGURE 3.14

ESF APPROPRIATIONS BY FISCAL YEAR
(\$ BILLIONS)





FIGURE 3.15

ESF FUNDS, CUMULATIVE COMPARISON
(\$ BILLIONS)




Note: Numbers have been rounded. Data reflects the following transfers from AIF to the ESF: \$101 million for FY 2011, \$179.5 million for FY 2013, and \$55 million for FY 2014. FY 2016 ESF for Afghanistan was reduced by \$179 million and put toward the U.S. commitment to the Green Climate Fund.

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019, 1/17/2019, 1/14/2019, and 10/15/2018; State, response to SIGAR data call, 10/11/2017, 5/4/2016, 10/20/2015, 4/15/2015, and 4/15/2014.

FOOD FOR PEACE: TITLE II AND IDA PROGRAMS

USAID's Office of Food for Peace administers Public Law 480 Title II and International Disaster Assistance (IDA) account resources that are requested and appropriated on a contingency basis to meet humanitarian needs worldwide, with a focus on emergency food and nutrition assistance. Food for Peace Title II resources are authorized by the Food for Peace Act and appropriated under the Agriculture appropriations bill, while IDA resources are authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act and Global Food Security Act and appropriated under the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs appropriation.⁹⁷

The Office of Food for Peace obligates funding for emergency food-assistance projects when there is an identified need and local authorities do not have the capacity to respond. More than three decades of war, population displacement and returns, civil unrest, insurgent activity, and recurring natural disasters have contributed to chronic humanitarian need in Afghanistan.⁹⁸ USAID obligated nearly \$74.00 million through IDA funds (\$69.78 million) and Title II Emergency funds (\$4.22 million) to provide vulnerable, food-insecure Afghan households with emergency food and nutrition assistance in FY 2018, and has obligated an additional \$0.59 million in IDA funds in FY 2019.⁹⁹ Figure 3.16 shows annual appropriations of Title II funds, and Figure 3.17 indicates that approximately \$1.10 billion in Title II funds have been appropriated and transferred to Afghanistan programs from 2002 through March 31, 2019.¹⁰⁰



FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE II AND IDA PROGRAMS

Appropriations: Total monies available for commitments

Obligations: Commitments to pay monies

Disbursements: Monies that have been expended

FIGURE 3.16

TITLE II APPROPRIATIONS BY FISCAL YEAR
(\$ MILLIONS)





FIGURE 3.17

TITLE II FUNDS, CUMULATIVE COMPARISON
(\$ BILLIONS)




Note: Numbers have been rounded.

^a Title II Emergency account resources are requested and appropriated on a contingency basis to meet unmet humanitarian needs.

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/15/2019 and 10/19/2018.

STATUS OF FUNDS



IDA FUNDS TERMINOLOGY

Appropriations: Total monies available for commitments

Obligations: Commitments to pay monies

Disbursements: Monies that have been expended

FOREIGN DISASTER ASSISTANCE: IDA PROGRAMS

USAID’s Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) teams with the Office of Food for Peace (FFP) to administer International Disaster Assistance (IDA) funds.¹⁰¹ OFDA is responsible for leading and coordinating the U.S. government response to disasters overseas. Its major programs include Relief Commodities & Logistics Support, Shelter & Settlements, Humanitarian Coordination & Information Management, Health, Protection, and WASH (water, sanitation, and hygiene). OFDA works closely with international partners such as the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations World Health Organization (WHO), and others to deliver goods and services to assist conflict- and disaster-affected populations in Afghanistan.¹⁰²

USAID reported that \$831.50 million in IDA funds had been allocated to Afghanistan from 2002 through March 31, 2019. Separately, FFP reported that IDA has funded Food for Peace programs in Afghanistan totaling \$218.75 million over this period, indicating that OFDA has allocated over \$612.75 million to its Afghanistan programs. Figure 3.18 presents annual appropriations of IDA funds to Afghanistan. Figure 3.19 presents cumulative appropriations, obligations, and disbursements.¹⁰³

FIGURE 3.18

IDA APPROPRIATIONS BY FISCAL YEAR
(\$ MILLIONS)





FIGURE 3.19

IDA FUNDS, CUMULATIVE COMPARISON
(\$ BILLIONS)




Note: Numbers have been rounded. Data may include interagency transfers.

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019, 1/14/2019, and 10/15/2018.

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

The U.S. Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) manages the International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) account which funds projects and programs for advancing the rule of law and combating narcotics production and trafficking. INCLE supports several INL program groups, including police, counternarcotics, and rule of law and justice.¹⁰⁴

The INCLE account was allocated \$160.00 million for Afghanistan for FY 2018 through the Section 653(a) consultation process between Congress and the Department of State concluding in the quarter ending September 30, 2018. The allocation to Afghanistan for the FY 2019 appropriation enacted in the quarter ending March 31, 2019, has not been completed. Cumulative funding for INCLE stands at more than \$5.25 billion, of which nearly \$4.97 billion has been obligated and nearly \$4.28 billion has been disbursed as of March 31, 2019. Figure 3.20 shows INCLE appropriations by fiscal year, and Figure 3.21 shows cumulative appropriations, obligations, and disbursements as of December 31, 2018, and March 31, 2019.¹⁰⁵



INL FUNDS TERMINOLOGY

Appropriations: Total monies available for commitments

Obligations: Commitments to pay monies

Disbursements: Monies that have been expended

FIGURE 3.20

INCLE APPROPRIATIONS BY FISCAL YEAR
(\$ MILLIONS)





FIGURE 3.21


INCLE FUNDS, CUMULATIVE COMPARISON
(\$ BILLIONS)



Note: Numbers have been rounded. Data may include interagency transfers.

Source: State, response to SIGAR data call, 4/8/2019 and 1/16/2019.

STATUS OF FUNDS



MRA FUNDS TERMINOLOGY

Appropriations: Total monies available for commitments

Obligations: Commitments to pay monies

Disbursements: Monies that have been expended

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

The Department of State's Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) administers the Migration and Refugee Assistance (MRA) account that funds programs to protect and assist refugees, conflict victims, internally displaced persons, stateless persons, and vulnerable migrants. Through MRA, PRM supports the work of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), other international organizations, and various nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in Afghanistan to support Afghan refugees throughout the region and upon their return to Afghanistan.¹⁰⁶

The MRA allocation for Afghan refugees, internally displaced persons, and returnees was \$76.25 million from the FY 2018 MRA appropriation, which was followed by modest allocations in the first and second quarters of FY 2019. Cumulative appropriations since 2002 totaled nearly \$1.35 billion as of March 31, 2019, with cumulative obligations and disbursements reaching \$1.34 billion and \$1.32 billion, respectively, on that date. Figure 3.22 shows MRA appropriations by fiscal year, and Figure 3.23 shows cumulative appropriations, obligations, and disbursements as of December 31, 2018, and March 31, 2019.¹⁰⁷

FIGURE 3.22

MRA APPROPRIATIONS BY FISCAL YEAR
(\$ MILLIONS)





FIGURE 3.23

MRA FUNDS, CUMULATIVE COMPARISON
(\$ BILLIONS)




Note: Numbers have been rounded. Data may include interagency transfers.

Source: State, response to SIGAR data call, 4/15/2019 and 10/24/2018.

NON-PROLIFERATION, ANTITERRORISM, DEMINING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

The Non-Proliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining, and Related Programs (NADR) account plays a critical role in improving the Afghan government's capacity to address terrorist threats, protect its borders, and remove dangerous explosive remnants of war.¹⁰⁸ The majority of NADR funding for Afghanistan is funneled through two subaccounts, Antiterrorist Assistance (ATA) and Conventional Weapons Destruction (CWD), with additional funds going to Export Control and Related Border Security (EXBS) and Counterterrorism Financing (CTF).¹⁰⁹

The Department of State and the U.S. Congress agree on the country-by-country allocation of annual appropriations for the foreign-assistance accounts, including NADR, through the Section 653(a) allocation process. The Office of Foreign Assistance Resources makes allocated funding available to relevant bureaus and offices that obligate and disburse these funds.¹¹⁰ The allocation to Afghanistan was \$36.60 million for FY 2018, while the allocation for FY 2019 remains pending until the Section 653(a) process is completed this year. Figure 3.24 shows annual allocations to the NADR account, and Figure 3.25 shows that the cumulative total of NADR funds appropriated and transferred stood at \$804.54 million as of December 31, 2018, and March 31, 2019.¹¹¹



NADR FUNDS TERMINOLOGY

Appropriations: Total monies available for commitments

Obligations: Commitments to pay monies

Disbursements: Monies that have been expended

FIGURE 3.24

NADR APPROPRIATIONS BY FISCAL YEAR
(\$ MILLIONS)





FIGURE 3.25

NADR FUNDS, CUMULATIVE COMPARISON
(\$ MILLIONS)



Note: Numbers have been rounded.

^a State and Congress agree on the country-by-country allocation of annual appropriations for the foreign assistance accounts, including NADR, through the Section 653(a) process. The Office of Foreign Assistance Resources makes allocated funding available to relevant bureaus at State that obligate and disburse these funds.

Source: State, response to SIGAR data call, 10/5/2018 and 10/10/2017.

STATUS OF FUNDS

INTERNATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION FUNDING FOR AFGHANISTAN


The international community provides significant funding to support Afghanistan relief and reconstruction efforts. Most of the international funding is administered through trust funds. The three main trust funds are the World Bank-managed Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)-managed Law and Order Trust Fund for Afghanistan (LOTFA), and the NATO-managed Afghan National Army (ANA) Trust Fund (NATO ANA Trust Fund or NATF).

Contributions to the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund

The largest share of international contributions to the Afghan government's operational and development budgets comes through the ARTF. From 2002 to January 20, 2019, the World Bank reported that 34 donors had paid in more than \$11.43 billion.¹¹² Figure 3.26 shows the five largest donors over this period as the United States, the UK, the European Union, Germany, and Canada. Figure 3.27 shows these five countries as the largest donors to the ARTF for Afghan FY 1397 (December 22, 2017–December 21, 2018). The ARTF received contributions of \$1.02 billion in Afghan FY 1397, marking the second highest annual amount of contributions received by the fund in its 17-year history.

FIGURE 3.26

CUMULATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS TO ARTF, LOTFA, AND NATO ANA TRUST FUND BY 10 LARGEST DONORS (\$ MILLIONS)



Note: Does not include the Asian Development Bank's Afghanistan Infrastructure Trust Fund (AITF), whose partners, the NATO ANA Trust Fund, Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States, have committed \$841 million as of June 2018.

Source: World Bank, ARTF: Administrator's Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019 (end of 1st month of FY 1398); UNDP, LOTFA Receipts 2002–2019, Updated April 16, 2019, in response to SIGAR data call 4/9/2019; NATO, Afghan National Army (ANA) Trust Fund, Media Backgrounder, Status of Contributions Made as of January 31, 2019; Asian Development Bank, "Afghanistan Infrastructure Trust Fund 2018 Fact Sheet."

STATUS OF FUNDS

Contributions to the ARTF are divided into two funding channels, the Recurrent Cost (RC) Window and the Investment Window.¹¹³ As of January 20, 2019, according to the World Bank, nearly \$5.05 billion of ARTF funds had been disbursed to the Afghan government through the RC Window to assist with recurrent costs such as civil servants' salaries.¹¹⁴ To ensure that the RC Window receives adequate funding, donors to the ARTF may not "preference" (earmark) more than half of their annual contributions.¹¹⁵

The Investment Window supports development programs. As of January 20, 2019, according to the World Bank, nearly \$5.39 billion had been committed through the Investment Window, and nearly \$4.51 billion had been disbursed. The Bank reported 36 active projects with a combined commitment value of nearly \$2.80 billion, of which nearly \$1.92 billion had been disbursed.¹¹⁶

Contributions to the Law and Order Trust Fund for Afghanistan

The UNDP administers the LOTFA to pay ANP salaries and build the capacity of the Ministry of Interior (MOI).¹¹⁷ Donors have paid in nearly \$5.54 billion to the LOTFA from 2002 through April 16, 2019. Figure 3.26 shows the fund's two largest donors on a cumulative basis have been the United States and Japan. Figure 3.28 shows the largest donors to the LOTFA in 2018. Annual contributions to LOTFA have been halved since 2016, from nearly \$565.02 million to nearly \$263.58 million in 2018, the lowest level of support since 2008. The United States contributed \$114.40 million in 2016, but only \$1.04 million in 2018.¹¹⁸


On July 1, 2015, UNDP divided LOTFA support into two projects: the Support to Payroll Management (SPM) project, and the MOI and Police Development (MPD) project. The SPM project aims to develop the capacity of the Afghan government to independently manage all nonfiduciary aspects of its pay budget for the ANP and Central Prisons Directorate (CPD) staff. Almost 99% of SPM project funding goes toward ANP and CPD staff remuneration. The MPD project focuses on institutional development of the MOI and police professionalization of the ANP. On November 25, 2018, the LOTFA Steering Committee, composed of Afghan ministries, international donors, and the UNDP, approved restructuring the fund and changing its scope of operations.¹¹⁹

Contributions to the NATO ANA Trust Fund

The NATO ANA Trust Fund supports the Afghan National Army and other elements of the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces through procurement by the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) and the NATO Support and Procurement Agency (NSPA).¹²⁰ The Fund has received contributions from 29 NATO members and six other Coalition partners totaling more than \$2.69 billion through January 31, 2019. Figure 3.26 shows Germany, Australia, and Italy as the three largest contributors to the fund. The United States made its first contribution in 2018 to support an existing procurement contract.¹²¹

FIGURE 3.27

ARTF CONTRIBUTIONS BY DONOR, AFGHAN FY 1397 (PERCENT)




Note: Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. "Others" includes 10 donors.

Source: World Bank, ARTF: Administrator's Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019 (end of 1st month of FY 1398).

FIGURE 3.28

LOTFA CONTRIBUTIONS BY DONOR, CALENDAR YEAR 2018 (PERCENT)



Note: Numbers have been rounded. "Others" includes the United States and four other countries.

Source: UNDP, LOTFA Receipts 2002–2019, updated April 16, 2019, in response to SIGAR data call, 4/9/2019.

SECURITY CONTENTS

Key Issues and Events	71
United States Forces-Afghanistan	81
Afghan National Defense and Security Forces	82
Afghan National Army	89
Afghan Air Force	93
Afghan National Police	99
Removing Unexploded Ordnance	104

SECURITY

KEY ISSUES AND EVENTS

The United States' primary goal in Afghanistan remains continued progress in the ongoing talks between the United States and the Taliban with the intent that U.S. efforts will lead to peace negotiations between the Afghan government and the Taliban. U.S. officials maintain that U.S. military support in Afghanistan will remain necessary until a final peace agreement and nationwide ceasefire is reached and the United States is confident that terrorists cannot use Afghanistan to threaten the United States or its interests.¹²²

This quarter, the outgoing Commander of United States Central Command, General Joseph Votel, told the House Armed Services Committee in a hearing on March 7 that, "In Afghanistan, the president's South Asia strategy is working. The efforts of our [Special Representative for Afghanistan Reconciliation] Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad show there is a path to progress. But there is much left to do to achieve our end-state of reconciliation between the government of Afghanistan and the Taliban."¹²³ General Votel added that U.S. military efforts must continue to be "focused on supporting the Afghan security forces and providing Ambassador Khalilzad the maximum military pressure and leverage to support his diplomatic efforts."¹²⁴

Ambassador Khalilzad participated in two rounds of talks with Taliban delegations in Qatar during this reporting period: six days of talks in late January and roughly two weeks of talks from late February through mid-March.¹²⁵ According to Ambassador Khalilzad, during the first round of talks, Taliban and the U.S. representatives "agreed in principle" to four major issues deemed essential to any final political settlement: counterterrorism assurances from the Taliban, U.S. troop withdrawal, intra-Afghan dialogue, and a complete ceasefire between the parties to the conflict.¹²⁶ Ambassador Khalilzad said on March 12, after the second round of talks with a more senior Taliban delegation, that both sides have now "agreed in draft" on the first two of these issues. He added that once the first two issues have been finalized, "the Taliban and [the Afghan government] will begin intra-Afghan negotiations on a political settlement and comprehensive ceasefire."¹²⁷

Though U.S. officials are optimistic about the recent progress made during the last few months of talks, there are several indications that the Taliban, the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF), and international forces will continue to fight to gain greater leverage at the



Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad greeting Afghan partners during an early April trip to Kabul. (U.S. Embassy Kabul photo)

FIGURE 3.29



Note: Fatalities are estimates and are the number of the opposing party killed. The March 7 IS-K attack's fatalities were civilians.

Source: ACLED, South Asia 2016-Present dataset, 1/1/2019–4/13/2019, available online at www.acleddata.com; SIGAR, analysis of ACLED data, 4/2019.

negotiating table. Figure 3.29 lists some of the key battles between the parties to the conflict this quarter, many of which occurred during or following each of the U.S.-Taliban talks. On April 12, the Taliban announced the beginning of its 2019 spring offensive just ahead of another round of talks scheduled between American, Taliban, and Afghan representatives for late April. The announcement reportedly followed President Ashraf Ghani's approval of an Afghan security plan in early April. Ambassador Khalilzad expressed particular discontent with the Taliban's decision, saying "It is irresponsible to suggest that an increase in violence is warranted because the [Afghan] government announced a security plan." On April 18, the scheduled talks were postponed due to unresolved disagreements over participation and representation between the parties involved.¹²⁸

This quarter, NATO's Resolute Support (RS) train-advise-assist mission in Afghanistan formally notified SIGAR that it has discontinued producing one of its most widely cited Afghan security metrics: district, population, and territorial control data. The command said they no longer saw decision-making value in these data.¹²⁹ The latest data from the few remaining publicly available measures of the security situation in Afghanistan—enemy-initiated attacks, general ANDSF casualty trends, and security incidents—show that Afghanistan experienced heightened insecurity over the winter months.

According to Resolute Support (RS), enemy-initiated attacks rose considerably: the monthly average attacks from November 2018 through January 2019 was up 19% compared to the monthly average over the last reporting period (August 16 to October 31, 2018).¹³⁰ USFOR-A said that from December 1, 2018, through February 28, 2019, "the number of ANDSF casualties were approximately 31% higher during this three-month period when compared to the same period one year prior."¹³¹ The Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) reported 2,234 security-related incidents in Afghanistan from December 1, 2018–February 28, 2019, a 39% increase compared to same period the year before.¹³² These trends are notable considering that violence has typically waned during the winter months in Afghanistan over the last several years.¹³³

These data align with the U.S. intelligence community's most recent public assessment that "Afghan forces generally have secured cities and other government strongholds, but the Taliban has increased large-scale attacks, and Afghan security suffers from a large number of forces being tied down in defensive missions, mobility shortfalls, and a lack of reliable forces to hold recaptured territory."¹³⁴ Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats projected in late January that in 2019 "neither the Afghan government nor the Taliban will be able to gain a strategic advantage in the Afghan war in the coming year, even if Coalition support remains at current levels."¹³⁵ General Votel echoed this statement in March. When pressed whether current conditions in Afghanistan merit a withdrawal of U.S. forces, General Votel said "The political conditions . . . right now don't merit that."¹³⁶

ANDSF Data Discontinued

USFOR-A discontinued the following data this quarter:

- District-stability assessments (district, population, and territorial control data)

ANDSF Data Classified or Not Publicly Releasable

USFOR-A newly classified the following data this quarter:

- A narrative assessment about Afghan Special Security Forces (ASSF) misuse by the Ministry of Defense (MOD) and Ministry of Interior (MOI)

USFOR-A continued to classify or restrict from public release, in accordance with classification guidelines or other restrictions placed by the Afghan government, the following data (mostly since October 2017):

- ANDSF casualties, by force element and total
- Corps- and zone-level Afghan National Army (ANA) and Afghan National Police (ANP) authorized and assigned strength by component
- Performance assessments for the ANA, ANP, MOD, and MOI
- Information about the operational readiness of ANA and ANP equipment
- Special Mission Wing (SMW) information, including the number and type of airframes in the SMW inventory, the number of pilots and aircrew, and the operational readiness (and associated benchmarks) of SMW airframes
- Reporting on anticorruption efforts by the MOI (unclassified but not publicly releasable)
- Reporting on the status of the ANDSF's progress on security-related benchmarks of the Afghanistan Compact (unclassified but not publicly releasable)

The classified annex for this report covers the classified and nonreleasable data.

Population, District, and Territorial Control

This quarter, RS formally notified SIGAR that it is no longer producing its district-level stability assessment of Afghan government and insurgent control and influence, expressed in a count of the districts, the total estimated population of the district, and the total estimated area of the districts.

According to RS, they determined the district-stability assessments were “of limited decision-making value to the [RS] Commander.” RS added that there is currently no other product or forum through which district-level control data is communicated within the command.¹³⁷ For RS's full statements on the discontinuation of its district-stability assessment, see Appendix D. The last district stability data RS produced was for its October 22, 2018, assessment; SIGAR reported on that assessment in its January 2019 *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*.

In mid-January, DOD told SIGAR that the assessments “are not indicative of effectiveness of the South Asia strategy or of progress toward security and stability in Afghanistan, particularly in the wake of the appointment of U.S. Special Representative for Afghanistan Reconciliation Zalmay Khalilzad.” They reiterated that there is some “uncertainty in the models that produce [the district-stability data] and the assessments that underlie them are to a degree subjective.” DOD said that it is “more important to instead focus on the principal goal of the strategy of concluding the war in Afghanistan on terms favorable to Afghanistan and the United States.”¹³⁸

SIGAR recognized and reported the limitations of the district-stability assessment, including its increasing level of subjectivity.¹³⁹ However, senior RS officials had previously cited its importance in public statements. For example, in November 2017, the then RS commander said that improving population control in Afghanistan (to 80% by the end of 2019) was one of his strategic priorities.¹⁴⁰ Additionally, RS told SIGAR in May 2017 that the district-control assessments were being “methodologically improved” by making them more subjective, basing them on RS regional commanders’ informed opinions about the control status of districts within their area of responsibility.¹⁴¹ Despite its limitations, the control data was the only unclassified metric provided by RS that consistently tracked changes to the security situation on the ground. While the data did not on its own indicate the success or failure of the South Asia strategy, it did contribute to an overall understanding of the situation in the country.

As SIGAR has reported, RS’s control data from May 2017 to October 2018 showed a stagnant security environment in Afghanistan. Addressing the stagnation, RS said in late January that “one necessary condition [for a political resolution] is the perception by both sides that the conflict is in a military stalemate . . . little variation in district stability data support multiple years of assessments that the conflict is in a stalemate.”¹⁴²


Security-Incident Data

SIGAR tracks and analyzes several types of security-incident data to provide a robust account of the security situation in Afghanistan. With the recent discontinuation of official data on government and insurgent control of Afghanistan’s districts, population, and territory, the data presented in this section is an effort to show security activity between the parties to the conflict.

Each type of incident data presented here has advantages and limitations: RS-reported enemy-initiated attack data comes from an official source, but is only available unclassified at the provincial level and does not include U.S. and ANDSF-initiated attacks on the enemy; Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project’s (ACLED) events data can be disaggregated to the district level, to a variety of security incident types, and to all the parties to the conflict, but depends entirely on media reporting of security-related events.

FIGURE 3.30

RS-REPORTED ENEMY-INITIATED ATTACKS IN 2018



Source: RS, response to SIGAR data call, 4/1/2019; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 4/2019.

Enemy-Initiated Attacks

According to RS, “enemy-initiated attacks are defined as all attacks (direct fire, indirect fire, surface-to-air fire, IED and mine explosions, etc.) initiated by insurgents that are reported as [significant activities] (SIGACTs).”¹⁴³ RS reported 22,669 enemy-initiated attacks (EIA) in Afghanistan in 2018, with 4,374 (19%) of them occurring in the last two months of the year (November 1 to December 31, 2018).¹⁴⁴ RS reported 6,245 EIA this quarter (November 1, 2018–January 31, 2019). This reporting period’s figures reflect an average of 2,082 EIA per month, a 19% increase in EIA compared to the average monthly EIA last reporting period (August 16 to October 31, 2018).¹⁴⁵


As seen in Figure 3.30, most of the attacks in 2018, (13,828, or 61%), occurred in eight of Afghanistan’s 34 provinces: Badghis, Farah, Faryab, Ghazni, Helmand, Kandahar, Uruzgan, and Herat. Of these provinces, Helmand and Badghis experienced the greatest increase in EIA since October 31 (96% and 30%, respectively). The most violent province in terms of EIA shifted toward the end of the year, with the most EIA reported by far in Helmand (2,861), followed by Farah (1,801), and Badghis (1,798)

Effective enemy-initiated attacks: a subset of all reported enemy-initiated attacks that result in combat-related ANDSF, civilian, or Coalition force casualties and are reported as a significant activity (SIGACT).

Source: RS, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019.

FIGURE 3.31

ENEMY-INITIATED ATTACKS IN 2018 BY ATTACK TYPE



Source: RS, response to SIGAR data call, 4/1/2019.

Provinces. Last quarter's data showed Farah with the most reported EIA, followed by Helmand and Faryab Provinces.¹⁴⁶

Figure 3.31 shows that the most common methods of attack for the EIA in 2018 were direct fire (82% of EIA), followed by IED explosions (12%), and indirect fire (5%).¹⁴⁷ SIGAR will continue to monitor EIA to track trends over time.

For the first time this quarter, SIGAR requested **effective enemy-initiated attacks** (EEIA) data from RS. Of the 22,669 EIA reported in 2018, RS said there were 10,990 EEIA, meaning about 48% of total EIA resulted in ANDSF, Coalition, or civilian casualties. RS recorded 2,384 EEIA this reporting period (November 1, 2018–January 31, 2019), about 38% of total EIA for the same period.¹⁴⁸ DOD has previously offered the caveat that ANDSF units do not always report insurgent attacks that do not result in casualties. As such, the number of EIA could be higher than what RS has reported, which would also impact the percentage of EEIA to EIA.¹⁴⁹

Security-Related Events


SIGAR also analyzes security incident data from Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED), which records district-level data of political violence and protest incidents across Afghanistan. For consistency with RS's enemy-initiated attacks data, SIGAR is presenting ACLED data at the provincial level this quarter (see Figure 3.32) and chose a date range for the data in alignment with RS's reporting period (January 1–December 31, 2018).

ACLED recorded 7,399 security-related events in Afghanistan in 2018, roughly the same as the 7,345 recorded in 2017. The three provinces with the most events were unchanged from 2017 to 2018: Nangarhar, Ghazni, and Helmand. The events occurring in these three provinces accounted for 35% of 2018's total events.¹⁵⁰ Eight of the top 10 provinces with the most ACLED-recorded security-related events in 2018 were also within the top 10 provinces where RS recorded the most enemy-initiated attacks in 2018 (Helmand, Farah, Faryab, Uruzgan, Kandahar, Herat, Ghazni, and Nangarhar).¹⁵¹

ACLED recorded 2,234 security-related events over the winter months (December 1, 2018–February 28, 2019), a roughly 39% increase compared to the 1,610 events reported during the same period one year prior.¹⁵² The three provinces with the most security-related events were Helmand, Kandahar, and Nangarhar.¹⁵³ Much of the increase in events this reporting period compared to the same period the year before was due to increases in events reported in Kandahar and Helmand Provinces.¹⁵⁴

FIGURE 3.32

ACLED-RECORDED SECURITY-RELATED EVENTS IN 2018



Source: ACLED, South Asia 2016–Present dataset, 1/1/2018–12/31/2018, available online at <https://www.acleddata.com/>; SIGAR, analysis of ACLED data, 4/2019.

What is ACLED?

The Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) is “a disaggregated conflict collection, analysis, and crisis-mapping project” funded by the State Department. The project collects the dates, actors, types of violence, locations, and fatalities of all political violence, protest, and select non-violent, politically important events across several regions, as reported from open, secondary sources. ACLED’s aim is to capture the modes, frequency, and intensity of political violence and opposition as it occurs.

ACLED considers the event data it collects as falling into three categories “violent events,” “demonstrations,” or “nonviolent actions.” Within these categories, ACLED codes their events as: (1) Battles, (2) Explosions/ Remote Violence, (3) Protests, (4) Riots, (5) Strategic Developments, and (6) Violence against Civilians.

Source: ACLED, “About ACLED: What is ACLED?” and “Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) Codebook (2019),” pp. 6–7, 4/2019, accessed online on 4/22/2019, available at <https://www.acleddata.com/>.

Civilian Casualties

UNAMA: Record-High Civilian Deaths in 2018

The United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) documented 10,993 civilian casualties from January 1 through December 31, 2018, an overall increase of 5% compared to 2017. The casualties included 3,804 deaths (a nearly 11% increase since 2017) and 7,189 injuries (a 2% increase), a record high number of civilian deaths since UNAMA began recording civilian-casualty data in 2009. Men made up the majority of civilian casualties (62%), followed by children (28%), and women (10%).¹⁵⁵

Seen in Figure 3.33 on the following page, UNAMA attributed the majority of civilian casualties in 2018 (6,980, 63%) to antigovernment groups, which included the Taliban (37%), IS-K (20%), and unspecified antigovernment groups (6%). Casualties attributed to antigovernment elements rose by 3% compared to 2017. Civilian casualties from attacks deliberately targeting civilians by IS-K more than doubled from 843 in 2017 to 1,871


UNAMA Collection Methodology

According to UNAMA, data on civilian casualties are collected through “direct site visits, physical examination of items and evidence gathered at the scene of incidents, visits to hospital and medical facilities, still and video images,” reports by UN entities, and primary, secondary, and third-party accounts. Information is obtained directly from primary accounts where possible. Civilians whose noncombatant status is under “significant doubt,” based on international humanitarian law, are not included in the figures. Ground-engagement casualties that cannot be definitively attributed to either side, such as those incurred during crossfire, are jointly attributed to both parties. UNAMA includes an “other” category to distinguish between these jointly-attributed casualties and those caused by other events, such as unexploded ordnance or cross-border shelling by Pakistani forces. UNAMA’s methodology has remained largely unchanged since 2008.

Source: UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict*, 3/6/2018, i-ii; 1/2010, p. 35; 2/11/2009, pp. 4–5; and 8/2015, p. 4.

FIGURE 3.33

UNAMA: CIVILIAN CASUALTIES IN 2018 BY RESPONSIBLE PARTY




Note: Casualties include dead and wounded. A similar graphic appears on page 4 of UNAMA’s report.

Source: UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict Annual Report 2018, 2/2019*, pp. 1, 4–5, 46.

FIGURE 3.34

UNAMA: CIVILIAN CASUALTIES IN 2018 BY INCIDENT TYPE



Note: Casualties include dead and wounded. A similar graphic appears on page 2 of UNAMA’s report.

Source: UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict Annual Report 2018, 2/2019*, pp. 1–2.

in 2018, mainly from suicide and other attacks, including deliberate sectarian-motivated attacks against the minority Shi’a Muslim population.¹⁵⁶

An additional 2,612 civilian casualties (24%) were attributed to progovernment groups, which included casualties caused by the ANDSF (14%), international military forces (6%), progovernment groups (2%), and undetermined or multiple progovernment groups (2%). Casualties attributed to progovernment elements rose by 24% compared to 2017, mainly due to the increase in AAF and Coalition air operations.¹⁵⁷

UNAMA attributed most of the 5% overall increase in civilian casualties to improvised-explosive devices (IEDs). UNAMA said Afghan antigovernment elements’ use of IEDs in both suicide and nonsuicide attacks was the leading cause of civilian casualties in 2018, comprising 42% of the total. Civilian casualties from all IED incidents increased by 11% compared to 2017, which was primarily driven by the 22% increase in suicide IED incidents, a record high in 2018. Although IEDs caused the most civilian casualties in 2018, other leading causes included ground engagements between pro- and antigovernment elements (31%), aerial operations (9%), and targeted killings (8%), as shown in Figure 3.34.¹⁵⁸

Civilians living in Kabul, Nangarhar, Helmand, Ghazni, and Faryab Provinces suffered the highest number of casualties in 2018. Of these five provinces, four experienced an increase in civilian casualties compared to 2017, including Kabul (2% increase), Nangarhar (111%), Ghazni (84%), and

Faryab (1%), with Helmand seeing an 11% decrease. Two provinces had the most civilian casualties in 2018 by far: Kabul with 1,866 casualties (596 deaths) and Nangarhar with 1,815 (681 deaths).¹⁵⁹

UNAMA: Civilian Casualties in Early 2019 Decline Sharply

In a stark change from the final months of 2018, UNAMA documented 1,773 civilian casualties from January 1 through March 31, 2019, a 23% decrease in casualties compared to the same period in 2018 and the lowest number of civilian casualties in the first three months of the year since 2013. The casualties included 581 deaths and 1,192 injuries.¹⁶⁰

UNAMA noted that the significant decrease in civilian casualties so far this year was primarily driven by a 76% decrease in casualties caused by suicide IED attacks. Last year's figures were higher due to many more suicide attacks in early 2018, including the January 27, 2018, attack in Kabul, which was the deadliest incident UNAMA had ever recorded. UNAMA also said the particularly harsh winter conditions during the first three months of this year may have contributed to the decline in civilian casualties, and that it is unclear whether the trend was influenced by any measures undertaken by parties to the conflict to better protect civilians, or by the ongoing talks between some of the parties. UNAMA expressed continued concern about the increase in civilian casualties from the use of nonsuicide IEDs by anti-government elements (up 21% compared to last year).¹⁶¹

UNAMA reported that progovernment elements caused more civilian deaths than antigovernment elements thus far in 2019 (608 casualties, 305 deaths and 303 injuries). This was attributed to substantial increases in civilian casualties caused by progovernment aerial (41%) and search operations (85%) compared to last year. UNAMA attributed 17% of all civilian casualties to the ANDSF, 13% to international military forces, 2% to progovernment armed groups, and 2% to multiple progovernment forces. As in previous years, antigovernment elements were responsible for the majority of overall civilian casualties during the first quarter of 2019 (963 casualties, 227 deaths and 736 injuries).¹⁶²


The decrease UNAMA reported for the first three months of 2019 is offset by the high number of civilian casualties seen from October through December 2018 (2,943). Civilian casualties from October 2018–March 2019 were at roughly the same level they were from October 2017–March 2018.¹⁶³

RS Civilian Casualties Data

RS reported 9,214 civilian casualties in 2018 (2,845 killed and 6,369 wounded). As reported last quarter, September and October were the deadliest months, with 950 and 1,274 civilian casualties respectively. RS's and UNAMA's data aligned in that Kabul, Nangarhar, and Helmand Provinces experienced the most civilian casualties in 2018. According to RS, about 21% of 2018's civilian casualties occurred in Kabul Province (1,976 casualties),

FIGURE 3.35

RS: CIVILIAN CASUALTIES IN 2018 BY INCIDENT TYPE



Note: Casualties include dead and wounded.

Source: RS, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.


RS Collection Methodology

According to DOD, the RS Civilian Casualty Management Team relies primarily upon operational reporting from RS's Train, Advise, and Assist Commands (TAACs), other Coalition force headquarters, and ANDSF reports from the Afghan Presidential Information Command Centre to collect civilian-casualty data.

Source: DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2017, p. 27.

FIGURE 3.36

UNAMA: AERIAL OPERATIONS CIVILIAN CASUALTIES BY RESPONSIBLE PARTY




Note: Casualties include killed and wounded during progovernment aerial operations in 2018.

Source: UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict Annual Report 2018, 2/2019*, p. 38.

FIGURE 3.37

RS: AERIAL OPERATIONS CIVILIAN CASUALTIES BY RESPONSIBLE PARTY




Note: Casualties include killed and wounded during progovernment aerial operations in 2018.

Source: RS, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.

FIGURE 3.38

UNAMA: AERIAL OPERATIONS CIVILIAN CASUALTIES, 2009–2018



Note: A similar graphic appears on page 39 of UNAMA's report.

Source: UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict Annual Report 2018, 2/2019*, p. 39.

17% in Nangarhar (1,590), and 5% in Helmand (477). As seen in Figure 3.35 on the previous page, RS said the majority of the civilian casualties reported in 2018 were caused by IEDs (50%), followed by direct fire (22%), and indirect fire (7%).¹⁶⁴

Civilian Casualties and Aerial Operations

As aerial operations of progovernment forces (international military forces and the AAF) have increased, so have UN-recorded incidents of civilian casualties resulting from them. UNAMA's records indicate that air operations in 2018 caused 1,015 civilian casualties (536 deaths and 479 injuries). Of these, it attributed 632 civilian casualties (393 deaths and 239 injuries) to international military forces, 304 (118 deaths and 186 injuries) to the Afghan Air Force, and the remaining 79 civilian casualties to undetermined or multiple progovernment forces.¹⁶⁵

Figure 3.38 shows that the number of UNAMA-recorded civilian casualties caused by aerial operations in 2018 increased by 61% compared to 2017 and was the highest number of civilian casualties from air strikes in a single year since UNAMA began tracking them in 2009. Figures 3.36 and

TABLE 3.6

WEAPONS RELEASED DURING U.S. AIR MISSIONS IN AFGHANISTAN, 2015–2019													
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
2015	40	30	47	31	41	109	79	156	111	203	69	31	947
2016	127	115	58	62	89	94	160	108	162	205	92	65	1,337
2017	54	200	203	460	328	389	350	503	414	653	352	455	4,361
2018	378	469	339	562	591	572	746	715	841	769	841	539	7,362
2019	463	327											790

Note: A similar graphic appears in AFCENT's February 2019 report.

Source: AFCENT, "Combined Forces Air Component Commander 2013–2019 Airpower Statistics," 2/28/2019.

3.37 show the contrast between UNAMA and RS figures. RS provided a much lower figure for civilian casualties caused by Coalition and Afghan air strikes, and a different breakdown of responsibility for the strikes. According to RS there were 183 such casualties in 2018 (71 deaths and 112 injuries), with U.S. air strikes causing 101 of the casualties, and AAF air strikes causing 82.¹⁶⁶

UNAMA's most recent report on civilian casualties in the first three months of 2019 shows that 2018 trends are continuing: UNAMA documented the highest number of civilian casualties from aerial operations recorded during the first quarter of 2019 compared to the same period of any year since UNAMA began systematic documentation. Additionally, UNAMA determined that aerial operations were the leading cause of civilian deaths from January 1–March 31, 2019. All progovernment forces' aerial operations caused 228 civilian casualties (145 deaths, 83 injuries), and international military forces were responsible for the vast majority of these casualties (140 deaths, 79 injuries).¹⁶⁷

The UN recorded a 42% increase in U.S. and AAF air strikes from 2017 to 2018. The U.S. Air Forces Central Command (AFCENT) reported a 69% increase in weapons released during U.S. air operations in 2018 compared to 2017. AFCENT's data show that weapons released thus far in 2019 are about on par with 2018, but this only accounts for the first two months of the year. For AFCENT's data on U.S. weapons released in Afghanistan from the beginning of the RS mission in January 2015 through February 2019, see Table 3.6.¹⁶⁸

UNITED STATES FORCES-AFGHANISTAN

Personnel Strength

According to DOD, as of March 2019, approximately 14,000 U.S. military personnel were serving as part of the United States' Operation Freedom's Sentinel mission in Afghanistan, the same number reported since November

“I have the authorities and the capabilities that I need from the U.S. and the Coalition standpoint to work with our Afghan partners. At the same time, as a commander, I’m always trying to bring the footprint down, bring our force structure down.”

—General Austin “Scott” Miller,
RS and USFOR-A Commander

Source: ABC News, “Top U.S. Commander: Political Talks with Taliban ‘Absolutely’ Key Part of Any Endgame in Afghanistan War,” 2/4/2019.

2017. There are also an additional 861 DOD civilian personnel and 10,698 U.S. citizens who serve as contractors are also in Afghanistan.¹⁶⁹ Of the 14,000 U.S. military personnel, 8,475 are assigned to the NATO RS mission to train, advise, and assist Afghan security forces, unchanged since last quarter.¹⁷⁰ The remaining U.S. military personnel serve in support roles or in conducting air operations, training the Afghan special forces, and conducting counterterror operations.¹⁷¹

As of March 2019, the RS mission included roughly 8,559 military personnel from NATO allies and non-NATO partner nations, bringing the current total of RS military personnel to 17,034 (a 115-person increase since last quarter). The United States contributes the most troops to the RS mission, followed by Germany (1,300 personnel) and the United Kingdom (1,100).¹⁷²

U.S. Force Casualties

According to DOD, six U.S. military personnel were killed in action and 23 were wounded in action (WIA) in Afghanistan this reporting period (January 16–April 16, 2019). As of April 16, 2019, a total of 67 U.S. military personnel have died in Afghanistan (50 from hostile deaths and 17 in non-hostile circumstances) and 392 military personnel were WIA since the start of Operation Freedom’s Sentinel on January 1, 2015. Since the beginning of U.S. operations in Afghanistan in October 2001, 2,414 U.S. military personnel have died (1,894 from hostile deaths and 520 in non-hostile circumstances) and 20,488 were WIA.¹⁷³

Insider Attacks on U.S. and Coalition Forces

USFOR-A reported that there were no insider attacks on U.S. and Coalition forces this quarter.¹⁷⁴ There were five insider attacks in 2018, four on U.S. personnel, and one on Coalition personnel. Four RS soldiers were killed and eight were wounded during those attacks. In 2017, there were six confirmed insider attacks that killed three personnel and wounded 11.¹⁷⁵

AFGHAN NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY FORCES

U.S. Reconstruction Funding for Security

As of March 31, 2019, the U.S. Congress had appropriated more than \$83.3 billion to support security in Afghanistan. This accounts for 63% of all U.S. reconstruction funding for Afghanistan since fiscal year (FY) 2002. Of the \$4.7 billion appropriated for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) in FY 2018, \$4 billion had been obligated and \$3.7 billion disbursed as of March 31, 2019.¹⁷⁶

In 2005, Congress established the ASFF to build, equip, train, and sustain the ANDSF, which comprises all forces under the Ministry of Defense (MOD) and Ministry of Interior (MOI). A significant portion of ASFF is

used for Afghan Air Force (AAF) aircraft maintenance, and for ANA, AAF, ASSF, and Afghan Local Police (ALP) salaries. The rest is used for fuel, ammunition, vehicle, facility, and equipment maintenance, and various communications and intelligence infrastructure. Detailed ASFF budget breakdowns are presented in Table 3.4 and 3.5 on pages 58–59.¹⁷⁷

ASFF funds are obligated by either the Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan (CSTC-A) or the Defense Security Cooperation Agency. Funds CSTC-A provides to the Afghan government to manage (on-budget funds) are then provided to the Ministry of Finance. The Ministry of Finance then transfers funds to the MOD and MOI based on submitted requests. The ALP falls under the authority of the MOI although it is not included in the 352,000 authorized ANDSF force level that donor nations have agreed to fund; only the United States and Afghanistan provide funding for the ALP.¹⁷⁸

Unlike the ANA, a significant share of ANP personnel costs are paid through the United Nations Development Programme’s multidonor Law and Order Trust Fund for Afghanistan (LOTFA), to which the United States has historically been (but is not currently) the largest contributor.¹⁷⁹

A discussion of on-budget (Afghan-managed) and off-budget (U.S.-managed) expenditures of ASFF is found on page 117.

ANDSF Strength

USFOR-A reported that the assigned (actual) personnel strength of the ANDSF (not including civilians) was 306,807, including 190,423 personnel in the ANA and AAF and 116,384 in the ANP. The ANA strength figure is as of January 31, 2019, and the ANP’s figure is as of December 21, 2018 (the latest available data).¹⁸⁰ For the third consecutive quarter, ANDSF strength is the lowest it has been since the RS mission began in January 2015.¹⁸¹ ANDSF strength decreased by 1,886 personnel since last quarter and by 6,921 compared to approximately the same period in 2017. CSTC-A always offers the caveat that ANDSF strength numbers are Afghan-reported and that RS cannot validate them for accuracy.¹⁸² See Figure 3.39 on the following page for a historical record of first-quarter ANDSF strength since 2015.

According to DOD, the ANDSF’s total authorized (goal) end strength in December remained 352,000 personnel, including 227,374 ANA and 124,626 ANP personnel. This number does not include 30,000 Afghan Local Police, who are under MOI’s command.¹⁸³ Table 3.7 on the following page shows this quarter’s ANDSF assigned strength at 87.2% (45,193 personnel short) of its authorized strength.¹⁸⁴


ANDSF Casualties Increase

USFOR-A provided a general, unclassified assessment of ANDSF casualties this quarter. USFOR-A said that December 1, 2018, through February 28, 2019, “the number of ANDSF casualties were approximately 31% higher during this three-month period when compared to the same period one

SECURITY

FIGURE 3.39

FIRST-QUARTER ANDSF ASSIGNED STRENGTH SINCE 2015



Note: ANA = Afghan National Army; AAF = Afghan Air Force; ANP = Afghan National Police; ANDSF = Afghan National Defense and Security Forces. ANA strength numbers include the AAF and trainees, transfers, holdees, and student personnel. No civilians are included. ANP strength numbers do not include “standby” personnel, generally reservists, personnel not in service while completing training, or civilians.

This quarter, ANA data is as of January 31, 2019, and ANP data is as of December 21, 2018. The change in the individual strengths of the ANA and ANP from 2017 to 2018 and 2018 to 2019 is skewed due to the gradual transfer of two force elements from MOI to MOD, but this change did not impact the overall strength of the ANDSF. The strength numbers reported here should not be viewed as exact: CSTC-A and SIGAR have long noted many data consistency issues with ANDSF strength numbers, and CSTC-A always cautions that ANDSF strength numbers are Afghan-reported and that RS cannot validate the data for accuracy.

Source: CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019 and 3/20/2015; CSTC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 5/10/2018; SIGAR, *Quarterly Reports to the United States Congress*, 4/30/2016 and 4/30/2017; SIGAR, analysis of CSTC-A-provided data, 4/2019.

TABLE 3.7

ANDSF ASSIGNED AND AUTHORIZED STRENGTH					
ANDSF Component	Authorized Strength	Assigned Strength	% of Target Authorization	Difference Between Assigned and Authorized	
				Assigned and Authorized	Difference
ANA including AAF	227,374	190,423	83.7%	(36,951)	(16.3%)
ANP	124,626	116,384	93.4%	(8,242)	(6.6%)
ANDSF Total without Civilians	352,000	306,807	87.2%	(45,193)	(12.8%)

Note: ANP data is as of December 21, 2018, and ANA data is as of January 31, 2019; ANDSF = Afghan National Defense and Security Forces; ANA = Afghan National Army; AAF = Afghan Air Force; ANP = Afghan National Police. CSTC-A always cautions that ANDSF strength numbers are Afghan-reported and that RS cannot validate the data for accuracy.

Source: CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019; SIGAR, analysis of CSTC-A-provided data, 4/2019.

year prior. The number of casualties incurred from defensive operations has increased by 45% while ANDSF casualties from offensive operations have increased by 21%.” USFOR-A also added that almost half of the ANDSF casualties this reporting period occurred during checkpoint security operations.¹⁸⁵

USFOR-A continued to classify most ANDSF casualty data this quarter at the request of the Afghan government.¹⁸⁶ SIGAR’s questions about ANDSF casualties can be found in Appendix F, available at www.sigar.mil. ANDSF casualties are reported in the classified annex of this report.

Insurgent Casualties

For the first time, SIGAR reported this quarter USFOR-A’s estimates of insurgent casualties, which can also be found in the classified annex.

Insider Attacks on the ANDSF Increase

“Green-on-green” insider attacks, in which ANDSF personnel are attacked from within their own ranks, sometimes by an insurgent infiltrator, remain a significant problem for the ANDSF.¹⁸⁷ According to USFOR-A, there were seven reported green-on-green insider attacks against ANDSF personnel from October 31 to December 31, 2018, bringing the 2018 total to 81 insider attacks resulting in 183 casualties (133 killed, 50 wounded). Compared to 2017, this represents 13 more attacks but 56 fewer casualties.¹⁸⁸

From January 1 through February 20, 2019, there have been six recorded insider attacks that inflicted 32 casualties (16 dead, 16 wounded), a decrease of two attacks but an increase of six casualties compared to roughly the same period in 2018.¹⁸⁹

ANDSF Personnel Accountability

The MOD and MOI, with RS assistance, are implementing and streamlining several systems to accurately manage, pay, and track their personnel—an effort DOD expects will improve protection of U.S. funds. The United States pays the ANA and ALP personnel costs through the unilateral ASFF and the ANP by contributing (until 2018) to the multilateral LOTFA managed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).¹⁹⁰

The Afghan Personnel Pay System (APPS) is currently being fielded and, when fully implemented, will integrate personnel data with compensation and payroll data to process authorizations, record unit-level time and attendance data, and calculate payroll amounts.¹⁹¹ The APPS data is also used to provide background information on ANDSF personnel to assist with assignment, promotions and other personnel actions.¹⁹²

As USFOR-A has reported previously, three ongoing efforts aim to ensure that accurate personnel data exist in APPS: (1) “slotting” or matching a person to an authorized position; (2) “data cleansing” or correcting and completing key personnel data; and (3) the personnel asset inventory

ONGOING SIGAR INVESTIGATION INTO PAYMENT OF “GHOST” POLICE

SIGAR’s special agents have been informed that portions of the ANDSF payroll process throughout Afghanistan have been manipulated to allow some former police officers to still be paid even though they have either resigned, been terminated, or been killed. These salary payments are then diverted to various bank accounts and are subsequently withdrawn and shared amongst conspirators. SIGAR’s Investigations Directorate is working closely with SIGAR’s Audits Directorate and CSTC-A to identify measures that will reduce and/or eliminate the payment of nonexistent police officers.

APPS Data-Input Requirements for ANDSF Payroll

There are 20 data points that all ANDSF personnel must have in their APPS record in order to be paid. These include:

- ID card number
- Date of birth
- Enrollment date
- Gender
- Biometric verification number
- Actual rank
- Military education
- Blood type
- First/full name
- Tashkil rank
- Bank account number
- Contract expiration date
- Father's name
- Date of rank
- AHRIMS ID
- Paragraph number
- Grandfather's name
- Unit identification code
- Civilian education
- Line number

Note: AHRIMS (the Afghan Human Resource Information System) was the Afghan personnel accountability system prior to APPS. Where possible, records were migrated for personnel enrolled in AHRIMS to APPS.

Source: CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018 and response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2019.

(PAI) for biometrically enrolling personnel. All three efforts result in the continuous process of physically counting personnel and correcting the employment status of personnel retired, separated, or killed in action.¹⁹³ As of November 30, 2018, CSTC-A reported that both the MOD and MOI became “fully operationally capable” in APPS, meaning that the APPS system has been delivered and both ministries have the ability to fully employ the system and maintain it to meet their operational needs. However, CSTC-A expects that the transition to APPS for force-strength reporting will take until June 2019 for the ANA and the end of 2019 for the ANP.¹⁹⁴

This quarter, CSTC-A reported improvements in the percentage of ANA and ANP personnel enrolled in APPS. As of February 28, 2019, 91% of ANA personnel were slotted into the system and met the minimum data-input requirements to be paid, an improvement from the 85% reported in December 2018. For the ANP, only 69% of the force is slotted into APPS and eligible to be paid, up from 60% reported in December 2018. CSTC-A calculates these percentages by dividing the number of personnel slotted in APPS by the number of personnel the Afghans report to be on hand in each force (their assigned-strength figures).¹⁹⁵

CSTC-A confirmed that it continues to only pay APPS-enrolled, biometrically validated ANDSF personnel. CSTC-A said they are encouraging UNDP to transition from its current ANP payroll system, the Web Enabled Pay System (WEPS) to APPS, and to provide salaries only to APPS-validated personnel. To assist with this process, CSTC-A said this quarter that it is synchronizing with UNDP to reconcile APPS personnel data with the data UNDP has in WEPS.¹⁹⁶

ANDSF Combat Element Performance – Most Data Classified

USFOR-A continued to classify most assessments of ANDSF performance. SIGAR’s questions about ANDSF performance can be found in Appendix F, available at www.sigar.mil. Detailed ANDSF performance assessments are reported in the classified annex for this report.

This quarter, USFOR-A provided a general overview on ANDSF performance. According to USFOR-A, senior ANDSF leaders are continuing to demonstrate progress in organizational management, decision-making, and operational planning and execution. The Afghan government has been striving to employ quality leaders and continues to successfully identify and replace ANDSF leaders found guilty of corruption.¹⁹⁷

USFOR-A continued to report that ANA corps receive the preponderance of Coalition train, advise, and assist (TAA) support, and that as a result, their capabilities continue to advance more rapidly than the ANP’s. USFOR-A said the ANA’s improvements are evident in their ability to synchronize combat enablers (e.g., air and artillery support) and to conduct coordinated operational planning with adjacent corps.¹⁹⁸

USFOR-A also reported this quarter that the Afghan government has dissolved the ANP’s zone system, which has challenged Coalition advisors,

FIGURE 3.40

RS AND ANA AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY



Note: The ANA 111th Capital Division covers Kabul Province with the exception of Sarobi District, which falls within the 201st Corps' area of responsibility.

Source: DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, pp. 18–19, 71; RS, "Train Advise Assist Command East," and "Task Force Southwest," accessed online at <https://rs.nato.int/rs-commands.aspx> on 4/17/2019.

who must now provide TAA support to multiple provincial police headquarters (PHQs) rather than to a single zone. Now instead of eight regional ANP zones, the 34 PHQs serve as the command structure for ANP throughout the country.¹⁹⁹

Operational Readiness Cycles

This quarter, SIGAR requested a status update on the implementation of **operational readiness cycles** (ORCs) for the ANA and ANP. The data discussed below shows an uneven execution of the ORC concept across the country. ANDSF personnel operating in the RS Task Force (TF) Southeast, Train, Advise, Assist Command (TAAC) East, and TAAC-West areas of responsibility (AORs) are implementing ORCs better than their counterparts in TAAC-Capital, TAAC-North, and TAAC-South.²⁰⁰ ANDSF personnel in the latter two AORs have not been able to successfully use the ORC to prepare for the spring fighting season. TAAC-North is the largest AOR (nine provinces) and had the second highest number of enemy-initiated attacks (EIA) in 2018 (4,346, or 19.2% of total attacks) of all RS AORs. Despite only having four provinces in its AOR, TAAC-South ranked third of seven RS AORs in the number of EIAs experienced in 2018 (3,953, or 17.4% of total attacks).²⁰¹ USFOR-A provided updated ORC information for each AOR (see Figure 3.40 for the geographic locations of these areas).²⁰²

Operational Readiness Cycle: a process that allows certain combat units to rotate out of operational duty to train, refit, and rest to increase readiness and effectiveness upon return to the battlefield. The ANDSF typically implement ORCs in the winter months when operational tempo is historically slower.

Source: General Joseph L. Votel, U.S. Army, U.S. CENTCOM Commander, "Statement before the Senate Committee on Armed Services: The Posture of U.S. Central Command," 3/9/2017; NSOCCA, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2016; USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 2/20/2017.

- **TF Southeast (SE):** The ANA 203rd Corps' Regional Military Training Center (RMTC) has been continuously conducting training for its soldiers from November 2018 until the most recent graduation of soldiers on February 19, 2019. Sometimes it is difficult for 203rd Corps personnel to get their brigade commanders to release them from operations in order to execute the re-training and refitting portion of the ORC. For the ANP, despite many of the provinces in the TF-SE AOR being under constant insurgent attack or threat of attack, the Gardez Regional Training Center (RTC) commander is reported to have successfully trained policemen assigned to the area. The RTC itself is well maintained and staffed and continues to train over 90% of assigned policemen in the AOR, which has better prepared the TF-SE provinces for the spring fighting season.
- **TAAC East:** The ANA's 201st Corps took it upon themselves to add an additional week of marksmanship training to its ORC process to maximize their combat effectiveness. The ANP in this AOR have used the RTC in Nangarhar for their training requirements. However, MOI has not developed an ORC program similar to MOD's.
- **TAAC West:** All three ANA 207th Corps brigades and two Afghan Border Force brigades entered into the ORC this quarter. The 207th Corps is gradually implementing the ORC until all platoons are phased into the cycle. There was no information available on ANP's ORC process in this area of responsibility.
- **TAAC North:** The ANA's 209th Corps has an established ORC process, but it is being implemented minimally due to frequent operations, manning of checkpoints, and critical manning shortfalls facing many of the units. Of eight kandaks in the 209th Corps, only one has been trained and through the ORC. The other kandaks have not been trained or reset and are not ready for the spring fighting season. There was no update for other ANP forces in this AOR.
- **TAAC Capital:** The ANA 111th Capital Division's ORC began in January 2019. The ORC lasts four weeks and was designed to accommodate one company at a time. As companies and kandaks rotate to different posts around the province, they plan to have a short retraining period at the Combat Training Center before they take their new posts.
- **TAAC South:** The 205th Corps has not successfully implemented an ORC due to heavy operational tempo in its AOR. There are not enough soldiers in the corps to man checkpoints, conduct operations, and return for training. ANP units in the TAAC-South AOR do not currently have a functioning ORC process, also due to their high operational tempo.

TABLE 3.8

ANDSF FEMALE PERSONNEL ASSIGNED STRENGTH					
	Officers	Noncommissioned Officers	Soldiers/ Patrolmen	Cadets	Total
ANP	748	1,220	1,375	0	3,343
ANA	697	603	220	121	1,641
Total					4,984
Afghan Air Force (AAF)					
AAF	45	27	9	5	86
Afghan Special Security Forces (ASSF)					
ANP	18	81	9	0	108
ANA	12	12	6	0	30

Note: ASSF personnel numbers are as of December 2018. All other data is as of January 2019.

Source: RS Gender Integration Advisory Office, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.

Women in the ANDSF

As of January 2019, the ANDSF had 4,984 female personnel, 1.6% of the ANDSF's total force strength. The number of women in the ANDSF increased by about 250 since last quarter and by about 650 personnel compared to the same period a year ago. The increase since last quarter comes from the addition of 124 women in the ANA and 125 in the ANP. As in the past, the ANP has the vast majority of ANDSF female personnel (3,343), while 1,641 are in the ANA.²⁰³

Included in the ANA and ANP numbers are 138 women serving in the Afghan Special Security Forces (the same as last quarter) and 86 in the AAF (one more than last quarter). Noncommissioned officers account for the greatest number of females in the ANDSF (1,823), followed by soldiers and police (1,595), and commissioned officers (1,445).²⁰⁴ For a full breakdown of ANDSF female strength, see Table 3.8.

The RS Gender Advisory Office said MOD and MOI recruitment of female personnel continues to be generally on hold as each ministry works to realign or create positions that allow for female personnel to have career progression.²⁰⁵

AFGHAN NATIONAL ARMY

As of March 31, 2019, the United States had obligated \$47.4 billion and disbursed \$47.1 billion of ASFF funds from FY 2005 through FY 2018 appropriations to build, train, equip, and sustain the ANA, AAF, and parts of the Afghan Special Security Forces (ASSF).²⁰⁶

ANA Force Manning

ANA Strength – Some Data Classified

This quarter, USFOR-A continued to classify unit-level ANA personnel strength data in accordance with Afghan government classification guidelines. Detailed assigned- and authorized-strength figures will appear in the classified annex for this report. SIGAR's questions about ANA strength can be found in Appendix F, available at www.sigar.mil.

According to DOD, the ANA's total authorized (goal) end strength as of December 2018 was 227,374.²⁰⁷ USFOR-A reported that the assigned (actual) strength of the ANA and AAF as of January 31, 2019, (not including civilians) was 190,423 personnel, a decrease of 330 personnel since last quarter. This quarter's ANA strength represents a 5,851-person increase from the same period in 2017, but this figure is skewed due to the transfer of 18,950 personnel from the Afghan Border Police (formerly under MOI) to MOD. When adjusting for that transfer, the ANA actually lost 13,099 personnel compared to the same period in 2017.²⁰⁸ CSTC-A always offers the caveat that ANDSF strength numbers are Afghan-reported and that RS cannot validate the data for accuracy.²⁰⁹

The ANA's 190,423 personnel consisted of 83,702 soldiers, 72,027 noncommissioned officers, and 34,694 officers. The ANA's noncommissioned officer and officer ranks experienced attrition since last quarter (losing 429 and 69 personnel, respectively), but the number of soldiers increased by 168.²¹⁰ This quarter's assigned strength puts the ANA at 83.7%, or 36,951 personnel short, of its goal strength, a slight decrease since last quarter.²¹¹

ANA Attrition – Some Data Classified

USFOR-A continued to classify detailed ANA attrition information this quarter. SIGAR's questions about ANA attrition can be found in Appendix F. A detailed analysis of attrition by ANA force element is provided in the classified annex of this report.

According to CSTC-A, ANA monthly attrition rates averaged approximately 2.2% over the quarter, a slight improvement from the 2.5% recorded over the previous quarter. This percentage accounts for attrition alone, not the total decrease in force strength listed on the previous page, as that percentage change includes any gains made from recruitment occurring over the quarter. CSTC-A reported that attrition figures are calculated by taking an average of monthly ANA attrition rates over the last three months. CSTC-A noted this figure was calculated from Afghan-owned and -reported data provided by the MOD and that CSTC-A cannot independently verify its accuracy.²¹²

TABLE 3.9

MAJOR EQUIPMENT PROVIDED TO THE ANA, DEC 1, 2018–FEB 18, 2019				
Equipment Type	Equipment Description	Units Issued in Quarter	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Aircraft	MD-530 Helicopter	13	\$6,518,000	\$84,734,000
Aircraft	UH-60 Helicopter	6	11,670,000	70,020,000
Vehicle	M1152 HMMWV (Humvee)	80	230,868	18,469,440
Vehicle	M1151 HMMWV (Humvee)	61	232,775	14,199,275
Vehicle	Medium Tactical Vehicle	87	162,079	14,100,873
Vehicle	Medium Tactical Vehicle Refueller	29	236,455	6,857,195
Weapon	M240B Machine Gun	438	7,927	3,472,026
Vehicle	Medium Tactical Vehicle Water Tanker	10	247,372	2,473,720
Weapon	M2 .50 Caliber Machine Gun	192	12,685	2,435,520
Vehicle	Medium Tactical Vehicle Wrecker	5	350,152	1,750,760
Total Cost of Equipment			\$218,512,809	

Note: These items were the major items of equipment provided to the ANA this quarter, not the only items. Vehicles issued this quarter were procured under varying foreign military sales cases, which may cause their unit cost to vary from the cost reported last quarter.

Source: CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.

ANA Sustainment

As of March 31, 2019, the United States had obligated \$23.5 billion and disbursed \$23.2 billion of ASFF from FY 2005 through FY 2018 appropriations for ANA, AAF, and some ASSF **sustainment**.²¹³

For more information about what these costs include and the amount U.S. funds appropriated for ANA sustainment in FY 2019, see page 59 of this report.

ANA Equipment and Transportation

As of March 31, 2019, the United States had obligated and disbursed \$13.7 billion of ASFF from FY 2005 through FY 2018 appropriations for ANA, AAF, and some ASSF equipment and transportation costs.²¹⁴

Seen in Table 3.9, CSTC-A reported that the highest-cost items of equipment provided to the ANA this quarter (December 1, 2018, through February 18, 2019) included 13 MD-530 helicopters (valued at a total of \$84.7 million), six UH-60 helicopters (\$70 million), and two variants of HMMWVs (valued at a total of about \$32.7 million).²¹⁵

ANA Equipment Operational Readiness – Data Classified

This quarter, USFOR-A continued to classify data on ANA equipment readiness. SIGAR’s questions about ANA equipment readiness can be found in Appendix F, available at www.sigar.mil. ANA equipment readiness is reported in the classified annex of this report.

Sustainment: Sustainment generally refers to operations and maintenance efforts. There are several types of sustainment costs: “personnel sustainment,” which includes salaries and incentive pay, food, the Afghan Personnel Pay System, “logistics sustainment” such as fuel, the CoreIMS inventory management system, and transportation services, “combat sustainment” to include organizational clothing and individual equipment, ammunition, and weapons repair parts, and other “general operational sustainment services,” such as vehicle, facility, and equipment sustainment (operations and maintenance costs).

Source: DOD, Department of Defense Budget, Fiscal Year (FY) 2019, Justification for FY 2019 Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF), 2/2018, pp. 15, 22–23, 28, 30.

SECURITY

TABLE 3.10

HIGHEST-COST ANA INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS				
Project Description	Project Location	Agency / Contractor	Estimated Cost	Estimated Completion Date
Awarded Projects				
ANA Kabul City Gates Improvements, Phase I	Kabul Province	USACE/Assist Consultants Inc.	\$2,637,500	9/14/2019
Kandahar Airfield Improvements, Phase I, Construction Materials	Kandahar Province	RCC-A	1,024,445	3/1/2019
Kandahar Airfield Improvements, Phase I, Heavy Equipment Lease	Kandahar Province	RCC-A	166,250	4/2/2019
Ongoing Projects				
Northern Electrical Interconnect at Camp Shaheen	Marmal, Balkh Province	USACE/Venco-Imtiaz Construction Company	27,692,414	10/21/2019
Special Operations Brigade North, Camp Pratt Forward Operating Center	Mazar-e Sharif, Balkh Province	USACE/Builtek Construction	25,353,848	2/26/2021
Northern Electrical Interconnect at Kunduz / Asqalan	Kunduz, Kunduz Province	USACE/Assist Consultants Inc.	10,488,724	7/15/2019
Completed Projects				
Kabul National Military Hospital, Entry Control Points	Kabul Province	USACE/Arab Shah Construction Company	703,962	12/17/2018
Planned Projects				
AAF Aviation Enhancement, Mazar-e Sharif Airfield*	Mazar-e Sharif, Balkh Province	N/A	47,000,000	N/A
AAF Kandahar Airfield Life Support Area	Kandahar, Kandahar Province	N/A	21,000,000	N/A
Special Mission Wing Ramp Growth at Kandahar Airfield	Kandahar, Kandahar Province	N/A	15,900,000	N/A
Special Mission Wing Ramp Growth at Kabul Airfield	Kabul, Kabul Province	N/A	13,600,000	N/A

Note: All data is as of February 28, 2019. *Partially funded by the multilateral NATO ANA Trust Fund (not all U.S. ASFF funds).

Source: CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019 and 12/20/2018. CSTC-A; response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.

ANA Infrastructure

The United States had obligated and disbursed \$5.9 billion of ASFF from FY 2005 through FY 2018 appropriations for ANA, AAF, and some ASSF infrastructure projects as of March 31, 2019.²¹⁶

This quarter, CSTC-A reported that the estimated U.S.-funded annual facilities-sustainment costs for all ANA facility and electrical generator requirements for FY 2019 will be \$110.8 million, the same as last quarter. This is a roughly \$43 million increase from the costs incurred in FY 2018. According to CSTC-A, of the \$110.8 million, \$74.7 million will be provided directly to the Afghan government and \$36.1 million will be spent by CSTC-A on behalf of the Afghan government. CSTC-A said the increase is due to the number of new construction projects slated for completion in 2019.²¹⁷

As of February 28, 2019, the United States completed 457 ANA infrastructure projects in Afghanistan valued at a total cost of \$5.4 billion. CSTC-A reported that one project was completed this quarter, costing roughly \$704,000. Another 47 projects (valued at \$193.3 million)

TABLE 3.11

HIGHEST-COST ANA WPP INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS			
Project Description	Project Location	Estimated Cost	Estimated Completion Date
Ongoing Projects			
Pediatrics and Obstetrics/Gynecology Clinic at Kabul National Military Hospital	Kabul, Kabul Province	\$8,500,000	3/15/2019
Women's Facilities at Marshal Fahim National Defense University*	Kabul, Kabul Province	5,337,730	2/28/2019
Women's Facilities at North Hamid Karzai International Airport AAF Airbase*	Kabul, Kabul Province	1,704,766	2/20/2019
Women's Barracks at South Hamid Karzai International Airport/Afghan Air University	Kabul, Kabul Province	1,143,739	4/20/2019
Awarded/Planned Projects			
Women's Training Center in Kabul*	Kabul, Kabul Province	2,605,200	11/1/2019
Daycare and Kitchen at Camp Zafar	Herat, Herat Province	1,014,000	TBD
Female Tactical Platoon Facility at Camp Scorpion*	Kandahar, Kandahar Province	805,200	TBD

Note: All data is as of February 28, 2019. *Partially funded by the multilateral NATO ANA Trust Fund (not all U.S. ASFF funds).

Source: CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019 and 12/20/2018; CSTC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.

were ongoing, three projects were awarded (valued at \$3.8 million), and 33 projects (valued at \$450 million) were being planned.²¹⁸ Table 3.10 describes the highest-value awarded, ongoing, completed, and planned ANA infrastructure projects.

Included in the projects described above are four ongoing ANA Women's Participation Program (WPP) projects valued at a total of \$16.7 million and three ANA WPP projects in the planning phase valued at \$4.4 million.²¹⁹ See Table 3.11 for a description of these projects.

ANA and MOD Training and Operations

As of March 31, 2019, the United States had obligated and disbursed \$4.3 billion of ASFF from FY 2005 through FY 2018 appropriations for ANA, AAF, some ASSF, and MOD training and operations.²²⁰

At the request of DOD, SIGAR will await the completion of the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) forthcoming audit on the cost of ASFF-funded ANDSF training contracts before reporting on the status of those contracts.²²¹ For more information about this and other GAO audits related to Afghanistan, see Section 4.

AFGHAN AIR FORCE

U.S. Funding

As of February 12, 2019, the United States had appropriated approximately \$8.4 billion to support and develop the AAF (including the SMW) from

SIGAR RELEASES UH-60 AUDIT

Last quarter, SIGAR released an audit on the status of the AAF's UH-60 program. Among the key findings of the audit:

- The Army met CSTC-A's request for an initial operational capability date of June 1, 2018, by beginning training early, sending training version helicopters in October 2017, and using contractors to provide refurbishment, logistic support, and training. (The first operational UH-60 mission was flown in May 2018.)
- Pilot production has already begun to fall behind the aircraft delivery schedule and is likely to persist.
- DOD has not established benchmarks for when aircraft deliveries should slow or stop based on pilot production, an advantage cited by DOD when selecting the refurbished UH-60 platform for the Afghans.
- No organic ANDSF maintenance training course for the UH-60 has begun, creating a necessity for contractor-provided maintenance that increases the cost to the United States of supporting the UH-60 program.
- Lack of trained ANDSF maintainers also limits the effective area that UH-60s can operate in due to Coalition security restrictions on where Western maintainers can work.

Source: SIGAR, 19-18-AR, *Afghan Air Force: DOD Met the Initial Date for Fielding UH-60 Helicopters, but Program Is at Risk of Not Having Enough Trained Pilots or the Capability to Maintain Future UH-60s*, 1/30/2019.

FY 2010 to FY 2019. Roughly \$1.7 billion of those funds were appropriated in FY 2019, a \$65.4 million increase in funds appropriated compared to FY 2018.²²² The AAF was allocated more funds in FY 2019 than any other ANDSF force element, \$88.3 million more than the funds allocated for the ANA.²²³

As in previous years, a large portion of the AAF's FY 2019 funds (\$893.2 million, or 52%) has been designated for AAF sustainment costs, a \$58.6 million decrease from \$951.8 million in FY 2018.²²⁴ These funds are primarily used to pay for contractor-provided maintenance, major and minor repairs, and the procurement of parts and supplies for the AAF's in-country inventory of seven air platforms: UH-60, MD-530, Mi-17, A-29, C-208, AC-208, and C-130.²²⁵

DOD allocated \$537.6 million (31%) of the AAF's FY 2019 funds for equipment and transportation costs, roughly \$419.6 million of which is designated for the procurement of additional U.S.-manufactured UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters intended to replace the AAF's aging Russian-manufactured Mi-17 helicopters.²²⁶

Also, as of February 12, nearly \$5.3 billion had been obligated for the AAF and SMW, a roughly \$4 million increase since last quarter. About \$1.6 billion of those funds were obligated in FY 2018. A substantial portion of these funds (\$2.6 billion) was obligated for AAF sustainment, which accounts for 48.6% of obligated funds, followed by equipment and aircraft at 34.2%.²²⁷

Aircraft Inventory and Status

As seen in Table 3.12, the AAF's current in-country inventory, as of February 2019, includes 170 aircraft (143 of which are operational).²²⁸

Train, Advise, Assist Command-Air (TAAC-Air) reported this quarter that the AAF received six more MD-530s and 10 UH-60s in Afghanistan. Additionally, the AAF received its first five AC-208 light attack aircraft this

TABLE 3.12

AFGHAN AVIATION SUMMARY AS OF FEBRUARY 2019						
Aircraft	Total	Usable	Quarter Change	Command Pilots	Co-Pilots	Other Aircrew
A-29	12	11	0	13	0	8
Mi-17	46	23	(3)	25	33	7
UH-60	36	35	10	11	26	35
MD-530	43	41	6	32	28	0
C-130	4	4	0	8	3	14
AC-208	5	5	5	5	0	4
C-208	24	24	1	25	25	0

Note: Only qualified pilots and aircrew are listed in this table, except for AC-208 personnel (who will be fully qualified in May 2019). "Other Aircrew" includes loadmasters, flight engineers, and special mission operators and vary by airframe. These figures do not include the aircraft or personnel for the Special Mission Wing, which are classified. "Quarter Change" refers to the change in usable aircraft only. All AC-208s are in this category because the air platform is new this quarter to the AAF's inventory.

Source: TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019 and response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019; SIGAR, analysis of TAAC-Air-provided data, 4/2019.

quarter. Five more AC-208s are scheduled to arrive in Afghanistan by late May 2019, and two MD-530s, six UH-60s, and three A-29s are scheduled to arrive by September. Two MD-530s were lost this quarter: one was hit by surface-to-air fire near Ghazni City on February 7 and destroyed in place; another experienced engine failure after a hard landing in Zabul Province on February 10. The latter aircraft is expected to be recovered, but TAAC-South has so far had higher-priority missions.²²⁹

AAF Operations and Task Availability

TAAC-Air reported that the AAF flew 14,398 sorties from December 1, 2018, through March 31, 2019. A sortie is defined as one takeoff and one landing. There were an average of 3,600 sorties per month this quarter, with the most sorties (4,027) flown in March 2019. This is a 10% increase from the 3,264 average sorties per month reported last quarter (August 1–November 30, 2018).²³⁰ As in previous quarters, the Mi-17 flew the greatest number of sorties (6,182), followed by the UH-60 (3,270).²³¹

According to TAAC-Air, two of six AAF airframes failed to meet their **task availability** benchmarks this quarter, the same airframes as last quarter. The MD-530's average task availability this reporting period was 74.3% against a goal of 75%, and the C-208's was an average of 68.3% against a goal of 75%.²³²

According to TAAC-Air, the AAF flew an average of roughly 2,875 hours this quarter, a 2% decrease in the average number of hours flown last quarter. Both the UH-60 and the MD-530 overtook the Mi-17 and flew the most hours, averaging 699.4 and 671.4 hours per month respectively.²³³ USFOR-A said the AAF's flight-hours data include all hours flown by all aircraft, whether the hours flown were for operations, maintenance, training, or navigation.²³⁴

Of the six AAF airframes, only the Mi-17 continued to exceed its recommended flight hours. The Mi-17's average of 599.7 hours per month was 104.3% of its recommended flying time of 575 hours per month, an improvement from 123% of its recommended hours per month recorded over the previous reporting period.²³⁵ With the increased usage of other airframes, the Mi-17's overutilization is declining: the airframe flew 20.9% of the total hours flown by the AAF this quarter, a nearly 6.5 percentage-point decrease from the 27.3% of the AAF's total hours the Mi-17 flew last quarter. The Mi-17's average task availability over the reporting period also met its task availability benchmark.²³⁶

AAF Training and Manning

Training

Critical for the success of the AAF modernization and expansion is the timely training of pilots, aircrew, and maintainers to ensure those personnel are capable of operating and maintaining the new aircraft procured for the AAF. Last quarter, TAAC-Air reported that the training of UH-60 and

Task availability: The task availability rate is defined as the number of aircraft serviceable and ready to be tasked, for combat or training, compared to the number of aircraft in the operational fleet (excluding those in depot). For example, if a 12-aircraft fleet has five serviceable aircraft, two aircraft in the maintenance depot, and five in other status, this calculation yields a 50% task availability (i.e., five of the 10 airframes not undergoing maintenance) for that aircraft type. Task availability is a capabilities-based measurement for senior leadership mission planning, rather than a measurement of how contractors are performing in maintaining AAF aircraft.

Source: USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2018.



Two AAF UH-60 pilots prepare for a training flight at Kandahar Airfield. (AFCENT photo by Staff Sgt. Clayton Cupit)

Over 40% of the AAF students enrolled in the U.S.-based training went AWOL.

Source: TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call 3/21/2019; OUSD-F response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.

MD-530 pilots, aircrew, and maintainers had begun to lag behind schedule to produce the required number of aircrew for the fielded aircraft and for planned fleet expansions. This quarter, TAAC-Air provided several updates that show it has begun to address these issues. For example, regarding the training of aircraft maintainers, TAAC-Air said standing up the AAF Aircraft Maintenance Development Center (AMDC) and its personnel pipeline by June 2019 is expected to rapidly accelerate the development of mission-qualified maintainers. The AMDC will utilize a third-country and an Afghanistan location to train the maintainers. TAAC-Air anticipates that the AMDC pipeline will produce the required number of entry-level maintainers for all the AAF's platforms within the next two years.²³⁷

TAAC-Air provided the following updates on the training effort for each AAF platform:²³⁸

- **UH-60:** The UH-60 program is currently making a new effort to maximize the recruitment and training of pilots and aircrew utilizing a third-country location. The new effort will push all aircraft-qualification training through a third-country and mission-qualification training (which includes combat skills training) will take place in Kandahar. This adjusted, parallel effort will allow for qualified aircrew to keep pace with aircraft deliveries in Afghanistan. TAAC-Air is also using smaller class sizes in more frequent intervals to minimize the delay time for students between training programs. Some Mi-17 aircrew will be converted to UH-60 aircrew as the Mi-17 mission draws to a close for the AAF. There remains a continued emphasis on night-vision goggle training and employment for the UH-60 platform.
- **AC-208 and C-208:** The AC-208 pilot training classes that were underway in the United States were disbanded due to the number of trainees who were going absent without leave (AWOL). Those students that did not go AWOL were pulled back to Afghanistan to complete their training: as a result, only one class graduated from the U.S.-based program. The second and third classes will continue and finish their training in Afghanistan. TAAC-Air has a plan to continue the student training and is developing a contract solution to support the effort to train the initial group of AC-208 aircrew. TAAC-Air said the C-208 trainees continue to progress to a self-sustaining level of proficiency.
- **A-29:** The A-29 program is still building its pilot force at Moody Air Force Base in the United States. The U.S.-based program will end in late 2020 and the A-29 training efforts will transition to Afghanistan in order to develop the remaining A-29 force. After the required force is built, A-29 pilot training in Afghanistan will still be needed to create new pilots as older pilots leave due to promotions and retirements. The Afghanistan portion of the program will begin with a very small footprint in mid-2019 and is expected to be located in Mazar-e Sharif. TAAC-Air is exploring options to streamline the training timeline for

TABLE 3.13

AAF MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL STRENGTH, AS OF FEBRUARY 2019										
Maintenance Positions	2019 AUTHORIZED STRENGTH					2019 ASSIGNED STRENGTH				
	Kabul	Kand	MeS	Shind	Total	Kabul	Kand	MeS	Shind	Total
A-29	57	63	0	0	120	56	33	0	0	89
AC-208	56	4	0	0	60	55	4	0	0	59
C-208	49	53	0	44	146	48	43	0	41	132
C-130	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2
MD-530	87	102	0	0	189	85	63	0	0	148
Mi-17	0	51	0	4	55	0	42	0	4	46
UH-60	74	78	0	42	194	74	29	0	38	141
Maintenance Operations	409	169	39	139	756	405	147	38	128	718
Munitions Squadron	71	48	17	16	152	70	32	17	16	135
Maintenance Staff	45	3	0	3	51	44	2	0	3	49
Air University	20	0	0	0	20	19	0	0	0	19
Total	870	571	56	248	1,745	858	395	55	230	1,538

Note: All personnel listed above are reported to be trained and fully mission-capable. The locations on the table refer to AAF airbases. Kand = Kandahar, MeS = Mazar-e Sharif, and Shind = Shindand. Maintenance Operations = nonmechanical functions like quality assurance, analysis, plans, scheduling, documentation, training, and logistics; Munitions Squadron = a squadron that stores, maintains, inspects, assembles, and issues aircraft munitions; Maintenance Staff = staff that handle command, support, and finance. In addition to the personnel listed above, there are U.S., local-national, or other-country national contractors who perform aircraft maintenance for the AAF. These include: A-29: 35 contractors, C208: 26, C-130: 30, Mi-17: 418 (includes contractors who maintain SMW aircraft), MD-530: 86, UH-60: 119.

Source: TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.

pilots from entry level pilot training to mission qualified training. Night training also continues to be a training priority for this platform.

- MD-530:** TAAC-Air said it continues to find efficient solutions for the MD-530 training pipeline to ensure that students delivered to the squadron are trained to the best standard possible. Following issues raised last quarter, they are currently exploring options to expand the pilot training pipeline, including options to give contractors that provide training support more flexibility to train students. This would reduce the strain on the already limited Afghan trainer force. As with the UH-60 platform, TAAC-Air is also considering a third-country option to expand and streamline the pilot and aircrew training pipeline for the MD-530.

Manning

TAAC-Air continued to provide information on the number of fully mission-qualified, or certified mission-ready aircrew and pilots the AAF has for each of its airframes, as shown in Table 3.12 on page 94.²³⁹ TAAC-Air also provided the number of qualified maintenance personnel on hand for each AAF platform.²⁴⁰ Table 3.13 shows the current number of

authorized and assigned AAF maintenance personnel by airframe and other maintenance function.

The Special Mission Wing – Some Data Classified

This quarter, NATO Special Operations Component Command-Afghanistan (NSOCC-A) provided an expanded unclassified update on the Special Mission Wing (SMW). NSOCC-A continued to classify other data on the SMW. SIGAR's questions on this data can be found in Appendix F, available at www.sigar.mil; information about the SMW is reported in the classified annex for this report.

Funding

As of January 31, 2019, the United States had obligated a total of nearly \$2.3 billion for the SMW since FY 2012 from ASFF and the DOD-Counter narcotics Fund, a roughly \$94.4 million decrease since last quarter. About \$182.1 million of those funds were obligated in FY 2018. A substantial portion of the funding obligated since FY 2012 (\$2.3 billion) was obligated for SMW sustainment, which accounts for 48.9% of obligated funds, followed by equipment and aircraft at 42.7%. NSOCC-A said that the figures for SMW obligated funds decreased this quarter because NSOCC-A found several items in CSTC-A-reported obligations data were inflated. This issue is now resolved. NSOCC-A also said that FY 2019 funds will begin to be disbursed in May or June 2019.²⁴¹

SMW Operations and Performance

The SMW is an AAF component whose mission is to support the ASSF in operations. About 85% of SMW missions are focused on counterterrorism. However, the SMW has recently been tasked by the ANA and ANP to support conventional ground forces. This quarter, NSOCC-A again reported that the MOD, MOI, and the National Directorate of Security (NDS) continue to demand support from the SMW, though these instances of misuse have decreased compared to last quarter after the appointment of a new minister of defense in early 2019. However, the issue still negatively affects aircraft maintenance and the SMW's implementation of operational readiness cycles, and has at times resulted in higher-priority missions being dropped or pushed back. NSOCC-A's leadership continues to address this with the MOD by recommending CSTC-A levy financial penalties to curb SMW misuse.²⁴²

Between November 13, 2018, and February 18, 2019, NSOCC-A reported three aircraft mishaps, with two resulting in total aircraft losses (two more than last quarter). All three incidents occurred within days of each other in December 2018; they caused no AAF casualties. Both aircraft lost were Mi-17s; one loss occurred in Faryab Province, the other in Kandahar Province.²⁴³

According to NSOCC-A, the SMW continues to develop its capabilities, achieving success training with partner units on the Mi-17 Fast Rope Insertion and Exfiltration System (FRIES) for quickly delivering and retrieving troopers by rope from helicopters. As a complementary effort, SMW has also worked with Crisis Response Unit (CRU) 222 to develop an Aerial Suppression Platform (ASP) capability, in which snipers can conduct precision fires in urban areas during FRIES operations. These capabilities are vital to operations to defend against high-profile attacks within Kabul.²⁴⁴

Manning

NSOCC-A reported that the SMW's leadership continues to emphasize quality recruiting, partly by developing its junior-officer and noncommissioned-officer leaders through mentorship and language training. The SMW is currently authorized to select 40 personnel (20 pilots and 20 crew chiefs) for training to field the first 10 of 20 UH-60 aircraft expected to arrive in the second quarter of FY 2020 and have already accepted 16 applicants this quarter. The SMW is expected to grow to an authorization of 1,086 personnel in 2019. NSOCC-A expressed some concern about the challenges with inducting enough qualified candidates with sufficient education capable of successfully completing the rigors of aircrew training.²⁴⁵

Additionally, SMW expansion is expected to include requisite maintenance personnel, to build up an organic SMW UH-60 maintenance workforce, but the force will remain reliant on contractor-provided maintenance. There are currently 206 of 228 authorized maintenance personnel assigned to the SMW. The SMW's maintainer squadron needs to grow from 228 to 960 personnel to fulfill the forecasted growth of the force and its aircraft.²⁴⁶

AFGHAN NATIONAL POLICE

As of March 31, 2019, the United States had obligated \$21.4 billion and disbursed \$21.1 billion of ASFF funds from FY 2005 through FY 2018 appropriations to build, train, equip, and sustain the ANP and some ASSF.²⁴⁷

ANP Force Manning

ANP Personnel Strength – Some Data Classified

This quarter, USFOR-A continued to classify unit-level ANP personnel strength data in accordance with Afghan government classification guidelines. Detailed assigned- and authorized-strength figures will appear in the classified annex for this report. SIGAR's questions about ANP strength can be found in Appendix F, available at www.sigar.mil.

According to DOD, the ANP's total authorized (goal) end strength in December 2018 was 124,626.²⁴⁸ The assigned (actual) strength of the ANP, as of December 21, 2018, was 116,384 personnel. This figure represents a decrease of 1,556 personnel since last quarter, and a 12,772-person decrease compared to the same period in 2018. The latter decrease was mostly due to the transfer of 18,950 Afghan Border Police (formerly MOD) personnel to MOD. When adjusting for that transfer, the ANP actually gained 6,178 personnel compared to last year. CSTC-A always offers the caveat that ANDSF strength numbers are Afghan-reported and that RS cannot validate the data for accuracy.²⁴⁹ This quarter's strength puts the ANP at 93.4% (or 8,242 personnel below) of its authorized strength.²⁵⁰

ANP Attrition – Data Classified

USFOR-A continued to classify detailed ANP attrition information this quarter but declassified limited attrition information. SIGAR's questions about ANP attrition can be found in Appendix F, available at www.sigar.mil. A detailed analysis of attrition by ANP force element is provided in the classified annex of this report.

According to CSTC-A, ANP attrition rates this quarter averaged approximately 2.2%, the same average reported last quarter. This percentage accounts for attrition alone, not the total decrease in force strength above as that percentage change would include any gains made from recruitment occurring over the quarter. CSTC-A reported that attrition figures are calculated by taking an average of monthly ANP attrition rates over the last three months. CSTC-A noted this figure was calculated from Afghan-owned and -reported data provided by the MOI.²⁵¹

ANP Sustainment

As of March 31, 2019, the United States had obligated \$9.4 billion and disbursed \$9.3 billion of ASFF from FY 2005 through FY 2018 appropriations for ANP and some ASSF sustainment.²⁵²

For more information about what these costs include and the amount U.S. funds appropriated for ANP sustainment in FY 2019, see page 59 of this report.

ANP Equipment and Transportation

As of March 31, 2019, the United States had obligated \$4.8 billion and disbursed \$4.7 billion of ASFF from FY 2005 through FY 2018 appropriations for ANP and some ASSF equipment and transportation.²⁵³

Seen in Table 3.14, CSTC-A reported that the highest-cost items of equipment provided to the ANP this quarter included 181 HMMWVs (Humvees) valued at a total of \$43.1 million and 38 water tankers valued at about \$9.4 million.²⁵⁴

TABLE 3.14

MAJOR EQUIPMENT PROVIDED TO THE ANP, DEC 1, 2018–FEB 18, 2019				
Equipment Type	Equipment Description	Units Issued in Quarter	Unit Cost	Total Cost*
Vehicle	M1152 HMMWV (Humvee)	97	\$239,818	\$23,262,346
Vehicle	M1151 HMMWV (Humvee)	84	235,693	19,798,212
Vehicle	Medium Tactical Vehicle Water Tanker	38	247,372	9,400,136
Vehicle	Medium Tactical Vehicle	55	160,594	8,832,670
Vehicle	M1152 Ambulance	58	131,372	7,619,576
Vehicle	Medium Tactical Vehicle Fuel Tanker	13	235,776	3,065,088
Weapon	60mm Mortar	19	48,475	921,025
Weapon	40mm RPG-7s (Rocket-Propelled Grenade Launchers)	864	900	777,600
Weapon	M9 Pistols	206	636	131,016
Vehicle	DSHKA (Heavy Machine Gun)	50	2,250	112,500
Total Cost of Equipment			\$73,920,169	

Note: These items were the major items of equipment provided to the ANP this quarter, not the only items. Vehicles issued this quarter were procured under varying foreign military sales cases, which may cause their unit cost to vary from the cost reported last quarter.

Source: CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.

Equipment Operational Readiness – Data Classified

This quarter USFOR-A continued to classify the data concerning the ANP's equipment readiness. The questions SIGAR asked about ANP equipment readiness can be found in Appendix F, available at www.sigar.mil. ANP equipment readiness is reported in the classified annex of this report.

ANP Infrastructure

The United States had obligated \$3.2 billion and disbursed \$3.1 billion of ASFF from FY 2005 through FY 2018 appropriations for ANP and some ASSF infrastructure projects as of March 31, 2019.²⁵⁵

This quarter, CSTC-A reported the estimated U.S.-funded annual facilities-sustainment costs for all ANP facility and electrical generator requirements for FY 2019 will be \$78.8 million, the same amount reported last quarter. According to CSTC-A, of the \$78.8 million, \$45.4 million will be provided directly to the Afghan government and \$33.4 million will be spent by CSTC-A for the Afghan government.²⁵⁶

As of February 28, 2018, the United States completed 773 ANP infrastructure projects in Afghanistan valued at roughly \$3 billion. CSTC-A reported that five projects were completed this quarter, costing \$3.4 million. Another 14 projects (valued at \$98.5 million) were ongoing, one project was awarded (valued at about \$33 million), and six projects (valued at \$77.9 million) were being planned.²⁵⁷ Table 3.15 on the following page

SECURITY

TABLE 3.15

HIGHEST-COST ANP INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS				
Project Description	Project Location	Agency / Contractor	Estimated Cost	Estimated Completion Date
Awarded Projects				
ANP Kabul Surveillance System Camera and Security Upgrade and Expansion	Kabul Province	USACE/Xator Corporation	\$32,992,327	5/1/2021
Ongoing Projects				
WPP Police Town, Phase II*	Kabul, Kabul Province	USACE/Macro Vantage Levant DMCC	32,831,000	5/23/2021
WPP Police Town, Phase I*	Kabul, Kabul Province	USACE/Macro Vantage Levant DMCC	23,646,225	11/21/2020
WPP Facilities at Kabul Police Academy*	Kabul, Kabul Province	USACE/Macro Vantage Levant DMCC	7,072,803	6/13/2019
Completed Projects				
ANP WPP Police Town Water Tank Replacement	Kabul Province	USACE/Assist Consultants Inc.	1,266,512	12/19/2018
ANP WPP Daycare at Kapisa Provincial Police Headquarters	Kapisa Province	USACE/Assist Consultants Inc.	838,846	12/18/2018
ANP Bagram Ground Defense Checkpoints	Bagram, Parwan Province	USACE/Kahkashan Balkh Building	590,628	12/8/2018
Planned Projects				
WPP Police Town, Phase III	Kabul, Kabul Province	USACE/Macro Vantage Levant DMCC	30,000,000	6/30/2021
WPP Police Town, Phase IV	Kabul, Kabul Province	USACE/Macro Vantage Levant DMCC	40,000,000	8/30/2021

Note: All data are as of February 28, 2019. *Funded by the multilateral NATO ANA Trust Fund (not U.S. ASFF funds). The estimated cost of the two WPP Police Town projects in the planning phase are rough estimates based upon recent contract awards.

Source: CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019 and response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.

describes the highest-value awarded, ongoing, completed, and planned ANP infrastructure projects.

Included in these projects are 14 ANP Women’s Participation Program (WPP) projects valued at a total of about \$143.1 million, comprising nine ongoing projects (\$70.4 million), two projects in the planning phase (\$70 million), and three recently completed projects (\$2.7 million). The vast majority of these ANP WPP projects are being funded by the NATO ANA Trust Fund.²⁵⁸

ANP Training and Operations

As of March 31, 2019, the United States had obligated \$4 billion and disbursed \$3.9 billion of ASFF from FY 2005 through FY 2018 appropriations for ANP, some ASFF, and MOI training and operations.²⁵⁹ At the request of DOD, SIGAR will await the completion of GAO’s forthcoming audit on the cost of ASFF-funded ANDSF training contracts before reporting on the status of those contracts.²⁶⁰ For more information about this and other GAO audits related to Afghanistan, see Section 4.

Afghan Local Police

ALP members, known as “guardians,” are usually local citizens selected by village elders or local leaders to protect their communities against insurgent attack, guard facilities, and conduct local counterinsurgency missions.

While the ANP’s personnel costs are paid via the LOTFA, only DOD funds the ALP, including its personnel and other costs. Funding for the ALP’s personnel costs is provided directly to the Afghan government.²⁶¹ Although the ALP is overseen by the MOI, it is not counted toward the ANDSF’s authorized end strength.²⁶² NSOCC-A reported the estimated amount of ASFF needed to fund the ALP for FY 2019 (assuming an ALP force authorization of 30,000 personnel) is about \$60 million, the same amount reported last quarter.²⁶³

NSOCC-A reported that according to the ALP Staff Directorate, the ALP had roughly 28,000 guardians on hand as of January 31, 2019, roughly 21,500 of whom were fully trained. The ALP’s strength declined by roughly 150 personnel since last quarter, and by about 1,100 since the same period in 2018. The number of trained personnel also dropped this quarter by about 1,300 personnel since last quarter, causing the percentage of the force that is untrained or in training to increase to 23%, up four percentage points since last quarter.²⁶⁴ NSOCC-A has previously said that even if ALP training centers are full for the year, the number of ALP personnel losses and new and untrained recruits is so high that there probably will not be an appreciable increase in the number or percentage of trained ALP personnel.²⁶⁵

This quarter, NSOCC-A reported on the ALP’s continuing efforts to enroll personnel in APPS and to transition ALP salary payments to an electronic funds-transfer process. According to NSOCC-A, as of February 10, 2019, 70% of ALP personnel have been slotted into APPS. As of February 15, 2019, 85% of ALP personnel have banking/ATM/mobile money capabilities available to them and are encouraged to utilize these services instead of the previous system of turning over salaries to a trusted agent.²⁶⁶

For the first time, NSOCC-A reported this quarter that ALP reform has been a challenge due to the uncertainty regarding the future of the ALP. Both RS and NSOCC-A, in coordination with the Afghan government, are planning a possible transfer of the ALP to other ANDSF force elements. As this report went to press, no decisions have been made on timing of this change to the ALP’s status, nor is it clear to which ANDSF force the ALP would be transferred.²⁶⁷

This quarter, NSOCC-A provided SIGAR with the latest ALP power-broker-influence report that lists ALP personnel determined to be under the influence of local powerbrokers, such as village elders, parliamentarians, and other individuals outside the proper chain of command. As of December 12, 2018, 116 ALP personnel were under the influence of power-brokers across 11 provinces, an increase of 46 personnel and two provinces since last quarter. This is still a decrease from the 219 ALP personnel across

12 provinces reported under the influence of powerbrokers in July 2018. Most provinces have only a couple of ALP personnel under powerbroker influence, but the personnel in two provinces—Nangarhar (36 personnel) and Uruzgan (40 personnel) account for about 66% of the total number under powerbroker influence.²⁶⁸

REMOVING UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE

According to the United Nations (UN), Afghanistan is one of the countries most affected by landmines and explosive remnants of war (ERW) such as live shells and bombs.²⁶⁹ The UN said the country is averaging 180 civilian casualties per month from ERW and improvised landmines by antigovernment forces. The National Disability Survey of Afghanistan estimates at least 2.7% of the population are severely disabled, including 60,000 landmine and ERW survivors.²⁷⁰

The Department of State's Bureau of Political-Military Affairs' Office of Weapons Removal and Abatement (PM/WRA) manages the conventional-weapons destruction program in Afghanistan. Since FY 2002, State has provided \$381.9 million in weapons-destruction and humanitarian mine-action assistance to Afghanistan. (An additional \$11.6 million was provided between 1997 and 2001 before the current U.S. reconstruction effort.) PM/WRA so far obligated \$1.85 million in FY 2018 funds.²⁷¹

State directly funds seven Afghan nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), six international NGOs, and one U.S.-based higher-education institution to help clear areas in Afghanistan contaminated by ERW and conventional weapons used by insurgents to construct roadside bombs and other improvised explosive devices (IEDs).

From 1997 through December 31, 2018, State-funded implementing partners have cleared more than 267.8 million square meters of land (101 square miles, or 1.7 times the land area of Washington, DC) and removed or destroyed over eight million landmines and other ERW such as unexploded ordnance (UXO), abandoned ordnance (AO), stockpiled munitions, and homemade explosives. Table 3.16 shows conventional weapons destruction figures, FY 2010–2019.²⁷²

The estimated total area of contaminated land continues to fluctuate: clearance activities reduce the extent of hazardous areas, but ongoing surveys find new contaminated land. At the beginning of October 2018, there were 558.7 square kilometers (215.7 square miles) of contaminated minefields and battlefields. As of December 31, the total known contaminated area was 636.9 square kilometers (245.9 square miles) in 3,754 hazard areas. PM/WRA defines a minefield as the area contaminated by landmines, whereas a contaminated area can include both landmines and other ERW.²⁷³

USAID's Conflict Mitigation Assistance for Civilians (COMAC) is a \$40 million, five-year, nationwide program that began in March 2018 and

TABLE 3.16

DEMINEING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE METRICS, FISCAL YEARS 2010–2019						
Fiscal Year	Minefields Cleared (m²)	AT/AP Destroyed	UXO Destroyed	SAA Destroyed	Fragments Cleared	Estimated Contaminated Area Remaining (m²)¹
2010	39,337,557	13,879	663,162	1,602,267	4,339,235	650,662,000
2011	31,644,360	10,504	345,029	2,393,725	21,966,347	602,000,000
2012	46,783,527	11,830	344,363	1,058,760	22,912,702	550,000,000
2013	25,059,918	6,431	203,024	275,697	10,148,683	521,000,000
2014	22,071,212	12,397	287,331	346,484	9,415,712	511,600,000
2015	12,101,386	2,134	33,078	88,798	4,062,478	570,800,000
2016	27,856,346	6,493	6,289	91,563	9,616,485	607,600,000
2017	31,897,313	6,646	37,632	88,261	1,158,886	547,000,000
2018	25,233,844	5,299	30,924	158,850	N/A	558,700,000
2019 ²	5,829,893	1,058	1,956	19,337	N/A	636,900,000
Total	267,815,356	76,671	1,952,788	6,123,742	83,620,528	636,900,000

Note: AT/AP = antitank/antipersonnel ordnance. UXO = unexploded ordnance. SAA = small-arms ammunition. N/A = not applicable.

Fragments are reported because clearing them requires the same care as other objects until their nature is determined. There are about 4,047 square meters (m²) to an acre.

¹ Total area of contaminated land fluctuates as clearance activities reduce hazardous areas while ongoing survey work identifies and adds new contaminated land in the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) database.

² Partial fiscal year results (10/1/2018–12/31/2018)

Source: PM/WRA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; PM/WRA, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.

supports Afghan victims and their families who have suffered losses from military operations against the Taliban or from insurgent attacks. COMAC provides assistance to Afghan civilians and their dependent family members who have experienced loss due to:²⁷⁴

- military operations involving the U.S., Coalition, or ANDSF against insurgents, criminals, terrorists, or illegal armed groups
- landmines, improvised explosive devices (IED), unexploded ordnances, suicide attacks
- public mass shootings, or other insurgent or terrorist actions
- cross-border shelling or cross-border fighting

COMAC provides in-kind goods sufficient to support families affected by conflict for 60 days. Additional assistance such as referrals for health care and livelihood service providers, and assistance with economic reintegration for families impacted by loss or injury is also covered.²⁷⁵ During the first quarter of FY 2019, COMAC provided immediate assistance to 3,102 families, including 317 households that received counseling, 80 beneficiaries that received medical assistance, and 735 households that received income-generation packages. COMAC is developing an incident-management system to be deployed in the coming months with biometric registration and identification of beneficiaries.²⁷⁶ As of March 31, 2019, USAID has disbursed \$6.76 million for this program.²⁷⁷

GOVERNANCE CONTENTS

Key Issues and Events	107
U.S. Reconstruction Funding for Governance	108
Fallout from the October 2018 Parliamentary Elections	108
Reconciliation and Reintegration	112
Mutual Accountability	114
U.S. Assistance to the Afghan Government Budget	115
National Governance	119
Subnational Governance	121
Rule of Law and Anticorruption	124
Refugees and Internal Displacement	131
Gender	132

GOVERNANCE

KEY ISSUES AND EVENTS

On March 12, U.S. Special Representative for Afghanistan Reconciliation Zalmay Khalilzad said the United States and the Taliban “agreed in draft” on counterterrorism assurances and troop withdrawal following more than two weeks of talks in Doha, Qatar. According to Special Representative Khalilzad, once the troop withdrawal and effective counterterrorism measures are finalized, the Taliban and the Afghan government will begin intra-Afghan negotiations on a political settlement and a comprehensive ceasefire. Special Representative Khalilzad stated that “there is no final agreement until everything is agreed.”²⁷⁸

At a news conference at the Afghan Embassy in Washington, DC, on March 14, President Ashraf Ghani’s National Security Advisor, Hamdullah Mohib, accused Special Representative Khalilzad of delegitimizing and weakening the Afghan government. Mohib further accused Special Representative Khalilzad of using the talks to “create a caretaker government of which he will then become the viceroy.”²⁷⁹ Under Secretary for Political Affairs David Hale summoned Mohib that day to denounce the national security advisor’s public comments. Further, the State Department told Mohib that “attacks on Ambassador Khalilzad are attacks on the Department and only serve to hinder the bilateral relationship and the peace process.”²⁸⁰

Representatives of the Taliban along with a 250-person delegation of Afghan politicians, representatives of the Afghan government (serving in their personal capacity), and civil society members planned to meet informally in Qatar in April to express their views on peace. President Ashraf Ghani was quoted by Reuters telling delegates that they would represent “the wishes of the Afghan nation and government of Afghanistan.” The Taliban protested, insisting that none of the delegates could represent the Afghan government. On April 18, the hosting organization announced that the event planned for April 20–21 was postponed due to “lack of agreement around participation and representation.” President Ghani’s office blamed the Qatar government, arguing that its handling of the episode showed “disrespect” for the will of the Afghans.²⁸¹

On March 20, the Independent Election Commission (IEC) delayed the presidential election for a second time, to September 28, 2019. The IEC said



Special Representative for Afghanistan Reconciliation Zalmay Khalilzad, Ambassador John R. Bass, and General Austin Scott Miller meet with Afghan government officials and political leaders to discuss the ongoing peace process. (Government of Afghanistan photo)

the new delay was necessary to implement voting system reforms.²⁸² The presidential election was originally scheduled for April 20, 2019.²⁸³

U.S. RECONSTRUCTION FUNDING FOR GOVERNANCE

As of March 31, 2019, the United States had provided nearly \$34.5 billion to support governance and economic development in Afghanistan. Most of this funding, more than \$20.5 billion, was appropriated to the Economic Support Fund (ESF) administered by the State Department (State) and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).²⁸⁴

FALLOUT FROM THE OCTOBER 2018 PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS

Some Results of the October 2018 Elections for Lower House of Parliament Still Outstanding

On October 20, 2018, the elections for the lower house of parliament began in 32 provinces, not including Ghazni and Kandahar. Later that day, the Independent Election Commission (IEC) announced that voting would extend to the next day in response to a number of closed polling centers and reports of missing electoral materials. The elections for Kandahar Province, delayed due to the October 18 assassination of the Kandahar police chief, were held on October 27.²⁸⁵ Elections were not held in Ghazni Province due to insecurity.²⁸⁶

Parliament was in recess between January 20 and April 26, 2019. The new parliament was scheduled to open March 6; however, the delay in finalizing the results of the October 2018 election postponed the start of the new parliament. On April 26, President Ghani inaugurated the upper and lower house of parliament, despite the IEC not announcing the final results for 33 lower house seats for Kabul Province.²⁸⁷

This quarter, the State Department said it would be premature to judge the impact of the October 2018 parliamentary elections on the legitimacy and inclusivity of the Afghan government while the final results are still outstanding.²⁸⁸ State had previously said credible parliamentary elections in 2018 and presidential elections in 2019 are critical for demonstrating that the Afghan government is “inclusive” and has the necessary political coherence to achieve and implement a peace settlement by potentially sapping support for the insurgency.²⁸⁹ As State described the situation in September, the 2018 parliamentary and 2019 presidential elections are “both a threat and an opportunity given [Afghanistan’s present] political fragility.”²⁹⁰

The October 2018 elections featured the first use of polling-center-based voter lists (which requires voters to cast their ballots at the polling center at which they register) and biometric voter-verification (BVV) devices. State

GOVERNANCE

FIGURE 3.41

TURNOUT OF REGISTERED VOTERS IN THE OCTOBER 2018 ELECTIONS



Source: SIGAR analysis of UN election data from UNDP, *United Nations Electoral Support Project (UNESP): 2018 Annual Project Progress Report*, 2/2019, pp. 51–52 and UNDP, *United Nations Electoral Support Project (UNESP): Monthly Electoral Update January 2019*, 2/2019, pp. 13–14.

previously told SIGAR that polling-center-based registration would allow the IEC to predetermine the number of ballots required at each polling center during elections, greatly reducing the potential number of excess ballots available at each polling center. State also said elections experts assessed that polling-center-based registration is the critical reform necessary to reduce ballot-box stuffing, the principal method of fraud in the 2014 election.²⁹¹


As shown in Figure 3.41, Daykundi and Bamyan Provinces had the highest percentage of registered male and female voters vote in the elections. In Daykundi, 82% of female and 78% of male registered voters voted. In Bamyan, 76% of female and 74% of male registered voters voted. Paktiya and Paktika Provinces had the lowest percent of registered female voters vote on election day (20% and 12% respectively) while Zabul and Paktika had the lowest percent of male voters vote (20% and 19% respectively).²⁹²

On the following page, Figure 3.42 shows the use of BVV devices varied significantly by province. According to United Nations (UN) data, Faryab Province had the largest use of BVV devices with the number of votes recorded by BVV devices representing the equivalent of 103% of the total votes recorded for the province. Conversely, Wardak Province registered the lowest use of BVV devices with the number of votes recorded by BVV devices representing the equivalent of 43% of the total votes recorded for the province.²⁹³

GOVERNANCE

FIGURE 3.42

PERCENT OF VOTES RECORDED USING BIOMETRIC VOTER VERIFICATION DEVICES IN THE OCTOBER 2018 ELECTIONS



Note: The number of votes recorded by biometric voter verification devices may exceed the total number of votes cast due to duplicate biometric verifications.

Source: SIGAR analysis of UN election data from UNDP, *United Nations Electoral Support Project (UNESP): 2018 Annual Project Progress Report*, 2/2019, pp. 51–52 and UNDP, *United Nations Electoral Support Project (UNESP): Monthly Electoral Update January 2019*, 2/2019, pp. 13–14.

All Election Commissioners Fired, New Ones Appointed

On February 12, President Ghani announced that he had fired all 12 IEC and ECC commissioners for alleged abuse of their authorities. A presidential advisor tweeted that the firing had been unanimously approved by “all presidential candidates, political parties, and election observer groups.” The day before the firing, the IEC had issued a statement criticizing the Afghan government for meddling in the presidential elections by changing the election law.²⁹⁴

Following the announced firing of the elections commissioners, the Attorney General’s Office (AGO) announced that it was investigating the commissioners for misuse of their authority. These commissioners were also barred from leaving the country.²⁹⁵

Also on February 12, President Ghani issued a presidential decree amending the 2016 electoral law. According to State, key reforms included a new selection process for IEC and ECC commissioners, clearer lines of authority between the IEC and ECC as well as between each commission’s

professional secretariat and political leadership, and the creation of a special court to resolve disputes between the IEC and ECC.²⁹⁶

According to the Afghanistan Analysts Network, senior election commissioners' appointments have been terminated—through amendments to the election law after every Afghan election.²⁹⁷

On March 3, President Ghani swore in a new slate of IEC and ECC commissioners and chief electoral officers. According to State, the senior IEC and ECC officials were appointed to their respective commissions following an inclusive selection process where political parties and civil society groups nominated and voted on candidates for appointment by President Ghani.²⁹⁸

Presidential Elections Delayed to September 2019

On December 30, 2018, the Independent Election Commission (IEC) announced a three-month delay of Afghanistan's presidential elections from the originally announced date of April 20, 2019, to July 2019. The IEC said that weather, transportation, security, and budget issues were causing the delay.²⁹⁹

On March 20, the IEC again delayed the elections, this time to September 28, 2019. The IEC said the new delay was necessary to implement voting-system reforms.³⁰⁰

U.S. Funding Support to Elections

The U.S. government has provided financial support to the Afghan elections in 2018 and planned elections in 2019 through a grant of up to nearly \$79 million to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Through this grant, UNDP provides support to Afghanistan's electoral management bodies—the IEC and the ECC.³⁰¹

As shown in Table 3.17, USAID has had three active elections-related programs this quarter, the largest of which is their support to the UNDP.³⁰²

On August 8, 2018, USAID signed a three-year, \$14 million cooperative agreement with the Consortium for Elections and Political Process Strengthening (CEPPS)—representing the International Foundation for Electoral Systems, the International Republican Institute, and the National



U.S. Embassy officials met with Independent Election Committee officials to discuss the planned September 28, 2019, elections. (U.S. Embassy photo)

TABLE 3.17

USAID ELECTION-RELATED PROGRAMS				
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
Electoral Support Activity (ESA)	5/20/2015	12/31/2019	\$78,995,000	\$27,411,968
Strengthening Civic Engagement in Elections in Afghanistan Activity (SCEEA)	8/9/2018	8/8/2021	14,000,000	3,472,150
Global Elections and Political Transitions Program	1/1/2018	12/30/2018	222,445	222,445

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.



Special Representative for Afghanistan Reconciliation Zalmay Khalilzad speaking via computer with young people from Bamyan, Jowzjan, and Parwan Provinces to discuss the ongoing peace process. (U.S. Embassy photo)

Democratic Institute—to support domestic Afghan election observation of the 2018 parliamentary elections and the 2019 presidential elections, and to promote longer-term electoral reforms.³⁰³ According to USAID, 6,510 of the promised CEPPS-supported 6,817 domestic monitors were deployed for the October 2018 parliamentary elections.³⁰⁴

A more comprehensive discussion of State’s perspectives on the elections is presented in the classified annex of this report.

RECONCILIATION AND REINTEGRATION

Peace Efforts with the Taliban

On March 12, U.S. Special Representative for Afghanistan Reconciliation Zalmay Khalilzad said the United States and the Taliban “agreed in draft” on counter-terrorism assurances and troop withdrawal following more than two weeks of talks in Doha, Qatar. According to Special Representative Khalilzad, once the troop withdrawal and effective counterterrorism measures are finalized, the Taliban and the Afghan government will begin intra-Afghan negotiations on a political settlement and a comprehensive ceasefire. Khalilzad noted that “there is no final agreement until everything is agreed.”³⁰⁵

On February 5–6, a Taliban delegation met with a number of Afghan political leaders (including many opposition politicians) in Moscow. A representative of the Taliban Political Commission described what he considered to be important steps for the peace process, including delisting of the Taliban from sanctions lists, the release of detainees, and the formal opening of a Taliban office. The representative also highlighted the need for international guarantees of an eventual peace agreement. According to the UN Secretary-General, the participants called for an inclusive intra-Afghan dialogue. In the declaration, they also called for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Afghanistan and expressed support for ensuring the educational, political, social and economic rights of women, as well as for the freedom of speech of all Afghans, in accordance with Islamic values.³⁰⁶

Nevertheless, many questions regarding the Taliban’s stance remain, particularly around their interpretation of women’s rights according to Islam. In a speech delivered on February 5 in Moscow, the Taliban denounced “so-called women’s rights activists” who, in their view, were encouraging women to violate Afghan customs. Thus, specific Taliban positions on women’s rights are difficult to ascertain, catalyzing much concern among Afghan women.³⁰⁷

On February 11, President Ghani called for a grand consultative jirga (a traditional assembly) to discuss the peace process and the post-peace government in Afghanistan.³⁰⁸ The High Peace Council (HPC) announced



President Ghani chairing the second meeting of the Reconciliation Leadership Council. (Government of Afghanistan photo)

on February 20 that the jirga would be held March 17–20 and would discuss the “values and red lines” for peace.³⁰⁹ However, the meeting was delayed to April 29, 2019.³¹⁰

This quarter, the Afghan government created the Reconciliation Leadership Council to establish a unified Afghan government position on peace negotiations. According to the head of the HPC, this council would draft red lines, prepare to “exchange views” (but not negotiate with) Taliban representatives, and determine the composition and authorities of a future negotiating team.³¹¹

State Sees the Need for Additional Afghan Government Reforms to Prepare for Peace

According to State, the Afghan government recognizes that it needs to develop and implement comprehensive peace-related guidelines for provincial and district Afghan government officials. State said these guidelines are necessary to facilitate and manage de-escalation and reintegration by local Taliban fighters and commanders to reduce violence, enhance stability at the local/district level, and set the stage for implementing a peace agreement.³¹² Further, State believes that the Afghan government needs to develop a messaging campaign that explicitly supports the government’s negotiating team, emphasizing how this representative group incorporates elements of government, political parties, women, and civil society and is empowered to negotiate with the Taliban.³¹³

A more comprehensive discussion of State’s perspectives on reconciliation is presented in the classified annex of this report.

U.S. Support to Peace and Reconciliation

State provided \$3.9 million to the UNDP to support reconciliation, including the activities of the High Peace Council (HPC) in September 2017.³¹⁴ State provided an additional \$6 million in September 2018 for a project extension to April 30, 2019.³¹⁵

According to State, these funds have supported the HPC to reform itself, start building a consensus for peace across the country, and develop Afghanistan's institutional capacity to facilitate reconciliation.³¹⁶ While the Afghan government has taken positive steps to have the HPC enact structural reforms, a great deal of work remains to be done to make the HPC a truly effective organization, State says.³¹⁷

The World Bank has drafted a *Package of Economic Incentives Report* that includes the use of Citizens' Charter of Afghanistan Project (CCAP) as a possible platform for delivering programming in the event of a post-settlement environment in Afghanistan. According to State, the Afghan government is establishing criteria for expanding CCAP into newly stabilized communities should a peace agreement be achieved.³¹⁸

MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Afghanistan Compact

In August 2017, the U.S. and Afghan governments announced the launch of the "Afghanistan Compact."³¹⁹ The Afghanistan Compact is an Afghan-led initiative designed to demonstrate the government's commitment to reforms.³²⁰ The Afghan government appears to face no direct financial consequences if it fails to meet the Afghanistan Compact reform commitments.³²¹ Instead, the principal motivation for the Afghan government officials tasked with achieving the Compact benchmarks appears to be avoiding embarrassment, State said.³²²

According to State, this quarter, the Afghan and U.S. Compact working groups focused on updating the benchmarks and milestones with an overall focus on countercorruption efforts.³²³ State attributed the following actions this quarter to the pressure created by the Compact:³²⁴

- The Afghan government began the process of verifying the assets of 17,000 Afghan officials.
- The Attorney General's Office (AGO) continued investigating individuals named in the Farooqi Report on fuel-related corruption. According to DOJ, the investigation that produced this report in October 2015 uncovered collusion, price fixing, and bribery related to bids for fuel contracts totaling nearly \$1 billion. (SIGAR was instrumental in this investigation. In August 2014, SIGAR investigators received allegations that companies bidding on the MOD fuel contract colluded to rig their bids, inflate fuel prices, and prevent two other competing companies

from submitting bids.³²⁵) DOJ reported last quarter that the Anti-Corruption Justice Center (ACJC) was not receiving the necessary copies of MOD fuel contracts from the MOD.³²⁶ This quarter, however, DOJ said that the ACJC is now receiving the necessary documents following a phone call by the attorney general to the minister of defense.³²⁷

- The AGO agreed to investigate and prosecute corrupt elections officials, including elections commissioners. The AGO announced travel bans against all of the commissioners and stated publicly that multiple investigations are under way.
- The Afghan government convened top-level meetings to dislodge international humanitarian assistance that had been held up in the Afghan customs process.

State says that Afghan self-reporting is the primary means for determining Afghan government progress in meeting Compact benchmarks. The U.S. Embassy tries to verify this progress when possible.³²⁸

U.S. ASSISTANCE TO THE AFGHAN GOVERNMENT BUDGET

Summary of Assistance Agreements

At the Brussels Conference in October 2016, the United States and other international participants confirmed their intention to provide \$15.2 billion between 2017 and 2020 in support of Afghanistan's development priorities.³²⁹ At the November 2018 Geneva Conference on Afghanistan, international donors reaffirmed their intention to provide \$15.2 billion for Afghanistan's development priorities up to 2020 and to direct continuing but gradually declining financial support to Afghanistan's social and economic development up to 2024.³³⁰

In several conferences since the 2010 Kabul Conference, the United States and other international donors have supported an increase to 50% in the proportion of civilian development aid delivered **on-budget** through the Afghan government or multidonor trust funds to improve governance, cut costs, and align development efforts with Afghan priorities.³³¹

At the November 2018 Geneva Conference on Afghanistan, the Afghan government proposed that donors commit to delivering 60% of aid on-budget.³³² Yet, international donors committed only to continue channeling aid on-budget "as appropriate" with no specific target.³³³ USAID said it does not target or commit to a specific percentage of funds to be used for on-budget programming.³³⁴

As shown in Table 3.18 on the following page, USAID's active, direct bilateral-assistance programs have a total estimated cost of \$75 million.

On-budget assistance: encompasses donor funds that are aligned with Afghan government plans, included in Afghan government budget documents, and included in the budget approved by the parliament and managed by the Afghan treasury system. On-budget assistance is primarily delivered either bilaterally from a donor to Afghan government entities, or through multidonor trust funds. (DOD prefers the term "direct contributions" when referring to Afghanistan Security Forces Fund monies executed via Afghan government contracts or Afghan spending on personnel.)

Off-budget assistance: encompasses donor funds that are excluded from the Afghan national budget and not managed through Afghan government systems.

Source: SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 7/30/2014, p. 130; Ministry of Finance, "Aid Management Policy for Transition and Beyond," 12/10/2012, p. 8; State, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/14/2016; DOD, OSD-P response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2018.

GOVERNANCE

TABLE 3.18

USAID ON-BUDGET PROGRAMS					
Project/Trust Fund Title	Afghan Government On-Budget Partner	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
Bilateral Government-to-Government Projects					
Textbook Printing and Distribution	Ministry of Education	9/15/2017	12/31/2019	\$ 75,000,000	\$0
Multi-Donor Trust Funds					
Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF) (current award)*	Multiple	3/31/2012	7/31/2019	2,700,000,000	2,155,686,333
Afghanistan Infrastructure Trust Fund (AITF)	Multiple	3/7/2013	3/6/2023	153,670,184	153,670,184

Note: *USAID had a previous award to the ARTF that concluded in March 2012 and totaled \$1,371,991,195 in disbursements. Cumulative disbursements from all ARTF awards is currently \$3,527,677,528.

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.

USAID also expects to contribute \$2.7 billion to the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF) from 2012 through 2020 in addition to \$1.37 billion disbursed under the previous grant agreement between USAID and the World Bank (2002–2011). USAID has disbursed \$154 million to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Trust Fund (AITF).³³⁵

On July 11, 2018, participants in the NATO Brussels Summit committed to extend “financial sustainment of the Afghan forces through 2024.” The public declaration did not specify an amount of money or targets for the on-budget share of assistance.³³⁶

Civilian On-Budget Assistance

USAID has provided on-budget civilian assistance in two ways: bilaterally to Afghan government entities, and through contributions to two multidonor trust funds, the World Bank-administered Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF) and the Asian Development Bank-administered Afghanistan Infrastructure Trust Fund (AITF).³³⁷ According to USAID, all bilateral-assistance funds are deposited in separate bank accounts established by the Ministry of Finance (MOF) for each program.³³⁸

The ARTF provides funds to the Afghan government’s operating and development budgets in support of Afghan government operations, policy reforms, and national-priority programs.³³⁹ The AITF coordinates donor assistance for infrastructure projects.³⁴⁰

As of January 2019, the United States remains the largest cumulative donor to the ARTF (30.9% of actual, as distinct from pledged, contributions) with the next-largest donor being the United Kingdom (16.8% of actual contributions).³⁴¹

The ARTF recurrent-cost window supports operating costs, such as Afghan government non-security salaries. As of January 2019, the ARTF recurrent-cost window has cumulatively provided the Afghan government

approximately \$2.6 billion for wages, \$600 million for operations and maintenance costs, \$1.1 billion in incentive program funds, and \$62 million in ad hoc payments since 2002.³⁴²

In 2018, the Afghan government, World Bank, and ARTF donors agreed to restructure the recurrent-cost window to make provision of funds contingent upon policy reforms and fiscal stability-related results. Within the recurrent-cost window, there are two instruments: (1) the Incentive Program Development Policy Grant (IP DPG), a policy-based budget support program, and (2) the Fiscal Stability Facility (FSF), a results-based, recurrent-cost financing program.³⁴³ However, in March 2019, ARTF donors agreed to merge these two programs for 2019.³⁴⁴ As shown in Figure 3.43, the ARTF recurrent-cost window has changed in the overall size and composition of funds. Starting in FY 1397 (December 2017–December 2018), the baseline recurrent-cost window funds were eliminated and reform- and performance-based funds gained prominence.³⁴⁵

The three-year, \$900 million IP DPG program is meant to incentivize Afghanistan’s timely implementation of reforms to improve its economic and fiscal self-reliance.³⁴⁶ For USAID, IP DPG replaced its own mechanism for providing reform-based financial incentives, the New Development Partnership (NDP) program. Through NDP, USAID agreed to provide \$20 million through the ARTF recurrent-cost window for each development result the Afghan government achieved. Between 2015 and 2017, USAID disbursed \$380 million before formally ending NDP in July 2018. USAID said they ended NDP because (1) the Afghan government requested that donors consolidate and align their incentive-based development assistance programs, and (2) the World Bank modified its ARTF incentive program to better align with USAID’s development objectives in Afghanistan.³⁴⁷

As of April 2019, the ARTF donors, the World Bank, and the Afghan government are still negotiating the specific reforms for funds disbursement.


On-Budget Assistance to the ANDSF

Approximately 69% of total U.S. on-budget assistance goes toward the requirements of the Afghan security forces.³⁴⁸ DOD provides on-budget assistance to the Afghan government through direct contributions from the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) to the Afghan government to fund a portion of Ministry of Defense (MOD) and Ministry of Interior (MOI) requirements, and through ASFF contributions to the multidonor Law and Order Trust Fund for Afghanistan (LOTFA).³⁴⁹

According to DOD, most of the ASFF appropriation is not on-budget as it is spent on equipment, supplies, and services for the Afghan security forces using DOD contracts.³⁵⁰ LOTFA is administered by the UNDP and primarily funds Afghan National Police salaries and incentives.³⁵¹ Direct-contribution funding is provided to the MOF, which allots it incrementally to the MOD and MOI, as required.³⁵²

FIGURE 3.43

**ARTF RECURRENT-COST WINDOW
COMPOSITION OF FUNDS (1395–1397)**
(\$ MILLIONS)



Note: Afghan fiscal years run from approximately one December 22 to the next; fiscal years 1395, 1396, and 1397 run 2015–2016, 2016–2017, and 2017–2018, respectively.

Source: BDO, *Monitoring Agent for ARTF Detailed Quarterly Management Report Meezan to Qaws FY 1397, 1/2019*, p. 16.

The U.S. Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan (CSTC-A) monitors and formally audits the execution of those funds. The aim is to assess ministerial capability and to ensure proper controls and compliance with documented accounting procedures and provisions of commitment letters used to enforce agreements with the Afghan government.³⁵³

For Afghan fiscal year (FY) 1398 (December 2018–December 2019), DOD plans to provide the Afghan government up to the equivalent of \$707.5 million to support the MOD and \$137.3 million to support the MOI.³⁵⁴

As of February 28, CSTC-A had provided the Afghan government the equivalent of \$61.3 million to support the MOD for FY 1398. All of these funds paid for salaries.³⁵⁵

Additionally, as of February 28, CSTC-A provided the equivalent of \$71 million to support the MOI. Of these funds, none were delivered via the LOTFA.³⁵⁶

The LOTFA's salary support project that pays the salaries, hazard-duty pay, and incentives of the Afghan National Police and Central Prisons Department personnel was extended for another year to December 31, 2019.³⁵⁷ According to CSTC-A, the majority of LOTFA donors still support the transition of payroll management from UNDP to MOI once the MOI meets the necessary conditions. This quarter, CSTC-A said it has received no updates on the Afghan government's progress in meeting these conditions.³⁵⁸

CSTC-A Reassessing their Conditionality Assessment Approach

This quarter, CSTC-A reported to SIGAR that it conducted no assessments of the MOD or MOI in meeting the conditions outlined in the 1397/1398 commitment letters.³⁵⁹ Instead, CSTC-A is reassessing the bilateral financial-commitment letter conditionality approach.³⁶⁰

According to CSTC-A, the commitment-letter conditions were meant to drive behavior change in the MOD and MOI by ensuring these institutions complied with various Afghan legal regulations, the Afghanistan Compact, and the U.S.-Afghanistan Strategic Partnership Agreement. The commitment letters were implemented in 2014. As the commander of CSTC-A told SIGAR at that time, this was a reaction to his observation that “in 2013, we had no conditions” for on-budget funds to support the MOD and MOI. CSTC-A would apply financial and nonfinancial penalties (levers) when it observed noncompliance with commitment-letter conditions. One example of a nonfinancial lever included withholding fuel allocations. According to CSTC-A, exercising these levers improved Afghan reporting and added rigor to certain Afghan procedures.³⁶¹

Now, however, CSTC-A believes that assessing MOD and MOI change in relation to the commitment-letter conditions is not feasible because of the complex sustainability challenges facing the Afghan security forces.

Further, the CSTC-A commander has directed a review of the commitment-letter process as he believes it contradicts his decision to empower CSTC-A's senior ministerial advisors.³⁶²

NATIONAL GOVERNANCE

Capacity-Building Programs

USAID capacity-building programs seek to improve Afghan government stakeholders' ability to prepare, manage, and account for on-budget assistance. These programs, shown in Table 3.19, also provide general assistance to support broader human and institutional capacity building of Afghan government entities such as civil-society organizations and the media.³⁶³

TABLE 3.19

USAID CAPACITY-BUILDING PROGRAMS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL				
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
Afghan Civic Engagement Program (ACEP)	12/4/2013	12/4/2019	\$79,120,000	\$71,297,480
Rasana (Media)	3/29/2017	3/28/2020	9,000,000	4,838,235

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.

Civil Society and Media

The Afghan Civic Engagement Program's (ACEP) goal is to promote civil-society and media engagement that enables Afghan citizens to influence policy, monitor government accountability, and serve as advocates for political reform.³⁶⁴ In July, USAID approved extending and modifying ACEP to focus its civil-society organization (CSO) support on civic and voter education for the 2018 and 2019 elections.³⁶⁵

This quarter, USAID provided data on ACEP's support to civic and voter education. Between January and February 2019, 25 ACEP CSO partners conducted 1,426 civic and voter education sessions in 21 provinces. According to USAID, 54,465 people (28,298 men, 26,167 women) participated in these civic and voter education sessions.³⁶⁶ Also this quarter, ACEP facilitated a Civil Society Elections Coordination Group (CECG) meeting, with five CSO members and four donor organizations, to discuss Election Law amendments, including the dismissal of IEC and ECC officials and preparations for candidate nominations to fill the vacant commissioner positions. As the amendments coincided with the dismissal of all IEC and ECC commissioners, the meeting was the first not to include representatives of the electoral-management bodies.³⁶⁷

GOVERNANCE

In March 2017, USAID launched the \$9 million Rasana program. According to USAID, Rasana, which means “media” in Dari, provides support to women journalists and women-run or women-owned media organizations. The program has four program areas: (1) support and training for women journalists, (2) investigative journalism initiatives, (3) advocacy and training for the protection of journalists, and (4) expanding the outreach of media through small grants for content production in underserved areas.³⁶⁸

A recently completed, USAID-commissioned study of the current state of civil society and media in Afghanistan offered an overall negative impression. The purpose of the assessment was to identify key challenges and opportunities in the civil-society and media sector in Afghanistan following more than a decade of sustained development assistance. According to the assessors, civil-society and media sectors in Afghanistan have been largely created and supported by the international community over the past 17 years. While the authors pointed to many positive developments in these sectors, in the past few years the “civil society ecosystem” has faced “a corrosive combination of threats, especially those emanating from increasing insecurity, and rising levels of corruption.”³⁶⁹

The assessors focused on three areas, including the civil-society and media-sector operational environment, the capacity of the sector, and the state of vital relationships. The authors reached the following key findings:³⁷⁰

- Declining security has rendered many areas inaccessible to civil-society activists and journalists (with women more affected than men).
- Journalists are increasingly at risk and subject to physical violence and abuse.
- Corruption and powerbroker influence and increasing insecurity are shrinking civic space.
- Despite an enabling environment on paper, CSOs and media organizations still face challenges regarding accurate and timely access to information from the government.
- While the media sector is widely seen as a success, the gains are largely concentrated at the national level. At the provincial and district level, the media is struggling for survival. Also, while the assessors consider the new Access to Information Law to be a model piece of legislation, there are major problems with the law’s implementation.
- Journalists have been able to combine forces to advance their interests, forming a variety of unions and associations.
- The civil society sector has substantial experience in service delivery and advocacy, especially in health and education and promotion of legal reform and women’s empowerment.

- The initiatives and capacity of women and youth are increasing. For example, the assessors cited the “impressive” level of sophistication and confidence of women and youth civil society activists.³⁷¹
- Relationships between CSOs and their constituencies are very weak, though reportedly improving slightly. Although CSOs face the inherent challenge of limited public understanding of civil society in Afghanistan (exacerbated by the unclear distinctions between different types of CSOs), CSO unaccountability to their constituencies is the main culprit.³⁷²
- There is a prevailing sentiment among many government officials that CSOs are unaccountable competitors for foreign funding.
- With the exception of a few interviewees who reported some support from private donors, CSO partnerships with the private sector are almost nonexistent.

In summarizing the current situation, the authors said that civil society and the media are operating under severe duress in a repressed civic environment. Further, insecurity has largely confined civic activities to urban centers and has made it difficult for civil-society activists and journalists, especially women, to enjoy freedom of movement and expression.³⁷³

SUBNATIONAL GOVERNANCE

A recently completed, USAID-commissioned study of the current state of subnational governance in Afghanistan offered a mixed assessment of some progress attributable to USAID programs but also of persistent challenges. The report was based on documents, key informant interviews, and focus-group discussions. A total of 95 individuals (37 women and 58 men) in five locations (Kabul, Mazar-e Sharif, Herat, Kandahar, and Jalalabad) were interviewed.³⁷⁴

The authors had the following key findings in response to the questions posed by USAID:³⁷⁵

- Informants reported a variety of changes over the past four years, mainly for the better. These were attributed to a number of factors, mainly the merit-based appointment of younger, educated people to senior level positions across the country.
- Challenges included corruption, capacity problems, and the influence of power brokers and political interests. A rapid rise in urban populations due to instability and economic factors was creating problems for service providers, resulting in reduced services per capita in the cities.
- Most informants reported low levels of satisfaction with service delivery. Examples included overcrowded schools and unhygienic clinics, which prompted citizens to seek services from the private sector or in neighboring countries.

GOVERNANCE

- Challenges related to improving service delivery at the provincial and municipal levels included reduced government budgets, patronage and nepotism in recruitment, the public’s unrealistic expectations, and the refusal of powerful people to pay taxes. Other challenges included complex and bureaucratic business processes, and low capacity of older, semiliterate public servants.
- Donor inputs, such as from USAID’s Strong Hubs for Afghan Hope and Resilience (SHAHAR), were reported as improving budgeting and planning capacity, but there were also concerns about sustainability, and comments about donors setting up parallel systems that did not strengthen the state. There were major problems in the linkages among provincial-level planning, the central government, and subsequent provincial-level ministry programming.
- Informants were almost unanimous in reporting major improvements in revenue generation at both municipal and provincial levels. However, a major challenge was the reduction of revenue potential due to declining economic activity.

Provincial and Municipal Programs

USAID has two subnational programs focused on provincial centers and municipalities: the Initiative to Strengthen Local Administrations (ISLA) and Strong Hubs for Afghan Hope and Resilience (SHAHAR) programs. USAID is also directing a portion of its ARTF contributions to support the Citizen’s Charter Afghanistan Project (CCAP). Table 3.20 summarizes total program costs and disbursements to date.

TABLE 3.20

USAID SUBNATIONAL (PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL) PROGRAMS				
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
Strong Hubs for Afghan Hope and Resilience (SHAHAR)	11/30/2014	11/29/2019	\$72,000,000	\$51,892,317
Initiative to Strengthen Local Administrations (ISLA)	2/1/2015	1/31/2020	48,000,000	34,685,637
Citizens’ Charter Afghanistan Project (CCAP)*	10/27/2016	10/31/2021	N/A	34,310,000

Note: *This includes USAID contributions to ARTF with an express preference for the Citizens’ Charter Afghanistan Project. Disbursements to the World Bank are as of 1/20/2019.

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019; World Bank, *Administrator’s Report on Financial Status*, 1/20/2019, p. 5.

Citizen’s Charter Afghanistan Project

Starting in October 2018, USAID now explicitly contributes a portion of its ARTF funds to the Citizen’s Charter Afghanistan Project (CCAP), the first time since the program began in 2016. In October, USAID requested that \$34 million of its \$300 million contribution to the World Bank’s ARTF be spent on CCAP. According to the Afghan government, CCAP is the center-piece of the government’s national inclusive development strategy for rural

and urban areas. As of November 1, 2018, the Afghan government reported that CCAP had been rolled out in 10,000 communities (700 urban and 9,300 rural) in all 34 provinces. CCAP works through Community Development Councils (CDC) to implement community projects. CCAP defines a suite of minimum basic services for each community covering health, education, and a choice of infrastructure investments (such as road access, electricity, or small-scale irrigation for rural communities).³⁷⁶

Initiative to Strengthen Local Administrations

The \$48 million ISLA program is meant to enable the Afghan government to improve provincial governance in the areas of fiscal and development planning, representation of citizens, and enhanced delivery of public services. ISLA aims to strengthen subnational systems of planning, operations, communication, representation, and citizen engagement, leading to services that more closely respond to all citizens' needs in health, education, security, justice, and urban services.³⁷⁷

According to USAID, one of the key provisions of the Afghan government's provincial budget policy is to link the provincial development plans (PDP) with the Afghan budget. USAID said it is critical to ensure that budgets are linked to and defined by development needs and priorities at the provincial level. As of December, USAID said that of the 126 projects in the Afghan FY 1397 (December 2017–December 2018) budget that are being implemented through the \$1 million per province in unconditional funds, 123 were derived from province development plans.³⁷⁸

A recent, USAID-commissioned assessment of the state of subnational governance reported consistent complaints about the PDP process. According to the assessment, there is a perception that when the Afghan budgets are allocated, Afghan ministry programming at the provincial level often bears little resemblance to the previous year's planning and budgeting work that went into the PDPs. Central ministries were reportedly as much as five months late in releasing funds at the provincial level, which put ministry staff in the position of trying to accomplish a year's work in the short remaining available time. This contributed to low levels of budget execution, negatively impacted service delivery, and reduced public perception of state legitimacy. The assessors concluded that despite considerable efforts at developing PDPs, they have had limited impact on subsequent sectoral programming and budgeting by central ministries.³⁷⁹

Despite these negative findings on the actual utility of PDPs, the assessors rated the technical support of USAID programs as having been highly effective. For example, the assessors wrote that ISLA had a considerable impact in supporting provincial entities in preparing quality PDPs.³⁸⁰

GOVERNANCE

Strong Hubs for Afghan Hope and Resilience

The objective of the \$72 million SHAHAR program is to create well-governed, fiscally sustainable Afghan municipalities capable of meeting the needs of a growing urban population. SHAHAR partners with municipalities to, among other things, deliver capacity-building for outreach and citizen consultation, improved revenue forecasting and generation, and budget formulation and execution.³⁸¹

RULE OF LAW AND ANTICORRUPTION

Rule of Law and Anticorruption Programs

The United States has assisted the formal and informal justice sectors through several mechanisms. These include State's Justice Sector Support Program (JSSP) and Justice Training Transition Program (JTTP). These and other rule-of-law and anticorruption programs are shown in Table 3.21.

USAID has a cooperation arrangement with the UK's Department for International Development to fund the Independent Joint Anti-Corruption Monitoring and Evaluation Committee (MEC). USAID funds the MEC's monitoring, analysis, and reporting activities, including its vulnerability-to-corruption assessments.³⁸²

State's Justice Sector Support Program is the largest rule-of-law program in Afghanistan. JSSP was established in 2005 to provide capacity-building support to the Afghan justice system through training, mentoring, and advisory services. The current JSSP contract began in August 2017 and has an estimated cost of \$23 million. The previous JSSP contract, which began in 2010, cost \$280 million.³⁸³ JSSP provides technical assistance to the Afghan justice-sector institutions through (1) building the capacity of justice institutions to be professional, transparent, and accountable; (2) assisting the

TABLE 3.21

RULE OF LAW AND ANTICORRUPTION PROGRAMS				
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
Assistance for Development of Afghan Legal Access and Transparency (ADALAT)	4/15/2016	4/17/2021	\$68,163,468	\$21,977,760
Afghanistan's Measure for Accountability and Transparency (AMANAT)	8/23/2017	8/22/2022	31,986,588	3,492,015
Corrections System Support Program (OASIS CSSP) Option Year 1*	6/1/2018	5/31/2022	12,131,642	6,319,617
Justice Sector Support Program OASIS Contract*	8/28/2017	8/28/2022	23,424,669	11,901,506
Continuing Professional Development Support (CPDS)*	2/6/2018	4/6/2020	7,938,401	7,938,401
Delegated Cooperation Agreement (DCAR) with the Department for International Development (DFID) for Independent Joint Anti-Corruption Monitoring and Evaluation Committee (MEC)	5/19/2015	8/31/2020	4,600,000	2,000,000

Note: *Disbursements as of 3/20/2019.

Source: State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019; USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.

development of statutes that are clearly drafted, constitutional, and the product of effective, consultative drafting processes; and (3) supporting the case-management system so that Afghan justice institutions work in a harmonized and interlinked manner and resolve cases in a transparent and legally sufficient manner.³⁸⁴

This quarter, JSSP reported that the MOI recently used the case-management system to perform criminal background checks on nearly 9,000 applicants for government jobs (around 200 applicants were found to have criminal convictions).³⁸⁵

In February 2018, State launched the \$8 million Continuing Professional Development Support (CPDS) program. According to State, CPDS will respond to an urgent need by the Afghan government to train legal professionals on the newly revised penal code and build the organizational capacity of the nascent professional training departments of Afghan legal institutions.³⁸⁶ As of December 2018, CPDS reported that the Afghan government demonstrated increased interest in the professional training and development of the CPDS partner institutions by greatly increasing the budgets from training. The training departments of the AGO, Supreme Court, and Ministry of Justice all saw increased budgets, with an average of 544% among these three institutions. Also this quarter, CPDS said it is developing a curriculum on terrorist financing.³⁸⁷

In April 2016, USAID launched the \$68 million Assistance for the Development of Afghan Legal Access and Transparency (ADALAT) program. ADALAT aims to (1) increase the effectiveness and reach of the formal justice sector, (2) strengthen the linkages between the formal and traditional justice sectors, and (3) increase citizen demand for quality legal services.³⁸⁸

In August 2017, USAID awarded the Afghanistan's Measure for Accountability and Transparency (AMANAT) contract to support the Afghan government's efforts to reduce and prevent corruption in government public services.³⁸⁹

Afghan Correctional System

As of January 31, 2019, the General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Centers (GDPDC) incarcerated 31,262 males and 796 females, while the MOJ's Juvenile Rehabilitation Directorate (JRD) incarcerated 725 male and 17 female juveniles. These incarceration totals do not include detainees held by any other Afghan governmental organization, as State's Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) does not have access to their data.³⁹⁰

According to State, the major corrections-related accomplishments this quarter related to improved detection and reduction of contraband entering Afghan correctional facilities. The GDPDC, in collaboration with the State-funded Corrections System Support Program (CSSP), provided security

SIGAR AUDIT

As directed by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, SIGAR will submit an updated assessment of the Afghan government's implementation of its national anticorruption strategy to Congress this year that includes an examination of whether the Afghan government is making progress toward achieving its anticorruption objectives. The Afghan attorney general has recently provided information concerning their activities to implement this strategy that SIGAR staff is translating and reviewing as part of this assessment. SIGAR staff are seeking further input.

staff at the Pul-e Charkhi central prison technology, training, and mentoring to combat what State describes as the contraband security crisis. According to State, in January 2019, approximately 85 grams of heroin, 426 grams of hashish, and 19 tablets were confiscated by prison staff.³⁹¹

Anticorruption

When SIGAR asked DOJ this quarter for its current assessment of the Afghan government's political will to pursue major crimes and corruption cases, DOJ responded that they had "no opinion" on political will, but that recent events indicate an improved commitment to prosecute major crimes and corruption cases.³⁹² However, in its most recent report to State, covering the period October 2018 to December 2018, DOJ says that while the Afghan government has made some progress in its response to corruption, it has not demonstrated that it is serious about combating corruption.³⁹³ DOJ reported to State that the Afghan government needs to demonstrate real initiative to prosecute corrupt actors without having to be told to do so (presumably by international partners).³⁹⁴

One recurring high-profile corruption prosecution involves the former Minister of Communications and Information Technology, Abdul Razaq Wahidi. According to DOJ, Wahidi was suspended from his post on January 2, 2017, based on allegations of nepotism, overpayments, illegally contracted workers, embezzlement, and misappropriation of tax revenue. After being acquitted by the first-ever Special Court last quarter, DOJ says that Wahidi is now being prosecuted at the Anti-Corruption Justice Center (ACJC) for alleged offenses committed while he was deputy minister of finance.³⁹⁵

Attorney General's Office

When SIGAR asked DOJ for its current assessment of the Afghan government's capacity to effectively combat major crimes and public corruption with a focus on sustainable and independent Afghan operations, DOJ said that recent events indicate an improving capacity to bring major crime and public corruption cases.³⁹⁶ In its most recent report to State covering the period October 2018 to December 2018, DOJ said the Afghan government has made slow progress in becoming more effective in investigating and prosecuting corruption cases.³⁹⁷ According to DOJ, it appears that many of the obstacles to the ACJC effectiveness are not necessarily caused by AGO officials. Instead, DOJ believes other high-level Afghan officials and the failure of other Afghan ministries (such as MOI) to provide support has resulted in the failure to execute ACJC warrants.³⁹⁸

Anti-Corruption Justice Center

In May 2016, President Ghani announced the establishment of a specialized anticorruption court, the ACJC.³⁹⁹ At the ACJC, elements of the Major

Crimes Task Force (MCTF) investigators, AGO prosecutors, and judges work to combat serious corruption.⁴⁰⁰ The ACJC's jurisdiction covers major corruption cases committed in any province involving senior officials (up to the deputy minister), generals, and colonels or cases involving substantial monetary losses. Substantial losses are defined as a minimum of five million afghani—approximately \$73,000—in cases of bribes, money laundering, selling of historical or cultural relics, illegal mining, and appropriation of Afghan government property; or a minimum of 10 million afghani—approximately \$146,000—in cases of embezzlement.⁴⁰¹

This quarter, the ACJC held seven trials, prosecuting 41 corruption suspects and securing 35 convictions—an 85% conviction rate. CSTC-A said that while the number of trials was below expectations, it was an improvement over the quarterly average in 2018, making it one of the ACJC's most productive quarters to date.⁴⁰²

After months of international pressure, the AGO, reportedly for the first time, began publicizing the final Supreme Court decisions on ACJC corruption cases on the internet.⁴⁰³

According to CSTC-A, the most notable conviction this quarter was of Colonel Abdul Hamid, former chief of the General Command of Police Special Units (GCPSU), who was sentenced to seven years and six months in jail for treachery and forgery in connection with an \$80,000 fraud scheme. This case represented the first time a suspect arrested as a result of a CSTC-A-facilitated warrant-tracking initiative was tried and convicted.⁴⁰⁴

CSTC-A observed the ACJC making progress in working toward bringing INTERPOL into the warrant-tracking process. This is a critical step as half of the ACJC's unexecuted warrants are for international fugitives, CSTC-A says. CSTC-A is also working to have the GCPSU use their special-tactics skills to execute more domestic warrants.⁴⁰⁵

CSTC-A views the failure of the Afghan government to prosecute significant corrupt actors through the ACJC as the main long-term challenge to their countercorruption efforts.⁴⁰⁶ According to CSTC-A, the Afghan government has shown a lack of political will to investigate and prosecute high-level corruption cases through the ACJC. CSTC-A says its counterparts are generally willing to pursue low-level corruption cases but “act as if they are walking on proverbial egg-shells” with high-level corruption cases. These counterparts reportedly fear the personal and political repercussions of crossing the wrong high-level figure.⁴⁰⁷

Afghanistan Security Forces

According to CSTC-A, corruption remains pervasive throughout the Afghan security forces. This corruption harms the battlefield effectiveness of the Afghan security forces by diverting resources meant for fighting units and creating negative perceptions of the Afghan government, undermining the Afghan government's legitimacy and reconciliation efforts, CSTC-A says.⁴⁰⁸

GOVERNANCE

Last quarter, CSTC-A observed that security-related corruption is primarily associated with high-volume support, including food and rations, petroleum and oil, ammunition and weapons, and, to a lesser degree, payroll.⁴⁰⁹ CSTC-A reports that regional logistics centers are focal points of corruption where ammunition, uniforms, and other commodities are easily pilfered and sold.⁴¹⁰

This quarter, CSTC-A reported that it had assisted in the following countercorruption actions, a number of which related to logistics matters:⁴¹¹

- Removing a colonel from the 203rd Corps' logistics section
- Removing the commander (and subordinates) of the Regional Logistics Center in Nangarhar Province who were involved in the theft of fuel, ammunition, weapons and other commodities
- Disrupting a criminal scheme to steal spare parts in the 20th Division by removing an officer in the division's logistics section
- Assisting the MOD Criminal Investigation Directorate (CID) in its continuing investigation of fuel theft in the 209th Corps (reported last quarter), resulting in pending indictments against a brigadier general, two lieutenant colonels, a major, three captains, and four senior noncommissioned officers
- Ensuring increased oversight at the Kabul Military Training Center following an investigation of a lieutenant general

CSTC-A is currently working to reform the jurisdictional issues associated with corruption-related military crimes. At present, all corruption crimes are referred to the AGO, regardless of severity. According to CSTC-A, the AGO cannot effectively manage its current caseload. Military courts now have the jurisdiction and capacity to prosecute military offenders, and low-level crimes, in CSTC-A's view, should be retained by the military courts. MOD is presently working with the AGO to transfer responsibility for these prosecutions to the MOD. As of January 2019, the military has begun taking back lower-level cases and those committed by general officers that are unrelated to corruption.⁴¹²

Despite CSTC-A's advocating to have the MOD judicial system handle more criminal cases itself, the Supreme Court has challenged the authority of MOD courts. CSTC-A observed progress when, in August 2018, President Ghani issued a legislative decree that seeks to reestablish the jurisdiction of military courts. That decree, though, is subject to being reversed by the Afghan parliament within 90 days of the start of its session. Despite the decree, the Supreme Court has refused to confirm any new military judges. This, along with the implementation of the Inherent Law, has created a chronic shortage of military judges.⁴¹³ The implementation of the Inherent Law has resulted in the retirement more than 3,000 senior MOD and MOI leaders as of April 2018 based on time-in-service, the age of the individual, and performance in the present position.⁴¹⁴

In previous quarters, CSTC-A expressed its hope that implementation of the Inherent Law would help fight corruption. However, last quarter, CSTC-A acknowledged that it is not possible for CSTC-A to determine whether the majority of those retired to date were suspected of corruption.⁴¹⁵

A related CSTC-A-identified corruption-related challenge is the more than 6,000 outstanding warrants maintained by the AGO. The Afghan government agencies that are responsible for executing warrants are ineffective and largely unwilling to perform this task, CSTC-A said. Individuals awaiting trial and convicted felons remain free. According to CSTC-A, the MOD is working to create a warrant-enforcement squad that will serve warrants on military members. In December 2018, the MOD approved the transfer of 156 military police to the MOD CID. According to CSTC-A, these military police will provide prisoner and court security and assist the MOD CID to serve outstanding warrants.⁴¹⁶

CSTC-A said that the most significant near-term countercorruption challenge they face is the absence of a permanent minister of interior, as the previous minister resigned to run for vice president. This limits CSTC-A's ability to influence and pressure the minister to administratively remove, retire, reassign, or permanently eliminate known MOI corrupt actors and network leaders.⁴¹⁷ Further, CSTC-A says that lower-level MOI officials are hesitant to pursue certain corruption-related initiatives without senior leadership approval. The number of MOI leadership vacancies means that such approval is not forthcoming.⁴¹⁸

Security Ministry Inspectors General

CSTC-A provides training, advice, and assistance to the inspectors general for the MOD (MOD IG) and MOI (MOI IG). As with previous quarters, CSTC-A reported to SIGAR that it observed an increase in the quality and professionalism of the MOD IG and MOI IG inspections reports.⁴¹⁹ Also this quarter, CSTC-A reported to SIGAR that it is working with the MOI IG to review and update its internal assessments in order to comply with the ministry's reporting requirements established in December 2017.⁴²⁰

CSTC-A said the acting minister of interior recently decided to move the MOI IG's anticorruption unit to the MOI Criminal Investigative Directorate (MOI CID). Along with losing staff, CSTC-A said this decision caused the MOI IG to lose critical anticorruption capabilities to prepare and conduct the monthly meetings, collect asset declarations, and administer the ministerial internal control program.⁴²¹ Further, CSTC-A believes that the MOI IG will not be a truly independent organization until it reports directly to the interior minister and becomes its own budgetary unit.⁴²²

The MOD has also taken steps to establish a CID as the lead criminal investigative office for the ministry that will report directly to the minister. In October 2018, the minister of defense approved a plan that gave the MOD

CID the authority to investigate without approval of corps commanders and increased the size of the organization from 69 to 134 personnel. These plans await approval by President Ghani.⁴²³

The minister of defense also directed the merging of the MOD IG and the General Staff IG (GS IG). According to CSTC-A, this will increase the number of available investigators and inspectors and eliminates structural redundancies.⁴²⁴

Major Crimes Task Force in Flux

The Major Crimes Task Force (MCTF) is an elite MOI unit chartered to investigate corruption by senior government officials and organized criminal networks, and high-profile kidnappings committed throughout Afghanistan.⁴²⁵ This quarter, CSTC-A reported that the MCTF's internal political will and overall effectiveness faces significant challenges. Major leadership changes at MOI have disrupted the MOI at all levels, including the MCTF. According to CSTC-A, the MOI CID and MCTF are particularly affected as they require senior-level protection to carry out their tasks.⁴²⁶

CSTC-A observed significant progress in the MCTF's ability to discover and feed digital evidence into police intelligence. Further, CSTC-A said the MCTF is working to establish a framework for cybercrime capacity, which is a first for the organization and should enhance the MCTF's corruption-fighting abilities. CSTC-A does not have an estimate for when the MCTF will be fully proficient in this new capacity.⁴²⁷ CSTC-A observed an improved working relationship between the MCTF and the Financial Investigations Unit (FIU), which they hope will result in more referrals from FIU to the MCTF for investigation.⁴²⁸

Despite these improvements, CSTC-A believes that poor infrastructure (including poor internet and facilities and neglected vehicle maintenance) and political influence hinder the MCTF. CSTC-A cited the case of Major General Zemarai Paikan (the former chief of the Afghanistan National Civil Order Police, who was convicted in absentia of murder and abuse of power and sentenced to five years and two months confinement) as an example of how political influence undermines the work of the MCTF. According to CSTC-A, although the MCTF has sufficient information to support Paikan's capture, he has never been taken into custody. CSTC-A says that MOI leaders at both the MCTF and above have not provided CSTC-A with justification for why Paikan has not been apprehended. The fact that Paikan is living comfortably and unconcerned about his apprehension despite being sentenced for serious felonies sets a bad example for other Afghan government officials, CSTC-A says.⁴²⁹



Afghan refugees in Quetta, Pakistan, who live outside of the formal system of refugee camps. (UN photo)

REFUGEES AND INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT

Afghan Refugees

According to State, the Pakistan government extended the validity of Proof of Registration (POR) cards, which confer refugee status on 1.4 million Afghans, until June 30, 2019.⁴³⁰ On March 1, the State Bank of Pakistan issued a directive to banks and development-finance institutions allowing Afghan refugees to open up accounts by using the POR cards. According to State, this directive paves the way for Afghan refugees to avail themselves of banking services in Pakistan. Also on March 1, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) re-opened voluntary repatriation centers following the annual winter pause.⁴³¹

As of March 30, 2019, the UNHCR reported that 611 refugees have voluntarily returned to Afghanistan in 2019. The majority (312) of these refugee returns were from Iran.⁴³²

Undocumented Afghan Returnees

As of March 23, the International Organization of Migration (IOM) reported that 88,516 undocumented Afghans returned from Iran and 4,182 undocumented Afghans returned from Pakistan in 2019. So far, 92,698 undocumented Afghans have returned in 2019. For 2019, IOM is projecting over 570,000 returnees from Iran (due to Iran's ongoing economic challenges) and a minimum of 50,000 returns from Pakistan. Additionally, IOM says more than 1,000,000 Afghans may face deportation from Pakistan in 2019.⁴³³



A USAID Promote-supported intern prepares for the Afghan civil service. (USAID photo)

Conflict-Induced Internal Displacement

There has been less conflict-induced internal displacement this year than in 2018. According to the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), as of March 22, the conflicts of 2019 had induced 35,433 people to flee. The office recorded 85,817 persons in the same period last year.⁴³⁴

GENDER

In July 2013, then-USAID Administrator Rajiv Shah described the Promote partnership in a public speech as “the largest investment USAID has ever made to advance women in development.”⁴³⁵ According to USAID, Promote aims to strengthen women’s participation in civil society, boost female participation in the economy, increase the number of women in decision-making positions within the Afghan government, and help women gain business and management skills.⁴³⁶

USAID has committed \$280 million to Promote.⁴³⁷ Table 3.22 shows the current Promote programs.

As of December 31, 2018, USAID said that a total of 16,468 Promote beneficiaries have been hired. Of these, 1,407 have been employed by the Afghan government and 7,461 have secured permanent employment in the private sector. There are also 7,600 Promote beneficiaries holding internships in the private sector.⁴³⁸

According to USAID, all Promote-supported private-sector interns receive a stipend. These stipends are meant to cover the cost of commuting to and from work, phone credit top-ups to communicate with employer and program staff, and a meal when at the workplace. This quarter, Promote

GOVERNANCE

TABLE 3.22

USAID GENDER PROGRAMS				
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
Promote: Women in the Economy	7/1/2015	6/30/2019	\$71,571,543	\$44,433,202
Promote: Women's Leadership Development	9/23/2014	9/22/2019	41,959,377	38,300,520
Promote: Women in Government	4/21/2015	4/20/2020	37,997,644	30,261,403
Promote: Women's Rights Groups and Coalitions	9/2/2015	9/1/2020	29,534,401	17,834,450
Promote: Rolling Baseline and End-line Survey	2/21/2017	10/20/2020	7,577,638	4,310,379
Combating Human Trafficking in Afghanistan	1/11/2016	6/30/2019	7,098,717	6,142,999
Gender Based Violence (GBV)	7/9/2015	7/8/2020	6,667,272	6,667,272
Promote: Economic Empowerment of Women in Afghanistan	5/8/2015	5/7/2018	1,500,000	1,485,875
Countering Trafficking in Persons (CTIP) II - Empowerment and Advocacy to Prevent Trafficking	1/10/2018	1/9/2020	1,483,950	744,950
Promote: Scholarships	3/4/2015	3/3/2020	1,247,522	1,247,522

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.

decreased the stipends for future interns as it was recognized that the full-time salary later offered by employers is sometimes less than that of the internship stipend.⁴³⁹

Promote has benefited 58,124 women through leadership training, civil-service training and internships, civil-society advocacy work, and economic growth activities, USAID says.⁴⁴⁰

This quarter, USAID reported that Promote established the Women in Peace Process coalition and hosted the first national conference on women and the Peace Process aimed at establishing strategies to facilitate women's participation in the peace and reconciliation process.⁴⁴¹

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTENTS

Key Issues and Events	135
U.S. Support for Economic and Social Development: Theory, Objectives, and Funding	136
Economic Profile	138
Banking and Finance	143
Economic Growth	145
Agriculture	149
Essential Services and Development	150
Education	153
Health	156

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

KEY ISSUES AND EVENTS

Following a significant drought in 2018, severe floods affected more than 163,000 people in at least 14 of Afghanistan's 34 provinces this quarter, as of April 2, 2019, according to the United Nations.⁴⁴² Of those affected, more than 42,000 Afghans had been displaced.⁴⁴³ Speaking to the *Guardian*, the deputy governor of hard-hit Kandahar Province, where nearly 33,000 people had been affected, described the floods as “the worst in at least seven years.”⁴⁴⁴ The UN said 63 people had died as a result of the floods and that an additional 31 people had been injured, as of March 19, 2019.⁴⁴⁵ Droughts can contribute to flooding when precipitation begins again because droughts kill water-absorbing vegetation and dry out (and therefore compact) soil, limiting absorption during heavy rains.⁴⁴⁶

Displacement related to the flooding, combined with the lingering effects of the 2018 drought, high levels of violence, frigid winter temperatures, and general poverty led Toby Lanzer, UN Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General, to describe the level of suffering in Afghanistan as “as bad as [he’s] ever seen,” according to reporting from the *Guardian*.⁴⁴⁷ According to the USAID-funded Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), as of March 11, 2019, most Afghan households faced acute food insecurity—meaning they were likely to suffer from food consumption gaps leading to acute malnutrition or would be forced to deplete household assets to meet minimum needs.⁴⁴⁸

In addition to the factors identified by the UN, FEWS NET ascribed current levels of food insecurity to a weakening of the casual labor market and below-average remittances from Afghans living in Iran.⁴⁴⁹ Reimposed U.S. sanctions resulted in substantial depreciation of the Iranian rial and lower demand for labor in the informal sector, where Afghans in Iran generally work.⁴⁵⁰ Largely because of the effects of the sanctions, 773,125 Afghans returned to Afghanistan from Iran in 2018, according to the UN’s International Organization for Migration.⁴⁵¹

In September 2018, USAID contributed approximately \$44 million to the UN World Food Programme (WFP) to support the provision of critical food assistance to Afghans.⁴⁵² According to UN data, 78% of Afghanistan’s humanitarian assistance needs in 2018 were met by donors.⁴⁵³ So far, disaster assistance in 2019 has not kept pace. In early March 2019, UN

Deputy Special Representative Lanzer described donor contributions of approximately \$611.8 million toward UN-identified humanitarian assistance requirements for Afghanistan in 2019 as “shocking” because they were so low (3% of total requirements as of the end of February 2019).⁴⁵⁴ As of March 20, 2019, donor funding had reached only 10.6% (\$64.9 million) of total identified requirements.⁴⁵⁵

This quarter, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) released preliminary results of its latest macroeconomic appraisal of Afghanistan. The IMF said it had revised its estimate of 2018 growth in Afghan gross domestic product (GDP) from 2.3% to 2.7%.⁴⁵⁶ Estimated growth was higher due to stronger-than-expected performance from Afghanistan’s industrial sector, which compensated for the effects of the widespread drought on agricultural performance.⁴⁵⁷ The IMF assessed that growth in 2019 would improve to 3% as agricultural production recovered.⁴⁵⁸ According to the World Bank, the agricultural sector employs approximately 40% of Afghans overall and more than half of the rural labor force.⁴⁵⁹

In sharp contrast to the IMF’s estimates, updated World Bank estimates released this quarter had Afghanistan’s GDP growing by only 1.0% in 2018.⁴⁶⁰ Previously, the Bank had projected 2.4% growth for 2018.⁴⁶¹ While the factors accounting for the Bank’s downward revision were not immediately clear, it appeared that lower-than-expected agricultural output played a significant role.⁴⁶² The Bank added that heightened political uncertainty and election-related violence had lowered business confidence.⁴⁶³

SIGAR analysis showed that the Afghan government’s domestic revenues grew by approximately 12.9%, year-on-year, over the first three months of Fiscal Year (FY) 1398 (December 22, 2018–March 19, 2019), compared to the first three months of FY 1397 (December 22, 2017–March 20, 2018).⁴⁶⁴ Expenditures, meanwhile, increased by 32.1% year-on-year, over the first three months of FY 1398. While this is a large increase, average monthly expenditures over the first three months of FY 1398 were 46.1% less than average monthly expenditures over all 12 months of FY 1397, suggesting that expenditure increases may moderate as the year progresses.⁴⁶⁵

U.S. SUPPORT FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: THEORY, OBJECTIVES, AND FUNDING

Over the course of the U.S. reconstruction effort in Afghanistan, U.S. officials have viewed economic development as a necessary component of security. The U.S. government saw the development of a robust economy in Afghanistan as contributing positively to security by (1) providing gainful employment to the young, unemployed men who were considered most likely to join an insurgency; (2) creating confidence in and legitimacy for the state; and (3) generating revenue that would enable the state to deliver services and prevent dependency on donors.⁴⁶⁶

This quarter, SIGAR published its third *High-Risk List*. The purpose of the *High-Risk List* is to alert Members of Congress and the Secretaries of State and Defense to major areas of reconstruction at risk of waste, fraud, abuse, mismanagement, or mission failure. One reconstruction area deemed at risk by SIGAR was Afghanistan’s sluggish economic growth. For more, see pages 11–12 of this report.

The United States continues to emphasize the importance of economic development in its policy planning for Afghanistan. The U.S. government’s current Integrated Country Strategy (ICS) for Afghanistan states that U.S. efforts in Afghanistan—including the fundamental objective of preventing further attacks by terrorists on the U.S. homeland—cannot be sustained without a growing licit Afghan economy.⁴⁶⁷ The ICS further identifies clear risks posed by a lack of sustained economic growth and job creation—risks that include increased youth unemployment and poverty that could lead to extremism.⁴⁶⁸ One goal of the U.S. mission in Afghanistan, therefore, is to create economic prosperity in Afghanistan by advancing private-sector-led export growth and job creation, and by bolstering social gains in health, education, and women’s empowerment.⁴⁶⁹

This goal, as well as the aspiration of rendering the Afghan government more stable and accountable, links the ICS to USAID’s Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) for Afghanistan.⁴⁷⁰ The CDCS, which postulates that accelerating economic growth will help expand the Afghan government’s revenue base, contribute to stability, and create the conditions necessary for peace, defines how the agency plans to approach its development efforts in Afghanistan over the next five years.⁴⁷¹ Figure 3.44 shows USAID assistance by sector.


USAID articulated its strategic **Development Objectives (DOs)** for Afghanistan in the articles of a \$2.5 billion assistance agreement with the Afghan government signed on September 6, 2018. The agreement, which

Development Objectives (DOs): correspond to specific development challenges that a mission aims to address. A Country Development Cooperation Strategy cannot have more than four DOs. DOs are typically the most ambitious results to which a USAID Mission in a particular country (e.g., the USAID/Afghanistan Mission), in conjunction with its development partners, can contribute.

Source: USAID, *ADS Chapter 201: Program Cycle Operational Policy*, 5/24/2018, p. 29.

FIGURE 3.44

USAID DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE, CUMULATIVE DISBURSEMENTS, AS OF APRIL 6, 2019 (\$ MILLIONS)



Note: USAID Mission-managed funds. Numbers are rounded. USAID gender programs managed by the agency’s Office of Gender are presented as a separate category. Agriculture programs include Alternative Development. Infrastructure programs include power, roads, extractives, and other programs that build health and education facilities. OFM activities (e.g. audits and pre-award assessments) included under Program Support funds. In line with last quarter, additional OFM activities added due to increased data coverage. Discrepancies in the data provided by USAID between last quarter and this quarter for Stabilization and Program Support projects resulted in a drop in cumulative disbursements for these categories. This did not seem realistic. Therefore, SIGAR used the cumulative disbursement figures from last quarter for the Stabilization and Program Support categories. SIGAR will raise this issue with USAID prior to next quarter’s reporting cycle.

*Unpreferred funds are U.S. contributions to the ARTF that can be used for any ARTF-supported initiatives.

Source: SIGAR analysis of USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019; SIGAR analysis of World Bank, ARTF, *Administrator’s Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019*, 3/6/2019.

covers the agency's development efforts through December 31, 2023, states that USAID's development assistance is intended to:⁴⁷²

- accelerate private-sector-driven, export-led economic growth (DO 1)
- advance social gains in health, education, and gender equality (DO 2)
- increase the Afghan government's accountability to its citizens (DO 3)

It is unclear if these objectives are achievable, especially without a peace agreement. While the emphasis and intensity of specific policies and programs have changed over the past 17 years, the core belief and theory of change—that a growing economy contributes to stability and security—has remained constant.⁴⁷³ Yet, there is not universal agreement on the relationship between economic growth and security.⁴⁷⁴ SIGAR's own research suggests that security may be a prerequisite to sustained development.⁴⁷⁵

As of March 31, 2019, the U.S. government has provided approximately \$34.5 billion to support governance and economic and social development in Afghanistan since 2002. Most of these funds—nearly \$20.5 billion—were appropriated to USAID's Economic Support Fund (ESF). Of this amount, \$19.2 billion has been obligated and \$16.7 billion has been disbursed.⁴⁷⁶

ECONOMIC PROFILE

Donor plans articulated in the ICS and CDCS must grapple with the reality that building economic momentum will be difficult within the present context of increased political uncertainty, the lingering effects of an extreme drought for much of 2018, and declining business confidence, according to the World Bank.⁴⁷⁷ The IMF noted that as of December 2018, the midterm outlook for the Afghan economy faced “considerable downside risks” and that the near-term outlook had “weakened.”⁴⁷⁸

Even so, the IMF unexpectedly revised upward its 2018 GDP growth estimate to 2.7% due to stronger-than-expected performance from Afghanistan's industrial sector, which compensated for the effects of the drought on agricultural performance.⁴⁷⁹ Previously, the IMF had projected that Afghanistan's 2018 growth rate would be 2.3%.⁴⁸⁰

In sharp contrast to the IMF, but still in line with Afghanistan's recent low-growth trend, the Bank estimated that Afghanistan's GDP grew by only 1.0% in 2018.⁴⁸¹ Previously, the Bank had projected 2.4% growth for 2018.⁴⁸² While the reasons for the differing estimates (and the divergent revisions) were not immediately clear, the Bank appeared to have made the downward revision because of lower-than-expected agricultural output.⁴⁸³ According to the Bank, political uncertainty, which was degrading business confidence, had been heightened not only because of upcoming Afghan presidential elections scheduled for September 2019, but also because of ongoing peace talks between the U.S. and the Taliban.⁴⁸⁴

Opium and GDP Growth

Inclusive of the opium economy, GDP growth in Afghanistan can be higher or lower than that reported by the IMF and the World Bank. Reflecting the significant (approximately 90%) growth of opium production in 2017, Afghanistan's National Statistics and Information Authority reported that GDP growth inclusive of the opium economy in that year was 7.2%. Although final figures have not yet been published, opium will likely contribute far less to GDP growth in 2018, as high levels of supply and a widespread drought resulted in a significant decline in the amount of income earned by opium farmers.

Source: NSIA, *Afghanistan Statistical Yearbook 2017–2018*, 8/2018, p. 110; SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, pp. 150, 152; UNODC, *Afghanistan Opium Survey 2018: Cultivation and Production*, 11/2018, p. 5.

While both the Bank and the IMF anticipated that agricultural output would recover somewhat in 2019, the IMF said that even under its current projections, Afghanistan “would not make much progress in reducing poverty.”⁴⁸⁵ Neither the Bank’s nor the IMF’s analyses, however, account for the financial impacts of the opium economy to any significant extent.⁴⁸⁶

Although both donors and the Afghan government hope that licit growth will pick up gradually over the next several years, SIGAR’s 2018 lessons-learned report on private-sector development and economic growth found that optimistic longer-term expectations for the pace and level of progress did not always reflect the realities of the Afghan economy and the operating environment.⁴⁸⁷ Overall, many enduring barriers to growth remain, including limited skilled labor, a significant infrastructure deficit, corruption, and heavy reliance on foreign donor support.⁴⁸⁸

Fiscal Situation: Revenue Gains Remained Strong in Early 2019

Following a substantial budget shortfall in 2014 when international military expenditures in-country declined rapidly, the Afghan government’s revenue gains have been quite strong.⁴⁸⁹ The World Bank said Afghanistan’s 2018 revenue performance (AFN 189.7 billion, or approximately \$2.6 billion) represented a record high, reaching 14.2% of GDP according to SIGAR analysis.⁴⁹⁰

According to the Bank, recent revenue gains were attributable to improved customs enforcement and administration as well as new non-tax charges and fees, although revenue gains attributable to these factors were reaching diminishing returns.⁴⁹¹ The Bank expected revenues to stall in 2019, partly because these measures had reached exhaustion, and partly because of anticipated weakening in customs revenues due to diminished governance and political instability.⁴⁹²

SIGAR analysis showed that the Afghan government’s domestic revenue performance remained strong this quarter despite these concerns. Revenues grew by approximately 12.9%, year-on-year, over the first three months of Fiscal Year (FY) 1398 (December 22, 2018–March 19, 2019), compared to the first three months of FY 1397 (December 22, 2017–March 20, 2018).⁴⁹³

Ascertaining what revenue categories might have driven this increase was difficult this quarter because a large proportion (14.2%) of revenues over the first three months of FY 1398 were categorized as unspecified “Other Revenue” (also referred to as “Miscellaneous” revenue).⁴⁹⁴ According to MOF officials, the “Miscellaneous” category is sometimes used as a catch-all designation for uncategorized revenues prior to the MOF’s reconciliation.⁴⁹⁵ However, a 56.7% increase in income tax revenues and an 18.9% increase in revenues from the sale of goods and services appear to have contributed to the overall increase.⁴⁹⁶

TABLE 3.23

EXPENDITURES, FIRST THREE MONTHS, AFGHAN FISCAL YEARS 1397 AND 1398 COMPARED (IN AFGHANIS)			
Category	FY 1396	FY 1397	% Change
Wages and Salaries ^a	33,592,390,324	37,403,674,732	11.3%
Goods and Services ^b	3,361,042,150	7,776,365,575	131.4%
Subsidies, Grants, and Social Benefits ^c	1,438,338,383	929,497,905	(35.4%)
Acquisition of Assets ^d	657,513,061	5,574,659,282	747.8%
Interest and Repayment of Loans ^e	410,469,547	435,065,213	6.0%
Total	39,459,753,465	52,119,262,708	32.1%

Note:
^a Compensation of government employees.
^b Includes: (1) payments to private firms in return for goods and/or services, and (2) payments to other government units or agencies in return for services performed.
^c Includes: (1) expenditures made to entities in return for development assistance and promotional aid, or reimbursement for losses caused by equalization of commodity tariffs, price controls, and other similar purposes that are not repayable; (2) grants to other government units for which unequal value is provided in return; and (3) social assistance benefits not covered by social security.
^d Expenditures related to the purchase, improvement, or construction of assets.
^e Interest, principal payments, and fees related to government debt.

Source: SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 4/8/2019; SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 1/12/2019; Government of Afghanistan, MOF, *Chart of Account Guide Fiscal Year: 1397, Version 1, "Object Exp Long Des,"* 1/7/2018.

On-budget assistance: encompasses donor funds that are aligned with Afghan government plans, included in Afghan government budget documents, and included in the budget approved by the parliament and managed by the Afghan treasury system. On-budget assistance is primarily delivered either bilaterally from a donor to Afghan government entities, or through multidonor trust funds. (DOD prefers the term “direct contributions” when referring to Afghanistan Security Forces Fund monies executed via Afghan government contracts or Afghan spending on personnel.)

Off-budget assistance: encompasses donor funds that are excluded from the Afghan national budget and not managed through Afghan government systems.


Expenditures, meanwhile, increased by 32.1% year-on-year. While this is a large increase, average monthly expenditures over the first three months of FY 1398 were 46.1% less than average monthly expenditures over all 12 months of FY 1397, suggesting that expenditure increases may moderate as the year progresses. Higher expenditures at the beginning of FY 1398, compared to the beginning of FY 1397, may also portend a smoother spending pattern this year. The first two months of FY 1397 were marked by unusually low spending levels, which did not tick up to end-of-year average monthly expenditure thresholds until months 4–5. Thus far, spending increases have been driven primarily by increases in outlays for the acquisition of assets and the purchase of goods and services. An 11.3% increase to wage and salary expenditures was also a factor.⁴⁹⁷ Table 3.23 shows a comparison of expenditures for the first three months of FY 1398, compared to FY 1397.

Overall, Afghanistan’s fiscal situation remains fragile. According to IMF projections, the Afghan government’s domestic revenues (total revenues minus donor contributions) will continue to cover less than 50% of total Afghan government expenditures through 2023.⁴⁹⁸ SIGAR analysis of World Bank data shows that foreign grants currently finance more than 70% of combined Afghan government expenditures and **off-budget** security and development spending.⁴⁹⁹ Consequently, increasing the fiscal sustainability of the Afghan government remains a key development objective for the United States.⁵⁰⁰

Source: SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 7/30/2014, p. 130; Ministry of Finance, “Aid Management Policy for Transition and Beyond,” 12/10/2012, p. 8; State, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/14/2016; DOD, OSD-R, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2018.

FIGURE 3.45

AFGHANISTAN'S EXPORT PERFORMANCE, 2017-2018 (\$ MILLIONS)



Source: SIGAR analysis of NSIA quarterly and annual export data, 2017-2018, accessed 9/25/2018, 12/20/2018, and 3/23/2019.

Trade: Exports Rose by Nearly 12% from 2017-2018 but Air Exports have been Subsidized

Afghanistan maintains a large licit merchandise trade deficit, equivalent to more than 30% of GDP, according to the IMF.⁵⁰¹ Nonetheless, air exports have been growing at a rapid rate. According to USAID, the value of goods exported by air rose from nearly \$250 million in 2016 to over \$500 million in 2018—an increase of more than 100% over that two-year period.⁵⁰² Data provided to SIGAR by USAID this quarter showed that the value of air exports as a proportion of the total value of merchandise exports had increased to nearly 50% by the end of 2017.⁵⁰³

USAID has promoted its support to Afghanistan's recent surge in air exports: in January 2018, USAID said exports were “set to soar” as a result of that support.⁵⁰⁴ Despite this, the IMF said Afghanistan's trade deficit remained “very large,” noting that recent efforts to increase exports did not yet appear to have had a material effect.⁵⁰⁵ In fact, the IMF projected the trade deficit to rise substantially in 2018, from the equivalent of 31.2% of GDP to 39.7% of GDP.⁵⁰⁶

Potential Data Quality Issue

On its public website, USAID said the total value of Afghanistan's air exports in 2018 was more than \$500 million. However, when SIGAR asked USAID's Office of Economic Growth to provide disaggregated data on air exports, USAID reported that the value of air exports in 2018 was only \$152.2 million—more than \$347.8 million (or approximately 70%) less than its public reporting. The reasons for this discrepancy were insufficiently explained. SIGAR will continue to follow this matter.

Source: USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 9/21/2018; USAID, "Economic Growth: Afghanistan," 3/20/2019, <https://www.usaid.gov/afghanistan/economic-growth>, accessed 3/24/2019; USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.

Moreover, overall gains in Afghanistan's merchandise exports appear to be slowing. While SIGAR analysis of recent data from Afghanistan's National Statistics and Information Authority showed that overall export growth from 2017–2018 stood at 11.6%, quarter-to-quarter growth has slowed significantly, as Figure 3.45 on the previous page shows.⁵⁰⁷ The value of exports in quarter 4 of 2018 (\$294.1 million) was virtually unchanged from the value of exports in quarter 4 of 2017 (\$293.4 million), reflecting quarter-to-quarter, year-on-year growth of just 0.2%.⁵⁰⁸ The total value of merchandise exports in 2018 was \$875.2 million, while the total value of imports over the period was \$7.4 billion, putting Afghanistan's 2018 merchandise trade deficit at \$6.5 billion, nearly unchanged from 2017.⁵⁰⁹

Furthermore, Afghan, USAID, and State officials confirm that Afghanistan's air exports are currently receiving subsidies.⁵¹⁰ This quarter, USAID further clarified the magnitude of these subsidies. Relaying data from the Afghanistan Chamber of Commerce, USAID said that Afghan government subsidies covered 83% of shipment costs for flights to New Delhi, India; 80% of shipment costs for flights to Mumbai, India; and 70% of shipping costs for flights to Europe.⁵¹¹

Subsidies distort market dynamics. The World Trade Organization (of which Afghanistan is a member) prohibits export subsidies, subject to limited exceptions, because they provide an unfair competitive advantage to recipients. In particular, exceptions are made for specified developing countries.⁵¹²

It is not clear whether recent, seemingly encouraging merchandise export gains are sustainable given that subsidies cover the majority of what the Afghanistan Chamber of Commerce described as "shipment costs."⁵¹³ Despite a request from SIGAR, USAID has not fully explained the economics of the subsidies (which could clarify whether they exceed the profit margins of exporters and whether their net effect on Afghan income is positive, negative, or neutral).⁵¹⁴ While USAID claimed net gains to Afghan income as a result of the subsidies were 24% of the exported value of covered products, SIGAR has not independently verified this figure.⁵¹⁵ SIGAR will continue to look into this matter.

Afghanistan Sends First Round of Export Trade Through Chabahar Port

Although the United States reimposed sanctions on Iran, a waiver granted under the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (IFCA) provided an exemption for the development of the Chabahar Port in southeastern Iran, including the construction of an associated railway.⁵¹⁶ State said the purpose of the exemption was to facilitate reconstruction assistance to, and economic development for, Afghanistan.⁵¹⁷

On February 24, 2019, Afghanistan sent its first exports through Chabahar in a convoy of 23 trucks carrying 570 tons of dried fruit, textiles,

carpets, and mineral products, according to State.⁵¹⁸ State said that using the route from Zaranj (Nimroz Province), the departure point of the convoy, to Chabahar allows Afghan goods to reach India without crossing Pakistani territory.⁵¹⁹ Pakistan is regularly criticized by Afghan media and government officials for predatory economic practices, such as product dumping and nontariff barriers to trade.⁵²⁰

Even with the waiver for Chabahar and a separate exemption that allows Afghanistan to continue importing petroleum from Iran, reimposed sanctions may be having an overall negative effect on Afghanistan.⁵²¹ The sanctions resulted in substantial depreciation of the Iranian rial and lower demand for labor in the informal sector, where Afghans in Iran generally work.⁵²² Largely because of the effects of the sanctions, 773,125 Afghans returned to Afghanistan from Iran in 2018, according to the UN's International Organization for Migration, cutting remittances from Iran to Afghanistan to "almost zero" according to State.⁵²³ The loss of remittance incomes to families already stressed by a multi-year drought and heavy conflict, including some 250,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs) in western Afghanistan, will continue to provide significant challenges to those communities, according to State.⁵²⁴ State said the returnees include 4,005 unaccompanied Afghan children from Iran, many of whom faced severe sexual and physical abuse in detention centers before crossing the border.⁵²⁵ Most of these migrant children (98%) were forcibly deported from Iran, according to State.⁵²⁶

BANKING AND FINANCE

Afghanistan's modest financial sector consists of 12 banks—seven Afghan private banks, two branches of foreign banks, and three state-owned institutions.⁵²⁷ Arian Bank, a subsidiary of Iran's state-owned Bank Melli with a presence in Afghanistan, was recently subjected to U.S. sanctions as a result of the U.S. withdrawal from the Iran nuclear deal and is no longer listed as a licensed financial institution on the Afghan central bank's website.⁵²⁸ This quarter, Afghanistan's central bank also canceled the operating license of Habib Bank Ltd., a Pakistani financial institution with a presence in Afghanistan.⁵²⁹ While the precise reason for the cancellation was unclear, various Afghan news agencies reported that Habib had committed unspecified violations of Afghan law.⁵³⁰

Overall, Afghanistan's weak and underdeveloped banking sector constrains investment and growth, according to the World Bank.⁵³¹ The Bank said that, due to high levels of uncertainty affecting the business climate, credit to the private sector had declined by 4% in 2018 and was equal to just 3% of GDP.⁵³² Excess liquidity, the Bank added, had risen to 63% of total bank assets.⁵³³

The banking sector is also vulnerable to high levels of abuse from terrorist and criminal organizations. In a report released this quarter, State continued to list Afghanistan as a major money-laundering jurisdiction. State said that terrorist and insurgent financing, money laundering, bulk cash smuggling, abuse of informal value-transfer systems, and other illicit activities that finance criminal activity continue to threaten Afghanistan's security and development. State added that although the Afghan government has enacted laws and regulations to combat financial crimes, it faces significant challenges in implementing and enforcing them.⁵³⁴

Treasury Technical Assistance Remained Limited This Quarter

In March 2015, the U.S. Treasury's Office of Technical Assistance (OTA) signed an agreement with Afghanistan's MOF to develop and execute technical-assistance and capacity-building programs aimed at strengthening the government's public financial management. OTA also aims to help the government of Afghanistan provide better oversight of its financial sector. President Ghani requested that OTA renew its engagement with the Afghan government in 2014 to assist with budget reforms and other activities.⁵³⁵ OTA's current work in Afghanistan is funded through an interagency agreement with USAID that expires in September 2019.⁵³⁶

This quarter, OTA reported that travel to Kabul continued to be on hold due to security concerns.⁵³⁷ OTA said it provided limited assistance to the MOF during the reporting period.⁵³⁸ No assistance was provided to Afghanistan's central bank this quarter, but OTA said it was planning a series of training sessions for central bank officials that would be executed in 2019.⁵³⁹

Kabul Bank Theft: Progress on Cash and Asset Recoveries Inches Forward

Embezzlement and fraud by a handful of politically connected individuals and entities left Kabul Bank—a systemically important Afghan financial institution—at the brink of collapse in September 2010.⁵⁴⁰ The scam, which required an \$825 million bailout from the Afghan government (an amount equivalent to approximately 5–6% of the country's GDP at the time), was one of the largest banking catastrophes in the world, relative to GDP.⁵⁴¹

The scandal involved an elaborate fraud and money-laundering scheme orchestrated by Kabul Bank chief executive officer Khalilullah Ferozi, founder Sherkhan Farnood (who died in August 2018 while serving time in Bagram Prison), and other key shareholders and administrators. According to a report from the United States Institute of Peace (USIP), years later, the legacy of Kabul Bank remains a striking symbol of the extensive corruption and criminality that undermines the Afghan government's legitimacy.⁵⁴² Every quarter, SIGAR requests an update from relevant agencies on Kabul

Bank Receivership (KBR) efforts to recover funds stolen from the Kabul Bank. The KBR was established to manage Kabul Bank's bad assets.⁵⁴³

According to State, KBR continued to make progress in recovering sizeable amounts of cash and assets from Kabul Bank debtors this quarter.⁵⁴⁴ Specifically, State said that since it began demanding that the Afghan government make progress on Kabul Bank debt collections and seizures through the Afghanistan Compact in June 2018, approximately \$10.3 million in cash or liquidated assets had been transferred to Afghan courts.⁵⁴⁵ The Afghanistan Compact is an initiative designed to demonstrate the Afghan government's commitment to reforms.⁵⁴⁶ State added that an additional \$10 million in property was making its way through Afghan courts for forfeiture, and that, separately, a large cache of gems possessed by Farnood's family, with a potential multi-million-dollar value, had been seized for forfeiture and auction.⁵⁴⁷

Nevertheless, total cash recoveries, as reported by the KBR, were \$265.92 million, as of March 20, 2019.⁵⁴⁸ This figure was just \$5.62 million more than total cash recoveries reported by the KBR on June 10, 2018.⁵⁴⁹ From January 6, 2019, to March 20, 2019, cash recoveries increased by \$2.02 million.⁵⁵⁰

State added that \$48.69 million in penalties were reimposed against Ferozi, reducing the total amount of waived interest to \$63.42 million (because interest payments previously waived are now being demanded), and raising the total amount of outstanding debt.⁵⁵¹ Mostly driven by this action, the KBR's figure for total recoveries fell by nearly \$50 million to \$401.9 million, which amounted to just 40.7% of \$987 million in total possible recoveries.⁵⁵²

ECONOMIC GROWTH

USAID's objective to accelerate private-sector-driven, export-led growth means that the agency's Office of Economic Growth (OEG) will play an important role in the agency's Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS).⁵⁵³ Within the context of the new strategy, OEG's efforts seek to:⁵⁵⁴

- strengthen trade connections between Afghanistan and its neighbors
- increase firm-level competitiveness by supporting export-ready Afghan businesses
- raise employment levels through that firm-level support and by creating a more favorable enabling environment for businesses

It will be difficult for USAID to achieve its goal of accelerating Afghanistan's economic growth rate amid heightened uncertainty and ongoing conflict. USAID has cumulatively disbursed over \$1.2 billion for economic-growth programs in Afghanistan.⁵⁵⁵ USAID's active economic-growth programs have a total estimated cost of \$114 million and can be found in Table 3.24 on the following page.

TABLE 3.24

USAID ACTIVE ECONOMIC-GROWTH PROGRAMS				
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
Multi-dimensional Legal Economic Reform Assistance (MELRA)	2/7/2018	2/6/2023	\$19,990,260	\$0
Extractive Technical Assistance by USGS	1/1/2018	12/31/2022	18,226,206	2,246,298
Afghanistan Investment Climate Reform Program	3/27/2015	3/26/2020	13,300,000	5,892,783
Commercial Law Development Program	3/1/2014	9/30/2019	13,000,000	9,819,364
Carpet and Jewelry Value Chains	2/1/2019	3/31/2023	9,941,606	0
Goldozi Project	4/5/2018	4/4/2022	9,718,763	1,158,551
Livelihood Advancement for Marginalized Population (LAMP)	8/1/2018	7/31/2022	9,491,153	170,750
Establishing Kabul Carpet Export Center (KCEC)	6/6/2018	6/5/2021	9,416,507	2,373,000
Trade Show Support (TSS) Activity	6/7/2018	12/6/2020	3,999,174	2,249,850
Development Credit Authority (DCA) with Ghazanfar Bank	Not provided	Not provided	2,163,000	0
Afghanistan International Bank Guarantee Agreement	9/27/2012	9/27/2020	2,000,000	520,800
Development Credit Authority (DCA) with FINCA, OXUS, and First Microfinance Banks	9/25/2014	9/24/2020	1,958,000	0
Afghanistan Loan Portfolio Guarantee	9/27/2017	9/26/2023	665,820	732
Total			\$113,870,489	\$24,432,128

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.

Natural Resources Remain Relatively Untapped

According to the World Bank, Afghanistan’s medium-term economic growth will depend in part on the realization of Afghanistan’s extractives industry potential.⁵⁵⁶ President Ghani has said, “The economic development and prosperity of Afghanistan depends on its mining sector, which will enable Afghanistan to pay its military expenditure and achieve self-reliance.”⁵⁵⁷ According to U.S. government estimates, Afghanistan has more than \$1 trillion in untapped extractive reserves that could generate more than \$2 billion in annual revenues for the Afghan government.⁵⁵⁸

Over the last several quarters, the Afghan government has attempted to move forward on tendering and approving mining projects. In the fall of 2018, the Afghan government signed three major contracts that had previously been stalled. These contracts included two copper mines—one in Herat Province and the other in Balkh and Sar-e Pul Provinces—and one gold mine in Badakhshan Province.⁵⁵⁹ This quarter, according to reporting from Reuters, Acting Minister of Mines and Petroleum Nargis Nehan announced 43 tenders for natural resource projects during a visit to Dubai. Nehan said the projects had generated interest from U.S., European, and

Persian Gulf companies. Further details regarding claimed investor interest were not provided.⁵⁶⁰

But despite much hope about the promises of mineral riches, mining currently constitutes only a small share of Afghan economic activity.⁵⁶¹ SIGAR analysis of Afghanistan National Statistics and Information Authority data shows that, in 2017, mining contributed only 0.97% of added value to the country's licit GDP. Including the opium economy, value added from the mining sector was even lower: 0.92% of GDP.⁵⁶²

In contrast to licit mining, illegal mining—broadly defined—has flourished in Afghanistan. Most mineral extraction in the country is either illicit or unregulated, according to a USIP report. While some local communities have operated for decades under informal agreements brokered before the current regulatory regime took effect, the Taliban and various criminal networks control other sites.⁵⁶³ State said that, according to Afghan mining experts, Afghan raw minerals are exported almost entirely to Pakistan through informal channels, with no chain of custody for tax revenue collection.⁵⁶⁴

Bilateral U.S. Support to Afghanistan's Extractives Sector Likely to Remain Minimal Through 2023

U.S. interest in developing Afghanistan's extractives sector appeared to reemerge following President Donald J. Trump's August 2017 announcement of a new South Asia strategy.⁵⁶⁵ In September 2017, President Trump met with Afghan President Ashraf Ghani on the sidelines of the United Nations General Assembly in New York, where they discussed, among other topics, how American companies could rapidly develop Afghanistan's rare-earth minerals to lower the costs of U.S. assistance and render Afghanistan more self-reliant.⁵⁶⁶

Still, U.S. programming to develop the extractives sector remains relatively minimal. USAID has interagency agreements with the Department of Commerce to provide legal assistance to the sector (among other business-enabling activities that are not specific to extractives).⁵⁶⁷ USAID has a separate interagency agreement with the United States Geological Survey (USGS) to provide technical advisory services.⁵⁶⁸ These represent the only current U.S.-led initiatives to develop the natural resources industry.⁵⁶⁹

USAID's Office of Economic Growth, which manages the agency's current extractives sector assistance to Afghanistan, said the current projects involving CLDP and USGS are the only U.S. government projects likely to be implemented in the extractives sector over the implementation period of the CDCS, which covers USAID's development efforts in Afghanistan through 2023.⁵⁷⁰ State said it was unaware of any plans emanating from the Administration to develop Afghanistan's extractives sector, despite reported interest when President Trump took office.⁵⁷¹

Taliban Mining Revenues

While the Taliban are believed to derive revenues from illegal mining, reliable data on the extent of that revenue is difficult to obtain. According to one USIP report, extractives represent the second-largest revenue stream after narcotics, with approximately \$200–300 million in illegal mining revenues flowing to the group annually. However, State said its sources indicate that Taliban mining activities comprise a relatively small proportion of the total informal mining sector. According to State's sources, total Taliban revenues from illegal mining were just \$21 million (though it was unclear whether this figure was intended to include revenue from taxation). Thus, the range of possible Taliban revenues from illegal mining is quite wide.

Source: State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019; USIP, *Illegal Mining in Afghanistan: A Driver of Conflict*, 7/2017, pp. 1–2; State, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/9/2019.

In October 2018, two large mining contracts were indirectly awarded to a company—Centar Ltd.—that State believes reincorporated as a U.S. firm in Delaware just prior to signing the contracts.⁵⁷² One concession is for the Balkhab copper mine in Sar-e Pul and Balkh Provinces, and the other for a gold mine in Badakhshan.⁵⁷³ State said it is not aware of which investors hold precisely what percentage in either contract.⁵⁷⁴ According to contract documents, a company named Centar Ltd., based in Guernsey in the Channel Islands of the UK, owns 24.5% of the Badakhshan concession and 49.9% of the Balkhab project.⁵⁷⁵ Therefore, while at least one company executive and other Centar Ltd. representatives are American, according to State, it is not clear that Centar Ltd. is itself a U.S.-based firm.⁵⁷⁶

2018 Mining Law is in Force

SIGAR reported last quarter that there was some confusion whether Afghanistan's 2018 mining law was in effect. The Departments of State and Commerce reported this quarter that Afghanistan's 2018 mining law, which supersedes a 2014 law, was in force.⁵⁷⁷ The Afghan government is currently drafting new regulations, with input from donors, to support implementation of the new law.⁵⁷⁸

According to a September 2018 statement from Global Witness, a nongovernmental organization that aims to expose corruption and human-rights abuses, Afghan civil society organizations (CSOs) had reacted positively to some parts of a draft version of the law, including a transparency provision requiring that contracts be published before becoming valid.⁵⁷⁹ However, some concerns remained. For example, the draft law granted significant authority to presidentially appointed bodies, minimizing the role of Afghanistan's Ministry of Mines and Petroleum (MOMP), according to the CSOs.⁵⁸⁰ Additionally, CSOs said, the draft version of the law did not require publishing Afghan government sub-accounts used for mining revenues, which would make it more difficult to determine whether mining companies were paying required royalty fees.⁵⁸¹ There is also some concern among donors that royalty rates, which are fixed in the law, could render certain projects uneconomical (and therefore not investment-worthy).⁵⁸²

The Afghan government said the new law more clearly defined roles and responsibilities within MOMP departments and generally contained greater transparency and anticorruption provisions than the earlier statute.⁵⁸³ SIGAR has not independently assessed the 2018 mining law and does not currently have an official English translation of its final version.⁵⁸⁴ SIGAR will continue to report on the implications of the new law.

TABLE 3.25

USAID ACTIVE AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS				
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
Strengthening Watershed and Irrigation Management (SWIM)	12/7/2016	12/6/2021	\$87,905,437	\$15,046,901
Regional Agriculture Development Program (RADP North)	5/21/2014	5/20/2019	78,429,714	64,490,651
Commercial Horticulture and Agriculture Marketing Program (CHAMP)	2/1/2010	12/31/2019	71,292,850	61,532,955
Afghan Value Chains-Livestock Activity	6/9/2018	6/8/2021	55,672,170	4,233,421
Afghanistan Value Chains-High Value Crops	8/2/2018	8/1/2023	54,958,860	2,300,878
RADP East (Regional Agriculture Development Program-East)	7/21/2016	7/20/2021	28,126,111	11,726,049
Grain Research and Innovation (GRAIN)	3/13/2017	9/30/2022	19,500,000	8,380,990
Promoting Value Chain-West	9/20/2017	9/19/2020	19,000,000	8,000,000
ACE II (Agriculture Credit Enhancement II)	6/23/2015	6/30/2019	18,234,849	17,041,341
Catalyzing Afghan Agricultural Innovation	5/28/2018	5/27/2023	8,000,000	967,508
SERVIR	9/14/2015	9/30/2020	3,100,000	1,558,556
Total			\$444,219,991	\$195,279,249

Note: Some of the USAID programs listed receive both Alternative Development and Agriculture Development funds. For more information on Alternative Development programs, see pages 170–177 of this report.

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.

AGRICULTURE

The agricultural sector employs more than half of the rural labor force and approximately 40% of Afghans overall, according to the World Bank. Historically, agriculture has made substantial contributions to Afghanistan’s licit economic growth, although the sector’s share of the overall economy has declined since the 2001 intervention in Afghanistan due to growth in Afghanistan’s service sector.⁵⁸⁵

In addition to licit agricultural activity, which donors support, illicit opium-poppy cultivation thrives in Afghanistan.⁵⁸⁶ According to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, in 2017, the value of opiates potentially available for export was the equivalent of 20–32% of Afghanistan’s licit GDP.⁵⁸⁷

Since 2002, USAID has disbursed more than \$2.2 billion to improve agricultural production, increase access to markets, and develop income alternatives to growing poppy for opium production.⁵⁸⁸ Pages 170–177 of this quarterly report discuss USAID’s agriculture alternative-development programs. USAID’s active agriculture programs have a total estimated cost of \$444 million and can be found in Table 3.25.



Flash floods struck large swathes of Afghanistan in early March 2019. A second wave of flooding hit later that month. (U.S. Embassy Kabul photo)

In a February 13, 2019, press briefing, Toby Lanzer, the UN Secretary-General's Deputy Special Representative for Afghanistan, in response to a question about Taliban taxation of NGOs, said importing humanitarian aid into Afghanistan was sometimes a challenge for NGOs. While Lanzer provided no specifics, he said aid agencies "sometimes struggle with the authorities on either side of any dividing line." Lanzer added the UN was "having a conversation about this with everyone to make all officials aware and all people in position of influence aware."

Source: UN, "Press briefing by DSRSG Toby Lanzer in Kabul," 2/14/2019.

Floods Follow Drought, Contributing to High Levels of Food Insecurity

Severe floods affected at least 14 of Afghanistan's 34 provinces this quarter. According to the United Nations (UN), the floods had affected more than 163,000 people as of April 2, 2019, with more than 42,000 displaced.⁵⁸⁹ Speaking to *Guardian*, the Deputy Governor of hard-hit Kandahar Province, where nearly 33,000 people had been affected, described the floods as "the worst in at least seven years."⁵⁹⁰ The UN said 63 people had died as a result of the floods and that an additional 31 people had been injured, as of March 19, 2019.⁵⁹¹

The floods follow a severe drought in 2018 that affected the majority of Afghan provinces, with precipitation 70% below Afghanistan's long-term rainfall average.⁵⁹² Droughts can lead to flooding when precipitation begins again because they kill water-absorbing vegetation and dry out (and therefore compact) soil, limiting absorption during heavy rains.⁵⁹³

The drought decreased winter food supplies in many locations, thereby increasing the urgency of assisting displaced and returned populations, according to State.⁵⁹⁴ According to the USAID-funded Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), as of March 11, 2019, most Afghan households faced acute food insecurity—meaning they were likely to suffer from food-consumption gaps leading to acute malnutrition or would be forced to deplete assets to meet minimum needs.⁵⁹⁵

Some households had resorted to selling children or forcing them into childhood marriages in order to survive, according to State.⁵⁹⁶ Flood-related displacement, combined with the lingering effects of the drought, high levels of violence, frigid winter temperatures, and general poverty led UN Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General Toby Lanzer to describe the level of suffering in Afghanistan as "as bad as [he's] ever seen," according to reporting from the *Guardian*.⁵⁹⁷ In September 2018, USAID contributed approximately \$44 million to the UN World Food Programme (WFP) to support the provision of critical food assistance to Afghans.⁵⁹⁸ However, as of March 20, 2019, donor funding had reached just 10.6% (\$64.9 million) of total UN-identified humanitarian relief requirements.⁵⁹⁹ According to UN data, 78% of Afghanistan's humanitarian assistance needs were met by donors in 2018.⁶⁰⁰

ESSENTIAL SERVICES AND DEVELOPMENT

The United States has provided reconstruction funds to increase the electricity supply, build roads and bridges, and construct and improve health and education facilities in Afghanistan since 2002.⁶⁰¹ This section addresses key developments in U.S. efforts to improve the government's ability to deliver these essential services, focusing specifically on ongoing projects intended to increase access to electricity in Afghanistan.

Power Supply: Lack of Access to Electricity Remains a Key Challenge

Approximately 30% of Afghans had access to grid-based electricity, as of August 2017, according to USAID. USAID said the proliferation of distributed solar systems (systems that provide energy at or near where it will be used) means that significantly more than 30% of Afghans have access to electricity today. However, the agency added that these systems lack the capacity and availability required to be the primary source of power for commercial enterprises.⁶⁰²

The World Bank said that lack of access constitutes a crucial barrier to progress on a wide range of development indicators, including poverty reduction, health, education, food security, and livelihoods.⁶⁰³ Overall, many enduring challenges in the power sector remain, according to USAID. Those challenges include Afghanistan's near-complete (80%) dependence on electricity imports, weak sector governance, a poorly functioning national utility, insufficient supply to meet growing demand, and insufficient transmission and distribution networks.⁶⁰⁴

Insecurity can also present obstacles to implementing power-infrastructure projects. In an interview conducted by SIGAR in Kabul last quarter, USAID Office of Infrastructure (OI) officials stated that once power-infrastructure has been constructed, the Taliban rarely attack it directly; damage is more often a result of crossfire.⁶⁰⁵ According to The Asia Foundation's 2018 *Survey of the Afghan People* released last quarter, perceptions of access to electricity appear to have improved slightly from last year, with 16.4% of respondents to the 2018 survey stating that their electricity supply had improved, relative to the previous year.⁶⁰⁶ In contrast, only 12.2% of respondents to the Foundation's 2017 survey said their electricity supply had improved relative to the prior year.⁶⁰⁷ Still, 20.1% of respondents cited access to electricity as the biggest problem in their local area.⁶⁰⁸

U.S. Power-Sector Assistance: Priority on Expanding the National Power Grid

The majority of the U.S. government's current work in the Afghan power sector consists of large-scale infrastructure projects. A top priority has been expanding and connecting islanded power grids. Both USAID and DOD have been working to connect Afghanistan's Northeast Power System (NEPS) with its southeastern counterpart, the Southeast Power System (SEPS).⁶⁰⁹ USAID is funding the construction of a 470-kilometer transmission line that, when complete, will connect the two networks.⁶¹⁰ USAID is also expanding the SEPS network.⁶¹¹

For its part, DOD has funded projects intended to expand and improve SEPS, as well as a significant expansion of NEPS. DOD also funded a "bridging solution" for power in Kandahar City that concluded in September 2015. The bridging solution provided power to key industrial parks to buy

SIGAR SPECIAL PROJECT

In March 2019, SIGAR released the results of site visits to verify the locations and conditions of eight DOD-funded bridge projects in Ghazni Province. The eight bridges were constructed or rehabilitated using funds from the Commander's Emergency Response Program between 2009 and 2012. SIGAR found that the location information maintained in DOD systems was accurate; all eight bridges were within one kilometer of their recorded coordinates. SIGAR also found that all eight bridges were open, in good condition, and that local community members regarded them as being very useful to the local communities.

In addition to power-infrastructure projects funded by AIF, DOD is connecting Afghan National Defense and Security Force bases to regional electricity networks. These projects are funded through the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund. For a list of current projects, see pp. 92 and 102 of this report.

TABLE 3.26

USAID ACTIVE POWER-INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS				
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
Contributions to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Trust Fund (AIF)	3/7/2013	3/6/2023	\$153,670,184	\$153,670,184
Engineering Support Program	7/23/2016	7/22/2019	125,000,000	59,502,138
Kandahar Solar Project	2/23/2017	8/25/2019	10,000,000	1,000,000
Design and Acquisition of SEPS Completion and NEPS-SEPS Connector	3/7/2018	6/27/2022	20,151,240	991,145
Power Sector Governance and Management Assessment	1/12/2019	3/2/2019	567,330	567,330
Total			\$309,388,754	\$215,730,797

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.

According to USAID, when power-infrastructure projects are completed, they provide nearly immediate benefits to local populations. In an interview in Kabul last quarter, USAID officials told SIGAR that its construction of substations and transmission lines from Arghandi to Ghazni (the first segment of the USAID's NEPS-SEPS Connector) had resulted in increased access to electricity for Afghans in Ghazni City and Sayyidabad (located in Ghazni and Wardak Provinces, respectively). According to data provided to USAID by DABS, the project had resulted in 1,500 new connections in Sayyidabad and 2,600 new connections in Ghazni.

Source: SIGAR, interview with USAID/OIG officials, 11/8/2018.

time for other infrastructure to be built.⁶¹² However, much of that additional infrastructure was either completed well after the bridging solution ended, or is still under construction.⁶¹³

DOD and USAID's power-infrastructure projects are funded through the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF), with monies appropriated by Congress in Fiscal Years (FYs) 2011–2014. USAID is also using the Economic Support Fund to cover some project costs.⁶¹⁴ No additional AIF monies have been appropriated since FY 2014.⁶¹⁵ However, up to \$50 million of Title IX Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funds appropriated in later acts may be used to complete these projects.⁶¹⁶

DOD Power-Infrastructure Projects are Nearly Complete; Major USAID Projects Remain Ongoing; Implementation Risks Remain

The majority of DOD's AIF power-infrastructure projects are complete. Two remain. The first is a two-part project to construct substations and a transmission line from Sangin to Lashkar Gah in Afghanistan's restive Helmand Province (this component of the project remains ongoing) and to improve three substations in SEPS (this component of the project is now complete). The second ongoing project will construct transmission lines from Paktiya Province to Khost Province. Approximately \$187.4 million has been obligated for those two projects, of which \$166.1 million has been disbursed. In total, \$601.0 million has been obligated for DOD's AIF-funded power infrastructure projects (including \$141.7 million for the aforementioned Kandahar Power Bridging Solution project), with \$572.1 million disbursed.⁶¹⁷

Cumulatively, USAID has disbursed more than \$1.5 billion in Economic Support Funds since 2002 to build power plants, substations, and transmission lines, and to provide technical assistance in the power sector.⁶¹⁸ The

agency's active power-infrastructure programs have a total estimated cost of more than \$309 million and are listed in Table 3.26.

Both DOD and USAID power-infrastructure projects have faced substantial delays over the years, raising questions about whether they will fully achieve their intended economic-development effects.⁶¹⁹

USAID said its current set of power-infrastructure projects would be complete by late 2022.⁶²⁰ Completion delays for the agency's power-infrastructure projects may continue: in a biweekly report submitted on March 6, 2019, USAID quality-assurance contractor Tetra Tech warned that Afghanistan's national utility, Da Afghanistan Breshna Sherket (DABS), had not yet compensated persons affected by the project's land-acquisition resettlement plan for USAID-funded NEPS-SEPS connector transmission lines.⁶²¹ Consequently, those persons had stopped construction activities at 88 project locations, as of March 6, 2019. Tetra Tech said this development would affect the project completion date.⁶²² In response to a draft of this report, USAID said the number of construction locations affected by the project's land-acquisition resettlement plan had dropped from 88 to 59, as of April 11, 2019.⁶²³ Tetra Tech also noted numerous instances of contract non-conformance on the part of the contractor, KEC International Limited, that may indicate substandard construction quality at some work sites along the planned transmission lines.⁶²⁴

Tetra Tech said that, as of March 3, 2019, project sites for USAID's NEPS-SEPS Connector had a total of 92 open construction deficiencies.⁶²⁵ According to USAID, 5% of the total contract value is withheld from the contractor until all deficiencies noted in the final inspection are resolved.⁶²⁶

EDUCATION

Prior to the U.S.-led military intervention of 2001, Afghanistan's education system had been decimated by several decades of conflict. In the years since, donors have generally highlighted Afghanistan's progress in the education sector as a significant success story.⁶²⁷ However, given poor data quality, it is difficult to ascertain the extent of that success. Figures for the number of children and youth in school vary widely.⁶²⁸ Afghanistan's Ministry of Education (MOE) counts students who have been absent for up to three years as enrolled because, it says, they might return to school, limiting the usefulness of government data to determine attendance rates.⁶²⁹

It is clear that many Afghan children and youth do not attend school, either because they drop out or because they never enroll at all.⁶³⁰ According to a comprehensive survey conducted by Afghanistan's statistical authority in 2016 and 2017, the number of out-of-school children ages 7–18 was more than 4.2 million, of whom nearly 2.6 million were girls.⁶³¹ Moreover, attendance rates appear to have stagnated in recent years. Commenting on the failure to raise attendance rates of primary-school

Education and the Taliban

The Taliban periodically disrupt the education system in Afghanistan. However, unverified reports paint a more complicated portrait of negotiation and compromise between the Afghan government and its adversary. For example, according to the Afghanistan Analysts Network (AAN), schools continue to operate in areas under Taliban control in Dasht-e Archi district, Kunduz Province. In most of the district, a Taliban education committee controls the schools. The committee reportedly interferes in curricula by insisting on additional religious teaching and exerts influence over school staffing. A dispute between the government and the Taliban over teacher salaries was mediated by local elders, according to AAN's research.

Source: Pajhwok Afghan News, "Taliban shut 39 schools in Logar," 7/7/2018; UN, *The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security*, report of the Secretary-General, 9/10/2018, p. 8; Afghanistan Analysts Network, "One Land, Two Rules (3): Delivering public services in insurgency-affected Dasht-e Archi district in Kunduz province," 2/26/2019.

TABLE 3.27

USAID ACTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS				
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
Afghanistan University Support and Workforce Development Program	1/1/2014	9/30/2019	\$93,158,698	\$86,687,630
Increasing Access to Basic Education and Gender Equality	9/17/2014	12/31/2019	77,402,457	77,402,457
Textbook Printing and Distribution II	9/15/2017	12/31/2019	75,000,000	0
Afghan Children Read (ACR)	4/4/2016	4/3/2021	69,547,810	29,899,949
Support to the American University of Afghanistan (AUAF)	8/1/2013	11/29/2019	72,181,844	61,858,575
Strengthening Education in Afghanistan (SEA II)	5/19/2014	9/30/2020	44,835,920	32,835,808
Let Girls Learn Initiative and Girls' Education Challenge Programme (GEC)	6/29/2016	6/28/2021	25,000,000	15,000,000
Capacity Building Activity at the Ministry of Education	2/1/2017	1/31/2022	23,212,618	10,073,392
Afghanistan's Global Partnership for Education	10/11/2012	6/30/2019	15,785,770	14,235,078
Financial and Business Management Activity with AUAF	7/5/2017	6/4/2019	4,384,058	2,290,957
PROMOTE Scholarships PAPA	3/4/2015	3/3/2020	1,247,522	1,247,522
Total			\$501,756,697	\$331,531,367

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.

age children between surveys conducted in 2011–2012 and 2016–2017, Afghanistan's statistical authority said, "This is a remarkable finding, given the continuous efforts to expand primary education facilities across the country."⁶³²

Numerous challenges plague the education sector. They include insecurity, shortages of school buildings and textbooks, rural access issues, poor data reliability, and the alleged appointment of teachers on the basis of cronyism and bribery.⁶³³ While they have improved since 2001, educational prospects for girls in particular remain low.⁶³⁴

USAID, which aims to improve access to and quality of education in Afghanistan, as well as build capacity at the MOE, has disbursed nearly \$1.1 billion for education programs in Afghanistan, as of April 6, 2019.⁶³⁵ USAID's active education programs have a total estimated cost of \$502 million as shown in Table 3.27.

New World Bank Education Project Moving Forward, but Experiencing Some Friction

The World Bank's \$298 million Education Quality Reform in Afghanistan (EQRA) project aims to increase access to primary and secondary education, especially for girls, in provinces where attendance and enrollment indicators are lagging behind. Another objective of the project is to improve learning conditions in Afghanistan.⁶³⁶ According to the Bank, EQRA is

designed to build on its predecessors, the First and Second Educational Quality Improvement Programs (EQUIP I and EQUIP II).⁶³⁷

EQRA is financed by a \$100 million grant from the World Bank's International Development Association (which provides grants and zero- or low-interest loans to help develop low-income countries), a \$100 million grant from the Global Partnership for Education (GPE, a multistakeholder organization that assists developing countries implement their education strategies), and a \$100 million contribution from the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF).⁶³⁸ The grant from GPE includes \$2 million to cover administrative costs borne by the World Bank throughout project implementation (hence, the Bank lists the total project cost as \$298 million rather than \$300 million).⁶³⁹ EQRA, which was approved in September 2018, will be implemented through December 2023.⁶⁴⁰ The U.S. has disbursed approximately \$21.1 million to the ARTF to support EQRA.⁶⁴¹ Since October 2012, the U.S. has disbursed approximately \$12.9 million to GPE to support education in Afghanistan.⁶⁴²

This quarter, SIGAR received a report describing the results of the Bank's first implementation support mission for EQRA. The purpose of the mission was to review implementation progress and provide technical support.⁶⁴³ Bank officials noted there had been "concrete progress" on EQRA implementation. That progress included the signing of a memorandum of understanding between the MOE and the Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD) that delineated their respective responsibilities to further the planned construction of nearly 1,950 new schools and the improvement of 700 others under the project.⁶⁴⁴ According to the Bank, the mandate for school construction in rural areas was shifted last year from the MOE to the MRRD.⁶⁴⁵

Bank officials also said MRRD engineers surveying sites identified for school construction had observed a variety of issues that could warrant concern if not resolved in a timely manner. According to MRRD engineers, some of the surveyed sites did not have functioning Community Development Councils (CDCs).⁶⁴⁶ The Bank views CDCs, which were first established under its National Solidarity Program (NSP), as viable mechanisms for channeling development funding to local areas.⁶⁴⁷ During the implementation of NSP, CDCs, which operate at the village level and consist of members selected by a given community, were trained to manage small-scale projects funded by block grants.⁶⁴⁸

The lack of functioning CDCs at some planned school-construction sites, the Bank said, was an indication there was insufficient capacity to implement construction projects in these areas.⁶⁴⁹ Other issues identified by MRRD engineers included unavailable land, school buildings already constructed by other donors, community requests extending beyond the scope of the project, and unspecified security issues.⁶⁵⁰ Of 700 sites surveyed by MRRD engineers, only 300 had been found acceptable by the Bank

Seemingly acknowledging the limited utility of Afghan government enrollment data, USAID said the World Bank's Education Quality Reform in Afghanistan project, to which the agency contributes, will attempt to track actual attendance rates. USAID said this represented a shift in the World Bank's approach to monitoring its education projects in Afghanistan.

Source: USAID, OED, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.

for the construction or improvement of schools, as of December 2018.⁶⁵¹ SIGAR will continue to track implementation progress of this flagship education project.

SPECIAL PROJECT

SIGAR released findings from site visits at 17 USAID-supported public health facilities in Faryab Province. The purpose of this review was to determine if the public health facilities were open, operational and adequately maintained and whether geospatial coordinates were accurate. SIGAR found that all 17 facilities were open and operational. Several facilities had minor structural issues (including cracked walls and leaking roofs) and not all facilities had access to reliable electricity.

HEALTH

Afghanistan's health outcomes have improved since 2001. Nevertheless, fairly serious data limitations complicate a precise evaluation of the extent to which those outcomes have improved.⁶⁵²

According to the World Bank, Afghanistan has made progress in key health indicators concerning maternal and child health, health service delivery, and nutrition, despite increasing insecurity since 2005. Pointing to Afghanistan's Demographic and Health Survey, which gathered substantial data on then-current health outcomes in Afghanistan, the Bank said that Afghanistan benefitted from a significant reduction in the under-five mortality rate, which fell from 97 per 1,000 live births in 2010 to 55 per 1,000 live births in 2015.⁶⁵³

Even with these improvements, however, Afghanistan's maternal mortality ratio remains very high at 650 deaths per 100,000 live births, according to the Bank (demonstrating the extent of discrepancies in health outcome data, another World Bank source, referring to UN estimates, stated that the maternal-mortality ratio was 396 deaths per 100,000 live births in 2015).⁶⁵⁴ The Bank added that Afghanistan's neonatal mortality rates, which account for approximately 40% of total under-five mortality, also remain high.⁶⁵⁵ According to the CIA World Factbook, Afghanistan also has the lowest life expectancy (52.1 years) in the world.⁶⁵⁶

USAID believes that continuing to improve health outcomes will help achieve stability by bolstering Afghans' confidence in the government's capacity to deliver services.⁶⁵⁷ However, there is reason to doubt this theory of change. Although SIGAR cannot independently verify them, some reports indicate that the Taliban benefit directly from government-funded health provision. For example, recent research from AAN in Dasht-e Archi District, Kunduz Province, found that the majority of the 10 health facilities in the district were located in Taliban-controlled areas. Health services are crucial for the Taliban, AAN said, because the group must ensure that their fighters are treated.⁶⁵⁸ According to AAN, the Taliban do not interfere directly in health services in Dasht-e Archi.⁶⁵⁹ While respondents to AAN interviews said that health facilities in the district treated both men and women, women are unable to seek treatment at health facilities unless they were accompanied by a male relative, indirectly limiting their access.⁶⁶⁰

U.S. on- and off-budget assistance to Afghanistan's health sector totaled nearly \$1.3 billion as of April 6, 2018.⁶⁶¹ USAID's active health programs have a total estimated cost of \$284 million, and are listed in Table 3.28.

TABLE 3.28

USAID ACTIVE HEALTH PROGRAMS				
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
Initiative for Hygiene, Sanitation, and Nutrition (IHSAN)	5/11/2016	5/10/2021	\$75,503,848	\$22,181,634
Helping Mothers and Children Thrive (HEMAYAT)	1/7/2015	1/06/2020	60,000,000	50,443,943
Disease Early Warning System Plus (DEWS Plus)	7/1/2014	6/30/2022	54,288,615	28,988,615
Health Sector Resiliency (HSR)	9/28/2015	9/27/2020	27,634,654	17,097,156
Medicines, Technologies and Pharmaceuticals Services (MTaPS)	9/20/2018	9/20/2023	20,000,000	174,925
Challenge Tuberculosis	1/1/2015	9/29/2019	16,886,357	12,889,395
Enhance Community Access, Use of Zinc, Oral Rehydration Salts for Management of Childhood Diarrhea	7/21/2015	7/20/2020	13,000,000	13,000,000
Sustaining Health Outcomes through the Private Sector (SHOPS) Plus	10/11/2015	9/30/2020	12,500,000	8,210,149
Provide Family Planning Health Commodities for USAID Health Programs (GHSCM-PSM)	4/20/2015	4/19/2020	2,343,773	256,227
Global Health Supply Chain Quality Assurance (GHSC-QA)	1/2/2015	12/31/2019	1,500,000	1,182,308
Global Health Supply Chain Management (GHSCM)	4/20/2015	4/19/2020	176,568	176,568
4 Children	9/15/2014	9/16/2019	20,000	20,000
Total			\$283,853,815	\$154,620,920

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.

\$624 Million World Bank Program Intended to Improve Health Outcomes Yields Some Encouraging Results, but Misses on 67% of Objectives

The World Bank's \$623.9 million System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition project (SEHAT), which concluded on June 30, 2018, aimed to expand the coverage, quality, and scope of health-care services, particularly to Afghans living below the poverty line in project areas.⁶⁶² The project also sought to strengthen the Ministry of Public Health to integrate its health-services contracting unit and develop uniform performance-monitoring and contracting-management systems.⁶⁶³ SEHAT, which funded basic primary health-care services, provided support to more than 2,000 facilities across Afghanistan.⁶⁶⁴

As of January 20, 2019, the United States, through USAID, had provided approximately \$218.7 million in funding for the project, paid through the World Bank-administered Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund.⁶⁶⁵

According to SEHAT's Implementation Completion and Results (ICR) Report on final project results, which was provided to SIGAR this quarter by USAID, SEHAT exceeded two of its development objectives by wide margins.⁶⁶⁶ SEHAT helped increase the number of births attended by skilled



World Health Organization (WHO) Director-General Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus reemphasized the WHO's commitment to eradicating polio in Afghanistan while speaking at the Ministry of Public Health in January 2019. (WHO photo)

health professionals from a baseline of 429,305 in December 2012 to 890,240 as of June 30, 2018. This latter figure was more than 107% above the project baseline and just over 57% more than SEHAT's target of 566,683.⁶⁶⁷ The project also expanded treatment of acute malnutrition for children under five years old from a baseline value of 24% to 77% of those children, a figure that was well above the project's target of 55%.⁶⁶⁸

While these results are impressive, the ICR also noted that the project had fallen short of 67% of project development objectives.⁶⁶⁹ While SEHAT expanded coverage of the Pentavalent vaccine, which provides immunization against five life-threatening diseases (tetanus, hepatitis B, pertussis, diphtheria, and Hib influenza) and is administered in three doses, to 45.0% of children between 12 and 23 months old in Afghanistan's lowest income quintile—up from a baseline of 28.9% in January 2011—the target for this indicator, to be achieved by June 30, 2018, was 60.0%.⁶⁷⁰

SEHAT also lagged significantly behind on expanding the use of contraceptives, finishing 13.7 percentage points below its end-program target of 30%. According to the data presented in the ICR, the contraceptive prevalence rate may have decreased by 1.7 percentage points from a January 2011 baseline value of 18.0%.⁶⁷¹ Moreover, while SEHAT made progress on improving the quality of health care from a baseline value of 55% (assessed via a balanced scorecard) to 59.3% by project closure, progress halted 10.7 percentage points shy of the project's end target of 70%.⁶⁷² Finally, SEHAT had not achieved full accreditation of the MOPH's procurement department, which was part of an effort to strengthen the ministry's fiduciary systems.⁶⁷³

While SEHAT is now closed, the World Bank approved the \$600 million Sehatmandi project in March 2018. Sehatmandi has similar objectives.⁶⁷⁴

Polio: 2018 was a Bad Year

Afghanistan and Pakistan, which share a 1,500-mile border, are the only two countries in which polio remains endemic or “usually present,” according to the Centers for Disease Control.⁶⁷⁵ A fatwa issued by the Pakistani Taliban targeting polio workers complicates vaccination outreach, while large-scale population movements between the two countries increase the risk of cross-border transmission.⁶⁷⁶

Although they sometimes provide access to vaccination efforts, the Afghan Taliban also disrupt them. This quarter, the Taliban reportedly announced a ban on the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in areas controlled by the group. The Taliban claimed the WHO, which is conducting a vaccination campaign in Afghanistan, and the ICRC had been engaging in unspecified “suspicious activities.”⁶⁷⁷

As of March 28, two new polio cases were reported in Afghanistan in 2019. Twenty-one cases were reported in 2018, which was substantially higher than the 13–14 cases seen in 2016 and in 2017.⁶⁷⁸ In November 2018, the World Health Organization said it was “very concerned” by the increase in polio cases worldwide, particularly by the increase in Afghanistan.⁶⁷⁹

As of December 31, 2018, USAID had obligated approximately \$36.6 million and disbursed approximately \$32.5 million for polio-eradication efforts in Afghanistan since 2003.⁶⁸⁰

In a February 13, 2019, press briefing, Toby Lanzer, the UN Secretary-General's Deputy Special Representative for Afghanistan, called Shah Wali Kot district in Kandahar Province the “epicenter of polio in the world.”

Source: UN, “Press briefing by DSRSG Toby Lanzer in Kabul,” 2/14/2019.

COUNTERNARCOTICS CONTENTS

Key Issues and Events	161
U.S. Reconstruction Funding for Counternarcotics	162
Institutional Development	164
Treatment and Prevention	169
Alternative Development	170

COUNTERNARCOTICS

KEY ISSUES AND EVENTS

Poppy cultivation for 2018 decreased 33% to 221,000 hectares from 2017's level of 329,000 hectares, "but remained a near record high," according to a U.S. government estimate released in April 2019. Potential opium production decreased 42% from 9,140 metric tons in 2017 to 5,330 metric tons in 2018. The decline in cultivation and production are attributed to large areas of drought and low opium prices stemming from 2017's record crop.⁶⁸¹

U.S. government estimates are lower than the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)'s estimates for 2018. UNODC reported 263,000 hectares and 6,400 metric tons for 2018 in its latest opium survey (released November 2018).⁶⁸² The U.S. government and UNODC frequently differ in their estimates; however, the differences in recent years are not as significant as in the early years of the reconstruction period.⁶⁸³

INL released its annual narcotics-control strategy report in March 2019. Afghanistan remains the world's foremost supplier of illicit opiates. According to INL, the country's illicit drug trafficking does not just benefit the insurgency, nor is it limited to insurgent-controlled areas. It is a main driver of corruption throughout the country, undermining governance and rule of law. Illicit drug use is widespread in Afghanistan, resulting in a considerable health crisis.⁶⁸⁴

The fiscal year (FY) 2020 budget released by the Trump Administration in March 2019 proposes \$963 million for the Department of Defense (DOD)'s global drug-interdiction and counterdrug activities, a \$72 million decrease from FY 2019 approved levels, and \$945 million for the State Department's Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL), a \$424 million decrease from the previous year.⁶⁸⁵

Between January 1 and March 21, 2019, DOD reported seizures of 1,327 kilograms (kg) (2,925.5 lbs) of heroin, 18,808 kg (41,465 lbs) of hashish, and 14.68 kg (32.4 lbs) of methamphetamine.⁶⁸⁶ A kilogram is about 2.2 pounds.⁶⁸⁷ DOD did not provide SIGAR with opium-seizure data or cumulative interdiction results for various illicit narcotics this quarter. According to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Afghan specialized units conducted 36 operations, compared to 53 operations reported last quarter. No high-value targets were apprehended during the quarter. DEA said the

COUNTERNARCOTICS

After reviewing SIGAR's June 2018 counternarcotics findings and ongoing U.S. government counterthreat finance (CTF) efforts, the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control requested that SIGAR evaluate the effectiveness of U.S. CTF efforts against Afghan terrorist and insurgent narcotics trade in Afghanistan. In response, SIGAR began an audit in February 2019 that is reviewing the Departments of Defense, Justice, State, and Treasury's CTF efforts and funding in Afghanistan since 2017. Specifically, the audit will: (1) identify the strategies and policies that guide the U.S. government's counternarcotics efforts, including efforts to counter Afghan terrorists and insurgents' drug trade-related sources of funding; (2) identify the activities and funding U.S. agencies have directed to counter Afghan terrorists and insurgents' drug trade-related sources of funding; (3) determine the extent to which U.S. agencies measure and evaluate the effectiveness of their efforts to counter Afghan terrorists and insurgents' drug-trade-related sources of funding; and (4) identify the challenges, if any, that affect these efforts and how the agencies are addressing these challenges.

Inspector General John Sopko testified on April 3 before the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Subcommittee on National Security. The hearing examined U.S. reconstruction activities in Afghanistan, including the progress of U.S. efforts to build, equip, train, and sustain the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces, as well as high-risk U.S. reconstruction program areas, including counternarcotics efforts, that are particularly vulnerable to waste, fraud, and abuse.

challenging security situation in Afghanistan's drug-producing and drug-refining areas "has impacted every aspect of interdiction activities" and "constrains virtually every aspect of drug enforcement."⁶⁸⁸

In February 2019, DOD ceased its counterthreat finance (CTF) campaign targeting insurgents' revenue generation at the end of 2018. The campaign sought to disrupt and degrade Taliban resources through air strikes and raids targeting narcotics production, processing, trading, and transportation.⁶⁸⁹ DOD reported to its Inspector General in April that the NATO Resolute Support (RS) commander ended the CTF campaign because military operations strategy had changed to maximize impact on the Taliban and bring them to the negotiating table.⁶⁹⁰ DOD reported to SIGAR that the Afghan Air Force (AAF) did not destroy any labs outside of the CTF campaign between October 2018 and March 21, 2019, which they said may indicate a deprioritization of the counternarcotics mission at the senior levels of the Afghan government.⁶⁹¹ The AAF had destroyed 10 narcotics facilities during October 2017 to September 2018 outside the CTF campaign.⁶⁹²

The U.S. government's updated integrated country strategy does not discuss efforts to reduce Afghanistan's illicit narcotics trade and its expanding opium-poppy cultivation.⁶⁹³ USAID no longer includes counternarcotics indicators in its alternative-development or agriculture programs, focusing instead on achieving private-sector-driven and export-led economic growth.⁶⁹⁴ DOD has informed SIGAR that it does not have a counternarcotics mission in Afghanistan and DEA has reduced its personnel in country.⁶⁹⁵ Consequently, INL remains the U.S. government agency responsible for implementing counternarcotics activities. According to the State Department, counternarcotics is interwoven into the U.S. Administration's South Asia strategy.⁶⁹⁶

U.S. RECONSTRUCTION FUNDING FOR COUNTERNARCOTICS

As of March 31, 2019, the United States has appropriated \$9.01 billion for counternarcotics (CN) efforts in Afghanistan since FY 2002. Congress appropriated most CN funds for Afghanistan through the Department of Defense Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities (DICDA) Fund (\$3.38 billion), the Afghan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) (\$1.31 billion), the Economic Support Fund (\$1.42 billion), and a portion of the State Department's International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) account (\$2.31 billion).⁶⁹⁷

ASFF is primarily used to develop the Afghan National Army and Police, including the Counter Narcotics Police of Afghanistan (CNPA) and the Special Mission Wing (SMW), which support the counternarcotics efforts of the Ministries of Defense (MOD) and Interior (MOI).⁶⁹⁸ As shown in

Figure 3.46, DOD is the largest contributor, followed by INL, in support of CN efforts.

Dissolution of the Ministry of Counter Narcotics


In January 2019, Afghan President Ashraf Ghani issued a decree dissolving the Ministry of Counter Narcotics (MCN) and merging some of its responsibilities with the Ministry of Interior (MOI). A committee is to present a plan for the new counternarcotics structure within three months.⁶⁹⁹ The decree established a ministerial committee, led by the MOI minister, and includes staff members from the MCN, MOI, Ministry of Public Health (MOPH), Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock (MAIL), and Administrative Office of the President. There is also a national committee overseeing the transition composed of officials from the President's Office, MCN, MAIL, National Security Council, Ministry of Finance, Attorney General's Office, Civil Service Commission, and Civil Statistics Office.⁷⁰⁰

This quarter, the Independent Joint Anti-Corruption Monitoring and Evaluation Committee (MEC) reported serious deficiencies in the MOI's procurement process which rendered it extremely vulnerable to corruption. Issues such as poor record-keeping and lack of transparency hampered inventory management and the flow of goods and services from providers, to warehouses, to the end user.⁷⁰¹ According to State, the dissolution of the MCN will have no significant impact on current counternarcotics programs when the MCN's responsibilities are absorbed into other ministries.⁷⁰² The MOPH is currently responsible for implementing drug-demand-reduction policy, so the MCN's abolition would have no significant impact on drug-demand-reduction responsibilities, according to INL.⁷⁰³ The Afghan government is updating its own counternarcotics strategy, the National Drug Action Plan (NDAP), and INL has provided an advisor to assist. The advisor's findings and recommendations are still going through the Afghan intergovernmental clearance process. INL will continue to assist in updating the government's strategy once the MCN dissolution is complete.⁷⁰⁴

INL is evaluating all its advisory contracts with the MCN given its dissolution and has not reassigned advisors/mentors to other ministries.⁷⁰⁵ The Afghan press has reported that since the announcement of the dissolution, MCN employees have been receiving salaries without having any work to do. According to INL, no staff terminations have occurred, though some have found other employment. The MOI has denied recent INL requests to visit it, though INL local Afghan staff have visited. INL is unable to provide the precise number of staff still on the MCN's payroll, but the MCN is currently funded for 549 staff until September.⁷⁰⁶

FIGURE 3.46

U.S. FEDERAL AGENCY SPENDING ON COUNTERNARCOTICS, AS OF MARCH 31, 2019 (\$ BILLIONS)



Note: *DEA funds the salary supplements of the specialized units annually.

Source: SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 4/30/2019, Appendix B.

INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Developing Afghan institutions that can effectively fight the narcotics trade remains a challenge. INL supports several Afghan government institutions to combat the illicit drug trade, strengthen law enforcement, and combat domestic substance abuse.⁷⁰⁷ According to INL, the MCN worked at mainstreaming drug control activities throughout the entire government. However, high-level Afghan government support at countering illicit drugs through other ministries has historically been lacking.⁷⁰⁸ Moreover, DOJ reported that the Counter Narcotics Justice Center (CNJC), the unit created to prosecute high level narcotics cases, is totally dependent on donor support. There is no evidence that the Afghan government will support the Center should INL funding end. The UK government also disburses salary supplements to employees, an additional handicap to CNJC's sustainability if donor funding were to stop.⁷⁰⁹ Since 2008, INL has obligated \$35.8 million and disbursed \$27.7 million to build capacity at the MCN.⁷¹⁰

Composition of the Afghan Counter Narcotics Police

The Counter Narcotics Police of Afghanistan (CNPA), comprising regular narcotics police and specialized units, leads counternarcotics efforts by Afghan law-enforcement personnel. The CNPA, authorized at 2,596 personnel, are located in all 34 provinces. Specialized units include the Sensitive Investigative Unit (SIU), the National Interdiction Unit (NIU), and the Intelligence and Investigation Unit (IIU).⁷¹¹ The NIU conducts interdiction operations and seizures, serves arrest warrants, and executes search warrants in high-threat environments. The NIU receives mentoring from the DEA and U.S. Special Operations Forces.⁷¹² The NIU maintains forward-based personnel in Kandahar, Kunduz, and Herat.⁷¹³ In 2018, the NIU's tashkil was increased by 250 personnel to 783.⁷¹⁴

The SIU's mission is to identify significant drug-trafficking and narcoterrorist organizations operating in Afghanistan and dismantle them through the Afghan criminal justice system.⁷¹⁵ The Technical Investigative Unit (TIU) consists of 100 staff who collect and analyze evidence in support of SIU/NIU investigations.⁷¹⁶ Another SIU component has four officers responsible for administrative management of court orders obtained by SIU investigators to conduct Afghan judicially authorized intercepts.⁷¹⁷

Other Afghan law-enforcement elements such as the General Command of Police Special Units conducts high-risk operations against terrorism, narcotics, and organized crime.⁷¹⁸ The Afghan Uniform Police and Afghan Border Police (ABP) also participate in counternarcotics activities.⁷¹⁹ The ABP collaborate closely with the counternarcotics elements of the Anti-Crime Police and Ministry of Finance, national and international intelligence agencies, as well as border police of neighboring states.⁷²⁰

The Special Mission Wing (SMW) is a rotary- and fixed-wing aircraft force that supports NIU missions as well as counterterrorism missions conducted

by Afghan special security forces. The SMW is the only Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF) organization with night-vision, rotary-wing air assault, and fixed-wing intelligence-surveillance-reconnaissance capabilities. The SMW structure consists of four squadrons: two in Kabul, one at Kandahar Airfield, and one at Mazar-e Sharif.⁷²¹

Since its establishment in 2012, the SMW has been used to conduct counterterrorism and counternarcotics missions. In recent years, counterterrorism missions have dominated.⁷²² According to RS, the SMW is misused when officials do not follow the mission approval process or use assets without appropriate execution-planning time, for civilian movements, or to evacuate non-Afghan Special Security Forces. CSTC-A began enforcing penalties for SMW misuse in August 2018. Fines increased to \$150,000 per Mi-17 flight hour and \$60,000 per PC-12 flight hour in September 2018. According to DOD, the penalties were effective in the near term since SMW misuse decreased in September. CSTC-A fines totaled \$582,306 from June 1 through November 30, 2018.⁷²³

More information on the SMW is available in the Security section on pp. 98–99.

Funding for Afghan Counternarcotics Elements

INL estimates that it funds approximately \$21 million per year for NIU and SIU operations and maintenance. Costs directly attributable to NIU and SIU include \$6.01 million to support an evidence-gathering platform over two years under an interagency agreement with the DEA, \$9.56 million in other interagency agreement support, and \$825,000 per year for NIU salary supplements. SIU supplements are funded separately by DEA.⁷²⁴ In October, DEA allocated \$40,000 to SIU for FY 2019. As of March 21, DEA has disbursed \$5,250 in interagency agreement operational funds, and \$35,646 for SIU salary stipends.⁷²⁵ Salary supplements are used to attract and retain the most qualified and highly trained officers to the specialized units. Supplements are provided to all NIU officers, from police officers to unit commanders on the basis of rank.⁷²⁶ DOD provided \$675,000 for equipment to the NIU for 2017 and \$1 million for equipment such as vehicles and communications gear to be delivered in 2019.⁷²⁷

Interdiction Results

Between January 1 and March 21, 2019, DOD reported seizures of 1,327 kilograms (kg) (2,925.5 lbs) of heroin, 18,808 kg (41,465 lbs) of hashish, and 14.68 kg (32.4 lbs) of methamphetamine.⁷²⁸ A kilogram is about 2.2 pounds.⁷²⁹ Unlike prior quarters, DOD did not provide SIGAR with opium-seizure data or cumulative interdiction results for various illicit narcotics. DEA reported that Afghan specialized units conducted 36 operations during the same period, compared to 53 operations reported last quarter, resulting in seizures and arrests. No high-value targets were apprehended during the

COUNTERNARCOTICS

TABLE 3.29

SPECIALIZED UNITS SEIZURE RESULTS FROM FY 2015 TO FY 2019						
Sensitive Investigative Unit and National Interdiction Unit Results	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019*	Total
Number of Operations	33	55	85	119	89	381
Arrests	56	105	119	228	136	644
Labs destroyed	5	14	105	131	18	273
Heroin seized (kg)	183	1,404	10,707	3,470	3,488	19,252
Opium seized (kg)	7,682	6,591	33,601	14,661	2,306	64,841
Hashish seized (kg)	1,040	77,377	263,972	31,467	189,681	563,537
Morphine seized (kg)	380	3,650	75,660	15,767	1,857	97,314
Liquid chemicals seized (liters)	234,039	3,185	27,899	93,974	120	359,217
Dry chemicals seized (kg)	1,450	3,250	71,074	18,100	N/A	93,874
Cash seized (USD equivalent)	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$974,049	\$66,870	\$1,040,919

Note: *Results for the first two quarters.

Source: DEA, response to SIGAR data call, 4/8/2019; DEA, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/15/2019.

quarter.⁷³⁰ In February 2019, an Afghan man was extradited to New York from Estonia, where he had been arrested last October for attempting to import large quantities of heroin into the United States, funneling the proceeds to the Taliban, and attempting to provide financial assistance to the Haqqani terrorist network.⁷³¹

DEA told SIGAR the challenging security environment in drug-producing and drug-refining areas constrains every aspect of drug enforcement and is the primary reason for the drop in interdiction activities throughout Afghanistan.⁷³² INL reports that members of the CNPA are increasingly able to plan and conduct effective counterdrug operations.⁷³³

Specialized units' seizure results have improved over the past five years, but as shown in Table 3.29, the thousands of kilograms of narcotics seized pale in comparison to yearly opium production. Nearly 65 metric tons of opium were seized between 2015 and 2019, yet Afghanistan's opium production for 2018 alone reached 5,330 metric tons, according to U.S. government estimates.⁷³⁴

Penal Law Enforcement

The CNJC is the central facility for the investigation, prosecution, and trial of major drug and drug-related corruption cases.⁷³⁵ It receives \$6 million annually from INL for operations and maintenance.⁷³⁶ According to DOJ, between October 1 and December 31, 2018, the CNJC investigated 134 cases, arrested 166 individuals in relation to those cases, and referred 302 cases for trial resulting in 129 court convictions.⁷³⁷

COUNTERNARCOTICS



Afghan commandos seized more than \$12 million worth of opium in a night raid on this processing lab in Helmand Province in April 2018. (RS photo by Martha Schaeffer courtesy of ANDSF)

As noted in SIGAR's lessons-learned report on counternarcotics, the CNJC is an example of a capacity-building success, but not a strategic one. The CNJC investigates and prosecutes several hundred cases annually. Yet, its high conviction rate has not had a noticeable impact on overall levels of drug production and trafficking. The CNJC has not prosecuted major traffickers, who are often connected to Afghanistan's political elite.⁷³⁸

Afghanistan's new penal code, enacted in late 2017, authorizes confiscating assets (including land, structures, and vehicles) used in, or earned through, narcotics production and trafficking. However, according to DOJ, the government does not have procedures in place to distribute the proceeds of seized assets to support law enforcement.⁷³⁹ According to DOJ, the CNJC focuses on low-level offenders at the expense of pursuing high-profile targets. The investigators and prosecutors build solid cases and have a high conviction rate, but they often fail to pursue the next-higher ranking targets. Ringleaders then hire new people to replace the lower-rung suspects targeted by the CNJC and continue operations.⁷⁴⁰


DOJ, INL, and U.S. Embassy officials have attempted to increase the number of kingpin cases pursued, but they said the Afghan criminal-procedure process is incompatible with long-term investigations. Under Afghan law, prosecutors have little discretion in determining or filing charges; an arrest is almost always required.⁷⁴¹

DOJ said it has a cooperative relationship with the CNJC and its general director, Mohammed Arif Noori, always complies with DOJ requests for information. However, Director Noori has not taken a polygraph,

COUNTERNARCOTICS

FIGURE 3.47

AFGHAN OPIUM-POPPY CULTIVATION, ERADICATION, AND PRODUCTION SINCE 2008



Source: UNODC, *World Drug Report 2016*, 5/2016, Annex, vii, ix, xii; UNODC, *Afghanistan Opium Survey 2018: Cultivation and Production*, 11/2018, pp. 5, 61–68.

unlike his subordinates, leading the UK government to suspend his salary supplement.⁷⁴²

Eradication Results

Governor-Led Eradication

Under the Governor-Led Eradication (GLE) program, INL reimburses provincial governors \$250 toward the eradication costs of every UNODC-verified hectare of eradicated poppy.⁷⁴³ INL has disbursed \$6.9 million since the program's inception in 2008.⁷⁴⁴

UNODC reported the eradication of 406 hectares during 2018, a 46% decrease from 2017. Eradication took place in Kunar, Nangarhar, Kandahar, and Badakhshan Provinces. No eradication took place in Helmand, the highest poppy-cultivating province, between 2016 and 2018.⁷⁴⁵ Afghan press reported in early April 2019 that the government started poppy-eradication campaigns in Helmand and Nangarhar Provinces.⁷⁴⁶

INL reports that the Afghan government has still not finalized its eradication strategy containing provincial targets for 2019.⁷⁴⁷

As Figure 3.47 illustrates, eradication efforts have had minimal impact on curbing opium-poppy cultivation. Since 2008, on average, annual eradication results represent 2% of the total yearly opium cultivation total.⁷⁴⁸

Good Performers Initiative

The Good Performers Initiative (GPI) sought to incentivize provincial governors' counternarcotics and supply-reduction activities by supporting sustainable, community-led development projects in provinces that significantly reduced or eliminated poppy cultivation.⁷⁴⁹ GPI projects included schools, roads, bridges, irrigation structures, health clinics, and drug treatment centers.⁷⁵⁰ According to INL, the program was deemed “ineffectual at curbing opium cultivation” in those provinces receiving awards. MCN's inability to adequately manage the program was also a factor in INL phasing out the program.⁷⁵¹

As of March 2019, INL reported that 286 projects valued at \$126.9 million have been contracted. Of those, 283 projects have been completed and three are still in progress, though INL provided no update on details.⁷⁵² However, no new GPI projects were approved after April 30, 2016.⁷⁵³

The number of poppy-free provinces increased from six at the beginning of the program in 2007 to 15 in 2013, the last year GPI awards were granted.⁷⁵⁴

TREATMENT AND PREVENTION

INL works closely with international partners to coordinate and execute capacity building and training activities for service providers in drug prevention, treatment, and recovery.⁷⁵⁵ The INL-funded 2015 *Afghanistan National Drug Use Survey* conservatively estimated that roughly 11% of the population would test positive for one or more drugs, including 5.3% of the urban population and 13% of the rural population. Drug use among women and children is among the highest documented worldwide, and 38.5% of rural households tested positive for some form of illicit drug.⁷⁵⁶

The United States and the Afghan government are finalizing a transition plan for the transfer of U.S.-funded drug-treatment centers to the Afghan government. INL is finalizing the plan to include the modifications from the December 2018 bilateral workshop with the **Colombo Plan** held in Jakarta.⁷⁵⁷ In December 2018, INL signed an agreement to fund drug-treatment centers in the amount of \$2.8 million. INL will provide additional funds through a future agreement to support the treatment centers until December 31, 2020.⁷⁵⁸ According to INL, MCN's dissolution would have little the impact on drug-demand-reduction programs since MOPH is currently responsible for implementing drug-demand-reduction policy.⁷⁵⁹

Most of the patients at the 86 drug-treatment centers (DTCs) supported by INL are adult males. Of the 86 facilities, 67 are inpatient centers and 19 are outpatient centers; 24 are dedicated to women, adolescents, and children.⁷⁶⁰ Forty-four of the residential treatment centers also offer home-based services, with six of them providing services to adult females.⁷⁶¹ INL has developed a software tool to monitor inventory and procurement of

Colombo Plan: Instituted as a regional intergovernmental organization to further economic and social development, it was conceived at a conference held in Colombo, Sri Lanka (then Ceylon) in 1950 with seven founding-member countries. The organization has since expanded to include 26 member countries. INL supports the Colombo Plan's Universal Treatment Curriculum, a national level training and certification system for drug-addiction counselors aimed at improving the delivery of drug treatment services in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Source: Colombo Plan Secretariat website, “History,” www.colombo-plan.org, accessed 7/1/2017; INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2018, p. 19.

SIGAR AUDIT

An ongoing SIGAR audit of INL's drug-treatment programs in Afghanistan is examining the extent to which INL and its implementers: (1) developed strategies and assessed program achievements; (2) conducted required oversight, and identified and addressed program challenges; and (3) incorporated sustainment into the programs. More information is found in Appendix C of this report.

INL-funded drug treatment centers. In September 2018, INL used the tool to monitor DTCs in Kabul. The tool has also been deployed to Nangarhar, Herat, Kandahar, and Balkh Provinces this fiscal year.⁷⁶²

INL has obligated and disbursed approximately \$159.7 million for the Colombo Plan since 2008 on drug demand reduction programs.⁷⁶³ According to INL, the demand for treatment and prevention services far exceeds the capacity of the centers, most of which have extensive waiting lists for new patients.⁷⁶⁴

The United States supports UNODC's global child-addiction program to develop protocols for treating opioid-addicted children, training treatment staff, and delivering services through nongovernmental organizations. The United States also funds an antidrug curriculum in Afghan schools that has trained over 1,900 teachers and reached over 600,000 students in 900 schools over seven years.⁷⁶⁵

ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT

The United States is currently implementing alternative development initiatives, within the framework of the Afghanistan Integrated Country Strategy, to reduce illicit drug production and promote sustainable agriculture-led economic growth.⁷⁶⁶ The U.S.-funded programs listed in Table 3.30 are discussed in this section of the report:

Boost Alternative Development Intervention Through Licit Livelihoods

The U.S.-funded Boost Alternative Development Interventions through Licit Livelihoods (BADILL) project, implemented by UNODC, aims to strengthen and diversify licit livelihoods of small and marginal farmers through alternative development methods. The project supports and strengthens selected value chains in production, processing, quality control, and market linkages across the following 13 target provinces: Helmand, Uruzgan, Nimroz, Samangan, Jowzjan, Takhar, Bamyan, Wardak, Parwan, Panjshir, Paktiya, Paktika, and Nangarhar.⁷⁶⁷

From January through March 2019, the project established 762 new orchards, provided nearly 55,000 saplings, 3.4 metric tons (MT) of flax, pea seed, and 35 MT of fertilizer to farmers. Additional activities such as sales of backyard poultry and dairy milk brought in approximately \$320,000. According to UNODC, 192.4 hectares of land were brought under licit cultivation. The project also facilitated the participation of female entrepreneurs to several events such as the International Women's Day Jobs and Fair Exhibition, the UNAMA Welfare exhibition, and the National Spring Agriculture Exhibition. The exhibitions provided male and female beneficiaries the opportunity to showcase their products, engage with other producers, meet distributors and wholesalers, and share ideas about

COUNTERNARCOTICS

TABLE 3.30

ALTERNATIVE LIVELIHOOD PROGRAMS					
Project Title	U.S. Implementing Agency	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
Regional Agricultural Development Program-North (RADP-N)	USAID	5/21/2014	5/20/2019	\$78,429,714	\$64,490,651
Commercial Horticulture and Agricultural Marketing Program (CHAMP)	USAID	2/1/2010	12/31/2019	71,292,850	61,532,955
Afghanistan Value Chain-Livestock (AVC-L)	USAID	6/9/2018	6/8/2021	55,672,170	4,233,421
Afghanistan Value Chain-High Value Crops (AVC-HVC)	USAID	8/2/2018	8/1/2023	54,958,860	2,300,878
Regional Agricultural Development Program-East (RADP-E)	USAID	7/21/2016	7/20/2021	28,126,111	11,726,049
Community-Based Agriculture and Alternative Development-West (CBARD-West)*	INL	9/1/2016	4/18/2020	24,368,607	24,368,607
Community-Based Agriculture and Alternative Development-East (CBARD-East)*	INL	11/11/2017	11/11/2020	22,128,683	22,128,683
Boost Alternative Development Intervention Through Licit Livelihoods (BADILL)*	INL	8/12/2016	8/12/2020	20,000,000	20,000,000
Promoting Value Chains-Western Afghanistan (PVC-W)	USAID	9/20/2017	9/19/2020	19,000,000	8,000,000
Total				\$373,976,995	\$218,781,243

Note: * Cumulative disbursements, as of 3/31/2019.

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019; State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019; USAID, *Commercial Horticulture and Agricultural Marketing Program (CHAMP), Quarterly Report, January–March 2018*, 2018, p. 1; USAID, *Promoting Value Chains—Western Afghanistan, Semi-Annual Progress Report, September 20, 2017 to March 31, 2018, 5/29/2018*, i; USAID, *Regional Agricultural Development Program—East (RADP-E), Quarterly Report FY 2018, Quarter 3 (April–June, 2018)*, 7/30/2018, p. 3; USAID, *Regional Agricultural Development Program—East (RADP-E), Activity Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, FY 2018, 1/20/2018*, p. 1; USAID, *Regional Agricultural Development Program (RADP)—North, FY 2018, Quarter 3 (April–June, 2018)*, 7/31/2018, p. 8.

increasing the quality and reach of their products. During the exhibitions, 21 BADILL beneficiaries realized approximately \$5,900 in sales from their off-farm products (natural soap, mint oil, dry fruit, and mint tea). UNODC reported that one of the events hosted by MAIL Minister Nasir Ahmad Durrani, featured speeches encouraging Afghan farmers to embrace licit agriculture.⁷⁶⁸

Community-Based Agriculture and Rural Development

The U.S.-funded Community-Based Agriculture and Rural Development projects implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) work to improve household income while reducing dependency on illicit poppy cultivation for selected communities in 12 high-poppy cultivating districts in Badghis, Farah, and Nangarhar Provinces. The projects will also develop and strengthen community-based agribusiness infrastructure, such as irrigation, transportation, and storage facilities.⁷⁶⁹ Information about the CBARD projects is available in Table 3.31 on the following page.

TABLE 3.31

COMMUNITY-BASED AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (CBARD)					
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Implementing Partner	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 3/31/2019
CBARD-West	11/2016	4/2020	UNDP	\$24,368,607	All funds disbursed
CBARD-East	11/2017	12/2020	UNDP	22,128,683	All funds disbursed
Total				\$46,497,290	\$46,497,290

Source: INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/13/2017; State, INL, *Letter of Agreement with UNDP*, 11/09/2017; State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.

Value chain: the range of goods and services necessary for an agricultural product to move from the farm to the final customer or consumer. It encompasses the provision of inputs, actual on-farm production, post-harvest storage and processing, marketing, transportation, and wholesale and retail sales.

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2015.

Micro greenhouses: are 60 square meters and given primarily to women for income diversification and production at the household level. They are often close to the homes to allow access for women and produce seedlings for commercial greenhouses.

Source: State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2019.

Community-Based Agriculture and Rural Development-East

The \$22 million Community-based Agriculture and Rural Development-East (CBARD-E) project strengthens community-based local production and marketing of high-value crops in 100 communities in Nangarhar Province. CBARD-E will assess alternative livelihoods as alternatives to opium cultivation in communities and directly benefit approximately 28,500 households (199,500 individuals). In addition to building capacity in treatment communities, CBARD-E strengthens public and private agribusiness infrastructures such as **value-chain** facilities, irrigation, and transportation.⁷⁷⁰

From October 1 to December 31, 2018, CBARD-E provided training to 840 people (223 women, 617 men) in agribusiness development, as well as training to 359 people (24 women, 335 men) on land layout, orchard plantation, kitchen gardening, and post-harvest processing of citrus and pomegranate. The project's lead farmers (7 women, 28 men) provided technical skills training to 169 farmers on high-value crop cultivation at farmer field schools and distributed 460 horticulture tool packages directly to local beneficiaries.⁷⁷¹

CBARD-E established 230 kitchen gardens, created orchards on 20 hectares (ha) of land, rehabilitated orchards on 10 ha of land, and distributed 100 beekeeping packages and 4,600 kg of fertilizer. CBARD-E also completed construction on 30 **micro greenhouses** in six districts of Nangarhar, which are being used for the cultivation of tomato, cucumber, and other vegetables. According to UNDP, micro greenhouses provide farmers with returns of about \$100 annually, which is an initial economic incentive not to cultivate opium. In addition, CBARD-E project staff, collaborating with Afghan government and local organizations, identified 30 new irrigation projects to improve water resource management on an additional 425 ha.⁷⁷²

The micro greenhouses in Nangarhar were specifically planned for female beneficiaries in order to improve household livelihoods and increase food security by providing income through the cultivation of vegetables. Insecurity, cultural traditions, and the remoteness of CBARD-E project sites make it difficult for women to participate. The CBARD-E project is addressing these challenges by prioritizing interventions more accessible

to women, such as kitchen gardens and home-based greenhouses that don't require women to leave the vicinity of their residences.⁷⁷³

Community-Based Agriculture and Rural Development-West

The \$24 million Community-based Agriculture and Rural Development-West (CBARD-W) project strengthens community-based local production and marketing of high-value crops in 63 communities in Farah and Badghis Provinces. CBARD-W will assess alternative livelihoods as alternatives to opium cultivation in communities and directly benefit approximately 33,240 households (232,680 individuals). In addition to building capacity in treatment communities, CBARD-W strengthens public and private agribusiness infrastructures such as value-chain facilities, irrigation, and transportation.⁷⁷⁴

During the final calendar quarter of 2018, CBARD-W trained 853 individuals (617 men, 236 women) on agribusiness development, and 344 people (173 men, 171 women) on land layout, orchard plantation, kitchen gardening, and post-harvest processing techniques. In addition, the CBARD-W project's 45 lead farmers (38 men and 7 women) trained 74 farmers in Badghis on technical skills related to high-value crop cultivation and distributed 110 horticulture tool packages and 164 items of post-harvest value additional equipment directly to beneficiaries. CBARD-W also established 147 kitchen gardens, orchards on 268.4 ha of land, and distributed 80 bee-keeping packages and nearly 19,000 kg of fertilizer.⁷⁷⁵ CBARD-W completed construction on 79 greenhouses and 10 micro greenhouses, which are being used for the cultivation of tomato, cucumber, and other vegetables.⁷⁷⁶

Afghanistan Value Chains Programs

These programs cover the regions previously targeted by now-inactive Regional Agricultural Development programs (RADP).⁷⁷⁷ RADP's objective is to help Afghan farmers achieve more inclusive and sustainable economic growth. RADP projects focus on strengthening farmers' productivity in wheat, high-value crops, and livestock. Using a value-chain approach, these projects work with farmers and agribusinesses to overcome obstacles hindering production, processing, sales, and overall development of

TABLE 3.32

AFGHANISTAN VALUE-CHAINS (AVC) PROGRAM				
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
AVC-Livestock	6/9/2018	6/8/2021	\$34,714,295	\$4,233,421
AVC-High Value Crops	8/2/2018	8/1/2021	33,482,672	2,300,878
Total			\$68,196,967	\$6,534,299

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.

agricultural value chains.⁷⁷⁸ Table 3.32 on the previous page, provides program value, duration, and expenditures to date.

Afghanistan Value Chains - High Value Crops

The \$33.5 million Afghanistan Value Chains-High Value Crops (AVC-HVC) is a five-year project to reverse market failures, strengthen linkages, spur growth and job creation for men, women, and youth along value chains for fruit, nuts, high-value horticulture, spices, and medicinal crops.⁷⁷⁹ Activities are designed around “anchor firms” and important value-chain service providers such as financial institutions, shipping and transport companies, and management consultant firms.⁷⁸⁰ According to USAID, anchor firms have the willingness and potential to create systemic change in their value-chain, with benefits that go beyond the individual firm.⁷⁸¹

The project established regional offices in Jalalabad, Kandahar, Herat, and Mazar-e Sharif during the quarter. AVC-HVC selected 26 anchor firms to enter into partnership agreements. The project will support the participation of anchor firms in trade and promotion events. It selected four firms to participate at the Gulfood 2019 exhibition.⁷⁸² As of April 6, 2019, USAID has disbursed \$2.3 million.⁷⁸³

Afghanistan Value Chains - Livestock

The three-year \$34.7 million Afghanistan Value Chains-Livestock (AVC-L) will work with anchor firms in the poultry, small ruminants, dairy products, and other livestock value-chains.⁷⁸⁴ During the first quarter of FY 2019, AVC-L completed its livestock value-chain analysis and signed eight partnership agreements with livestock agribusinesses. The project also referred several agribusinesses to the Agriculture Development Fund to which a dozen submitted loan applications totaling \$1.6 million.⁷⁸⁵ As of April 6, 2019, USAID has disbursed \$4.2 million.⁷⁸⁶

Promoting Value Chains - Western Afghanistan

The \$19 million Promoting Value Chains-Western Afghanistan (PVC-W) program is implemented by the UN's Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).⁷⁸⁷ PVC-W aims to promote inclusive growth and create jobs in the agriculture sector by strengthening the capabilities of producers and private enterprises by:⁷⁸⁸

- increasing wheat productivity
- improving production and productivity of high-value crops
- enhancing technology utilization in the livestock industry
- building institutional capacity at provincial and district levels

The first year of the project, which launched in January 2018, targeted Herat Province. The project will expand to Badghis, Farah, and Nimroz Provinces in 2019. Sixteen project districts were identified based on the

presence of production and processing facilities for targeted crops, accessibility, and security. Nearly 120 beneficiaries such as suppliers, service providers, and associations were selected during the first year.⁷⁸⁹ During the second year, all other activities except for the wheat component will cease in Farah.⁷⁹⁰ Due to security concerns in Farah Province, USAID determined that the financial and security investments required for UN staff to operate in the province outweigh the value-chain development potential that can be realized within the project timeframe. According to USAID, the available funds will be more efficiently utilized in the remaining provinces targeted by the program.⁷⁹¹

Private-sector beneficiaries participate in a project innovation fund (PIF). The PIF is a source of co-financing for selected agribusinesses and enterprises. USAID hopes to stimulate investments in private agribusinesses that develop and promote new markets and sales for agricultural inputs, wheat, high-value crops, and dairy products. The PIF intends to improve business performance by addressing some of the key barriers to production and marketing, as well as support farmer and producer groups in adopting and using new technologies and equipment.⁷⁹² The initial group of companies was approved for the first round of PIF implementation during the second half of 2018. Proposals from another group were conditionally approved and will likely be accepted for the second round.⁷⁹³ As of April 6, 2019, USAID has disbursed \$8.0 million.⁷⁹⁴

Commercial Horticulture and Agricultural Marketing Program

The \$71.3 million Commercial Horticulture and Agricultural Marketing Program (CHAMP) works with leading Afghan processing and export firms to enhance the supply chain, marketing, and export promotion of Afghan fruits and nuts. CHAMP supports traders through its trade offices in India, United Arab Emirates, and Kazakhstan to boost Afghan agricultural exports.⁷⁹⁵

As of December 2018, CHAMP has exported 100,000 tons of produce valued at \$153 million to markets in Pakistan, India, the United Arab Emirates, Canada, and other nations. The program has trained 113,000 farmers, constructed over 230 storage facilities, such as cool rooms and raisin-drying facilities, and planted 2.85 million saplings.⁷⁹⁶ CHAMP initiated a grants program to finance innovative initiatives that will ultimately promote Afghan goods in international markets. In December, approximately four metric tons of dried fruit, nuts, and other Afghan agricultural goods were shipped to neighboring countries and Europe valued at \$10.6 million.⁷⁹⁷ As of April 6, 2019, USAID has disbursed \$61.5 million.⁷⁹⁸

Regional Agricultural Development Program

USAID's Regional Agricultural Development Program (RADP) intends to help Afghan farmers achieve more inclusive and sustainable economic

COUNTERNARCOTICS

growth. RADP projects have ended in the western and southern regions, but continue in the eastern and northern regions of Afghanistan. The projects focus on strengthening farmers' productivity in wheat, high-value crops, and livestock. Using a value-chain approach, these projects work with farmers and agribusinesses to overcome obstacles hindering production, processing, sales, and overall development of agricultural value chains.⁷⁹⁹

As shown in Table 3.33, USAID funding for all RADP programs, targeting various regions of the country amounts to approximately \$283.6 million and USAID has spent \$211.1 million as of April 6, 2019.⁸⁰⁰

TABLE 3.33

USAID REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (RADP)				
Project Title	Start Date	End Date	Total Estimated Cost	Cumulative Disbursements, as of 4/6/2019
RADP-South*	10/7/2013	11/20/2017	\$111,414,339	\$108,475,771
RADP-North	5/21/2014	5/20/2019	78,429,714	64,490,651
RADP-West*	8/10/2014	10/25/2016	65,629,170	26,394,196
RADP-East	7/21/2016	7/20/2021	28,126,111	11,726,049
Total			\$283,599,335	\$211,086,666

Note: * Denotes inactive programs. Afghanistan Value Chains-High Value Crops and Afghanistan Value Chains-Livestock target the regions previously served by the inactive RADP programs.

Source: USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.

USAID's midterm performance evaluation revealed mixed results among the RADP key indicators. Though projects sometimes failed to meet their targets, the evaluation team found that participants still benefited from engaging with the program. Significant challenges such as access to finance, water shortages, and access to markets were not always addressed by the RADP projects.⁸⁰¹ GIS analysis showed mixed results regarding opium-poppy cultivation. Poppy production fell in the RADP-East and RADP-West regions. But in RADP-South, total hectares allocated to poppy production increased, although the proportion of total agricultural land allocated to poppy production decreased due to increases in licit agricultural production. In RADP-North, poppy production rose substantially in terms of its absolute land area and its proportion of total agriculture.⁸⁰²

One of the report's recommendations is to support alternative development financing that will connect businesses to sources of finance to improve the program's sustainability.⁸⁰³

RADP-East

The five-year, \$28.1 million RADP-East program seeks to expand sustainable economic growth through the agriculture sector in eight provinces:

Ghazni, Kapisa, Laghman, Logar, Nangarhar, Parwan, Wardak, and Kabul. Its goal is to increase the sale of agricultural goods by at least \$57 million by the end of the program in July 2021.⁸⁰⁴

For the first quarter of FY 2019, RADP-E realized sales valued at \$4.29 million. The program monitors 32 grants valued at \$1.69 million across its targeted value chains. As part of initiatives to expand export-led economic growth, the program sponsored agribusiness representation to the World Food Kazakhstan event held in late October–early November 2018. The sponsored businesses signed agreements worth \$1.6 million and have potential deals worth \$2.4 million for various dried fruits.⁸⁰⁵ As of April 6, 2019, USAID has disbursed \$11.7 million.⁸⁰⁶

RADP-North

RADP-North extends food and economic security for rural Afghans of six provinces: Badakhshan, Baghlan, Balkh, Jowzjan, Kunduz, and Samangan. Activities strengthen farmers' capacity through improved production in the wheat, high-value crop, and livestock value chains.⁸⁰⁷ The \$78.4 million five-year program is in its final year.⁸⁰⁸

In October, **laser land leveling** (LLL) operators conducted 25 demonstration field days to 721 farmers in Balkh and Jowzjan Provinces. Three of the project's LLL operators leveled 69.4 *jeribs* (one hectare equals five *jeribs*) for seven farmers generating AFN 209,500 (\$2,831) in revenue.⁸⁰⁹

In November, RADP-North cultivated plots in 70 villages and distributed and sold wheat seeds to farmers. The program also conducted hygiene and nutrition training for 500 women in Balkh, Jowzjan, and Samangan. Laser-land-leveling operators leveled 305 *jeribs* of land which generated AFN 847,600 (\$12,465) in revenue. RADP-North supported nine agribusinesses at the WorldFood India trade show. Their attendance generated signed contracts valued at \$1.6 million.⁸¹⁰ **Paravets** trained 200 women and 400 men on livestock deworming in five provinces. Additional urea treatment training for 950 beneficiaries (800 men and 150 women) took place in Balkh, Jowzjan, and Samangan.⁸¹¹

At the Kabul Ag-Fair, held October 3–5, 2018, the program supported the participation of 11 agribusinesses. The companies reported confirmed sales of \$8,570, with additional deals for subsequent delivery of \$27,255. The 11 companies also reported potential deals worth \$296,232.⁸¹²

RADP-N provided support to four agribusinesses to participate at the WorldFood Kazakhstan trade show held October 31 through November 2, 2018. The participating companies generated confirmed sales of \$2,963,100 for dried fruit and nut products. The trade show also helped the agribusinesses establish networks with other international buyers and conduct 28 business-to-business meetings.⁸¹³ As of April 6, 2019, USAID has disbursed \$64.5 million.⁸¹⁴

A laser land leveller is a machine equipped with a laser-guided drag bucket and is more effective and quicker in ensuring a flat, table-top like surface. An even land surface means irrigation water reaches every part of the field with minimal waste from runoff or water-logging.

Source: CGIAR, Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security, *Laser land levelling: How it strikes all the right climate-smart chords*, 5/26/2015, <https://ccafs.cgiar.org/research-highlight/laser-land-levelling-how-it-strikes-all-right-climate-smart-chords>, accessed 4/2/2019.

Paraveterinarian or paravet: a community-based animal health worker who provides initial diagnosis and basic treatment of animals.

Source: A. Catley, T. Leyland, et al., "Para-veterinary professionals and the development of quality, self-sustaining community-based services," *Revue scientifique et technique (International Office of Epizootics)*, 2004, p. 225.

4 OTHER AGENCY OVERSIGHT



OTHER AGENCY OVERSIGHT CONTENTS

Completed Oversight Activities	182
Ongoing Oversight Activities	183

Photo on previous page

Aerial view of the Salang Pass, a geographical feature that connects northern Afghanistan and Kabul. (UNAMA photo by Fardin Waezi)

OTHER AGENCY OVERSIGHT

SIGAR's enabling legislation requires it to keep the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense fully informed about problems relating to the administration of Afghanistan reconstruction programs, and to submit a report to Congress on SIGAR's oversight work and on the status of the U.S. reconstruction effort no later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter. The statute also instructs SIGAR to include, to the extent possible, relevant matters from the end of the quarter up to the submission date of its report.

Each quarter, SIGAR requests updates from other agencies on completed and ongoing oversight activities. This section compiles these updates. Publicly available copies of completed reports are posted on the agencies' respective websites.

The descriptions appear as submitted, with minor changes to maintain consistency with other sections of this report: acronyms and abbreviations in place of full names; standardized capitalization, punctuation, and preferred spellings; and third-person instead of first-person construction.

These agencies perform oversight activities in Afghanistan and provide results to SIGAR:

- Department of Defense Office of Inspector General (DOD OIG)
- Department of State Office of Inspector General (State OIG)
- Government Accountability Office (GAO)
- U.S. Army Audit Agency (USAAA)
- U.S. Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General (USAID OIG)

OTHER AGENCY OVERSIGHT

COMPLETED OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

Table 4.1 lists one oversight report related to Afghanistan reconstruction that participating agencies completed this quarter.

TABLE 4.1

RECENTLY COMPLETED OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF OTHER U.S. AGENCIES, AS OF MARCH 31, 2019			
Agency	Report Number	Date Issued	Report Title
USAID	8-306-19-001-N	2/20/19	Financial Audit of Tetra Tech ARD, Initiative to Strengthen Local Administration (ISLA) Contract

Source: DOD OIG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; State OIG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; GAO, response to SIGAR data call, 3/25/2019; USAID OIG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; USAAA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/08/2019.

U.S. Department of Defense Office of Inspector General

DOD OIG released no reports related to Afghanistan reconstruction this quarter.

U.S. Department of State Office of Inspector General-Middle East Regional Operations

State OIG completed no reports related to Afghanistan reconstruction this quarter.

Government Accountability Office

GAO completed no reports related to Afghanistan reconstruction this quarter.

U.S. Army Audit Agency

The USAAA completed no audits related to Afghanistan reconstruction this quarter.

U.S. Agency for International Development Office of the Inspector General

During this quarter, USAID OIG released one report related to Afghanistan reconstruction.

Financial Audit of Tetra Tech ARD, Initiative to Strengthen Local Administration (ISLA) Contract

USAID OIG did not identify any material internal control weaknesses but did issue one recommendation that Tetra Tech establish and implement policies and procedures that would ensure required quarterly reports be submitted in a timely manner.

OTHER AGENCY OVERSIGHT

ONGOING OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

As of March 31, 2019, the participating agencies reported 40 ongoing oversight activities related to reconstruction in Afghanistan. The activities reported are listed in Table 4.2 and described in the following sections by agency.

TABLE 4.2

ONGOING OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF OTHER U.S. AGENCIES, AS OF MARCH 31, 2019			
Agency	Project Number	Date Initiated	Project Title
DOD OIG	D2019-D000RH-0082.000	1/22/2019	Audit of the Army Contracting Command-Afghanistan's Policies and Procedures for Contingency Contracting Risks
DOD OIG	D2019-DISPA5-0101.000	1/16/2019	Evaluation of Military Services Counterintelligence Workforce Capability Development
DOD OIG	D2019-DISPA5-0015.000	1/7/2019	Evaluation of Force Protection Screening, Vetting, and Biometric Operations in Afghanistan
DOD OIG	D2019-D00SPO-0017.000	10/1/2018	U.S. and Coalition Efforts to Train, Advise, Assist, and Equip Afghan Tactical Air Coordinators and Air Liaison Officers
DOD OIG	D2019-D00SPO-0187.000	7/30/2018	Audit of the Army's Oversight of National Afghan Trucking Services 3.0 Contract
DOD OIG	D2018-D000RG-0170.000	6/25/2018	Audit of the National Maintenance Strategy Contract in Afghanistan
DOD OIG	D2018-DISPA2-0112.000	5/3/2018	Evaluation of Theater Linguist Support for Operation Freedom's Sentinel
DOD OIG	D2018-D000RJ-0135.000	4/30/2018	Audit of the Afghan Personnel and Pay System
State OIG	19AUD037	2/13/2019	Audit of Cost Management and Recovery Efforts of Embassy Air in Afghanistan and Iraq
State OIG	18AUD066	9/20/2018	Audit of the Office of Overseas Buildings Operations Construction and Commissioning of Staff Diplomatic Apartments in Kabul, Afghanistan
State OIG	18AUD076	7/15/2018	Lessons Learned from Office of Inspector General Audits Concerning the Review and Payment of Contractor Invoices Supporting Overseas Contingency Operations
State OIG	18AUD051	5/24/2018	Audit of Grants and Cooperative Agreements Intended to Counter Violent Extremism
State OIG	18AUD038	3/15/2018	Audit of Embassy Kabul Physical Security Features
State OIG	18SEP044	12/20/2017	Evaluation of Camp Eggers Guard Housing Contract Termination
GAO	103066	10/29/2018	Advise and Assist Mission in Afghanistan
GAO	103076	10/1/2018	Afghanistan Reconstruction Projects—Waste, Fraud, and Abuse
GAO	102793	6/18/2018	Afghanistan Security Forces Fund
USAID OIG	8F200318	8/26/2018	Financial Audit of Chemonics International Inc. Promote Women in Governance
USAID OIG	8F200518	8/9/2018	Financial Audit of Democracy International DI, Election Observation Mission for 2009 Presidential and Provincial Council Election in Afghanistan
USAID OIG	8F200718	8/2/2018	Financial Audit of IDS - International Government Services LLC Monitoring Support Project
USAID OIG	8F200818	7/31/2018	Financial Audit of International Relief and Development (IRD)—Engineering, Quality Assurance and Logistical Support (EQUALS)
USAID OIG	8F200618	7/26/2018	Financial Audit of Family Health International—FHI 360, Supply Chain Quality Assessment
USAID OIG	8F200418	7/24/2018	Financial Audit of Counterpart International Inc. Afghan Civic Engagement Program
USAID OIG	8F200218	7/18/2018	Financial Audit of Creative Association International Inc.
USAID OIG	8F200118	7/12/2018	Financial Audit of Checchi and Company Consulting, Inc. Services under Program Project Offices for Results Tracking, Contract; Afghan Legal Access and Transparency, Contract
USAID OIG	8F1C0217	8/9/2017	Audit Follow-Up of USAID's Multi-Tiered Monitoring Strategy in Afghanistan
USAID OIG	8F201517	1/25/2017	Financial Audit of Ministry of Education (MoE), Basic Education, Learning and Training (BELT) Program

Continued on the next page

OTHER AGENCY OVERSIGHT

TABLE 4.2

ONGOING OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF OTHER U.S. AGENCIES, AS OF MARCH 31, 2019 (CONTINUED)			
Agency	Project Number	Date Initiated	Project Title
USAID OIG	8F201217	12/28/2016	Financial Audit of Management Systems International Inc. (MSI)—Monitoring Support Project- North Provinces, Contract; and Measuring Impact of Stabilization Initiative, Contract
USAID OIG	8F201117	12/28/2016	Financial Audit of Roots of Peace (RoP)—Commercial Horticulture and Agriculture Marketing Program (CHAMP), Cooperative Agreement
USAID OIG	8F201017	12/28/2016	Financial Audit of Palladium International LLC (Future Groups International) Health Sector Resiliency, Contract
USAID OIG	8F200317	12/27/2016	Financial Audit of National Academy of Science—PEER Grants, Cooperative Agreement
USAID OIG	8F200917	12/27/2016	Financial Audit of KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation—Challenge Tuberculosis, Cooperative Agreement
USAID OIG	8F200817	12/27/2016	Financial Audit of ICF Macro, Inc.—Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), Contract
USAID OIG	8F200717	12/27/2016	Financial Audit of Development Alternatives Inc. (DAI)—Agricultural Credit Enhancement (ACE II), Contract; Regional Agricultural Development Program (RADAP), Contract; MUSHARIKAT, Contract
USAID OIG	8F200617	12/20/2016	Financial Audit of Volunteers for Economic Growth Alliance (VEGA) - Assistance in Building Afghanistan by Developing Enterprise (ABADE), Cooperative Agreement
USAID OIG	8F200117	12/20/2016	Financial Audit of Purdue University (PU)—Strengthening Afghanistan Agricultural Facilities (SAAF), Grant
USAID OIG	8F200517	12/20/2016	Financial Audit of ABT Associates INC—Shop Plus, Cooperative Agreement
USAID OIG	8F200417	12/20/2016	Financial Audit of The Asia Foundation (TAF)—Survey of the Afghanistan People, Grant
USAID OIG	8F200217	11/30/2016	Financial Audit of American University of Afghanistan (AUAF), Cooperative Agreement
USAID OIG	FF1C0216	5/11/2016	Audit of USAID/Afghanistan's New Development Partnership

Source: DOD OIG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; State OIG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; GAO, response to SIGAR data call, 3/25/2019; USAID OIG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; USAAA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/08/2019.

U.S. Department of Defense Office of Inspector General

DOD OIG has eight ongoing projects this quarter that relate to reconstruction or security operations in Afghanistan.

Audit of the Army Contracting Command-Afghanistan's Policies and Procedures for Contingency Contracting Risks

The DOD OIG is determining whether the Army Contracting Command-Afghanistan's award and administration of contracts mitigate contingency contracting risks, such as nonperformance and improper payments specific to Afghanistan.

Evaluation of Military Services Counterintelligence Workforce Capability Development

The objectives for this evaluation are For Official Use Only.

Evaluation of Force Protection Screening, Vetting, and Biometric Operations in Afghanistan

The DOD OIG is determining whether U.S. Forces-Afghanistan have developed and implemented screening, vetting, and biometric processes for force protection in Afghanistan.

U.S. and Coalition Efforts to Train, Advise, Assist, and Equip Afghan Tactical Air Coordinators and Air Liaison Officers

The DOD OIG is evaluating whether U.S. and Coalition efforts to train, advise, assist, and equip Afghan Tactical Air Coordinators and Air Liaison Officers meet air-to-ground integration objectives identified in operational plans and applicable policies.

Audit of Army Oversight of National Afghan Trucking Services 3.0 Contract

The DOD OIG is determining whether the U.S. Army provided oversight of the National Afghan Trucking Services 3.0 contract.

Audit of the National Maintenance Strategy Contract in Afghanistan

The DOD OIG is determining if the Army developed the National Maintenance Strategy-Ground Vehicle Systems contract requirements to meet user needs to maintain and sustain the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces' vehicles.

Evaluation of Theater Linguist Support for Operation Freedom's Sentinel

The DOD OIG is determining if U.S. Central Command and U.S. Army Intelligence Security Command have developed and implemented processes for satisfying Commander U.S. Forces Afghanistan and Operation Freedom's Sentinel contract linguist requirements.

Audit of the Afghan Personnel and Pay System

The DOD OIG originally announced this audit on April 30, 2018, and then reannounced the audit on May 21, 2018, with a new objective. The DOD OIG is determining whether DOD's planning and implementation of the Afghan Personnel and Pay System will accurately pay and track Afghan forces.

OTHER AGENCY OVERSIGHT

U.S. Department of State Office of Inspector General-Middle East Regional Operations

State OIG has six ongoing projects this quarter related to Afghanistan reconstruction.

Evaluation of Camp Eggers Guard Housing Contract Termination

This is an evaluation of the Camp Eggers' guard housing contract termination.

Audit of Embassy Kabul Physical Security Features

The audit will examine the physical security features at Embassy Kabul.

Audit of Grants and Cooperative Agreements Intended to Counter Violent Extremism

This is an audit of grants and cooperative agreements intended to counter violent extremism in a number of countries, including Afghanistan.

Lessons Learned from Office of Inspector General Audits Concerning the Review and Payment of Contractor Invoices Supporting Overseas Contingency Operations

This is a review of lessons learned from audits of the role of contracting officer representatives in overseeing invoices for Overseas Contingency Operations contracts.

Audit of the Office of Overseas Buildings Construction and Commissioning of Staff Diplomatic Apartments

This is an audit of the Office of Overseas Buildings Operations construction and commissioning of the Staff Diplomatic Apartment-2 and Staff Diplomatic Apartment-3 in Kabul, Afghanistan.

Audit of Cost Management and Recovery Efforts of Embassy Air in Afghanistan and Iraq

This is an audit of the cost management and recovery efforts of Embassy Air in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Government Accountability Office

GAO has three ongoing projects this quarter related to Afghanistan reconstruction.

Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

The Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) was created for DOD to provide assistance to the security forces of Afghanistan to include the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation and construction, and funding. The Senate Appropriations Committee has expressed concerns about the costs of training contracts awarded under ASFF, citing recent reports from both SIGAR and other auditing agencies that found deficiencies that resulted in tens of millions of dollars potentially lost to fraud, waste, and abuse.

GAO will review DOD's ASFF Training Contracts to include researchable questions on the budgets, funding sources, and transactions for all ASFF Training Contracts during FYs 2017–2019 and the extent to which DOD has processes and procedures to ensure that ASFF training contracts' pricing and costs are reasonable.

Afghanistan Reconstruction Projects – Waste, Fraud, and Abuse

The U.S. government has funded numerous reconstruction projects in Afghanistan since September 2001. Costs for U.S. military, diplomatic, and reconstruction and relief operations have exceeded \$500 billion, and GAO has issued about 90 reports focused in whole or in part on Afghanistan since that time. GAO received a request to review past work assessing reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan and identify the dollar value of any waste, fraud, or abuse uncovered during the course of those reviews.

GAO will review prior work conducted on reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan that identified waste, fraud, and abuse; and assess the overall dollar amount of waste, fraud, and abuse uncovered through these efforts.

Advise and Assist Mission in Afghanistan

In August 2017, the President announced a new South Asia strategy that was accompanied by an increase of U.S. and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) troops in Afghanistan to support renewed efforts to advise and assist Afghan forces in the NATO Resolute Support Mission. As part of the increase, the Army deployed a Security Force Assistance Brigade (SFAB), a new unit created in October 2016 to advise and assist foreign military forces, including the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF). Development of ANDSF has been a central element of successive U.S. strategies in Afghanistan.

GAO will review the extent to which DOD, in conjunction with NATO, has defined advisor team missions, goals, and objectives, and the extent

OTHER AGENCY OVERSIGHT

to which advisors were trained and equipped for their specific missions in Afghanistan. GAO will also review the ability of the Army's Security Force Assistance Brigade to meet current and future advisor requirements in Afghanistan and elsewhere; what adjustments, if any, are being made to the manning, training and equipping, and deployment of the second and third SFABs; and any other issues the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to the advise and assist mission in Afghanistan.

U.S. Army Audit Agency

This quarter the USAAA has no ongoing audits related to Afghanistan reconstruction.

U.S. Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General

This quarter USAID OIG has 23 ongoing projects related to reconstruction initiatives, of which 21 are financial audits. The two ongoing performance audits are described below.

Follow-Up Audit of USAID's Multi-Tiered Monitoring Strategy in Afghanistan

The objectives of this audit are to determine the extent to which USAID has used its multi-tiered monitoring strategy in Afghanistan to manage projects and to serve as the basis for informed decision making. The entrance conference was held August 9, 2017.

Audit of USAID/Afghanistan's New Development Partnership

The objectives of this audit are to determine if USAID/Afghanistan has adopted internal policies and procedures to adequately verify the achievement of New Development Partnership (NDP) indicators contained in the July 25, 2015, NDP results framework; and if USAID/Afghanistan has adequately verified the achievement of completed indicators under the NDP for any payments made to date. The entrance conference was held May 11, 2016.

OTHER AGENCY OVERSIGHT

APPENDICES AND ENDNOTES CONTENTS

Appendix A	192
Appendix B	196
Appendix C	198
Appendix D	203
Appendix E	205
Appendix F	212
Appendix G	216
Endnotes	222

The Official Seal of SIGAR

The official seal of SIGAR represents the coordination of efforts between the United States and Afghanistan to provide accountability and oversight of reconstruction activities. The phrases in Dari (top) and Pashto (bottom) on the seal are translations of SIGAR's name.

APPENDICES AND ENDNOTES



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CROSS-REFERENCE OF REPORT TO STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

This appendix cross-references the sections of this report to the quarterly reporting and related requirements under SIGAR’s enabling legislation, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-181, § 1229 (Table A.1), and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-91, §1521. (Table A.2)

TABLE A.1

CROSS-REFERENCE TO SIGAR QUARTERLY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS UNDER PUB. L. NO. 110-181, § 1229			
Public Law Section	SIGAR Enabling Language	SIGAR Action	Report Section
Purpose			
Section 1229(a)(3)	To provide for an independent and objective means of keeping the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense fully and currently informed about problems and deficiencies relating to the administration of such programs and operations and the necessity for and progress on corrective action	Ongoing; quarterly report	Full report
Supervision			
Section 1229(e)(1)	The Inspector General shall report directly to, and be under the general supervision of, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense	Report to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense	Full report
Duties			
Section 1229(f)(1)	OVERSIGHT OF AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION – It shall be the duty of the Inspector General to conduct, supervise, and coordinate audits and investigations of the treatment, handling, and expenditure of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the reconstruction of Afghanistan, and of the programs, operations, and contracts carried out utilizing such funds, including subsections (A) through (G) below	Review appropriated/ available funds Review programs, operations, contracts using appropriated/ available funds	Full report
Section 1229(f)(1)(A)	The oversight and accounting of the obligation and expenditure of such funds	Review obligations and expenditures of appropriated/ available funds	SIGAR Oversight Funding
Section 1229(f)(1)(B)	The monitoring and review of reconstruction activities funded by such funds	Review reconstruction activities funded by appropriations and donations	SIGAR Oversight
Section 1229(f)(1)(C)	The monitoring and review of contracts funded by such funds	Review contracts using appropriated and available funds	Note
Section 1229(f)(1)(D)	The monitoring and review of the transfer of such funds and associated information between and among departments, agencies, and entities of the United States, and private and nongovernmental entities	Review internal and external transfers of appropriated/ available funds	Appendix B
Section 1229(f)(1)(E)	The maintenance of records on the use of such funds to facilitate future audits and investigations of the use of such fund[s]	Maintain audit records	SIGAR Oversight Appendix C Appendix E

Continued on the next page

APPENDICES

TABLE A.1 (CONTINUED)

CROSS-REFERENCE TO SIGAR QUARTERLY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS UNDER PUB. L. NO. 110-181, § 1229			
Public Law Section	SIGAR Enabling Language	SIGAR Action	Report Section
Section 1229(f)(1)(F)	The monitoring and review of the effectiveness of United States coordination with the Governments of Afghanistan and other donor countries in the implementation of the Afghanistan Compact and the Afghanistan National Development Strategy	Monitoring and review as described	Audits
Section 1229(f)(1)(G)	The investigation of overpayments such as duplicate payments or duplicate billing and any potential unethical or illegal actions of Federal employees, contractors, or affiliated entities, and the referral of such reports, as necessary, to the Department of Justice to ensure further investigations, prosecutions, recovery of further funds, or other remedies	Conduct and reporting of investigations as described	Investigations
Section 1229(f)(2)	OTHER DUTIES RELATED TO OVERSIGHT – The Inspector General shall establish, maintain, and oversee such systems, procedures, and controls as the Inspector General considers appropriate to discharge the duties under paragraph (1)	Establish, maintain, and oversee systems, procedures, and controls	Full report
Section 1229(f)(3)	DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978 – In addition, ... the Inspector General shall also have the duties and responsibilities of inspectors general under the Inspector General Act of 1978	Duties as specified in Inspector General Act	Full report
Section 1229(f)(4)	COORDINATION OF EFFORTS – The Inspector General shall coordinate with, and receive the cooperation of, each of the following: (A) the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, (B) the Inspector General of the Department of State, and (C) the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development	Coordination with the inspectors general of DOD, State, and USAID	Other Agency Oversight
Federal Support and Other Resources			
Section 1229(h)(5)(A)	ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES – Upon request of the Inspector General for information or assistance from any department, agency, or other entity of the Federal Government, the head of such entity shall, insofar as is practicable and not in contravention of any existing law, furnish such information or assistance to the Inspector General, or an authorized designee	Expect support as requested	Full report
Section 1229(h)(5)(B)	REPORTING OF REFUSED ASSISTANCE – Whenever information or assistance requested by the Inspector General is, in the judgment of the Inspector General, unreasonably refused or not provided, the Inspector General shall report the circumstances to the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate, and to the appropriate congressional committees without delay	Monitor cooperation	N/A

APPENDICES

TABLE A.1 (CONTINUED)

CROSS-REFERENCE TO SIGAR QUARTERLY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS UNDER PUB. L. NO. 110-181, § 1229			
Public Law Section	SIGAR Enabling Language	SIGAR Action	Report Section
Reports			
Section 1229(i)(1)	QUARTERLY REPORTS – Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal-year quarter, the Inspector General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report summarizing, for the period of that quarter and, to the extent possible, the period from the end of such quarter to the time of the submission of the report, the activities during such period of the Inspector General and the activities under programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the reconstruction of Afghanistan. Each report shall include, for the period covered by such report, a detailed statement of all obligations, expenditures, and revenues associated with reconstruction and rehabilitation activities in Afghanistan, including the following –	Report – 30 days after the end of each calendar quarter Summarize activities of the Inspector General Detailed statement of all obligations, expenditures, and revenues	Full report Appendix B
Section 1229(i)(1)(A)	Obligations and expenditures of appropriated/donated funds	Obligations and expenditures of appropriated/donated funds	Appendix B
Section 1229(i)(1)(B)	A project-by-project and program-by-program accounting of the costs incurred to date for the reconstruction of Afghanistan, together with the estimate of the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development, as applicable, of the costs to complete each project and each program	Project-by-project and program-by-program accounting of costs. List unexpended funds for each project or program	Funding Note
Section 1229(i)(1)(C)	Revenues attributable to or consisting of funds provided by foreign nations or international organizations to programs and projects funded by any department or agency of the United States Government, and any obligations or expenditures of such revenues	Revenues, obligations, and expenditures of donor funds	Funding
Section 1229(i)(1)(D)	Revenues attributable to or consisting of foreign assets seized or frozen that contribute to programs and projects funded by any U.S. government department or agency, and any obligations or expenditures of such revenues	Revenues, obligations, and expenditures of funds from seized or frozen assets	Funding
Section 1229(i)(1)(E)	Operating expenses of agencies or entities receiving amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the reconstruction of Afghanistan	Operating expenses of agencies or any organization receiving appropriated funds	Funding Appendix B
Section 1229(i)(1)(F)	In the case of any contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism described in paragraph (2)*– (i) The amount of the contract or other funding mechanism; (ii) A brief discussion of the scope of the contract or other funding mechanism; (iii) A discussion of how the department or agency of the United States Government involved in the contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism identified and solicited offers from potential contractors to perform the contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism, together with a list of the potential individuals or entities that were issued solicitations for the offers; and (iv) The justification and approval documents on which was based the determination to use procedures other than procedures that provide for full and open competition	Describe contract details	Note

Continued on the next page

APPENDICES

TABLE A.1 (CONTINUED)

CROSS-REFERENCE TO SIGAR QUARTERLY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS UNDER PUB. L. NO. 110-181, § 1229			
Public Law Section	SIGAR Enabling Language	SIGAR Action	Report Section
Section 1229(i)(3)	PUBLIC AVAILABILITY – The Inspector General shall publish on a publicly available Internet website each report under paragraph (1) of this subsection in English and other languages that the Inspector General determines are widely used and understood in Afghanistan	Publish report as directed at www.sigar.mil Dari and Pashto translation in process	Full report
Section 1229(i)(4)	FORM – Each report required under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex if the Inspector General considers it necessary	Publish report as directed	Full report
Section 1229(j)(1)	Inspector General shall also submit each report required under subsection (i) to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense	Submit quarterly report	Full report

Note: Although this data is normally made available on SIGAR's website (www.sigar.mil), the data SIGAR has received is in relatively raw form and is currently being reviewed, analyzed, and organized for future SIGAR use and publication.

* Covered "contracts, grants, agreements, and funding mechanisms" are defined in paragraph (2) of Section 1229(i) of Pub. L. No. 110-181 as being—
"any major contract, grant, agreement, or other funding mechanism that is entered into by any department or agency of the United States Government that involves the use of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the reconstruction of Afghanistan with any public or private sector entity for any of the following purposes:
To build or rebuild physical infrastructure of Afghanistan.
To establish or reestablish a political or societal institution of Afghanistan.
To provide products or services to the people of Afghanistan."

TABLE A.2

CROSS-REFERENCE TO SIGAR QUARTERLY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS UNDER PUB. L. NO. 115-91, §1521			
Public Law Section	NDAAs Language	SIGAR Action	Report Section
Section 1521(e)(1)	(1) QUALITY STANDARDS FOR IG PRODUCTS—Except as provided in paragraph (3), each product published or issued by an Inspector General relating to the oversight of programs and activities funded under the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund shall be prepared— (A) in accordance with the Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards/Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS/GAS), as issued and updated by the Government Accountability Office; or (B) if not prepared in accordance with the standards referred to in subparagraph (A), in accordance with the Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation issued by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (commonly referred to as the "CIGIE Blue Book")	Prepare quarterly report in accordance with the Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation, issued by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), commonly referred to as the "CIGIE Blue Book," for activities funded under the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	Section 1 Reconstruction Update (Section 3)
Section 1521(e)(2)	(2) SPECIFICATION OF QUALITY STANDARDS FOLLOWED— Each product published or issued by an Inspector General relating to the oversight of programs and activities funded under the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund shall cite within such product the quality standards followed in conducting and reporting the work concerned	Cite within the quarterly report the quality standards followed in conducting and reporting the work concerned. The required quality standards are quality control, planning, data collection and analysis, evidence, records maintenance, reporting, and follow-up	Inside front cover Appendix A

APPENDICES

APPENDIX B

U.S. FUNDS FOR AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION

Table B.1 lists funds appropriated for Afghanistan reconstruction by agency and fund per year, and Table B.2 lists funds appropriated for counternarcotics initiatives, as of March 31, 2019.

TABLE B.2

COUNTERNARCOTICS (\$ MILLIONS)	
Fund	Cumulative Since FY 2002
ASFF	\$1,311.92
DOD CN	3,382.82
ESF	1,453.39
DA	77.72
INCLE	2,314.87
DEA ^a	465.25
Total	\$9,005.97

Table B.2 Note: Numbers have been rounded. Counternarcotics funds cross-cut both the Security and Governance & Development spending categories; these funds are also captured in those categories in Table B.1. Figures represent cumulative amounts committed to counternarcotics initiatives in Afghanistan since 2002. Initiatives include eradication, interdiction, support to Afghanistan's Special Mission Wing (SMW), counternarcotics-related capacity building, and alternative agricultural development efforts. ESF, DA, and INCLE figures show the cumulative amounts committed for counternarcotics initiatives from those funds. SIGAR excluded ASFF funding for the SMW after FY 2013 from this analysis due to the decreasing number of counternarcotics missions conducted by the SMW.

^a DEA receives funding from State's Diplomatic & Consular Programs account in addition to DEA's direct line appropriation listed in Appendix B.

Table B.2 Source: SIGAR analysis of counternarcotics funding, 4/18/2019; State, response to SIGAR data call, 4/8/2019; DOD, response to SIGAR data call, 4/12/2019; USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019; DEA, response to SIGAR data call, 4/8/2019.

Table B.1 Note: Numbers have been rounded. DOD reprogrammed \$1 billion from FY 2011 ASFF, \$1 billion from FY 2012 ASFF, and \$1.78 million from FY 2013 ASFF to fund other DOD OCO requirements. DOD reprogrammed \$230 million into FY 2015 ASFF. ASFF data reflects the following rescissions: \$1 billion from FY 2012 in Pub. L. No. 113-6, \$764.38 million from FY 2014 in Pub. L. No. 113-235, \$400 million from FY 2015 in Pub. L. No. 114-113, and \$150 million from FY 2016 in Pub. L. No. 115-31. DOD transferred \$101 million from FY 2011 AIF, \$179.5 million from FY 2013 AIF, and \$55 million from FY 2014 AIF to the ESF to fund infrastructure projects implemented by USAID.

Table B.1 Source: DOD, response to SIGAR data call, 4/9/2019, 4/16/2019, 10/12/2017, 10/22/2012, 10/14/2009, and 10/1/2009; State, response to SIGAR data call, 4/8/2019, 4/9/2019, 4/15/2019, 10/5/2018, 1/10/2018, 10/13/2017, 10/11/2017, 5/4/2016, 10/20/2015, 4/15/2015, 4/15/2014, 6/27/2013, 10/5/2012 and 6/27/2012; Treasury, response to SIGAR data call, 7/10/2017; OMB, response to SIGAR data call, 4/16/2015, 7/14/2014, 7/19/2013 and 1/4/2013; USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/9/2019, 4/11/2019, 4/15/2019, 10/8/2018, 10/15/2010, 1/15/2010, and 10/9/2009; DOJ, response to SIGAR data call, 4/8/2019, 6/30/2017 and 7/7/2009; OPIC, response to SIGAR data call, 4/9/2019; USAGM, response to SIGAR data call, 4/9/2019; USDA, response to SIGAR data call, 4/2009; DFAS, "AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019," 4/12/2019; OSD Comptroller, 16-22 PA: Omnibus 2016 Prior Approval Request, 6/30/2016; Pub. L. Nos. 115-31, 114-113, 113-235, 113-76, 113-6, 112-74, 112-10, 111-212, 111-118.

TABLE B.1

U.S. FUNDS FOR AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION (\$ MILLIONS)			
U.S. Funding Sources	Agency	Total	FY 2002-07
Security			
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF)	DOD	\$77,752.18	\$10,309.53
Train & Equip (DOD)	DOD	440.00	440.00
Foreign Military Financing (FMF)	State	1,059.14	1,059.14
International Military Education and Training (IMET)	State	18.33	4.35
Voluntary Peacekeeping (PKO)	State	69.33	69.33
Afghanistan Freedom Support Act (AFSA)	DOD	550.00	550.00
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities (DICDA)	DOD	3,382.82	695.36
Total - Security		83,271.80	13,127.71
Governance & Development			
Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP)	DOD	3,704.00	600.00
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF)	DOD	988.50	0.00
Task Force for Business and Stability Operations (TFBSO)	DOD	822.85	0.00
Economic Support Fund (ESF)	USAID	20,499.44	4,229.19
Development Assistance (DA)	USAID	886.50	735.07
Child Survival & Health (CSH + GHAI)	USAID	554.63	270.82
Commodity Credit Corp (CCC)	USAID	34.95	8.80
USAID (Other)	USAID	53.73	5.50
Non-Proliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining & Related (NADR)	State	804.54	258.69
International Narcotics Control & Law Enforcement (INCLE)	State	5,254.53	1,473.67
Human Rights and Democracy Fund (HRDF)	State	12.29	0.71
U.S. Agency for Global Media (USAGM)	USAGM	256.50	0.00
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)	OPIC	317.37	177.65
Treasury Technical Assistance (TTA)	Treasury	4.65	3.23
Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)	DOJ	255.81	67.97
Total - Governance & Development		34,450.29	7,831.31
Humanitarian			
P.L. 480 Title II	USAID	1,095.68	436.65
International Disaster Assistance (IDA)	USAID	831.50	298.30
Transition Initiatives (TI)	USAID	37.54	32.58
Migration & Refugee Assistance (MRA)	State	1,348.93	408.80
Emergency Refugee & Migration Assistance (ERMA)	State	25.20	25.00
USDA Programs (Title I, §416(b), FFP, FFE, ET, PRTA)	USDA	288.26	227.52
Total - Humanitarian		3,627.11	1,428.85
Civilian Operations			
Oversight		591.51	2.50
Other		11,045.34	866.42
Total - Civilian Operations		11,636.84	868.92
TOTAL FUNDING		\$132,986.05	\$23,256.80

APPENDICES

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
	2,750.00	5,606.94	9,166.77	10,619.28	9,200.00	4,946.20	3,962.34	3,939.33	3,502.26	4,162.72	4,666.82	4,920.00
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	1.66	1.40	1.76	1.56	1.18	1.42	1.50	1.05	0.86	0.80	0.80	0.00
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	192.81	230.06	392.27	379.83	472.99	255.81	238.96	0.00	138.76	135.61	118.01	132.36
	2,944.47	5,838.40	9,560.80	11,000.67	9,674.16	5,203.44	4,202.80	3,940.38	3,641.88	4,299.12	4,785.62	5,052.36
	488.33	550.67	1,000.00	400.00	400.00	200.00	30.00	10.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	10.00
	0.00	0.00	0.00	299.00	400.00	145.50	144.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.00	14.44	59.26	239.24	245.76	138.20	122.24	3.72	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	1,399.51	2,077.48	3,346.00	2,168.51	1,836.76	1,802.65	907.00	831.90	633.27	767.17	500.00	0.00
	149.43	0.40	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	63.04	58.23	92.30	69.91	0.00	0.25	0.01	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	10.77	4.22	4.22	3.09	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.95	1.52	0.00
	21.96	2.81	3.45	6.25	7.10	1.84	0.80	0.82	2.91	0.29	0.00	0.00
	29.72	59.92	70.74	69.30	65.32	52.60	43.20	43.50	37.96	37.00	36.60	0.00
	307.56	493.90	589.00	400.00	357.92	593.81	225.00	250.00	210.00	184.50	160.00	9.17
	1.30	1.18	1.29	0.60	1.98	1.63	0.10	0.99	0.76	0.75	1.00	0.00
	0.00	15.50	27.40	24.40	21.50	21.50	22.10	22.70	23.90	25.90	25.70	25.90
	18.48	6.15	60.25	40.00	3.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.85	0.00
	0.75	0.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	40.59	18.88	19.20	18.70	18.70	17.00	18.70	9.05	3.31	11.03	11.11	1.58
	2,531.43	3,304.26	5,273.40	3,738.99	3,358.41	2,975.52	1,523.16	1,173.68	917.10	1,033.60	742.78	46.65
	154.73	73.01	58.13	112.55	59.20	46.15	65.97	53.73	26.65	4.69	4.22	0.00
	16.84	27.13	29.61	66.23	56.00	21.50	28.13	24.50	39.78	93.84	119.64	10.03
	0.00	0.75	0.84	1.08	0.62	0.32	0.82	0.49	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
	44.25	76.79	80.93	65.00	99.56	76.07	107.89	129.27	84.27	89.24	76.25	10.61
	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	42.95	17.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	258.77	195.67	169.51	244.85	215.38	144.04	202.82	207.99	150.74	187.76	200.11	20.64
	14.30	25.20	34.40	37.20	59.00	58.70	62.65	68.60	62.37	55.74	55.67	55.19
	435.51	1,052.76	1,747.00	893.50	1,406.35	1,260.44	838.45	888.60	795.20	782.07	73.63	5.41
	449.81	1,077.96	1,781.40	930.70	1,465.35	1,319.14	901.10	957.20	857.57	837.81	129.29	60.60
	6,184.47	10,416.29	16,785.10	15,915.21	14,713.30	9,642.15	6,829.87	6,279.25	5,567.29	6,358.29	5,857.81	5,180.24

APPENDICES

APPENDIX C

SIGAR WRITTEN PRODUCTS*

SIGAR Audits

Completed Performance Audit Reports

SIGAR completed one performance audit report during this reporting period.

COMPLETED SIGAR PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORTS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019		
Report Identifier	Report Title	Date Issued
SIGAR 19-37-AR	Afghanistan's Energy Sector: USAID and DOD Did Not Consistently Collect and Report Performance Data on Projects Related to Kajaki Dam, and Concerns Exist Regarding Sustainability	4/2019

New Performance Audits

SIGAR initiated one new performance audit during this reporting period.

NEW SIGAR PERFORMANCE AUDITS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019		
Project Identifier	Project Title	Date Initiated
SIGAR 132A	Counternarcotics/Counter-Threat Finance (CTF)	2/2019

Ongoing Performance Audits

SIGAR had nine ongoing performance audits during this reporting period.

ONGOING SIGAR PERFORMANCE AUDITS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019		
Project Identifier	Project Title	Date Initiated
SIGAR 131A	American University of Afghanistan	9/2018
SIGAR 130A	Anti-corruption Strategy Update	8/2018
SIGAR 128A	U.S. Agency for International Development's Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project	7/2018
SIGAR 127A	Department of Defense's Efforts to Train and Equip the Afghan National Army with ScanEagle Unmanned Aerial Vehicles	7/2018
SIGAR 126A	MOD/MOI Anti-corruption	7/2018
SIGAR 125A	USAID Food Assistance	7/2018
SIGAR 124A	Afghan Business Taxes Assessed on U.S. Government Contractors	4/2018
SIGAR 123A	Department of State's Efforts to Support and Transition Drug Treatment Programs in Afghanistan	11/2017
SIGAR 119A	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Local National Quality Assurance Program	3/2017

* As provided in its authorizing statute, SIGAR may also report on products and events occurring after March 31, 2019, up to the publication date of this report.

APPENDICES

Completed Financial Audit Reports

SIGAR completed seven financial audit reports during this reporting period.

COMPLETED SIGAR FINANCIAL AUDIT REPORTS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019

Report Identifier	Report Title	Date Issued
SIGAR 19-31-FA	Department of State's Afghan Civilian Advisor Support Program: Audit of Costs Incurred by DynCorp International LLC	4/2019
SIGAR 19-30-FA	USAID's Afghanistan University Support and Workforce Development Program: Audit of Costs Incurred by FHI 360	4/2019
SIGAR 19-28-FA	USAID's Helping Mothers and Children Thrive Program: Audit of Costs Incurred by Jhpiego Corporation	3/2019
SIGAR 19-27-FA	USAID's Technical Assistance Provided to the Afghan Ministry of Public Works: Audit of Costs Incurred by Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions Inc.	3/2019
SIGAR 19-26-FA	USAID's Women's Leadership Development Project in Afghanistan: Audit of Costs Incurred by ARD Inc.	3/2019
SIGAR 19-23-FA	Department of the Army's Law Enforcement Professionals Program: Audit of Costs Incurred by Engility Corporation	3/2019
SIGAR 19-19-FA	USAID's Afghanistan Agriculture Extension Project-II: Audit of Costs Incurred by University of California, Davis	2/2019

New Financial Audits

SIGAR initiated four new financial audits during this reporting period.

NEW SIGAR FINANCIAL AUDITS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019

Project Identifier	Project Title	Date Initiated
SIGAR-F-174	ABT Associates Inc.-SHOPS Plus	3/13/19
SIGAR-F-173	Futures Group International LLC-Health Sector Resiliency (HSR)	3/13/19
SIGAR-F-172	Checchi and Company Consulting Inc. (CCCI)-Assistance for the Development of Afghan Legal Access and Transparency (ADALAT)	3/13/19
SIGAR-F-171	Creative Associates International-Afghan Children Read (ACR)	3/13/19

Ongoing Financial Audits

SIGAR had 32 financial audits in progress during this reporting period.

ONGOING SIGAR FINANCIAL AUDITS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019

Project Identifier	Project Title	Date Initiated
SIGAR-F-170	Ideal Innovations Incorporated-Afghanistan Automated Biometric Identification System (AABIS)	10/31/18
SIGAR-F-169	CH2M HILL Inc.-Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP)	10/31/18
SIGAR-F-168	Alutiq Professional Training LLC-Antiterrorism Assistance Program (ATA)	10/31/18
SIGAR-F-167	The Colombo Plan-Drug Demand Reduction Project	10/31/18
SIGAR-F-166	Mercy Corps-Introducing New Vocational Educational Skills Training (INVEST 3)	10/31/18
SIGAR-F-165	HALO Trust-Weapons Removal and Mine Clearing	10/31/18
SIGAR-F-164	MDC-Demining Projects	10/31/18
SIGAR-F-162	New York University-Assessment of Learning Outcomes and Social Effects in Community-Based Education	10/2018

Continued on the next page

APPENDICES

ONGOING SIGAR FINANCIAL AUDITS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019 (CONTINUED)		
Project Identifier	Project Title	Date Initiated
SIGAR-F-161	KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation–Challenge Tuberculosis	10/2018
SIGAR-F-160	Chemonics International Inc.–Regional Agriculture Development Program–South (RADP-South)	10/2018
SIGAR-F-159	Da Afghanistan Breshna Sherkat (DABS)–Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity (PTEC)	10/2018
SIGAR-F-158	ITF Enhancing Human Security–Various Demining Projects	6/2018
SIGAR-F-157	Demining Agency for Afghanistan (DAFA)–Various Demining Projects	6/2018
SIGAR-F-156	International Rescue Committee–Supporting Livelihoods and Protection for Afghan Returnees, Internally Displaced People (IDPS) and Vulnerable Host Communities	6/2018
SIGAR-F-155	Stanford Law School–Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) Program Operations and Support Services in Kabul, Afghanistan.	6/2018
SIGAR-F-154	Science and Engineering Services LLC–Utility Helicopter Program Office (UHPO) UH-60A Enhanced Phase Maintenance Inspection (PMI) Program Afghanistan	6/2018
SIGAR-F-153	Leidos Innovations Corporation (previously Lockheed Martin)–Non-Standard Rotary Wing Aircraft (NSRWA) Contractor Logistics Sustainment (CLS), Afghanistan	6/2018
SIGAR-F-152	Management Sciences for Health–Strengthening Pharmaceutical Systems (SPS)	5/2018
SIGAR-F-151	Michigan State University–Grain Research and innovation (GRAIN)	5/2018
SIGAR-F-150	Tetra Tech Inc.–Engineering Support Program	5/2018
SIGAR-F-149	AECOM International Development (AECOM)–Strengthening Watershed and Irrigation Management (SWIM)	5/2018
SIGAR-F-148	Development Alternatives Inc.–Women in the Economy (WIE)	5/2018
SIGAR-F-147	Aga Khan Foundation U.S.A.–Multi-Input Area Development Global Development Alliance (MIAD-GDA)	5/2018
SIGAR-F-146	Creative Associates International Inc.–Afghanistan Workforce Development Program (AWDP)	5/2018
SIGAR-F-145	FHI 360–Initiative for Hygiene, Sanitation, and Nutrition (IHSAN)	5/2018
SIGAR-F-144	Development Alternatives Inc.–Assistance to Legislative Bodies of Afghanistan (ALBA)	5/2018
SIGAR-F-143	The Asia Foundation–Ministry of Women's Affairs Organizational	5/2018
SIGAR-F-141	International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Program's Operations and Support Services in Kabul, Afghanistan, Non-Chief of Mission	1/2018
SIGAR-F-137	Strong Hubs for Afghan Hope and Resilience (SHAHAR)	1/2018
SIGAR-F-136	Regional Agriculture Development Program (RADP North)	1/2018
SIGAR-F-135	Strengthening Education in Afghanistan (SEA II)	1/2018
SIGAR-F-132	Capacity Building and Change Management Program II (CBCMP-II)	1/2018

SIGAR Inspections Completed Inspection Reports

SIGAR completed two inspection reports during this reporting period.

COMPLETED SIGAR INSPECTION REPORTS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019

Product Identifier	Report Title	Date Issued
SIGAR 19-35-IP	USAID's Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project: Arghandi-Ghazni Transmission Line Was Generally Built to Contract Requirements, but Four Deficiencies Create Safety Hazards and Could Disrupt Electrical Power	4/2019
SIGAR 19-36-IP	Kang Border Patrol Headquarters: Construction Generally Met Contract Requirements, but Four Deficiencies Exist, and the \$5.2 Million Project Has Not Been Used or Maintained	4/2019

Ongoing Inspections

SIGAR had 10 ongoing inspections during this reporting period.

ONGOING SIGAR INSPECTIONS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019

Project Identifier	Project Title	Date Initiated
SIGAR-I-059	Inspection of the Ministry of Commerce and Industries Building-Kunduz	11/2018
SIGAR-I-058	Inspection of the ANA NEI in Pul-e Khumri	10/2018
SIGAR-I-057	Inspection of the ANA TAAC Air JAF I Demo/New Structure	10/2018
SIGAR-I-056	Inspection of the Women's Compound at ANP RTC Herat	10/2018
SIGAR-I-055	Inspection of the AIF Kajaki Dam Tunnel	10/2018
SIGAR-I-054	Inspection of the Women's Compound at the Afghan National Police Regional Training Center-Jalalabad	4/2018
SIGAR-I-053	Inspection of the Ghulam Khan Road	4/2018
SIGAR-I-052	Inspection of the North East Power System Project Phase 1: Transmission Lines Between Arghandi and Pul-e Alam and Substation at Pul-e Alam	10/2017
SIGAR-I-051	Inspection of the Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project Power Substations at Ghazni and Sayadabad	10/2017
SIGAR-I-050	Inspection of Construction and Utility Upgrades for the ANA Garrison at South Kabul International Airport	9/2017

APPENDICES

SIGAR Special Projects Completed Special Projects Reports

SIGAR completed six special projects reports during this reporting period.

COMPLETED SIGAR SPECIAL PROJECTS REPORTS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019

Project Identifier	Project Title	Date Issued
SIGAR 19-34-SP	USAID-Supported Health Facilities in Bamyan Province, Afghanistan: Observations from 44 Site Visits	4/2019
SIGAR 19-33-SP	Schools in Bamyan Province, Afghanistan: Observations from Site Visits at 16 Schools	4/2019
SIGAR 19-24-SP	Bridges in Ghazni Province, Afghanistan: All Eight Bridges SIGAR Visited Were In Good Condition	3/2019
SIGAR 19-22-SP	Afghan National Defense and Security Forces Facilities: Action Needed to Address Confiscation of Contractor-Owned Property and Contractor Mistreatment	3/2019
SIGAR 19-21-SP	Schools in Paktika Province, Afghanistan: Observations from Site Visits at Six Schools	2/2019
SIGAR 19-20-SP	USAID-Supported Health Facilities in Faryab Province, Afghanistan: Observations from 17 Site Visits	2/2019

SIGAR Lessons Learned Program Ongoing Lessons Learned Projects


SIGAR has four ongoing lessons-learned projects this reporting period.

ONGOING SIGAR LESSONS LEARNED PROJECTS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019

Project Identifier	Project Title	Date Initiated
SIGAR LL-12	Reintegration	8/2018
SIGAR LL-11	U.S. Support for Elections	9/2018
SIGAR LL-10	Contracting	8/2018
SIGAR LL-09	U.S. and Coalition Responsibilities for Security Sector Assistance	3/2018

APPENDIX D

UNCLASSIFIED



**HEADQUARTERS
UNITED STATES FORCES-AFGHANISTAN
KABUL, AFGHANISTAN**

██████████

DCOS S&P STRATPLANS AAG 3 March 2018

MEMORANDUM FOR Department of Defense Inspector General, ██████████
██████████

SUBJECT: Response to the 2nd Quarter FY19 SIGAR Data Call

1. (U) AAG was responsible for answering the following DoDIG Data Call question, Apr-Sec-37. The question is italicized and copied verbatim from the original tasker, and our answer is detailed in the following discussion.
2. (U) Apr-Sec-37, subsets a-n: *"To understand and track a key metric of the status of the war effort in Afghanistan, which has an unquestionable effect on the ANDSF reconstruction/development effort. As follow-up to the 1/17/2019 discussion with OUSD-P and RS/AAG on district control (which we found very helpful), we are planning to incorporate some of RS/AAG's suggestions about the context and concepts behind control data into the draft. We plan to provide draft language, additional analysis, and underlying sources for this contextual discussion of control around the time that we send the final data call to provide enough time for vetting. As we mentioned at the SVTC, we will send this draft language to OSD-P and RS/AAG for review and feedback. Please provide the following information on district, population, and land-area control/influence of GIROA versus the insurgency in an unclassified format (determined by COMRS on 2/7/2018):"*
 - (U) Subset a. *Please describe any recent changes in RS's thinking regarding its district stability data. We understand that there was a recent change in the command's views on the decision-making value of this data.*
 - a. (U) **RESPONSE:** The District Stability Assessment (DSA) is no longer being produced. The DSA was of limited decision-making value to the Commander, RS.
 - (U) Subset b. *Please provide the full district control data in spreadsheet format of any district control assessment roll-ups produced after the us of October 22, 2018 data we received last quarter. If such an items exists, please list the with "as of" date for the data. This should be provided in an unclassified format (determined by COMRS on 2/7/2018). We are looking to close the loop/ get the last assessment for our archives for this data.*
 - b. (U) **RESPONSE:** District stability data has not been collected since the October 22, 2018 data submitted last quarter.
 - (U) Subset d. *Please provide the quarterly district control assessment and/or map created for the next Periodic Mission Review for any district control assessment roll-ups produced after the us of October 22, 2018 data we received last quarter. If such an items exists, please list the 'as of' date for the data. If there are any district control assessments*

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDICES

DCOS S&P STRATPLANS AAG UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT: Response to the 1st Quarter FY19 SIGAR Data Call

created at a more frequent interval than the quarterly PMR, please provide copies of these products. These should be provided in an unclassified format (per COMRS on 2/7/2018). We are looking to close the loop/ get the last assessment for our archives for this data.

c. (U) **RESPONSE:** A new District Stability Assessment map has not been produced since the October 22, 2018 data submitted last quarter.

(U) Subset e: *Recognizing that the RS/USFOR-A command has a new perspective on the decision-making value of district control data, please provide copies of the two most recent full slide decks (or whatever format) used during the latest RS or USFOR-A commander's update brief (or similar forum). We realize this product will likely be classified.*

d. (U) **RESPONSE:** There are no products at command or other forums that communicate district stability or control information.

3. (U) The point of contact for this answer is

Director, Assessments & Analysis Group

End
None

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDIX E


SIGAR INVESTIGATIONS AND HOTLINE

SIGAR Investigations

This quarter, SIGAR opened 14 new investigations and closed 11, bringing the total number of ongoing investigations to 168. Of the closed investigations, most were closed due to conviction, administrative action, or unfounded allegations, as shown in Figure D.1. Of the new investigations, most were related to corruption and bribery or procurement and contract fraud, as shown in Figure D.2.

FIGURE D.1


SIGAR'S CLOSED INVESTIGATIONS, JANUARY 1-MARCH 31, 2019



Source: SIGAR Investigations Directorate, 4/4/2019.

FIGURE D.2

SIGAR NEW INVESTIGATIONS, JANUARY 1-MARCH 31, 2019



Source: SIGAR Investigations Directorate, 4/4/2019.


APPENDICES

SIGAR Hotline

The SIGAR Hotline (866-329-8893 in the USA, 0700107300 via cell phone in Afghanistan) received 44 complaints this quarter, as shown in Figure D.3. In addition to working on new complaints, the Investigations Directorate continued its work this quarter on complaints received prior to January 1, 2019. This quarter, the directorate processed 109 complaints, most of which are under review or were closed, as shown in Figure D.4.

FIGURE D.3


SOURCE OF SIGAR HOTLINE COMPLAINTS, JANUARY 1–MARCH 31, 2019



Source: SIGAR Investigations Directorate, 4/1/2019.

FIGURE D.4

STATUS OF SIGAR HOTLINE COMPLAINTS: JANUARY 1–MARCH 31, 2019



Source: SIGAR Investigations Directorate, 4/1/2019.

SIGAR SUSPENSIONS AND DEBARMENTS

Table D.1 is a comprehensive list of finalized suspensions, debarments, and special entity designations relating to SIGAR’s work in Afghanistan as of March 31, 2019. *SIGAR lists its suspensions, debarments and special entity designations for historical purposes only.* For the current status of any individual or entity listed herein as previously suspended, debarred or listed as a special entity designation, please consult the System for Award Management, www.sam.gov.

Entries appearing in both the suspension and debarment sections are based upon their placement in suspended status following criminal indictment or determination of non-responsibility by agency suspension and debarment official. Final debarment was imposed following criminal conviction in U.S. Federal District Court and/or final determination by agency suspension and debarment official regarding term of debarment.

APPENDICES

TABLE D.1

SPECIAL ENTITY DESIGNATIONS, SUSPENSIONS, AND DEBARMENTS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019

Special Entity Designations

Arvin Kam Construction Company	Noh-E Safi Mining Company	Saadat, Wakil
Arvin Kam Group, L.L.C., d.b.a. "Arvin Kam Group Security," d.b.a. "Arvin Kam Group Foundation," d.b.a. "Arvin Global Logistics Services Company"	Noor Rahman Company	Triangle Technologies
Ayub, Mohammad	Noor Rahman Construction Company	Wasim, Abdul Wakil
Fruzi, Haji Khalil	Nur Rahman Group, d.b.a. "NUCCL Construction Company," d.b.a. "RUCCL Rahman Umar Construction Company," d.b.a. "Rahman Trading and General Logistics Company LLC	Zaland, Yousef
Muhammad, Haji Amir	Rahman, Nur, a.k.a. "Noor Rahman, a.k.a. "Noor Rahman Safa"	Zurmat Construction Company
Haji Dhost Mohammad Zurmat Construction Company	Rhaman, Mohammad	Zurmat Foundation
Jan, Nurullah		Zurmat General Trading
Khan, Haji Mohammad Almas		Zurmat Group of Companies, d.b.a. "Zurmat LLC"
		Zurmat Material Testing Laboratory

Suspensions

Al-Watan Construction Company	Autry, Cleo Brian	Farouki, Abul Huda
Basirat Construction Firm	Chamberlain, William Todd	Farouki, Mazen
Naqibullah, Nadeem	Cook, Jeffrey Arthur	Maarouf, Salah
Rahman, Obaidur	Harper, Deric Tyron	ANHAM FZCO
Robinson, Franz Martin	Walls, Barry Lee, Jr.	ANHAM USA
Aaria Middle East	International Contracting and Development	Green, George E.
Aaria Middle East Company LLC	Sobh, Adeeb Nagib, a.k.a. "Ali Sobh"	Tran, Anthony Don
Aftech International	Stallion Construction and Engineering Group	Vergez, Norbert Eugene
Aftech International Pvt. Ltd.	Wazne Group, Inc., d.b.a. "Wazne Wholesale"	Bunch, Donald P.
Albahar Logistics	Wazne, Ayman, a.k.a. "Ayman Ibrahim Wazne"	Kline, David A.
American Aaria Company LLC	Green, George E.	Farouki, Abul Huda
American Aaria LLC	Tran, Anthony Don	Farouki, Mazen
Sharpway Logistics	Vergez, Norbert Eugene	Maarouf, Salah
United States California Logistics Company	Bunch, Donald P.	ANHAM FZCO
Brothers, Richard S.	Kline, David A.	ANHAM USA
Rivera-Medina, Franklin Delano		

Debarments

Farooqi, Hashmatullah	McCabe, Elton Maurice	Atal, Waheed
Hamid Lais Construction Company	Mihalcz, John	Daud, Abdullah
Hamid Lais Group	Qasimi, Mohammed Indress	Dehati, Abdul Majid
Lodin, Rohullah Farooqi	Radhi, Mohammad Khalid	Fazli, Qais
Bennett & Fouch Associates LLC	Safi, Fazal Ahmed	Hamdard, Mohammad Yousuf
Brandon, Gary	Shin Gul Shaheen, a.k.a. "Sheen Gul Shaheen"	Kunari, Haji Pir Mohammad
K5 Global	Espinoza-Loor, Pedro Alfredo	Mushfiq, Muhammad Jaffar
Ahmad, Noor	Campbell, Neil Patrick*	Mutallib, Abdul
Noor Ahmad Yousufzai Construction Company	Navarro, Wesley	Nasrat, Sami
Ayeni, Sheryl Adenike	Hazrati, Arash	National General Construction Company
Cannon, Justin	Midfield International	Passerly, Ahmaad Saleem
Constantino, April Anne	Moore, Robert G.	Rabi, Fazal
Constantino, Dee	Noori, Noor Alam, a.k.a. "Noor Alam"	Rahman, Atta
Constantino, Ramil Palmes	Northern Reconstruction Organization	Rahman, Fazal
Crilly, Braam	Shamal Pamir Building and Road Construction Company	Roshandil, Mohammad Ajmal
Drotleff, Christopher	Wade, Desi D.	Saber, Mohammed
Fil-Tech Engineering and Construction Company	Blue Planet Logistics Services	Safi, Azizur Rahman
Handa, Sdilharth	Mahmodi, Padres	Safi, Matiullah
Jabak, Imad	Mahmodi, Shikab	Sahak, Sher Khan
Jamally, Rohullah	Saber, Mohammed	Shaheed, Murad
Khalid, Mohammad	Watson, Brian Erik	Shirzad, Daulet Khan
Khan, Daro	Abbasi, Shahpoor	Uddin, Mehrib
Mariano, April Anne Perez	Amiri, Waheedullah	Watson, Brian Erik

* Indicate that the individual or entity was subject to two final agency actions by an agency suspension and debarment official, resulting in a suspension followed by final debarment following the resolution of a criminal indictment or determination of non-responsibility by agency suspension and debarment official.

APPENDICES

TABLE D.1 (CONTINUED)

SPECIAL ENTITY DESIGNATIONS, SUSPENSIONS, AND DEBARMENTS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019 (CONTINUED)		
Debarments (continued)		
Wooten, Philip Steven*	Safiullah, a.k.a. "Mr. Safiullah"	Hightower, Jonathan
Espinoza, Mauricio*	Sarfarez, a.k.a. "Mr. Sarfarez"	Khan, Noor Zali, a.k.a. "Wali Kahn Noor"
Alam, Ahmed Farzad*	Wazir, Khan	Saheed, a.k.a. "Mr. Saheed," a.k.a. "Sahil," a.k.a. "Ghazi-Rahman"
Greenlight General Trading*	Akbar, Ali	Weaver, Christopher
Aaria Middle East Company LLC*	Crystal Construction Company, d.b.a. "Samitullah Road Construction Company"	Al Kaheel Oasis Services
Aaria Middle East Company Ltd. - Herat*	Samitullah (Individual uses only one name)	Al Kaheel Technical Service
Aaria M.E. General Trading LLC*	Ashna, Mohammad Ibrahim, a.k.a. "Ibrahim"	CLC Construction Company
Aaria Middle East*	Gurvinder, Singh	CLC Consulting L.L.C.
Barakzai, Nangialai*	Jahan, Shah	Complete Manpower Solutions
Formid Supply and Services*	Shahim, Zakirullah a.k.a. "Zakrullah Shahim", a.k.a. "Zikrullah Shahim"	Mohammed, Masiuddin, a.k.a. "Masi Mohammed"
Aaria Supply Services and Consultancy*	Alyas, Maiwand Ansunullah a.k.a. "Engineer Maiwand Alyas"	Rhoden, Bradley L., a.k.a. "Brad L. Rhoden"
Kabul Hackle Logistics Company*	BMCSC	Rhoden, Lorraine Serena
Yusef, Najeebullah*	Maiwand Haqmal Construction and Supply Company	Royal Super Jet General Trading L.L.C.
Aaria Group*	New Riders Construction Company, d.b.a. "Riders Construction Company," d.b.a. "New Riders Construction and Services Company"	Super Jet Construction Company
Aaria Group Construction Company*	Riders Constructions, Services, Logistics and Transportation Company	Super Jet Fuel Services
Aaria Supplies Company LTD*	Riders Group of Companies	Super Jet Group
Rahimi, Mohammad Edris*	Domineck, Lavette Kaye*	Super Jet Tours L.L.C., d.b.a. "Super Jet Travel and Holidays L.L.C."
All Points International Distributors Inc.*	Markwith, James*	Super Solutions L.L.C.
Hercules Global Logistics*	Martinez, Rene	Abdullah, Bilal
Schroeder, Robert*	Maroof, Abdul	Farmer, Robert Scott
Helmand Twinkle Construction Company	Qara, Yousef	Mudiyansele, Oliver
Waziri, Heward Omar	Royal Palace Construction Company	Kelly, Albert III
Zadran, Mohammad	Bradshaw, Christopher Chase	Ethridge, James
Afghan Mercury Construction Company, d.b.a. "Afghan Mercury Construction & Logistics Co."	Zuhra Productions	Fernridge Strategic Partners
Mirzali Naseeb Construction Company	Zuhra, Niaza	AISC LLC*
Montes, Diyana	Boulware, Candice a.k.a. "Candice Joy Dawkins"	American International Security Corporation*
Naseeb, Mirzali	Dawkins, John	David A. Young Construction & Renovation Inc.*
Martino, Roberto F.	Mesopotamia Group LLC	Force Direct Solutions LLC*
Logjotatos, Peter R.	Nordloh, Geoffrey	Harris, Christopher*
Glass, Calvin	Kieffer, Jerry	Hernando County Holdings LLC*
Singleton, Jacy P.	Johnson, Angela	Hide-A-Wreck LLC*
Robinson, Franz Martin	CNH Development Company LLC	Panthers LLC*
Smith, Nancy	Johnson, Keith	Paper Mill Village Inc.*
Sultani, Abdul Anas a.k.a. "Abdul Anas"	Military Logistic Support LLC	Shroud Line LLC*
Faqiri, Shir	Eisner, John	Spada, Carol*
Hosmat, Haji	Taurus Holdings LLC	Welventure LLC*
Jim Black Construction Company	Brophy, Kenneth Michael*	World Wide Trainers LLC*
Arya Ariana Aryayee Logistics, d.b.a. "AAA Logistics," d.b.a. "Somo Logistics"	Abdul Haq Foundation	Young, David Andrew*
Garst, Donald	Adajar, Adonis	Woodruff and Company
Mukhtar, Abdul a.k.a. "Abdul Kubar"	Calhoun, Josh W.	Borcata, Raul A.*
Noori Mahgir Construction Company	Clark Logistic Services Company, d.b.a. "Clark Construction Company"	Close, Jarred Lee*
Noori, Sherin Agha	Farkas, Janos	Logistical Operations Worldwide*
Long, Tonya*	Flordeliz, Alex F.	Taylor, Zachery Dustin*
Isranuddin, Burhanuddin	Knight, Michael T. II	Travis, James Edward*
Matun, Navidullah, a.k.a. "Javid Ahmad"	Lozado, Gary	Khairfullah, Gul Agha
Matun, Wahidullah	Mijares, Armando N. Jr.	Khaili Rahimi Construction Company
Navid Basir Construction Company	Mullakhiel, Wadir Abdullahmatin	Momand, Jahanzeb, a.k.a. "Engineer Jahanzeb Momand"
Navid Basir JV Gaggar Baba Construction Company	Rainbow Construction Company	Yar-Mohammad, Hazrat Nabi
NBCC & GBCC JV	Sardar, Hassan, a.k.a. "Hassan Sardar Inqilab"	Walizada, Abdul Masoud, a.k.a. "Masood Walizada"
Noori, Navid	Shah, Mohammad Nadir, a.k.a. "Nader Shah"	Alizai, Zarghona
Asmatullah, Mahmood, a.k.a. "Mahmood"	Tito, Regor	Aman, Abdul
Khan, Gul	Brown, Charles Phillip	Anwari, Laila
Khan, Solomon Sherdad, a.k.a. "Solomon"	Sheren, Fasela, a.k.a. "Sheren Fasela"	Anwari, Mezhgan
Mursalini, Ikramullah, a.k.a. "Ikramullah"	Anderson, Jesse Montel	Anwari, Rafi
Musafer, Naseem, a.k.a. "Naseem"	Charboneau, Stephanie, a.k.a. "Stephanie Shankel"	Arghandiwal, Zahra, a.k.a. "Sarah Arghandiwal"
Ali, Esrar		Azizi, Farwad, a.k.a. "Farwad Mohammad Azizi"
Gul, Ghanzi		Bashizada, Razia
Luqman Engineering Construction Company, d.b.a. "Luqman Engineering"		Coates, Kenneth
		Gibani, Marika

APPENDICES

TABLE D.1 (CONTINUED)

SPECIAL ENTITY DESIGNATIONS, SUSPENSIONS, AND DEBARMENTS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019 (CONTINUED)

Debarments (continued)

Haidari, Mahboob	Inland Holdings Inc.	Timor, Karim
Latifi, Abdul	Intermaax, FZE	Wardak, Khalid
McCammon, Christina	Intermaax, Inc.	Rahmat Siddiqi Transportation Company
Mohibzada, Ahmadullah, a.k.a. "Ahmadullah Mohebzada"	Karkar, Shah Wali	Siddiqi, Rahmat
Neghat, Mustafa	Sandman Security Services	Siddiqi, Sayed Attaullah
Qurashi, Abdul	Siddiqi, Atta	Umbrella Insurance Limited Company
Raouf, Ashmatullah	Specialty Bunkering	Taylor, Michael
Shah, David	Spidle, Chris Calvin	Gardazi, Syed
Touba, Kajim	Vulcan Amps Inc.	Smarasinghage, Sagara
Zahir, Khalid	Worldwide Cargomasters	Security Assistance Group LLC
Aryubi, Mohammad Raza Samim	Aziz, Haji Abdul, a.k.a. "Abdul Aziz Shah Jan," a.k.a. "Aziz"	Edmondson, Jeffrey B.*
Atlas Sahil Construction Company	Castillo, Alfredo, Jr.	Montague, Geoffrey K.*
Bab Al Jazeera LLC	Abbasi, Asim	Ciampa, Christopher*
Emar-E-Sarey Construction Company	Muturi, Samuel	Lugo, Emanuel*
Muhammad, Pianda	Mwakio, Shannel	Bailly, Louis Matthew*
Sambros International, d.b.a. "Sambros International LTD," d.b.a. "Sambros-UK JV"	Ahmad, Jaweed	Kumar, Krishan
Sambros JV Emar-E-Sarey Construction Company, d.b.a. "Sambros JV ESCC"	Ahmad, Masood	Marshal Afghan American Construction Company
Antes, Bradley A.	A & J Total Landscapes	Marshal, Sayed Abbas Shah
Lakeshore Engineering & Construction Afghanistan Inc., d.b.a. "Lakeshore General Contractors Inc."	Aryana Green Light Support Services	Masraq Engineering and Construction Company
Lakeshore Engineering Services Inc.	Mohammad, Sardar, a.k.a. "Sardar Mohammad Barakzai"	Miakhiil, Azizullah
Lakeshore Engineering Services/Toltest JV, LLC	Pittman, James C., a.k.a. "Carl Pittman"	Raj, Janak
Lakeshore Toltest - Rentenbach JV, LLC	Poipuni, Clayton	Singh, Roop
Lakeshore Toltest Corporation, d.b.a. "Lakeshore Group," d.b.a. "LTC Newco d.b.a. "LTC CORP Michigan," d.b.a. "Lakeshore Toltest KK"	Wiley, Patrick	Stratton, William G
Lakeshore Toltest Guam LLC	Crystal Island Construction Company	Umeer Star Construction Company
Lakeshore Toltest JV, LLC	Bertolini, Robert L.*	Zahir, Mohammad Ayub
Lakeshore Toltest RRCC JV, LLC	Kahn, Haroon Shams, a.k.a. "Haroon Shams"*	Peace Thru Business*
Lakeshore/Walsh JV, LLC	Shams Constructions Limited*	Pudenz, Adam Jeff Julias*
LakeshoreToltest METAG JV, LLC	Shams General Services and Logistics Unlimited*	Green, Robert Warren*
LTC & Metawater JV, LLC	Shams Group International, d.b.a. "Shams Group International FZE"*	Mayberry, Teresa*
LTC Holdings Inc.	Shams London Academy*	Addas, James*
LTC Italia SRL	Shams Production*	Advanced Ability for U-PVC*
LTC Tower General Contractors LLC	Shams Welfare Foundation*	Al Bait Al Amer*
LTCORP Commercial LLC	Swim, Alexander*	Al Iraq Al Waed*
LTCORP E&C Inc.	Norris, James Edward	Al Quraishi Bureau*
LTCORP Government Services-OH Inc.	Afghan Columbia Constructon Company	Al Zakoura Company*
LTCORP Government Services, Inc.	Ahmadi, Mohammad Omid	Al-Amir Group LLC*
LTCORP Government Services-MI Inc.	Dashti, Jamsheed	Al-Noor Contracting Company*
LTCORP O&G LLC	Hamdard, Eraj	Al-Noor Industrial Technologies Company*
LTCORP Renewables LLC	Hamidi, Mahrokh	California for Project Company*
LTCORP Inc.	Raising Wall Construction Company	Civilian Technologies Limited Company*
LTCORP/Kaya Dighbouti LLC	Artemis Global Inc., d.b.a. "Artemis Global Logistics and Solutions," d.b.a. "Artemis Global Trucking L.L.C."	Industrial Techniques Engineering Electromechanically Company*
LTCORP/Kaya East Africa LLC	O'Brien, James Michael, a.k.a. "James Michael Wienert"	Pena, Ramiro*
LTCORP/Kaya Romania LLC	Tamerlane Global Services Inc., d.b.a. "Tamerlane Global LLC," d.b.a. "Tamerlane LLC," d.b.a. "Tamerlane Technologies LLC"	Pulsars Company*
LTCORP/Kaya Rwanda LLC	Sherzai, Akbar Ahmed*	San Francisco for Housing Company
LTCORP Technology LLC	Jean-Noel, Dimitry	Sura Al Mustakbal*
Toltest Inc., d.b.a. "Wolverine Testing and Engineering," d.b.a. "Toledo Testing Laboratory," d.b.a. "LTC," d.b.a. "LTC Corp," d.b.a. "LTC Corp Ohio," d.b.a. "LTC Ohio"	Hampton, Seneca Darnell*	
Toltest/Desbuild Germany JV, LLC	Dennis, Jimmy W.	
Veterans Construction/Lakeshore JV, LLC		
Afghan Royal First Logistics, d.b.a. "Afghan Royal"		
American Barriers		
Arakozia Afghan Advertising		
Dubai Armored Cars		
Enayatullah, son of Hafizullah		
Farhas, Ahmad		

APPENDICES

TABLE D.1 (CONTINUED)

SPECIAL ENTITY DESIGNATIONS, SUSPENSIONS, AND DEBARMENTS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019 (CONTINUED)		
Debarments (continued)		
Top Techno Concrete Batch*	Kaka, Son of Ismail	Nasir, Mohammad
Albright, Timothy H.*	Khalil, Son of Mohammad Ajan	Wali Eshaq Zada Logistics Company; d.b.a. "Wali Ashqa Zada Logistics Company"; d.b.a. "Nasert Nawazi Transportation Company"
Insurance Group of Afghanistan	Khan, Mirullah	Ware, Marvin*
Ratib, Ahmad, a.k.a. "Nazari"	Khan, Mukamal	Belgin, Andrew
Jamil, Omar K.	Khoshal, Son of Sayed Hasan	Afghan Bamdad Construction Company, d.b.a. "Afghan Bamdad Development Construction Company"
Rawat, Ashita	Malang, Son of Qand	Areeb of East Company for Trade & Farzam Construction Company JV
Qadery, Abdul Khalil	Masom, Son of Asad Gul	Areeb of East for Engineering and General Trading Company Limited, d.b.a. "Areeb of East LLC"
Casellas, Luis Ramon*	Mateen, Abdul	Areeb-BDCC JV
Saber, Mohammad a.k.a. "Saber," a.k.a. "Sabir"	Mohammad, Asghar	Areebel Engineering and Logisitcs - Farzam
Zahir, Shafiullah Mohammad a.k.a. "Shafiullah," a.k.a. "Shafie"	Mohammad, Baqi	Areebel Engineering and Logistics
Achiever's International Ministries, Inc., d.b.a. "Center for Achievement and Development LLC"	Mohammad, Khial	Areeb-Rixon Construction Company LLC, d.b.a. "Areeb-REC JV"
Bickersteth, Diana	Mohammad, Sayed	Carver, Elizabeth N.
Bonview Consulting Group, Inc.	Mujahid, Son of Abdul Qadir	Carver, Paul W.
Fagbenro, Oyeyayo Ayoola, a.k.a. "Tayo Ayoola Fagbenro"	Nangiali, Son of Alem Jan	RAB JV
Global Vision Consulting LLC	Nawid, Son of Mashoq	Ullah, Izat; a.k.a. "Ezatullah"; a.k.a. "Izatullah, son of Shamsudeen"
HUDA Development Organization	Noorullah, Son of Noor Mohammad	Saboor, Baryalai Abdul; a.k.a. "Barry Gafari"
Strategic Impact Consulting, d.b.a. "Strategic Impact KarKon Afghanistan Material Testing Laboratory"	Qayoum, Abdul	Stratex Logistic and Support, d.b.a. "Stratex Logistics"
Davies, Simon	Roz, Gul	Jahanzeb, Mohammad Nasir
Gannon, Robert, W.	Shafiq, Mohammad	Nasrat, Zaulhaq, a.k.a. "Zia Nasrat"
Gillam, Robert	Shah, Ahmad	Blevins, Kenneth Preston*
Mondial Defence Systems Ltd.	Shah, Mohammad	Banks, Michael*
Mondial Defense Systems USA LLC	Shah, Rahim	Afghan Armor Vehicle Rental Company
Mondial Logistics	Sharif, Mohammad	Hamdard, Javid
Khan, Adam	Waheedullah, Son of Sardar Mohammad	McAlpine, Nebraska
Khan, Amir, a.k.a. "Amir Khan Sahel"	Wahid, Abdul	Meli Afghanistan Group
Sharq Afghan Logistics Company, d.b.a. "East Afghan Logistics Company"	Wahid, Abdul	Badgett, Michael J.*
Hafizullah, Sayed; a.k.a. "Sadat Sayed Hafizullah"; a.k.a. "Sayed Hafizullah Delsooz"	Wais, Gul	Miller, Mark E.
Sadat Zohori Construction and Road Building Company; d.b.a. "Sadat Zohori Cons Co."	Wali, Khair	Anderson, William Paul
Abdullah, Son of Lal Gul	Wali, Sayed	Kazemi, Sayed Mustafa, a.k.a. "Said Mustafa Kazemi"
Ahmad, Aziz	Wali, Taj	Al Mostahan Construction Company
Ahmad, Zubir	Yaseen, Mohammad	Nazary, Nasir Ahmad
Aimal, Son of Masom	Yaseen, Son of Mohammad Aajan	Nazanin, a.k.a. "Ms. Nazanin"
Ajmal, Son of Mohammad Anwar	Zakir, Mohammad	Ahmadzai, Sajid
Fareed, Son of Shir	Zamir, Son of Kabir	Sajid, Amin Gul
Fayaz Afghan Logistics Services	Rogers, Sean	Elham, Yaser, a.k.a. "Najibullah Saadullah"*
Fayaz, Afghan, a.k.a. "Fayaz Alimi," a.k.a. "Fayaz, Son of Mohammad"	Slade, Justin	Everest Faizy Logistics Services*
Gul, Khuja	Morgan, Sheldon J.*	Faizy Elham Brothers Ltd.*
Habibullah, Son of Ainuddin	Dixon, Regionald	Faizy, Rohullah*
Hamidullah, Son of Abdul Rashid	Emmons, Larry	Hekmat Shadman General Trading LLC*
Haq, Fazal	Epps, Willis*	Hekmat Shadman Ltd., d.b.a. "Hikmat Shadman Ltd."*
Jahangir, Son of Abdul Qadir	Etihad Hamidi Group; d.b.a. "Etihad Hamidi Trading, Transportation, Logistics and Construction Company"	
	Etihad Hamidi Logistics Company; d.b.a. "Etihad Hamidi Transportation, Logistic Company Corporation"	
	Hamidi, Abdul Basit; a.k.a. Basit Hamidi	
	Kakar, Rohani; a.k.a. "Daro Khan Rohani"	
	Mohammad, Abdullah Nazar	

APPENDICES

TABLE D.1 (CONTINUED)

SPECIAL ENTITY DESIGNATIONS, SUSPENSIONS, AND DEBARMENTS AS OF MARCH 31, 2019 (CONTINUED)

Debarments (continued)

Hikmat Shadman Construction and Supply Company*
Hikmat Himmat Logistics Services Company*
Hikmat Shadman Logistics Services Company, d.b.a. "Hikmat Shadman Commerce Construction and Supply Company," d.b.a. "Hikmat Shadman Commerce Construction Services"*
Saif Hikmat Construction Logistic Services and Supply Co.*
Shadman, Hikmatullah, a.k.a. "Hikmat Shadman," a.k.a. "Haji Hikmatullah Shadman," a.k.a. "Hikmatullah Saadulah"*
Omonobi-Newton, Henry
Hele, Paul

APPENDIX F

SIGAR DATA CALL QUESTIONS THAT RECEIVED CLASSIFIED OR UNCLASSIFIED BUT NOT PUBLICLY RELEASABLE RESPONSES

Every quarter, SIGAR sends U.S. implementing agencies in Afghanistan a list of questions about their programs. This quarter, United States Forces-Afghanistan (USFOR-A) classified, or designated unclassified, but not publicly releasable, its responses to the bolded portions of 13 questions (the same as last quarter) from SIGAR’s data call (below). As authorized by its enabling statute, SIGAR will publish a classified annex containing the classified and publicly unreleasable data.

SECURITY

Question ID	Question
Apr-Sec-01	<p>1. Please provide the following information on ANA strength as of the latest available date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the most recent three ANA APPS month-end reports with “as of” dates on each. b. please complete the attached ANA Strength spreadsheets. There are two, one for unclassified strength data (e.g. authorized strength broken out separately from assigned strength if authorized is unclassified by itself) and one for classified. (Data Call Attachment Spreadsheet, Sec-01 and Sec-01a) c. total number of officers, NCOs, and enlisted personnel within the ANA. d. monthly attrition rates for the last three months for the ANA by Corps, Division, SOF, and AAF with “as of” dates provided. <p>2. Please provide an unclassified description of general ANA attrition trends over the last quarter.</p>
Apr-Sec-04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please provide a recent unclassified assessment of the ANDSF elements at the Corps and Zone level as well as below if possible. The assessment can be general or anecdotal, but please cover key performance areas such as reporting, training, planning, operational readiness, and leadership. b. Please provide the latest “ANDSF Operational Overview” PowerPoint slides (given to us via SIPR last quarter in response to Jan-Sec-04c) c. Please provide an unclassified narrative detailing the status of ANDSF’s operational readiness cycle implementation from November 2018 to the latest possible date (month-end). Please provide this information by ANA Corps and ANP Zone, if possible.
Apr-Sec-08	<p>1. Please provide the following information on ANP strength as of the latest available date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the most recent three ANP PERSTAT month-end reports with “as of” dates on each. b. please complete the attached ANA Strength spreadsheets. There are two, one for unclassified strength data (e.g. authorized strength broken out separately from assigned strength if authorized is unclassified by itself) and one for classified. (Data Call Attachment Spreadsheet, Sec-08 and Sec-08a) c. total number of officers, NCOs, and enlisted personnel within the ANP d. monthly attrition rates for the last three months for the entire ANP and by ANP component with “as of dates” included. (see example attached for how we would like the data presented) <p>2. Please provide an unclassified description of general ANP attrition trends over the last quarter.</p>
Apr-Sec-14	<p>Please provide an update on the Afghan Local Police program, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the current number of ALP members and current number of ALP members that are fully trained (include “as of” date) b. estimate of likely Fiscal Year 2019 costs to support and sustain the ALP at target strength (30,000) and capability c. retention and attrition for ALP members. d. ALP casualty figures from the date after last quarter’s response to the end of 2018 and for January 1, 2019, to the latest available date (month end, i.e. February 28, 2019) to facilitate future comparisons. e. an update to the ALP reform status and district assessment findings f. What percentage of the ALP force is registered in: APPS, EFT, and Mobile Money. What is currently being done to ensure ALP enrollment in these programs increases? g. Please provide all the quarterly ALP Powerbroker Reports from the ALP SD, as described in last quarter’s data call response, from 4th quarter 2018 to the latest available date (month end, i.e. February 28, 2019).

Continued on the next page

APPENDICES

SECURITY

Question ID	Question
Apr-Sec-23	<p>1. Please provide information on insider attacks against Coalition Forces for 2018 and January 1, 2019 to the latest possible date (month-end):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">the number of insider attacks against U.S. military personnel.the number of U.S. military personnel wounded or killed from insider attacks.the number of insider attacks against ANDSF. <p>2. Please provide a CIDNE Excel file export of all ANDSF casualties from January 1, 2015 through the latest available date. It is not necessary to filter the CIDNE export, but, at a minimum, these data should include the unit (lowest level available), location (highest fidelity possible), and date for all casualties.</p>
Apr-Sec-26	<p>Regarding USG support to the Special Mission Wing (SMW):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Please provide a recent comprehensive unclassified update of the SMW as of the latest possible date.Please identify each type of aircraft in the SMW inventory and the number of each. If aircraft became usable during this reporting period, please indicate when and the reason for each.Please provide the number of aircraft purchased but not yet fielded and what the anticipated dates are for fielding.Please complete the attached ANDSF spreadsheet/SMW tab, or provide the applicable data. (Sec-26 tab Data Call Attachment Spreadsheet)What percentage of the SMW sorties are in support of counternarcotics? of counterterrorism? or, counter-nexus (CN & CT)?How many aircrew members does the SMW currently have, by crew position and airframe? Please break out their level of mission qualification (e.g. Certified Mission Ready (night-vision qualified), the daytime equivalent, etc.):<ol style="list-style-type: none">Mi-17 Pilots and Pilot TrainersMi-17 Flight EngineersMi-17 Crew ChiefsPC-12 PilotsPC-12 Mission System OperatorsPlease provide the operational readiness rate of the SMW and what the achievement benchmarks are in this area.How many and what type of aircraft maintainers are currently assigned / authorized? Are these SMW personnel or contractors? If contractors, are they Afghan or international contractors?Provide the cost of aircraft maintenance being paid with ASFF or money from other countries.
Apr-Sec-40	<ol style="list-style-type: none">Please provide the ANA Corps' equipment operational readiness (OR) rates.Please provide the goal OR rate for each ANA corps, and the reasoning for that OR benchmark.If the OR rate is below the benchmark for some corps, please explain why for each corps and what actions are being taken to support the ANDSF to increase the OR rate.Please provide the OR rate or similar metric for the ANP by zone, including the benchmark OR rates by zone. If the rates are below benchmark, please explain why by zone.Please provide a general, unclassified assessment of equipment readiness for both the ANA and the ANP.
Apr-Sec-55	<p>1. Please provide a copy of the full USFOR-A submission for NATO's Spring 2019 Periodic Mission Review (PMR).</p>
Apr-Sec-56	<p>Regarding the security benchmarks matrix for the Afghanistan Compact:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Please provide in an unclassified and publicly releasable format:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a description of those milestones expected to be completed over the quarter by both MOD and MOIwhich of those milestones were completed or nota number of total completed milestones versus the number expected to be completed over the quarter.Please provide the most recent version of the security benchmarks matrix for the Afghanistan Compact.

Continued on the next page

APPENDICES

SECURITY

Question ID	Question
Apr-Sec-61	<p>1. Provide a spreadsheet documenting all concluded ANDSF offensive operations conducted from August 1 through September 30, 2018 (to fill in historical gaps) and also from December 1, 2018, through the latest complete month for which data is available (e.g. February 28, 2019) (each concluded operation should be its own row). For our purposes, an operation involves (1) at least one ANA kandak or (2) a combination of units from at least two Afghan security entities (MOI, MOD, and/or NDS). For each operation, we request the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. the district in which the operation primarily occurred (District name)b. the province in which the operation primarily occurred (Province name)c. any additional districts in which the operation occurred (District name(s))d. the start date of the operation (YYYY-MM-DD)e. the end date of the operation (YYYY-MM-DD)f. whether AAF A-29s or AC-208 provided direct support during the operation (Yes/No)g. whether AAF MD-530s, UH-60, or Mi-17 provided direct support during the operation (Yes/No)h. whether ANASOC MSFVs provided direct support during the operation (Yes/No)i. whether the operation involved ANA units (Yes/No)j. whether the operation involved MOI units (Yes/No)k. whether the operation involved NDS units (Yes/No)l. whether the operation involved ANASOC units (Yes/No)m. whether the operation involved elements from an outside MOD geographically defined command (i.e. 201, 203, 205, 207, 209, or 215 Corps or 111 Division). For example, in 2015, 215th Corps received support from the neighboring 205th and 207th Corps for their operations in northern Helmand Province. Since 205th and 207th Corps did not normally have responsibilities in Helmand Province, this instance would be coded "Yes". (Yes/No)n. whether the operation involved elements from an outside MOI geographically defined command (i.e. 101, 202, 303, 404, 505, 606, 707, or 808 Zones) (Yes/No)o. whether the operation was enabled by U.S. or Coalition air support (Yes/No)p. whether the operation was enabled by U.S. or Coalition ground support (Yes/No)q. whether any U.S. or Coalition military aircraft provided medical evacuation support (Yes/No)
Apr-Sec-70	<p>Purpose: To track important developments in the operational capability and use of the Afghan Special Security Forces (ASSF), which the U.S. is paying large sums of ASFF to expand and develop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1. Please provide in an unclassified and publicly releasable manner the following information about the ASSF, as published in the unclassified December 2018 1225 Report:<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. The number of ground operations ASSF conducted in 2018 and the number from January 1, 2019, to the latest available date (month end).b. For the operations listed in subquestion a, the breakdown of the number of these ASSF operations that SOJTF-A components advised, provided Coalition enablers, and those which the ASSF executed independently.c. A narrative assessment providing an update on ANASOC, GCPSU, and SMW misuse by MOD and MOId. Please provide the amount of fines CTSC-A enforced and waived against MOD and MOI for ASSF misuse in 2018 and from January 1, 2019, to the latest available date (month end).

Continued on the next page

APPENDICES

Question ID	Question
Apr-AC-05	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Please provide any minutes, handouts, slides, or additional materials provided to participants of the any anti-corruption forums/meetings with the MOD and/or MOI in which CSTC-A participates. The 1397/1398 MOD and MOI commitment letters mention counter and anti-corruption meetings. If these forums do not exist, but another forum exists that carries out a similar function, please provide the requested materials that relate to the alternative forums.<li>2. Please provide copies of any MOI IG, MOD IG, and GS IG inspection or audit reports (or summaries if the reports are not available) that have been made available to CSTC-A this quarter.<li>3. Provide copies of the following items (if generated or updated during the quarter):<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. MOI IG and GS IG and MOD IG monthly status of inspection reports<li>b. MOI Transparency, Accountability, and Law Enforcement (TALE) and MOD CAC meeting agendas and outcome reports<li>c. MOD and MOI Counter Corruption Policies<li>d. Any monitoring and evaluation data (including indicator definition, baselines, collection methodology, and progress to date) related to Objective 2.2 (Strengthen transparency and accountability to combat corruption in the MoIA and ANP) defined in the December 2017 MoIA Strategic Policy. We understand from the phone call with CSTC-A TAO on 2/5/2019 that this policy document is no longer considered the policy of the MOI. If MOI and/or MOD have developed any updated guidance for monitoring and evaluating their anti- and counter-corruption efforts against the goal of reducing corruption in the ANDSF, please provide a copy of the document and provide any monitoring and evaluation data CSTC-A has received. If CSTC-A is not aware of any existing policy that describes MOD and/or MOI's methods for assessing the effectiveness of their anti- and counter-corruption efforts, please say so.<li>e. Risk-based Annual Inspection Plan (AIP) (MOD) and Ministerial and Zone risk based Annual Inspection Plans (AIP) (MOI)<li>f. Monthly summaries for the execution of the MOD and MOI AIP<li>4. SIGAR has requested copies of the quarterly MOD and MOI Counter and Anti-Corruption assessments (designated as high priority strategic planning and performance requirements) mandated in Appendix A of the 1397/1398 MOD and MOI commitment letters. In response, CSTC-A said that these assessments are “embedded into the CSTC-A 1397/1398 Commitment Letter assessment battle rhythm briefing” but no copies of these briefings were provided and no detail was offered for how CSTC-A assessed that the MOD and MOI met standards. Therefore, describe the following:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. The MOD and MOI standards CSTC-A assessed<li>b. CSTC-A latest assessment of each of these standards

APPENDICES

APPENDIX G

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ACRONYM OR ABBREVIATION	DEFINITION
AABIS	Afghan Automated Biometric Identification System
AAF	Afghan Air Force
ABADE	Assistance in Building Afghanistan by Developing Enterprises
ABP	Afghan Border Police
ACE	Agricultural Credit Enhancement
ACEP	Afghan Civic Engagement Program
ACJC	Anti-Corruption Justice Center
ACLED	Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project
AD	alternative-development
ADALAT	Assistance for Development of Afghan Legal Access and Transparency
ADF	Agricultural Development Fund
AFCEC	Air Force Civil Engineer Center
AFMIS	Afghan Financial Management Information System
AFN	afghani (currency)
AGO	Attorney General's Office
AHRIMS	Afghan Human Resource Information Management System
AIF	Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund
AITF	Afghanistan Infrastructure Trust Fund
ALBA	Assistance to Legislative Bodies of Afghanistan
ALCS	Afghanistan Living Conditions Survey
ALP	Afghan Local Police
AMANAT	Afghanistan's Measure for Accountability and Transparency
ANA	Afghan National Army
ANASOC	ANA Special Operations Command
ANATF	ANA Territorial Force
ANCOP	Afghan National Civil Order Police
ANDSF	Afghan National Defense and Security Forces
ANP	Afghan National Police
AO	abandoned ordnance
AOR	area of responsibility
APPS	Afghan Personnel Pay System
AROC	Afghan Resources Oversight Council
ARTF	Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund
ASFF	Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

Continued on the next page

APPENDICES

ACRONYM OR ABBREVIATION	DEFINITION
ASSF	Afghan Special Security Forces
ATAR	Afghanistan Trade and Revenue Project
AUP	Afghan Uniformed Police
AWDP	Afghanistan Workforce Development Program
BADILL	Boost Alternative Development Intervention through Licit Livelihoods
CAT	Combat Advisor Team
CBARD	Community-Based Agriculture and Rural Development Project
CBCMP	Capacity Building and Change Management Program
CCAP	Citizen's Charter Afghanistan Project
CDCS	Country Development Cooperation Strategy
CERP	Commander's Emergency Response Program
CHAMP	Commercial Horticulture and Agricultural Marketing Program
CID	U.S. Army Criminal Investigation Command
CIGIE	Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency
CMR	certified mission ready
CMS	Case Management System
CN	Counternarcotics
CNJC	Counter Narcotics Justice Center
CNPA	Counter Narcotics Police of Afghanistan
COIN	counterinsurgency
COMAC	Conflict Mitigation Assistance for Civilians
CoreIMS	Core Information Management System
CPD	Central Prisons Directorate
CPDS	Continuing Professional Development Support
CSO	civil-society organization
CSO	Central Statistics Organization
CSSP	Corrections System Support Program
CSTC-A	Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan
CTA	Counter-narcotics Central Transfer Account
DABS	Da Afghanistan Breshna Sherkat
DCA	Development Credit Authority
DCAR	Delegated Cooperation Agreement
DCIS	Defense Criminal Investigative Service
DEA	Drug Enforcement Administration (U.S.)
DEWS Plus	Disease Early Warning System Plus
DFID	Department for International Development
DICDA	Department of Defense Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities fund (U.S.)
DIG	Deputy Inspector General
DLA	Defense Logistics Agency
DOD	Department of Defense (U.S.)

Continued on the next page

APPENDICES

ACRONYM OR ABBREVIATION	DEFINITION
DOD OIG	Department of Defense Office of Inspector General
DOJ	Department of Justice (U.S.)
ECC	Electoral Complaints Commission
ECF	Extended Credit Facility
EF	essential function
EFT	electronic funds-transfer
EIA	Enemy-Initiated Attacks
ERW	explosive remnants of war
ESF	Economic Support Fund
EU	European Union
FAP	Financial and Activity Plan
FAUAF	Friends of the American University of Afghanistan
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FEWS NET	Famine Early Warning Systems Network
FFP	Food for Peace
FY	fiscal year
GAO	Government Accountability Office (U.S.)
GCPSU	General Command of Police Special Units
GDP	gross domestic product
GDPDC	General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Centers
GEC	Girls' Education Challenge Program
GIROA	Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GLE	Governor-Led Eradication
GPI	Good Performer's Initiative
GMAF	Geneva Mutual Accountability Framework
GRAIN	Grain Research and Innovation
HEMAYAT	Helping Mothers and Children Thrive
HIG	Hezb-e Islami Gulbuddin
HPC	High Peace Council
HQ	headquarters
HRW	Human Rights Watch
HSR	Health Sector Resiliency
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
ICS	Integrated Country Strategy
IDA	International Disaster Assistance
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
IEC	Independent Election Commission (Afghan)
IED	improvised explosive device
IFCA	Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012

Continued on the next page

APPENDICES

ACRONYM OR ABBREVIATION	DEFINITION
IG	inspector general
IHSAN	Initiative for Hygiene, Sanitation, and Nutrition
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMSMA	Information Management System for Mine Action
INCLE	International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (U.S)
INL	Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (U.S.)
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IR	Intermediate Result
IS-K	Islamic State-Khorasan
ISLA	Initiative to Strengthen Local Administrations Program
IWA	Integrity Watch Afghanistan
JCPOA	Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action
JRD	Juvenile Rehabilitation Directorate
JSSP	Justice Sector Support Program (State)
JTTP	Justice Training Transition Program (State)
KBR	Kabul Bank Receivership
KFZ	Kandahar Food Zone
kg	kilograms
kWh	kilowatt-hours
LLP	Lessons Learned Program
LOTFA	Law and Order Trust Fund for Afghanistan
MAIL	Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock (Afghan)
MCN	Ministry of Counter-Narcotics (Afghan)
MCTF	Major Crimes Task Force
MEC	Monitoring and Evaluation Committee (Afghan)
MEDEVAC	medical evacuation
MFNDU	Marshal Fahim National Defense University
MOCI	Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Afghan)
MOD	Ministry of Defense (Afghan)
MOE	Minister of Education (Afghan)
MOEc	Ministry of Economy (Afghan)
MOF	Ministry of Finance (Afghan)
MOHE	Ministry of Higher Education (Afghan)
MOI	Ministry of Interior (Afghan)
MOJ	Ministry of Justice (Afghan)
MOMP	Ministry of Mines and Petroleum (Afghan)
MOPH	Ministry of Public Health (Afghan)
MOU	memorandum of understanding
MOWA	Ministry of Women's Affairs
MPD	MOI and Police Development project

Continued on the next page

APPENDICES

ACRONYM OR ABBREVIATION	DEFINITION
MRRD	Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (Afghan)
NADR	Non-Proliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining, and Related Programs
NAR	net attendance rates
NATF	NATO ANA Trust Fund
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NDAA	National Defense Authorization Act
NDAP	National Drug Action Plan
NDP	New Development Partnership
NDS	National Directorate of Security (Afghan)
NEF	National Elections forum
NEI	Northern Electrical Interconnect
NEPS	Northeast Power System
NGO	nongovernmental organization
NIU	National Interdiction Unit (Afghan)
NSA	National Security Advisor
NSIA	National Statistics and Information Authority (Afghan)
NSOCC-A	NATO Special Operations Component Command-Afghanistan
NSP	National Solidarity Program
NSPA	NATO Support and Procurement Agency
O&M	operations and maintenance
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OFS	Operation Freedom's Sentinel
OIG	Office of the Inspector General
OR	operational readiness
ORC	Operational Readiness Cycles
OTA	Office of Technical Assistance (U.S. Treasury)
PAI	Personnel Asset Inventory
PDP	Provincial Development Plans
PHQ	Provincial Police Headquarters
PM/WRA	Bureau of Political-Military Affairs' Office of Weapons Removal and Abatement (State)
POR	proof of registration
PTEC	Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity
RADP	Regional Agriculture Development Program
RC	Recurrent Cost
RMTC	Regional Military Training Center
RS	Resolute Support
SEPS	Southeast Power System
SFAB	Security Force Assistance Brigade
SHAHAR	Strong Hubs for Afghan Hope and Resilience

Continued on the next page

APPENDICES

ACRONYM OR ABBREVIATION	DEFINITION
SIKA	Stability in Key Areas
SIU	Sensitive Investigative Unit (Afghan)
SMAF	Self-Reliance through Mutual Accountability Framework
SME	subject-matter expert
SMW	Special Mission Wing (Afghan)
SOF	Special Operations Forces
SPM	Support to Payroll Management
State OIG	Department of State Office of the Inspector General
SWIM	Strengthening Watershed and Irrigation Management
TAA	train, advise, and assist
TAAC	train, advise, and assist command
TFBSO	Task Force for Business and Stability Operations
TIU	Technical Investigative Unit
UAE	United Arab Emirates
UN	United Nations
UNAMA	UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan
UNCAC	United Nations Convention Against Corruption
UNDP	UN Development Programme
UNMAS	UN Mine Action Service
UNODC	UN Office on Drugs and Crime
USAAA	U.S. Army Audit Agency
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USAID OIG	USAID Office of the Inspector General
USFOR-A	U.S. Forces-Afghanistan
USIP	United States Institute of Peace
USGS	United States Geological Survey
UXO	unexploded ordnance
WIA	Wounded in Action
WIE	Women in the Economy Project
WLD	Women's Leadership Development
WPP	Women's Participation Program
WTO	World Trade Organization

ENDNOTES

1. Voice of America News, "Taliban Unleashes Afghan Spring Offensive Despite US Push for Peace," <http://www.voanews.com>, 4/12/2019. VOA reported that the Taliban said their new "Al-Fath" ("victory" in Arabic) offensive's objective is to establish an "Islamic system" in an Afghanistan "cleansed from American occupation."
2. State, Office of the Spokesperson, "Special Representative for Afghanistan Reconciliation Khalilzad Travel to Afghanistan, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Jordan and Qatar," media note, 3/26/2019.
3. ForeignPolicy.com, "Afghan Women Are 'Not Willing to Give Up Their Rights,'" interview with Ambassador Roya Rahmani, 2/12/2019.
4. SIGAR, "Roundtable Discussion: How Women's Concerns and Security Should be Ensured/Protected in a Ceasefire," meeting record, 2/24/2019, pp. 1–2.
5. Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction John F. Sopko presented the 2019 *High-Risk List* in a 3/28/2019 debut event at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, DC.
6. SIGAR, *High-Risk List*, 3/2019 (hereafter "HRL 2019"). This and other SIGAR products are online at <https://www.sigar.mil>.
7. HRL 2019, p. 9.
8. Pub. L. No. 110-181, Section 1229 (i)(2).
9. Pub. L. No. 110-181, Section 1229, (i)(1)(E).
10. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, pp. 50–53, 79.
11. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 10/30/2018, p. 135.
12. IMF, *Country Report No. 18/359*, 12/2018, p. 25; World Bank, *Afghanistan Development Update*, 8/2018, pp. 15, 38–39; DAB, "Exchange Rates," 4/2/2019, <http://dab.gov.af/en>, accessed 4/2/2019; SIGAR analysis.
13. UNAMA, "Geneva Conference on Afghanistan: Joint Communiqué," 11/28/2018, pp. 1, 5–6.
14. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, pp. 8–9.
15. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 2/2019.
16. General Joseph L. Votel, spoken testimony to the House Armed Services Committee, "National Security Challenges and U.S. Military Activities in the Greater Middle East and Africa," 3/7/2019.
17. SIGAR, *Reconstructing the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces: Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, 9/2017, i.
18. SIGAR, *Reconstructing the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces: Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, 9/2017, i.
19. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018 and response to SIGAR vetting, 10/9/2016; SIGAR, analysis of CSTC-A-provided data, 3/2019.
20. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 7; CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 9/20/2018.
21. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 11/28/2017.
22. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 48.
23. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, pp. 64–65, 94–95.
24. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, pp. 62–63, 93.
25. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 9; UN, report of the Secretary-General, *The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security*, 3/7/2016.
26. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 1.
27. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 2/2019.
28. SIGAR, *Reconstructing the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces: Lessons From the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, SIGAR 16-62-LL, 9/2017, viii-ix, pp. 122–123.
29. SIGAR, *Reconstructing the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces: Lessons From the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, SIGAR 16-62-LL, 9/2017, viii-xix, pp. 122–123.
30. SIGAR, *Reconstructing the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces: Lessons From the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, SIGAR 16-62-LL, 9/2017, p. 182.
31. SIGAR, conference record, "North Atlantic Treaty Organization Stability Policing Center of Excellence (NATO SPCOE) – 2nd Stability Policing Lessons Learned Workshop," Vicenza, Italy, 10/9–12/2018.
32. SIGAR, *Corruption in Conflict: Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, 9/2016.
33. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Sustainability in Afghanistan*, 6/2018, p. 40.
34. UN, *The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security*, report of the Secretary-General, 6/6/2018, p. 10.
35. SIGAR, *Afghanistan's Anti-Corruption Efforts: The Afghan Government Has Begun to Implement an Anti-Corruption Strategy, but Significant Problems Must Be Addressed*, SIGAR 18-51-AR, 5/31/2018, ii.
36. Congress directed in Pub. L. No. 115-141, the FY 2018 Omnibus Appropriations Act, that SIGAR submit an update of its May 2018 assessment of the Afghan government's implementation of its anticorruption strategy, and determine whether the Afghan government is making progress on its anticorruption objectives. That report is in preparation.
37. State, *Integrated Country Strategy: Afghanistan*, 9/27/2018, pp. 2–3.
38. IMF, *Fourth Review under the Extended Credit Facility Arrangement, Request for Modification of Performance Criteria, and Request for Extension and Rephasing of the Arrangement*, 11/20/2018, p. 8.
39. USAID, *Country Development Cooperation Strategy FY 2019-2023*, 11/27/2018, p. 15; Bild, "Afghanistan's Ashraf Ghani: 'There's an illusion that streets in Germany are paved with gold,'" 9/6/2018.
40. Asian Development Bank, *Chair's Summary of Meeting of the Board of Directors*, "Country Partnership Strategy Afghanistan, 2017–2021—Achieving Inclusive Growth in a Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situation," 10/31/2017; USIP, *Afghan Economic Policy, Institutions, and Society Since 2001*, 10/2015, p. 6.

ENDNOTES

41. IMF, *Fourth Review under the Extended Credit Facility Arrangement, Request for Modification of Performance Criteria, and Request for Extension and Rephrasing of the Arrangement*, 11/20/2018, p. 24; USAID, “Economic Growth – Afghanistan,” 9/2018, <https://www.usaid.gov/afghanistan/economic-growth>, accessed 9/14/2018; Government of Afghanistan, *Realizing Self-Reliance: Commitments to Reforms and Renewed Partnership*, 12/2014, p. 4.
42. SIGAR, *Private Sector Development and Economic Growth: Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, 4/2018, viii–ix; SIGAR, *Corruption in Conflict: Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, 7/2016, p. 75.
43. USIP, *What Can Be Done to Revive Afghanistan’s Economy?*, 2/2016, p. 3; World Bank, “The World Bank in Afghanistan,” <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan>, accessed 9/14/2018.
44. UNAMA, Geneva Conference on Afghanistan: Joint Communiqué: “Securing Afghanistan’s Future: Peace, Self-Reliance and Connectivity,” 11/28/2018, p. 2; USIP, *How to Secure Afghanistan’s Future*, 12/10/2018.
45. USAID, *Country Development Cooperation Strategy FY 2019–2023*, 11/27/2018, p. 15.
46. *Bild*, “Afghanistan’s Ashraf Ghani: ‘There’s an illusion that streets in Germany are paved with gold,’” 9/6/2018.
47. Funding data as of December 31, 2018. UNODC, *2006 World Drug Report*, Volume I: Analysis, p. 57.
48. UNODC, *Afghanistan Opium Survey 2018: Cultivation and Production*, 11/2018, p. 5.
49. GIROA, *Afghanistan National Development Strategy 1387–1391 (2008–2013)*, p. 42.
50. John F. Sopko, SIGAR, “Future U.S. Counternarcotics Efforts in Afghanistan,” testimony before the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control on Future U.S. Counternarcotics Efforts in Afghanistan, 1/15/2014, p. 2.
51. SIGAR, *Counternarcotics: Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, 6/2018, vii, xi, p. 21.
52. SIGAR, *Counternarcotics: Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, 6/2018, viii, p. 79.
53. Najibullah Gulabzoi, “The Narco State of Afghanistan,” *The Diplomat*, 2/12/2015, <https://thediplomat.com/2015/02/the-narco-state-of-afghanistan/>, accessed 2/22/2019; Thomas Schweich, “Is Afghanistan a Narco-State?” *New York Times Magazine*, 7/27/2008, <https://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/27/magazine/27AFGHAN-t.html>, accessed 2/22/2019; Matthieu Aikens, “Afghanistan: The Making of a Narco-State,” *Rolling Stone*, 12/4/2014, <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-news/afghanistan-the-making-of-a-narco-state-48475/>, accessed 2/22/2019.
54. Women, Peace, and Security Act of 2017, Pub. L. No. 155-68, Section 3, 10/6/2017.
55. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 10/30/2016, p. 3.
56. UNDP, *Human Development Indices and Indicators 2018 Statistical Update*, p. 40; UNDP, “Gender Inequality Index (GII),” n.d., <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii>, accessed 3/4/2019; *The National Interest*, “Afghan Women are In Charge of Their Own Fate,” 2/27/2019.
57. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 10/30/2016, p. 3; SIGAR analysis of National Statistics and Information Authority, Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, *Estimated Population of Afghanistan 2018–19*, 6/27/2018, p. 1.
58. CSIS, *Finishing Strong: Seeking a Proper Exit from Afghanistan*, 2/2019, pp. 1, 5.
59. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 7/30/2018, p. 112.
60. DOD, “Advance Policy Questions for Lieutenant General Kenneth F. McKenzie Jr., USMC, Nominee for Commander, United States Central Command,” 12/4/2018, p. 9.
61. UNDP, “Practice Note: Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration of Ex-combatants,” 2011, p. 11.
62. UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, “Reintegration and Reconciliation in Conflict: Experience and Lessons,” 7/2016, p. 2.
63. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, pp. 9–10, 69, 80, 148, 169, 179.
64. CSIS, “Afghanistan as Vietnam Redux: Bomb, Declare Peace, and Leave?” 1/17/2019, p. 7; Brookings, “The U.S.-Taliban negotiations breakthrough: What it means and what lies ahead,” 1/29/2019.
65. SIGAR, “Challenges to Effective Oversight of Afghanistan Reconstruction Grow as High-Risk Areas Persist,” statement of John F. Sopko for the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on the Departments of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, 2/24/2016, p. 14.
66. Statement of John F. Sopko, Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, “High-Risk U.S. Reconstruction Program Areas in Afghanistan,” before the Subcommittee on National Security, Committee on Oversight and Reform, U.S. House of Representatives, 4/3/2019, pp. 6, 30.
67. USAID, Administrative Agreement with AUAF, 3/29/2019, signed by AUAF Board Chair David S. Sedney and USAID Suspending and Debarring Official Angelique M. Crumbly. Item VI, S of the agreement provides that it will be publicly posted on the website of the Federal Awardee Performance and Information System, www.fpiis.gov. AUAF documents on the FAPIIS site may be located by searching for DUNS number 557738467.
68. SIGAR Investigations Directorate, summary of investigations of AUAF by SIGAR, USAID, and other entities, internal communication, 3/8/2019.
69. SIGAR Investigations Directorate, summary of investigations of AUAF by SIGAR, USAID, and other entities, internal communication, 3/8/2019.
70. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, p. 169.
71. American University of Afghanistan, “About Us,” <http://auaf.edu.af/about-us>, accessed 4/10/19.
72. SIGAR Investigations Directorate, summary of investigations of AUAF by SIGAR, USAID, and other entities, internal communication, 3/8/2019.
73. SIGAR Investigations Directorate, summary of investigations of AUAF by SIGAR, USAID, and other entities, internal communication, 3/8/2019.
74. SIGAR Investigations Directorate, summary of investigations of AUAF by SIGAR, USAID, and other entities, internal communication, 3/8/2019.

ENDNOTES

75. SIGAR Investigations Directorate, summary of investigations of AUAF by SIGAR, USAID, and other entities, internal communication, 3/8/2019.
76. SIGAR Investigations Directorate, summary of investigations of AUAF by SIGAR, USAID, and other entities, internal communication, 3/8/2019.
77. The audit assesses USAID, State, and DOD oversight of their funding and programming for the AUAF since its inception, whether that funding and programming achieved intended goals, and the sustainability of the U.S. government's investment in the university. SIGAR began the audit in the fall of 2018, is currently completing data collection, and expects to issue the report late 2019 or early 2020.
78. DOD, *Cost of War Monthly Report, data as of December 31, 2018*, provided in response to SIGAR data call, 4/5/2019.
79. Pub. L. No. 111-32, 6/24/2009.
80. DOD, response to SIGAR vetting, 7/20/2009.
81. Pub. L. No. 112-74, Section 9009, 12/23/2011; Deputy Secretary of Defense, "Afghanistan Resources Oversight Council (AROC) memorandum," 8/3/2011; Public Law No. 115-245, 9/28/2018.
82. DFAS, "AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts June 2016," 7/15/2016.
83. DFAS, "AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts June 2016," 7/15/2016; DFAS, "AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2016," 4/15/2016.
84. DOD OIG, *Distribution of Funds and the Validity of Obligations for the Management of the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund - Phase I*, Report No. D-2008-012, 11/5/2007, p. 2.
85. Pub. L. No. 112-74, Section 9009 and Deputy Secretary of Defense, Afghanistan Resources Oversight Council (AROC) memorandum, 8/3/2011.
86. DFAS, "AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019," 4/12/2019.
87. NATO, "Afghan National Army (ANA) Trust Fund," media backgrounder, 2/2019, and DOD response to SIGAR data call 10/12/2018.
88. DOD response to SIGAR data call 4/22/2019.
89. DOD, "Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP)," DOD Financial Management Regulation Vol. 12, Ch. 27, 1/2009, p. 27-3.
90. Pub. L. No. 113-235, 12/16/2014.
91. DOD, response to SIGAR data call, 4/16/2019.
92. DOD, response to SIGAR data call 1/18/2019.
93. DOD, response to SIGAR data call 4/9/2019.
94. DOD, response to SIGAR data call 4/9/2019.
95. USAID, U.S. Foreign Assistance Reference Guide, 1/2005, p. 6.
96. USAID, response to SIGAR data call 4/11/2019.
97. USAID, response to SIGAR data call 1/22/2019.
98. USAID, response to SIGAR data call 1/22/2019.
99. USAID, response to SIGAR data call 4/15/2019.
100. USAID, response to SIGAR data call 1/22/2019 and 4/15/2019.
101. USAID, Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance, profile last updated on July 18, 2017, on www.usaid.gov website.
102. USAID, Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance, "Afghanistan-Complex Emergency, Fact Sheet #4, FY 2017," posted on www.usaid.gov.
103. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/15/2019 and 4/11/2019.
104. State, response to SIGAR data call, 10/13/2009.
105. State, response to SIGAR data call 4/8/2019.
106. State, *Congressional Budget Justification, Foreign Operations*, Appendix 2, FY 2019, Released February 12, 2018, pp. 44-52; and State, response to SIGAR data call, 4/17/2019.
107. State, response to SIGAR data call 4/17/2019 and 4/15/2019.
108. State, *Congressional Budget Justification, Foreign Operations*, Appendix 2, FY 2019, released 2/12/2018, p. 423.
109. State, response to SIGAR data call 3/29/2013.
110. State, response to SIGAR data call 3/29/2013.
111. State, response to SIGAR data calls, 10/5/2018 and 10/10/2017.
112. World Bank, *ARTF: Administrator's Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019 (end of 1st month of FY 1398)*, p. 6.
113. World Bank, *Quarterly Country Update: Afghanistan*, 4/2011, p. 16.
114. World Bank, *ARTF: Administrator's Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019 (end of 1st month of FY 1398)*, p. 4.
115. World Bank, *Quarterly Country Update: Afghanistan*, 4/2011, p. 16.
116. World Bank, *ARTF: Administrator's Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019 (end of 1st month of FY 1398)*, p. 8.
117. EC, "Afghanistan: State of Play, January 2011," 3/31/2011, p. 7.
118. UNDP, "LOTFA Receipts 2002-2018," updated 4/16/2019, in response to SIGAR data call on 4/9/2019.
119. UNDP, press release "Revamped Law and Order Trust Fund Aims to Support Entire Afghan Rule of Law Sector," posted December 9, 2018, appearing on www.undp.org.
120. DOD, response to SIGAR data call, 10/12/2018.
121. NATO, "Afghan National Army (ANA) Trust Fund," media backgrounder, Status of Contributions Made as of January 31, 2019, 2/2019.
122. OUSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019; State, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
123. General Joseph Votel, spoken testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, hearing on "Middle East-Africa Security Challenges and Military Activities," 3/7/2019.
124. General Joseph Votel, spoken testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, hearing on "Middle East-Africa Security Challenges and Military Activities," 3/7/2019.
125. *New York Times*, "U.S. and Taliban Agree in Principle to Peace Framework, Envoy Says," 1/28/2019; *NBC News*, "U.S., Taliban Peace Talks Produce Draft Deal on 2 Issues, Trump Envoy Says," 3/12/2019.
126. Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad, Twitter post, 3/12/2019, 9:59 am, accessed online on 3/24/2019 at <https://twitter.com/US4AfghanPeace/status/1105513780375625730>.
127. Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad, Twitter post, 3/12/2019, 9:59 am, accessed online on 3/24/2019 at <https://twitter.com/US4AfghanPeace/status/1105513780375625730>; Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad, Twitter post, 3/12/2019, 9:59am, accessed online on 3/24/2019 at <https://twitter.com/US4AfghanPeace/status/1105513781705302016>.
128. *New York Times*, "Taliban Announce Spring Offensive, Even as Peace Talks Gain Momentum," 4/12/2019; Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad, Twitter post, 4/12/2019,

ENDNOTES

- 10:53am, accessed online on 4/16/2019 at <https://twitter.com/US4AfghanPeace/status/1116761194797391873>; Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad, Twitter post, 4/18/2019, 2:52pm, accessed online on 4/22/2019 at <https://twitter.com/US4AfghanPeace/status/1118995794399498240>.
129. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.
130. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 4/1/2019; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 4/2019.
131. USFOR-A, response to DOD OIG data call, 4/8/2019.
132. ACLED, South Asia 2016–Present dataset, 11/1/2018–1/31/2019, available online at <https://www.acleddata.com/>; SIGAR, analysis of ACLED data, 4/2019.
133. UN, reports of Secretary-General, *The Situation in Afghanistan and its Implications for International Peace and Security*, reports of the Secretary-General, 3/7/2016, p. 6; 6/10/2016, p. 4; 9/7/2016, p. 5; 12/13/2016, p. 4; 3/3/2017, p. 4; 6/15/2017, p. 4; 9/15/2017, p. 4; 12/15/2017, p. 5; 2/27/2018, p. 5; 6/6/2018, p. 5; 9/10/2018, p. 5; 12/7/2019, p. 5; 2/28/2019, p. 6; SIGAR, analysis of UN-reported data, 4/2019.
134. Director Daniel Coats, statement for the record for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, hearing on “Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community,” 1/29/2019.
135. Director Daniel Coats, spoken testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, hearing on “Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community,” 1/29/2019.
136. General Joseph Votel, spoken testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, hearing on “Middle East-Africa Security Challenges and Military Activities,” 3/7/2019.
137. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
138. OUSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2019.
139. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 7/30/2017, p. 89; SIGAR, Addendum to SIGAR’s January 2018 *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 2/2018, p. 5.
140. DOD, “Department of Defense Press Briefing by General Nicholson via teleconference from Kabul, Afghanistan,” 11/28/2017.
141. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 5/15/2017.
142. RS, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2019. For more commentary on control data from DOD and RS, see page 68 of SIGAR’s January 2019 *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*.
143. RS, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019.
144. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 4/1/2019; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 4/2019.
145. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 4/1/2019; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 4/2019.
146. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 4/1/2019; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 4/2019.
147. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 4/1/2019; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 4/2019.
148. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 4/1/2019; RS, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 4/2019.
149. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 30.
150. ACLED, South Asia 2016–Present dataset, 1/1/2018–12/21/2018 and 1/1/201712/31/2017, available online at <https://www.acleddata.com/>; SIGAR, analysis of ACLED data, 4/2019.
151. ACLED, South Asia 2016–Present dataset, 1/1/2018–12/21/2018, available online at <https://www.acleddata.com/>; RS, response to SIGAR data call, 4/1/2019; SIGAR, analysis of ACLED and RS data, 4/2019.
152. ACLED, South Asia 2016–Present dataset, 11/1/2018–1/31/2019, available online at <https://www.acleddata.com/>; SIGAR, analysis of ACLED data, 4/2019.
153. ACLED, South Asia 2016–Present dataset, 11/1/2018–1/31/2019, available online at <https://www.acleddata.com/>; SIGAR, analysis of ACLED data, 4/2019.
154. ACLED, South Asia 2016–Present dataset, 11/1/2018–1/31/2019, available online at <https://www.acleddata.com/>; SIGAR, analysis of ACLED data, 4/2019.
155. UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, Annual Report*, 2/2019, pp. 1–3.
156. UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, Annual Report*, 2/2019, p. 4.
157. UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, Annual Report*, 2/2019, p. 5.
158. UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, Annual Report*, 2/2019, pp. 1–2.
159. UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, Annual Report*, 2/2019, p. 5.
160. UNAMA, *Quarterly Report on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict: 1 January to 31 March 2019*, 4/24/2019, p. 1.
161. UNAMA, *Quarterly Report on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict: 1 January to 31 March 2019*, 4/24/2019, pp. 1, 3.
162. UNAMA, *Quarterly Report on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict: 1 January to 31 March 2019*, 4/24/2019, pp. 3, 4.
163. UNAMA, *Quarterly Report on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict: 1 January to 31 March 2019*, 4/24/2019, p. 1; UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, Annual Report*, 2/2019, p. 1; *Quarterly Report on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict: 1 January to 30 September 2018*, 10/10/2018; SIGAR, analysis of UNAMA data, 4/2019.
164. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 4/2019.
165. UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, Annual Report*, 2/2019, pp. 5 and 33.
166. UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, Annual Report*, 2/2019, p. 33; RS, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
167. UNAMA, *Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, Annual Report*, 2/2019, p. 33; RS, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
168. UN, report of Secretary-General, *The Situation in Afghanistan and its Implications for International Peace and Security*, 2/28/2019, p. 6; AFCENT, “Combined Forces Air Component Commander 2013–2019 Airpower Statistics,” 2/28/2019.
169. OUSD-P, response to SIGAR data call, 4/2/2019; USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2018.
170. NATO, “Resolute Support Mission (RSM): Key Facts and Figures,” 3/2019 and 12/2018.
171. OUSD-P, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018.
172. NATO, “Resolute Support Mission (RSM): Key Facts and Figures,” 3/2019 and 12/2018.

ENDNOTES

173. DOD, “U.S. Military Casualties—Operation Freedom’s Sentinel (OFS), Casualty Summary by Casualty Category,” and “U.S. Military Casualties—Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), Casualty Summary by Casualty Category,” accessed 4/16/2019 and 1/15/2019; SIGAR, analysis of DOD data, 4/2019.
174. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.
175. For more information about USFOR-A’s green-on-blue attack mitigation policies, see SIGAR’s January 2018 *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2018 and response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2019.
176. See Appendix B of this report and DFAS, “AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019,” 4/12/2019.
177. See Appendix B of this report and DFAS, “AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019,” 4/12/2019.
178. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 8/27/2016; OSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2018 and 1/12/2019; SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 4/30/2018, p. 75; OUSD-P, email to SIGAR, 1/13/2017.
179. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 8/27/2016; OUSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2018; SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 4/30/2018, p. 75.
180. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 3/2019.
181. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 3/2019.
182. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019, 12/20/2018, and 5/10/2018; CSTC-A, response to vetting, 1/16/2019; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 3/2019.
183. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 41.
184. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 41; SIGAR, analysis of USFOR-A-provided data, 3/2019.
185. USFOR-A, response to DOD OIG data call, 4/8/2019.
186. SIGAR, record of meeting with RS, 3/4/2018; RS, letter from Mr. Atmar to General Nicholson, 12/5/2017; RS, letter from General Nicholson to Mr. Atmar, 3/5/2018.
187. BBC, “What Lies Behind Afghanistan’s Insider Attacks?” 3/11/2013.
188. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2018, 12/20/2018, and 3/20/2018; USFOR-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2019; SIGAR, analysis of USFOR-A-provided data, 3/2019.
189. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2018, and 3/20/2018; SIGAR, analysis of USFOR-A-provided data, 3/2019.
190. OUSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 7/14/2017, 1/15/2018, and 4/11/2019; CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 8/27/2016; SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, pp. 52–53.
191. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/4/2016; USFOR-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2016.
192. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 11/28/2017.
193. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 11/26/2016; USFOR-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 7/15/2016 and 1/12/2019; OUSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/14/2018.
194. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018; CSTC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/14/2019.
195. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; CSTC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2018 and 1/12/2019; DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/20/2018, p. 48.
196. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
197. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
198. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
199. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
200. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
201. RS, response to SIGAR data call, 4/1/2019; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 4/2019.
202. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
203. RS Gender Advisory Office, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019, 12/20/2018, and 3/3/2018; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 3/2019.
204. RS Gender Advisory Office, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019, 12/20/2018, and 3/3/2018.
205. RS Gender Advisory Office, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/20/2018; SIGAR, analysis of RS-provided data, 3/2019.
206. DFAS, “AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019,” 4/12/2019.
207. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 41.
208. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019, 12/20/2018, 3/20/2018, and 5/10/2018; SIGAR, analysis of CSTC-A-provided data, 3/2019.
209. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
210. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/21/2018; SIGAR, analysis of CSTC-A-provided data, 3/2019.
211. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/21/2018; SIGAR, analysis of CSTC-A-provided data, 3/2019; DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 41.
212. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/20/2018.
213. DFAS, “AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019,” 4/12/2019.
214. DFAS, “AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019,” 4/12/2019.
215. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
216. DFAS, “AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019,” 4/12/2019.
217. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019, 12/20/2018, and 9/19/2018; CSTC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2019.
218. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
219. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
220. DFAS, “AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019,” 4/12/2019.
221. OUSD-P, correspondence with SIGAR, 1/20/2019.
222. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/20/2018; SIGAR, analysis of CSTC-A provided data, 3/2019.
223. DOD, *FY 2019 Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) Financial Activity Plan (FAP 19-1)*, 10/22/2018.
224. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, p. 52.

ENDNOTES

225. DOD, *Department of Defense Budget, Fiscal Year (FY) 2019, Justification for FY 2019 Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF)*, 2/2018, p. 80.
226. DOD, *Department of Defense Budget, Fiscal Year (FY) 2019, Justification for FY 2019 Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF)*, 2/2018, pp. 85–87; DOD, *FY 2019 Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) Financial Activity Plan (FAP 19-1)*, 10/22/2018.
227. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/20/2018; SIGAR, analysis of CSTC-A provided data, 3/2019.
228. TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and response to SIGAR vetting.
229. TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/20/2018; TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
230. TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2018 and 12/20/2018; TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/16/2019, 4/1/2019, and 4/11/2019; SIGAR, analysis of TAAC-Air provided data, 4/2019.
231. TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2018 and 12/20/2018; TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/16/2019, 4/1/2019, and 4/11/2019; SIGAR, analysis of TAAC-Air provided data, 4/2019.
232. TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2018 and 12/20/2018; TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/16/2019, 4/1/2019, and 4/11/2019; SIGAR, analysis of TAAC-Air provided data, 4/2019.
233. TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2018 and 12/20/2018; TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/16/2019, 4/1/2019, and 4/11/2019; SIGAR, analysis of TAAC-Air provided data, 4/2019.
234. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/16/2018.
235. TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2018 and 12/20/2018; TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/16/2019, 4/1/2019, and 4/11/2019; SIGAR, analysis of TAAC-Air provided data, 4/2019.
236. TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2018 and 12/20/2018; TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/16/2019, 4/1/2019, and 4/11/2019; SIGAR, analysis of TAAC-Air provided data, 4/2019.
237. TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/20/2018; OUSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2019.
238. TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; OUSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
239. For more information about the specific training involved for crew members attaining CMR status, see SIGAR's April 2017 *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, pp. 111–113.
240. For more information about the qualifications training involved for AAF maintainers, see SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 10/30/2018, pp. 97–98.
241. Funds obligated come from two different funds, the Afghan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) and the DOD Counternarcotics Fund. NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/20/2018; SIGAR, analysis of CSTC-A provided data, 3/2019.
242. NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
243. NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/20/2018; OUSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
244. NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
245. NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
246. NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; OUSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
247. DFAS, “AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019,” 4/12/2019.
248. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 41.
249. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019, 12/20/2018, 3/20/2018, and 5/10/2018; CSTC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/16/2019; SIGAR, analysis of CSTC-A-provided data, 3/2019.
250. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 41; SIGAR, analysis of CSTC-A-provided data, 3/2019.
251. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
252. DFAS, “AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019,” 4/12/2019.
253. DFAS, “AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019,” 4/12/2019.
254. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
255. DFAS, “AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019,” 4/12/2019.
256. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/20/2018.
257. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
258. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
259. DFAS, “AR(M) 1002 Appropriation Status by FY Program and Subaccounts March 2019,” 4/12/2019.
260. OUSD-P, correspondence with SIGAR, 1/20/2019.
261. CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 8/27/2016; OSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2018; USIP, *Special Report 322, Police Transition in Afghanistan*, 2/2013.
262. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 6/2017, p. 33.
263. NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/20/2018; NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2019; DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 41.
264. NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019, 12/20/2018 and 3/20/2018; NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2019 and 4/11/2019; SIGAR, analysis of NSOCC-A provided data, 3/2019.
265. NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2018.
266. NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 3/21/2019.
267. NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; OUSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
268. NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 12/20/2018; NSOCC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2019.
269. Fondation Suisse de Déminage website, Afghanistan, <https://fsd.ch/en/project/afghanistan/>, accessed 4/1/2019.
270. E-Mine/UN Mine Action website, “Portfolio on Mine Action,” *Afghanistan Country Portfolio*, 2018, <https://mineaction.org/en/portfolio-of-mine-action-projects>, accessed 12/31/2018; PM/WRA, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
271. State, PM/WRA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2018.
272. State, PM/WRA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; U.S. Census Bureau, “Quick Facts: District of Columbia,” <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/dc/LND110210#viewtop>, accessed 10/4/2018.

ENDNOTES

273. State, PM/WRA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; State, PM/WRA, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
274. USAID, *Conflict Mitigation Assistance for Civilians (COMAC), Implementation Plan—Year 1, FY2018-19: March 12, 2018 to March 11, 2019*, 8/8/2018, p. 1; USAID, *OAPA-17-JULY-AFG-0037, Initial Environmental Examination*, 7/5/2017.
275. USAID, *Conflict Mitigation Assistance for Civilians (COMAC), Quarterly Report, Q1-FY 2019 (October to December 31, 2018)*, 2/21/2019, p. 6.
276. USAID, *Conflict Mitigation Assistance for Civilians (COMAC), Quarterly Report, Q1-FY 2019 (October to December 31, 2018)*, 2/21/2019, pp. 7-8.
277. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
278. Zalmay Khalilzad. (@US4AfghanPeace), "(1/4) Just finished a marathon round of talks with the Taliban in #Doha. The conditions for #peace have improved. It's clear all sides want to end the war. Despite ups and downs, we kept things on track and made real strides," 3/12/2019, <https://twitter.com/US4AfghanPeace/status/1105513778886643713>; *New York Times*, "2 Weeks of U.S.-Taliban Talks End With 'Progress' but No Breakthrough," 3/12/2019.
279. Radio Free Europe, "Afghan Official, U.S. Publicly Clash Over Envoy's Conduct In Taliban Peace Talks," 3/14/2019.
280. State, "Comments by U.S. Department of State Spokesperson," 3/17/2019.
281. Radio Free Europe, "Afghanistan To Send 250 Delegates To Taliban Meeting In Qatar," 4/17/2019; Reuters, "Confusion, mistrust ahead of Afghan peace meeting in Doha," 4/17/2019; Khalilzad, Zalmay. (@US4AfghanPeace), "(1/2) I'm disappointed Qatar's intra-Afghan initiative has been delayed. We're in touch with all parties and encouraged that everyone remains committed to dialogue and the #AfghanPeaceProcess," 4/18/2019, <https://twitter.com/US4AfghanPeace/status/1118995794399498240>.
282. Reuters, "Afghanistan presidential election postponed to September," 3/20/2019.
283. Reuters, "Afghanistan to delay presidential election to July: election body," 12/30/2018.
284. See Appendix B.
285. UN, *UN Electoral Support Project (UNESP) Monthly Electoral Update October 2018*, 2018, p. 4.
286. *TOLOnews*, "Afghans to Vote in Parliamentary Elections," 10/20/2018.
287. Associated Press, "After delays, Afghan president inaugurates new parliament," 4/26/2019; State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
288. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
289. State, *Integrated Country Strategy: Afghanistan*, 9/27/2018, p. 2; Ambassador Alice Wells, testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, hearing on "U.S. Policy Towards Afghanistan," 6/20/2018.
290. State, *Integrated Country Strategy: Afghanistan*, 9/27/2018, p. 2.
291. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 7/30/2018, pp. 121-122.
292. SIGAR analysis of UN election data from UNDP, *United Nations Electoral Support Project (UNESP): 2018 Annual Project Progress Report*, 2/2019, pp. 51-52 and UNDP, *United Nations Electoral Support Project (UNESP): Monthly Electoral Update January 2019*, 2/2019, pp. 13-14.
293. SIGAR analysis of UN election data from UNDP, *United Nations Electoral Support Project (UNESP): 2018 Annual Project Progress Report*, 2/2019, pp. 51-52 and UNDP, *United Nations Electoral Support Project (UNESP): Monthly Electoral Update January 2019*, 2/2019, pp. 13-14.
294. VOA, "Afghan Government Fires Election Commission," 2/12/2019; Radio Free Europe, "Afghanistan Investigating Fired Electoral Officials," 2/13/2019.
295. Radio Free Europe, "Afghanistan Investigating Fired Electoral Officials," 2/13/2019.
296. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
297. Afghanistan Analysts Network, "Afghanistan's 2019 Elections (3): New electoral commissioners, amendments to the electoral law," 3/5/2019.
298. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
299. Reuters, "Afghanistan to delay presidential election to July: election body," 12/30/2018.
300. Reuters, "Afghanistan presidential election postponed to September," 3/20/2019.
301. USAID, *AID-306-10-15-00006: Modification 08*, 4/29/2018.
302. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
303. USAID, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2018; NDI, *Consortium for Elections and Political Process Strengthening*, 2017.
304. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 12/23/2018; USAID, ODG, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
305. Zalmay Khalilzad. (@US4AfghanPeace), "(1/4) Just finished a marathon round of talks with the Taliban in #Doha. The conditions for #peace have improved. It's clear all sides want to end the war. Despite ups and downs, we kept things on track and made real strides," 3/12/2019, <https://twitter.com/US4AfghanPeace/status/1105513778886643713>; *New York Times*, "2 Weeks of U.S.-Taliban Talks End With 'Progress' but No Breakthrough," 3/12/2019.
306. UN, *The situation in Afghanistan and its Implications for International Peace and Security*, report of the Secretary-General, 2/28/2019, p. 3; *TOLOnews*, "Joint Declaration Issued After Moscow Talks," 2/6/2019.
307. SIGAR, *2019 High-Risk List*, 3/2019, p. 41.
308. *TOLOnews*, "Ghani Suggests 'Grand Consultative Jirga' For Peace," 2/12/2019.
309. Radio Free Europe, "Afghan Loya Jirga To Convene Next Month To Discuss Peace Talks," 2/20/2019.
310. *TOLOnews*, "Critics Brand Peace Jirga An Election Campaign," 4/7/2019.
311. *TOLOnews*, "New Council Will Create 'Unified' Stance On Peace," 4/7/2019; *New York Times*, "Afghans Name Council to Ease Logjam on Talks With Taliban," 4/7/2019.
312. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
313. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
314. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 1/9/2018, 3/27/2018, and 9/21/2018.
315. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
316. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
317. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.

ENDNOTES

318. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
319. For background information on the Afghanistan Compact, see pages 122–123 of SIGAR’s April 30, 2018, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*.
320. State, “Department Press Briefing,” 8/24/2017; Office of the President, “Joint Afghan-U.S. Press Release on the Bilateral Compact Executive Committee Meeting,” 8/23/2017; State, SCA, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/12/2017; State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 12/29/2017.
321. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 12/29/2017; DOD, CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/23/2018.
322. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
323. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
324. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
325. SIGAR, *Management and Oversight of Fuel in Afghanistan: DOD Is Taking Steps to Improve Accountability, but Additional Actions Are Needed*, SIGAR 18-41-IP, 4/10/2018, p. 9.
326. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, p. 114.
327. DOJ, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
328. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
329. Council of the EU, “Brussels Conference on Afghanistan: main results,” 10/5/2016, p. 1.
330. “Geneva Conference on Afghanistan: Joint Communiqué,” 11/28/2018, pp. 1, 5–6.
331. USAID, OPPD, response to SIGAR vetting 10/13/2014; USAID, OPPD, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2017; Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, “Communiqué: Conference Outcomes, Contributions and Participants,” 1/28/2010, p. 5; “The Tokyo Declaration: Partnership for Self-Reliance in Afghanistan from Transition to Transformation,” 7/8/2012; USAID, OPPD, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/13/2014; Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, *Self-Reliance through Mutual Accountability Framework (SMAF)*, 9/5/2015, p. 6; USAID, OPPD, response to SIGAR vetting, 7/10/2018.
332. Ministry of Finance, “The Pathway to Self-Reliance: Reform Progress and Priorities for Growth and Development,” 11/2018, p. 13.
333. “Geneva Conference on Afghanistan: Joint Communiqué,” 11/28/2018, p. 6.
334. USAID, OPPD, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
335. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
336. NATO, “Brussels Summit Declaration,” 7/11/2018.
337. USAID, OPPD, response to SIGAR data call, 12/30/2013.
338. USAID, OPPD, response to SIGAR data call, 6/30/2014.
339. USAID, “Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF),” 8/26/2013.
340. USAID, “U.S. government contributed \$105 million to Asian Development Bank Infrastructure Fund for Afghanistan,” 3/18/2014.
341. World Bank, *Administrator’s Report on Financial Status*, 1/20/2019, p. 4.
342. World Bank, *Administrator’s Report on Financial Status*, 1/20/2019, p. 2; World Bank, “Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund: Strategy and Finances,” 2019.
343. BDO, *ARTF Monitoring Agent Fiscal Stability Facility Project Withdrawal Conditions Verification Report*, 11/2018, p. 4.
344. USAID, OPPD, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
345. BDO, *Monitoring Agent for ARTF Detailed Quarterly Management Report Meezan to Qaws FY 1397*, 1/2019, p. 16.
346. World Bank, *Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund: Incentive Program 2018 Administrator’s Technical Review*, 12/2/2018, pp. 2, 23.
347. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 7/30/2017, pp. 115–116.
348. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, p. 47.
349. DOD, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2017; DOD, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2018.
350. DOD, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2017; DOD, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2018.
351. DOD, CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data calls, 7/1/2014.
352. DOD, CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 4/4/2014.
353. DOD, CSTC-A, response to SIGAR data call, 3/23/2015.
354. CSTC-A, “CSTC-A Funding Authorization Letter for the Ministry of Defense (MoD),” 1/3/2019, p. 1; DOD, “CSTC-A Funding Authorization Letter for the Ministry of Interior (MoI),” 1/11/2019, p. 1.
355. DOD, CSTC-A, RM, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
356. DOD, CSTC-A, RM, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
357. UNDP, “Support to Payroll Management (SPM) Project-Commitment Letter (2019 Budget),” 12/23/2018, p. 1.
358. DOD, CSTC-A, RM, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
359. DOD, CSTC-A, CJ3-5/7, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
360. DOD, CSTC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
361. DOD, CSTC-A, CJ3-5/7, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 7/30/2015, p. 3.
362. DOD, CSTC-A, CJ3-5/7, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; DOD, CSTC-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
363. USAID, OPPD, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2015; USAID, ODG, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/9/2018.
364. *Afghan Civic Engagement Program (ACEP): Agreement No. AID-306-A-14-00001*, 2/3/2016, p. 5.
365. *AID-306-A-14-00001, Modification 13*, 7/2/2018, pp. 1–2; *Activity Description for ACEP Extension*, 7/2/2018, p. 5.
366. USAID, ODG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
367. USAID, ODG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
368. USAID, ODG, response to SIGAR vetting, 7/10/2018; USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
369. Checchi and Company Consulting Inc., *Sector Assessment of Civil Society and Media in Afghanistan*, 12/12/2018, vii–ix.
370. Checchi and Company Consulting Inc., *Sector Assessment of Civil Society and Media in Afghanistan*, 12/12/2018, vii–ix.
371. Checchi and Company Consulting Inc., *Sector Assessment of Civil Society and Media in Afghanistan*, 12/12/2018, p. 14.
372. Checchi and Company Consulting Inc., *Sector Assessment of Civil Society and Media in Afghanistan*, 12/12/2018, p. 18.
373. Checchi and Company Consulting Inc., *Sector Assessment of Civil Society and Media in Afghanistan*, 12/12/2018, vii–ix.
374. Checchi and Company Consulting Inc., *Afghanistan Governance Sector Assessment*, 12/23/2018, vii.
375. Checchi and Company Consulting Inc., *Afghanistan Governance Sector Assessment*, 12/23/2018, viii–ix.
376. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, p. 124.

ENDNOTES

377. Tetra Tech ARD, *Initiative to Strengthen Local Administrations in Afghanistan (ISLA) Project) Monthly Report, February 2015*, 3/15/2015, ii; USAID, ODG, response to SIGAR data call, 12/22/2016; USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
378. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, p. 125.
379. Checchi and Company Consulting Inc., *Afghanistan Governance Sector Assessment*, 12/23/2018, p. 44.
380. Checchi and Company Consulting Inc., *Afghanistan Governance Sector Assessment*, 12/23/2018, pp. 12, 29.
381. Development Alternatives Inc., *Strong Hubs for Afghan Hope and Resilience (SHAHAR): Monthly Report February 2015*, 3/15/2015, p. 4; USAID, ODG, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/12/2017; USAID, "Modification 07/REQM-306-1 7-000434," 11/28/2017, p. 1; DAI, *Strong Hubs for Afghan Hope and Resilience (SHAHAR) Monthly Report # 38*, 2/15/2018, p. 6; USAID, ODG, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/10/2019.
382. USAID, ODG, response to SIGAR data call, 6/25/2015; USAID, ODG, response to SIGAR vetting, 7/12/2015.
383. Pacific Architects and Engineers Inc., *Quarterly Progress Report March - May 2017*, 5/2017, p. 1; State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019; State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 9/21/2018.
384. Tetra Tech, *Afghanistan Justice Sector Support Program (JSSP): Task Order #: SAQMMAF171220 Work Plan Year One*, 2/27/2018, p. 5.
385. JSSP, *Bi-Weekly Report # 3 Option Year 1 Feb 1 - Feb 15, 2019 Bi-Weekly Activities by Component Deliverables*, 3/6/2019, p. 3.
386. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/23/2018 and 3/20/2019.
387. IDLO, *Quarterly Reporting for US/INL Funded Projects*, 12/31/2018, p. 3.
388. USAID, *Contract AID-OAA-I-13-0034/AID-306-TO-16-00007*, 4/16/2016, pp. 1, 8; USAID, *Contract AID-OAA-I-13-0034/AID-306-TO-16-00007: Modification 01*, 7/31/2016, p. 3; USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
389. Management Systems International, *Afghanistan's Measure for Accountability and Transparency (AMANAT): Quarterly Performance Report: FY 2018, Quarter 3*, 7/31/2018, pp. 1-2.
390. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.
391. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.
392. DOJ, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
393. DOJ, *Department of Justice/Office of the Deputy Attorney General - INL Inter-Agency Agreement (December 30, 2016) Amendment One Counter-Corruption, Major Crimes, Counter-narcotics, and National Security Investigation and Prosecution Program Quarterly Progress Report Fourth Quarter, FY 2018 (October 2018-December 2018)*, 3/2019, p. 12.
394. DOJ, *Department of Justice/Office of the Deputy Attorney General - INL Inter-Agency Agreement (December 30, 2016) Amendment One Counter-Corruption, Major Crimes, Counter-narcotics, and National Security Investigation and Prosecution Program Quarterly Progress Report Fourth Quarter, FY 2018 (October 2018-December 2018)*, 3/2019, pp. 12-13.
395. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, pp. 131-132; DOJ, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
396. DOJ, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
397. DOJ, *Department of Justice/Office of the Deputy Attorney General - INL Inter-Agency Agreement (December 30, 2016) Amendment One Counter-Corruption, Major Crimes, Counter-narcotics, and National Security Investigation and Prosecution Program Quarterly Progress Report Fourth Quarter, FY 2018 (October 2018-December 2018)*, 3/2019, pp. 11-12.
398. DOJ, *Department of Justice/Office of the Deputy Attorney General - INL Inter-Agency Agreement (December 30, 2016) Amendment One Counter-Corruption, Major Crimes, Counter-narcotics, and National Security Investigation and Prosecution Program Quarterly Progress Report Fourth Quarter, FY 2018 (October 2018-December 2018)*, 3/2019, pp. 11-12.
399. UN, *The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security*, report of the Secretary-General, 6/10/2016, p. 11.
400. CSTC-A, "Briefing for Mr. John Sopko," 6/10/2016; "ACJC Organisational Planning," 1/21/2019.
401. UN, *The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security*, report of the Secretary-General, 9/7/2016, p. 10; CSTC-A, "Briefing for Mr. John Sopko," 6/10/2016; "ACJC Organisational Planning," 1/21/2019.
402. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
403. SIGAR, internal communications, 3/18/2019.
404. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
405. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
406. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
407. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
408. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018 and 3/21/2019.
409. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018.
410. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018.
411. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
412. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
413. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
414. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, p. 135.
415. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, p. 135.
416. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
417. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
418. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
419. DOD, CSTC-A, TAO, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
420. DOD, CSTC-A, TAO, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
421. DOD, CSTC-A, TAO, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
422. DOD, CSTC-A, TAO, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
423. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
424. DOD, CSTC-A, TAO, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
425. DOD, CSTC-A, EF3, response to SIGAR data call, 12/1/2017 and 3/22/2018.
426. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
427. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
428. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.

ENDNOTES

429. DOD, CSTC-A, ROL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
430. State, PRM, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018.
431. State, PRM, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.
432. SIGAR analysis of UNHCR, “Number of Afghan refugees returning to Afghanistan (1 Jan to 25 December 2018),” 12/25/2018.
433. IOM, “Return of Undocumented Afghans Weekly Situation Report,” 3/23/2018, pp. 1–2.
434. SIGAR analysis of UN, OCHA, “Summary of conflict induced displacements (1 Jan to 22 Mar 2019),” 3/24/2019; SIGAR analysis of UN, OCHA, “Summary of conflict induced displacements (1 Jan to 31 Dec 2018),” 1/28/2019.
435. USAID, “Remarks by Administrator Rajiv Shah at the U.S. Institute of Peace Regarding Afghanistan Promote,” 7/18/2013.
436. USAID, “Promote,” 12/17/2018.
437. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2016.
438. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
439. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
440. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
441. USAID, OG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
442. *Guardian*, “‘Chilling reality’: Afghanistan suffers worst floods in seven years,” 3/6/2019; UN, OCHA, “Afghanistan: Flash Floods Update No. 7 (as of 19 March 2019),” 3/19/2019, p. 1; UN, OCHA, “Afghanistan: Flash Floods Update No. 8 (as of 2 April 2019),” 4/2/2019.
443. UN, OCHA, “Afghanistan: Flash Floods Update No. 8 (as of 2 April 2019),” 4/2/2019.
444. *Guardian*, “‘Chilling reality’: Afghanistan suffers worst floods in seven years,” 3/6/2019; UN, OCHA, “Afghanistan: Flash Floods Update No. 7 (as of 19 March 2019),” 3/19/2019, p. 1.
445. UN, OCHA, “Afghanistan: Flash Floods Update No. 7 (as of 19 March 2019),” 3/19/2019, p. 1.
446. *Guardian*, “‘Chilling reality’: Afghanistan suffers worst floods in seven years,” 3/6/2019; *The Telegraph*, “Drought conditions could increase risk of flash flooding,” 4/11/2012.
447. *Guardian*, “‘Chilling reality’: Afghanistan suffers worst floods in seven years,” 3/6/2019.
448. FEWS NET, “Afghanistan Food Security Outlook February to September 2019,” 3/11/2019; FEWS NET, “Integrated Phase Classification,” n.d., accessed 12/21/2018.
449. FEWS NET, “Afghanistan Food Security Outlook February to September 2019,” 3/11/2019.
450. UN, IOM, “Return of Undocumented Afghans: Weekly Situation Report, 25 NOV–01 DEC 2018,” 12/6/2018, p. 1.
451. UN, IOM, “Return of Undocumented Afghans: Weekly Situation Report, JAN—DEC 2018/01–05 JAN 2019,” 12/6/2018, p. 1.
452. USAID, “USAID Provides \$43.8 million to WFP to Boost Food Assistance for Drought Affected Afghans,” 9/23/2018.
453. UN, OCHA, “Trends in response plan/appeal requirements,” <https://fts.unocha.org/appeals/645/summary>, accessed 3/20/2019.
454. *Guardian*, “‘Chilling reality’: Afghanistan suffers worst floods in seven years,” 3/6/2019; UN, OCHA, “Afghanistan 2019 (Humanitarian response plan): Totals,” <https://fts.unocha.org/appeals/672/recipients?f>, accessed 3/20/2019.
455. UN, OCHA, “Afghanistan 2019 (Humanitarian response plan): Totals,” <https://fts.unocha.org/appeals/672/recipients?f>, accessed 3/20/2019.
456. IMF, “IMF Staff Completes Fifth ECF Review Mission for Afghanistan,” Press Release No. 19/89, 3/25/2019; IMF, *Fourth Review under the Extended Credit Facility Arrangement, Request for Modification of Performance Criteria, and Request for Extension and Rephasing of the Arrangement*, 11/20/2018, p. 8.
457. IMF, “IMF Staff Completes Fifth ECF Review Mission for Afghanistan,” Press Release No. 19/89, 3/25/2019.
458. IMF, “IMF Staff Completes Fifth ECF Review Mission for Afghanistan,” Press Release No. 19/89, 3/25/2019.
459. World Bank, *Jobs from Agriculture in Afghanistan*, 2/2018, p. 9.
460. World Bank, “Afghanistan Overview,” <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019.
461. World Bank, *Afghanistan Development Update*, 8/2018, p. 38.
462. World Bank, *Afghanistan Development Update*, 8/2018, p. 38; World Bank, “Afghanistan Overview,” <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019; SIGAR analysis.
463. World Bank, “Afghanistan Overview,” <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019.
464. SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 1/12/2019; SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 4/13/2018.
465. SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 1/12/2019; SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 4/8/2019.
466. SIGAR, *Private Sector Development and Economic Growth – Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, SIGAR 18-38-LL, 4/2018, viii.
467. State, *Integrated Country Strategy: Afghanistan*, 9/27/2018, pp. 2–3.
468. State, *Integrated Country Strategy: Afghanistan*, 9/27/2018, p. 7.
469. State, *Integrated Country Strategy: Afghanistan*, 9/27/2018, p. 4.
470. State, *Integrated Country Strategy: Afghanistan*, 9/27/2018, p. 4.
471. USAID, *Country Development Cooperation Strategy FY 2019-2023*, 11/27/2018, pp. 10–11; USAID, “Country Strategies (CDCS),” 2/22/2018.
472. USAID, OAPA, *Grant Agreement 306-AA-18*, 9/6/2018, pp. 3–5.
473. SIGAR, *Private Sector Development and Economic Growth: Lessons from the U.S. Afghanistan Experience*, SIGAR 18-38-LL, 4/2018, p. 6.
474. SIGAR, *Private Sector Development and Economic Growth: Lessons from the U.S. Afghanistan Experience*, SIGAR 18-38-LL, 4/2018, p. 6.
475. SIGAR, *Stabilization: Lessons from the U.S. Afghanistan Experience*, SIGAR-18-48-LL, 5/2018, p. 187.
476. See Appendix B for a breakdown of U.S. reconstruction funding since 2002.
477. World Bank, *Afghanistan Development Update*, 8/2018, i; World Bank, “Afghanistan Overview,” <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019.
478. IMF, *Fourth Review under the Extended Credit Facility Arrangement, Request for Modification of Performance*

ENDNOTES

- Criteria, and Request for Extension and Rephasing of the Arrangement*, 11/20/2018, p. 8.
479. IMF, “IMF Staff Completes Fifth ECF Review Mission for Afghanistan,” Press Release No. 19/89, 3/25/2019.
480. IMF, *Fourth Review under the Extended Credit Facility Arrangement, Request for Modification of Performance Criteria, and Request for Extension and Rephasing of the Arrangement*, 11/20/2018, p. 8.
481. World Bank, “Afghanistan Overview,” <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019.
482. World Bank, *Afghanistan Development Update*, 8/2018, p. 38.
483. World Bank, *Afghanistan Development Update*, 8/2018, p. 38; World Bank, “Afghanistan Overview,” <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019; SIGAR analysis.
484. World Bank, “Afghanistan Overview,” <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019.
485. IMF, *Fourth Review under the Extended Credit Facility Arrangement, Request for Modification of Performance Criteria, and Request for Extension and Rephasing of the Arrangement*, 11/20/2018, p. 8; World Bank, “Afghanistan Overview,” <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019.
486. Pages 150–152 of SIGAR’s January 2019 *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress* explain why excluding the opium economy is problematic for evaluating Afghanistan’s economic performance.
487. SIGAR, *Private Sector Development and Economic Growth – Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, SIGAR-18-38-LL, 4/2018, p. 165; IMF, *Islamic Republic Of Afghanistan: Staff Report For the 2014 Article IV Consultation*, 4/22/2014, p. 38; IMF, *Third Review Under The Extended Credit Facility Arrangement And Request For Modification Of Performance Criteria*, 5/9/2018, p. 7; World Bank, *Afghanistan Development Update*, 8/2018, p. 15; SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, p. 149.
488. ADB, Chair’s Summary of Meeting of the Board of Directors, “Country Partnership Strategy Afghanistan, 2017–2021—Achieving Inclusive Growth in a Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situation,” 10/31/2017; USIP, *Afghan Economic Policy, Institutions, and Society Since 2001*, 10/2015, p. 6.
489. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 7/30/2018, p. 150; USIP, *What Can Be Done to Revive Afghanistan’s Economy?*, 2/2016, p. 8.
490. The World Bank’s revenue estimate for 2018 (AFN 189.7 billion) differs somewhat from SIGAR’s (AFN 182.3 billion). The timing of data exports likely accounts for this discrepancy. SIGAR used an exchange rate of 72.3 AFN/USD to convert the Bank’s 2018 revenue estimate to USD. World Bank, “Afghanistan Overview,” <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019; SIGAR analysis.
491. World Bank, *Afghanistan Development Update*, 8/2018, pp. 9–10; World Bank, “Afghanistan Overview,” <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019.
492. World Bank, “Afghanistan Overview,” <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019.
493. SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 1/12/2019; SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 4/13/2018.
494. SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 4/13/2018.
495. SIGAR, communications with MOF officials, 8/21/2017.
496. SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 1/12/2019; SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 4/13/2018.
497. SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 1/12/2019; SIGAR analysis of USAID-provided AFMIS data exported 4/8/2019.
498. SIGAR analysis of IMF, *Fourth Review under the Extended Credit Facility Arrangement, Request for Modification of Performance Criteria, and Request for Extension and Rephasing of the Arrangement*, 11/20/2018, p. 25.
499. World Bank, *Afghanistan Development Update*, 8/2018, pp. 15, 38–39; DAB, “Exchange Rates,” 4/2/2019, <http://dab.gov.af/en>, accessed 4/2/2019; SIGAR analysis.
500. State, *Integrated Country Strategy – Afghanistan*, 9/27/2018, p. 4.
501. IMF, *Fourth Review under the Extended Credit Facility Arrangement, Request for Modification of Performance Criteria, and Request for Extension and Rephasing of the Arrangement*, 11/20/2018, p. 23.
502. USAID, “Economic Growth: Afghanistan,” 3/20/2019, <https://www.usaid.gov/afghanistan/economic-growth>, accessed 3/24/2019; SIGAR analysis.
503. It was unclear whether USAID compared fiscal year air export value with solar year total export value in the data provided to SIGAR. Even with possible time-period discrepancies, the increasing materiality of air exports as a proportion of total merchandise exports is clear in the data trends. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
504. USAID, “Afghan Exports Set to Soar as USAID Supports Afghan Government Opening of One-Stop Shop at Hamid Karzai International Airport,” 1/25/2018.
505. IMF, *Fourth Review under the Extended Credit Facility Arrangement, Request for Modification of Performance Criteria, and Request for Extension and Rephasing of the Arrangement*, 11/20/2018, p. 6.
506. IMF, *Fourth Review under the Extended Credit Facility Arrangement, Request for Modification of Performance Criteria, and Request for Extension and Rephasing of the Arrangement*, 11/20/2018, p. 23.
507. SIGAR analysis of quarterly and annual NSIA trade data, accessed 9/25/2018, 12/20/2018, and 3/23/2019.
508. SIGAR analysis of quarterly and annual NSIA trade data, accessed 9/25/2018, 12/20/2018, and 3/23/2019.
509. SIGAR analysis of quarterly and annual NSIA trade data, accessed 9/25/2018, 12/20/2018, and 3/23/2019.
510. SIGAR, interview with USAID/OEG official, 11/8/2018; SIGAR, interview with Afghanistan Customs Department official, 11/13/2018; State, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018.
511. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.

ENDNOTES

512. United States Trade Representative, "United States Launches WTO Challenge to Indian Export Subsidy Programs," 3/14/2018; WTO, "Agriculture – Explanation of the Agreement," n.d., https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/agric_e/ag_intro04_export_e.htm, accessed 4/13/2019.
513. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019; USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
514. SIGAR conclusion based on USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
515. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
516. For more on the Iran sanctions, see pages 155–156 of SIGAR's January 2019 *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress. The Hill*, "Pompeo approves sanctions exception for development of Iranian port to help Afghan economy," 11/6/2018; State, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018.
517. State, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018.
518. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019; State, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/9/2019.
519. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019; *Voice of America*, "Afghanistan Begins Exports to India Through Iranian Port," 2/25/2019.
520. SIGAR, *Private Sector Development and Economic Growth: Lessons from the U.S. Afghanistan Experience*, SIGAR 18-38-LL, 4/2018, p. 18.
521. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019 and 12/20/2018.
522. UN, IOM, "Return of Undocumented Afghans: Weekly Situation Report, 25 NOV–01 DEC 2018," 12/6/2018, p. 1.
523. UN, IOM, "Return of Undocumented Afghans: Weekly Situation Report, JAN— DEC 2018/01– 05 JAN 2019," 12/6/2018, p. 1; State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/23/2019.
524. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/23/2019.
525. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/23/2019; State, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/9/2019.
526. State, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/9/2019.
527. DAB, "Banks," n.d., <http://dab.gov.af/en/page/financial-supervision/licensed-financial-institutions/banks>, accessed 4/2/2019.
528. Treasury, "U.S. Government Fully Re-Imposes Sanctions on the Iranian Regime," 11/5/2018; DAB, "Banks," n.d., <http://dab.gov.af/en/page/financial-supervision/licensed-financial-institutions/banks>, accessed 12/20/2018; DAB, "Banks," n.d., <http://dab.gov.af/en/page/financial-supervision/licensed-financial-institutions/banks>, accessed 4/2/2019.
529. DAB, "Banks," n.d., <http://dab.gov.af/en/page/financial-supervision/licensed-financial-institutions/banks>, accessed 12/20/2018; DAB, "Banks," n.d., <http://dab.gov.af/en/page/financial-supervision/licensed-financial-institutions/banks>, accessed 4/2/2019; *Khaama Press*, "Afghanistan cancels operating license of Pakistan Habib Bank Limited," 4/1/2019.
530. *Khaama Press*, "Afghanistan cancels operating license of Pakistan Habib Bank Limited," 4/1/2019; *Pajhwok Afghan News*, "Central Bank Cancels Pakistan HBL Business License," 4/1/2019.
531. World Bank, *Afghanistan Development Update*, 8/2018, p. 13.
532. World Bank, "Afghanistan Overview," <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019.
533. World Bank, "Afghanistan Overview," <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/afghanistan/overview>, updated 4/2/2019, accessed 4/8/2019.
534. State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report Volume II Money Laundering*, 3/2019, pp. 14, 35.
535. State, "Strengthening the Strategic Partnership of the United States and Afghanistan," 3/24/2015; Treasury, response to SIGAR data call, 3/23/2018.
536. Treasury, response to SIGAR data call, 6/25/2018.
537. Treasury, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
538. Treasury, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
539. Treasury, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
540. USIP, *Responding to Corruption and the Kabul Bank Collapse*, 12/2016, p. 2.
541. Independent Joint Anti-Corruption Monitoring and Evaluation Committee, *Report of the Public Inquiry into the Kabul Bank Crisis*, 11/15/2012, p. 2; USIP, *Responding to Corruption and the Kabul Bank Collapse*, 12/2016, p. 2.
542. USIP, *Responding to Corruption and the Kabul Bank Collapse*, 12/2016, p. 2; Independent Joint Anti-Corruption Monitoring And Evaluation Committee, *Report of the Public Inquiry into the Kabul Bank Crisis*, 11/15/2012, p. 9; TOLONews, "Former Head Of Kabul Bank Dies In Prison," 8/24/2018.
543. USIP, *Responding to Corruption and the Kabul Bank Collapse*, 12/2016, p. 2.
544. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019; State, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/9/2019.
545. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
546. For more on the Afghanistan Compact, see pages 150–151 of SIGAR's October 2017 *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 10/30/2017, p. 150.
547. State, SCA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
548. KBR, "Kabul Bank Recovery and Loan Portfolio Dated 20 March 2019," 3/20/2019.
549. SIGAR analysis of KBR, "Kabul Bank Recovery and Loan Portfolio Dated 20 March 2019," 3/20/2019 and KBR, "Kabul Bank Recovery and Loan Portfolio Dated 10 June 2018," 6/10/2018.
550. SIGAR analysis of SIGAR analysis of KBR, "Kabul Bank Recovery and Loan Portfolio Dated 20 March 2019," 3/20/2019 and KBR, "Kabul Bank Recovery and Loan Portfolio Dated 06 Jan 2019," 6/10/2018.
551. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
552. SIGAR analysis of KBR, "Kabul Bank Recovery and Loan Portfolio Dated 20 March 2019," 3/20/2019 and KBR, "Kabul Bank Recovery and Loan Portfolio Dated 06 Jan 2019," 6/10/2018.
553. USAID, OAPA, Grant Agreement 306-AA-18, 9/6/2018, p. 3.
554. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; SIGAR, interview with USAID/OEG official, 11/8/2018.
555. SIGAR analysis of USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019; SIGAR analysis of World Bank, ARTF, *Administrator's Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019*, 3/6/2019.
556. World Bank, *Afghanistan Development Update*, 8/2018, ii.

ENDNOTES

557. SIGAR, *Status of U.S. Efforts to Develop Extractive Tenders: \$125 Million Spent Resulting in No Active Contracts*, SIGAR-18-58-SP, 7/2018, p. 4.
558. SIGAR, *Status of U.S. Efforts to Develop Extractive Tenders: \$125 Million Spent Resulting in No Active Contracts*, SIGAR-18-58-SP, 7/2018, p. 4.
559. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 10/30/2018, p. 145.
560. Reuters, "Afghanistan pushes for investment as it waits for peace," 4/15/2019.
561. SIGAR, *Status of U.S. Efforts to Develop Extractive Tenders: \$125 Million Spent Resulting in No Active Contracts*, SIGAR-18-58-SP, 7/2018, p. 4.
562. SIGAR analysis of NSIA, *Afghanistan Statistical Yearbook 2017–2018*, p. 110.
563. USIP, *Illegal Mining in Afghanistan: A Driver of Conflict*, 7/2017, p. 1.
564. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
565. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 10/30/2017, p. 197.
566. White House, press release, "Readout of President Donald J. Trump's Meeting with President Ashraf Ghani of Afghanistan," 9/22/2017.
567. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 3/20/2018.
568. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 3/20/2018.
569. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019 and 3/20/2018.
570. USAID, OEG, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; USAID, OAPA, *Country Development Cooperation Strategy FY 2019–2023*, 9/2018, p. 2.
571. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019; *New York Times*, "Trump Finds Reason for the U.S. to Remain in Afghanistan: Minerals," 7/25/2017; Reuters, "Trump, Ghani agree U.S. can help develop Afghanistan's rare earth minerals," 9/21/2017; Foreign Policy, "Despite Risks, Trump Administration Moves Forward With Afghanistan Mining Plan," 8/29/2017.
572. *New York Times*, "Afghanistan Signs Major Mining Deals Despite Legal Concerns," 10/6/2018; Government of Afghanistan, MOMP, *Mining Contract relating to Balkhab Project*, 10/5/2018, pp. 109; Government of Afghanistan, MOMP, *Mining Contract relating to Badakhshan Project*, 10/5/2018, p. 109. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
573. Government of Afghanistan, MOMP, *Mining Contract relating to Balkhab Project*, 10/5/2018, p. 10; Government of Afghanistan, MOMP, *Mining Contract relating to Badakhshan Project*, 10/5/2018, p. 10.
574. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
575. Government of Afghanistan, MOMP, *Mining Contract relating to Balkhab Project*, 10/5/2018, pp. 109, 111; Government of Afghanistan, MOMP, *Mining Contract relating to Badakhshan Project*, 10/5/2018, p. 109.
576. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019; Government of Afghanistan, MOMP, *Mining Contract relating to Balkhab Project*, 10/5/2018, pp. 109, 111; Government of Afghanistan, MOMP, *Mining Contract relating to Badakhshan Project*, 10/5/2018, p. 109.
577. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019; Commerce, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019; Government of Afghanistan, *Minerals Law*, Draft document, 10/1/2018, p. 52; SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2019, p. 159.
578. Commerce, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
579. Global Witness, "About Us," <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/about-us/>, accessed 10/6/2018; Global Witness, "Afghanistan's new mining law risks falling short in the fight against corruption," 9/5/2018.
580. Global Witness, "Afghanistan's new mining law risks falling short in the fight against corruption," 9/5/2018.
581. Global Witness, "Afghanistan's new mining law risks falling short in the fight against corruption," 9/5/2018.
582. State, SCA, "Minerals Working Group Meeting Notes," 2/12/2019.
583. State, SCA, "Minerals Working Group Meeting Notes," 2/12/2019.
584. Commerce, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
585. World Bank, *Jobs from Agriculture in Afghanistan*, 2/2018, pp. 8–9.
586. World Bank, *Afghanistan Development Update*, 8/2018, p. 4; NSIA, *Afghanistan Statistical Yearbook 2017–2018*, 8/2018, p. 110.
587. Pages 150–152 of SIGAR's January 2019 *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress* discuss the economic implications of Afghanistan's opium economy. UNODC, *Afghanistan opium survey 2017 Challenges to sustainable development, peace and security*, 5/2018, p. 14.
588. SIGAR analysis of USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019; SIGAR analysis of World Bank, ARTF, *Administrator's Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019*, 3/6/2019.
589. *Guardian*, "'Chilling reality': Afghanistan suffers worst floods in seven years," 3/6/2019; UN, OCHA, "Afghanistan: Flash Floods Update No. 7 (as of 19 March 2019)," 3/19/2019, p. 1; UN, OCHA, "Afghanistan: Flash Floods Update No. 8 (as of 2 April 2019)," 4/2/2019.
590. *Guardian*, "'Chilling reality': Afghanistan suffers worst floods in seven years," 3/6/2019; UN, OCHA, "Afghanistan: Flash Floods Update No. 7 (as of 19 March 2019)," 3/19/2019, p. 1.
591. UN, OCHA, "Afghanistan: Flash Floods Update No. 7 (as of 19 March 2019)," 3/19/2019, p. 1.
592. UN, OCHA, "Drought grips large parts of Afghanistan," 6/6/2018; UN, Officer for Outer Space Affairs, "Drought," n.d., <http://www.un-spider.org/risks-and-disasters/natural-hazards/drought>, accessed 4/1/2019.
593. *Guardian*, "'Chilling reality': Afghanistan suffers worst floods in seven years," 3/6/2019; *The Telegraph*, "Drought conditions could increase risk of flash flooding," 4/11/2012.
594. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
595. FEWS NET, "Afghanistan Food Security Outlook February to September 2019," 3/11/2019; FEWS NET, "Integrated Phase Classification," n.d., accessed 12/21/2018.
596. State, response to SIGAR data call, 3/22/2019.
597. *Guardian*, "'Chilling reality': Afghanistan suffers worst floods in seven years," 3/6/2019.
598. USAID, "USAID Provides \$43.8 million to WFP to Boost Food Assistance for Drought Affected Afghans," 9/23/2018.

ENDNOTES

599. UN, OCHA, “Afghanistan 2019 (Humanitarian response plan): Totals,” <https://fts.unocha.org/appeals/672/recipients?f>, accessed 3/20/2019.
600. UN, OCHA, “Trends in response plan/appeal requirements,” <https://fts.unocha.org/appeals/645/summary>, accessed 3/20/2019.
601. USAID, *Afghanistan Energy Sector Technical Assessment Final Report*, 2/28/2018, p. 1; USAID, “Afghanistan: Our Work,” n.d., <https://www.usaid.gov/afghanistan/our-work>, accessed 7/8/2018.
602. USAID, fact sheet, “Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project,” 8/14/2017; USAID, OI, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2018.
603. World Bank, “Access to Electricity is at the Heart of Development,” 4/18/2018.
604. USAID, *Afghanistan Energy Sector Technical Assessment: Final Report*, 2/28/2018, pp. 10–11; Asian Development Bank, “Sector Assessment (Summary): Energy,” attachment to the ADB’s Energy Supply Improvement Investment Program document for Afghanistan, www.adb.org, 12/2015, p. 5.
605. SIGAR, interview with USAID/OI officials, 11/8/2018.
606. The Asia Foundation, *A Survey of the Afghan People: Afghanistan in 2018*, 11/15/218, p. 6.
607. The Asia Foundation, *A Survey of the Afghan People: Afghanistan in 2018*, 11/15/218, p. 6.
608. The Asia Foundation, *A Survey of the Afghan People: Afghanistan in 2018*, 11/15/218, p. 29.
609. USAID, Fact Sheet, “Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project,” 8/14/2017; USFOR-A, JENG, *FY 2011-2014 Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF) Program Status Report*, 3/3/2019.
610. USAID, fact sheet, “Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project,” 8/14/2017.
611. USAID, fact sheet, “Power Transmission Expansion and Connectivity Project,” 8/14/2017; USAID, OI, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
612. USFOR-A, JENG, *FY 2011-2014 Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF) Program Status Report*, 3/3/2019; DOD, U.S. Central Command, Office of the Commander, *Afghanistan Commander’s Emergency Response Program (CERP) Kandahar City 30 MW Diesel Power Generation Project*, 6/5/2010, p. 1.
613. USFOR-A, JENG, *FY 2011-2014 Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF) Program Status Report*, 3/3/2019.
614. USFOR-A, JENG, *FY 2011-2014 Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF) Program Status Report*, 3/3/2019; USAID, *Afghanistan Energy Sector Technical Assessment: Final Report*, 2/28/2018, p. 8.
615. See SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 4/30/2018, p. 169 and SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 4/30/2016, p. 186; Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, Division C—Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2015, Pub. L. No. 113-235; Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, Pub. L. No. 114-113; Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017, Pub. L. No. 115-31, pp. 146–147; Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-141, pp. 150–151.
616. DOD, OSD-P, response to SIGAR data call, 6/22/2018; DOD, OSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 7/16/2018; Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, Pub. L. No. 114-113, p. 97; Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017, Pub. L. No. 115-31, pp. 146–147; Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-141, pp. 150–151.
617. SIGAR analysis of DOD, USFOR-A, JENG, *FY 2011-2014 Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF) Program Status Report*, 3/3/2019; DOD, USFOR-A, JENG, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2018; DOD, OSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
618. USAID, OI, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
619. SIGAR, *Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund: Agencies Have Not Assessed Whether Six Projects That Began in Fiscal Year 2011, Worth about \$400 Million, Achieved Counterinsurgency Objectives and Can Be Sustained*, SIGAR 18-10-AR, 10/2017, ii; USAID, *Afghanistan Energy Sector Technical Assessment: Final Report*, 2/28/2018, p. 6; DOD, OSD-P, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
620. USAID, OI, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
621. Tetra Tech, *Engineering Support Program (ESP) Contract No. AID-306-C-16-00010 Bi-Weekly Report No. 47: February 20–March 5, 2019*, 3/6/2019, pp. 3, 5; Tetra Tech, *Engineering Support Program (ESP) Fiscal Year 2019 First Quarter Report*, 1/15/2019, i.
622. Tetra Tech, *Bi-Weekly Report No. 47: February 20–March 5, 2019*, 3/6/2019, p. 5.
623. USAID, OI, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
624. Tetra Tech, “Non-Conformance Report (NCR) 0008-HS_Rev0,” 1/12/2019, p. 1; Tetra Tech, “Non-Conformance Report (NCR) 0007-HS_Rev0,” 1/12/2019, p. 1; Tetra Tech, “Non-Conformance Report (NCR) 0006-HS_Rev0,” 1/12/2019, p. 1; Tetra Tech, “Non-Conformance Report (NCR) 0013-CW_Rev0,” 1/6/2019, p. 1; Tetra Tech, “Non-Conformance Report (NCR) 0014-CW_Rev0,” 1/8/2019, p. 1; Tetra Tech, “Non-Conformance Report (NCR) 0015-CW_Rev0,” 1/8/2019, p. 1; Tetra Tech, “Non-Conformance Report (NCR) 0018-CW_Rev0,” 1/8/2019, p. 1; Tetra Tech, “Non-Conformance Report (NCR) 0021-CW_Rev0,” 1/28/2019, p. 1; Tetra Tech, “Non-Conformance Report (NCR) 0019-CW_Rev0,” 1/8/2019, p. 1.
625. Tetra Tech, *Engineering Support Program (ESP) Contract No. AID-306-C-16-00010 Bi-Weekly Report No. 47: February 20–March 5, 2019*, 3/6/2019, p. 4.
626. USAID, OI, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
627. USAID, “Education: Afghanistan,” n.d., accessed 3/24/2018; USAID, OED, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/10/2018.
628. UNICEF, *Global Initiative on Out-Of-School Children: Afghanistan Country Study*, 6/2018, p. 1.
629. USAID, “Response to the Inquiry Letter on Afghanistan Education Data Reliability, (SIGAR Inquiry Letter-15-62-SP),” 6/30/2015, p. 6.
630. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 7/30/2018, p. 171.
631. SIGAR analysis of Government of Afghanistan, NSIA, *Afghanistan Living Conditions Survey 2016-17*, 8/29/2018, pp. 141, 154.
632. Government of Afghanistan, NSIA, *Afghanistan Living Conditions Survey 2016-17*, 8/29/2018, p. 151.
633. USAID, *Data Quality Assessment of the Ministry of Education’s Education Management Information System*,

ENDNOTES

- 7/2016, p. 7; UN, *The Situation in Afghanistan and its Implications for International Peace and Security*, report of the Secretary-General, 2/28/2018, p. 8; HRW, “I Won’t Be a Doctor, and One Day You’ll Be Sick”: *Girls’ Access to Education in Afghanistan*, 10/2017, pp. 21–22, 76; MEC, *Ministry-wide Vulnerability to Corruption Assessment of the Ministry of Education*, 10/2017, p. 3.
634. For a comprehensive treatment of the status of girls’ education in Afghanistan, see pages 170–174 of SIGAR’s January 2019 *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*.
635. SIGAR analysis of USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2018; SIGAR analysis of World Bank, ARTF, *Administrator’s Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019*, 3/6/2019; SIGAR, interview with USAID/OED officials, 11/12/2018.
636. World Bank, *International Development Association Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Grant in the Amount of SDR 71.2 Million (US\$100 Million Equivalent) and a Proposed Grant from the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund in the Amount of US\$100 Million and a Proposed Grant from the Global Partnership for Education in the Amount of US\$98 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the EQRA Project*, 9/7/2018, v–vi, p. 76.
637. World Bank, *International Development Association Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Grant in the Amount of SDR 71.2 Million (US\$100 Million Equivalent) and a Proposed Grant from the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund in the Amount of US\$100 Million and a Proposed Grant from the Global Partnership for Education in the Amount of US\$98 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the EQRA Project*, 9/7/2018, p. 6.
638. World Bank, IDA, “What Is IDA?,” 2018, <http://ida.worldbank.org/about/what-is-ida>, accessed 3/28/2019; Global Partnership for Education, “Donors,” n.d., <https://www.globalpartnership.org/about-us/donors>, accessed 3/28/2019; World Bank, *Country Update: The World Bank Group in Afghanistan*, 10/2018, p. 3. Global Partnership for Education, “Board of Directors Decision via Affirmative Vote: Afghanistan Education Sector Program Implementation Grant Allocation: Report from the Grants and Performance Committee,” 10/24/2018, pp. 2–3.
639. Global Partnership for Education, “Board of Directors Decision via Affirmative Vote: Afghanistan Education Sector Program Implementation Grant Allocation: Report from the Grants and Performance Committee,” 10/24/2018, pp. 2–3.
640. World Bank, *Afghanistan: EQRA First Implementation Support Mission*, 1/27/2019, p. 1; World Bank, *International Development Association Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Grant in the Amount of SDR 71.2 Million (US\$100 Million Equivalent) and a Proposed Grant from the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund in the Amount of US\$100 Million and a Proposed Grant from the Global Partnership for Education in the Amount Of US\$98 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the EQRA Project*, 9/7/2018, v.
641. World Bank, ARTF, *Administrator’s Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019*, 3/6/2019, p. 6.
642. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
643. World Bank, *Afghanistan: EQRA First Implementation Support Mission*, 1/27/2019, p. 1.
644. World Bank, *Afghanistan: EQRA First Implementation Support Mission*, 1/27/2019, pp. 1–3.
645. World Bank, *International Development Association Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Grant in the Amount of SDR 71.2 Million (US\$100 Million Equivalent) and a Proposed Grant from the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund in the Amount of US\$100 Million and a Proposed Grant from the Global Partnership for Education in the Amount of US\$98 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the EQRA Project*, 9/7/2018, p. 11.
646. World Bank, *Afghanistan: EQRA First Implementation Support Mission*, 1/27/2019, p. 3.
647. World Bank, “Afghan Villagers Accelerate Development Through Community Collaboration,” 7/24/2018.
648. SIGAR, *Afghanistan’s National Solidarity Program Has Reached Thousands of Afghan Communities, but Faces Challenges that Could Limit Outcomes*, SIGAR Audit-11-8, 3/22/2011, p. 2; World Bank, *The National Solidarity Program Assessing the Effects of Community-Driven Development in Afghanistan*, 9/2015, p. 2.
649. World Bank, *Afghanistan: EQRA First Implementation Support Mission*, 1/27/2019, p. 3.
650. World Bank, *Afghanistan: EQRA First Implementation Support Mission*, 1/27/2019, p. 3.
651. World Bank, *Afghanistan: EQRA First Implementation Support Mission*, 1/27/2019, pp. 1, 3.
652. For more, see page 161 of SIGAR’s October 2018 *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*. SIGAR, *Afghanistan’s Health Care Sector: USAID’s Use of Unreliable Data Presents Challenges in Assessing Program Performance and the Extent of Progress*, SIGAR 17-22-AR, 1/2017, i, p. 7.
653. World Bank, *International Development Association Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Grant in the Amount of SDR 96.1 Million (US\$ 140 Million Equivalent) and Proposed Grant from the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund in the Amount of US\$425 Million and a Proposed Grant from the Global Financing Facility in the Amount of US\$35 Million to the Islamic Republic Of Afghanistan for a Afghanistan Sehatmandi Project*, 3/12/2018, p. 8; Government of Afghanistan, NSIA and MOPH (funded by USAID), *Afghanistan Demographic and Health Survey 2015*, 1/2017, p. 1.
654. World Bank, *International Development Association Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Grant in the Amount of SDR 96.1 Million (US\$ 140 Million Equivalent) and a Proposed Grant From the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund in the Amount of US\$425 Million and a Proposed Grant from the Global Financing Facility in the Amount of US\$35 Million to the Islamic Republic Of Afghanistan for a Afghanistan Sehatmandi Project*, 3/12/2018, p. 9; World Bank, *Progress in the Face of Insecurity Improving Health Outcomes in Afghanistan*, 2/2018, p. 7.
655. World Bank, *International Development Association Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Grant in the Amount of SDR 96.1 Million (US\$ 140 Million Equivalent) and a Proposed Grant from the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund in the Amount of US\$425 Million and a Proposed*

ENDNOTES

- Grant from the Global Financing Facility in the Amount of US\$35 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for a Afghanistan Sehatmandi Project*, 3/12/2018, p. 9.
656. CIA, *The World Factbook*, “Afghanistan,” www.cia.gov, version of 3/29/2019.
657. USAID, OAPA, *Grant Agreement 306-AA-18*, 9/6/2018, p. 11.
658. Afghanistan Analysts Network, “One Land, Two Rules (3): Delivering public services in insurgency-affected Dasht-e Archi district in Kunduz province,” 2/26/2019.
659. Afghanistan Analysts Network, “One Land, Two Rules (3): Delivering public services in insurgency-affected Dasht-e Archi district in Kunduz province,” 2/26/2019.
660. Afghanistan Analysts Network, “One Land, Two Rules (3): Delivering public services in insurgency-affected Dasht-e Archi district in Kunduz province,” 2/26/2019.
661. SIGAR analysis of USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2018; SIGAR analysis of World Bank, ARTF, *Administrator’s Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019*, 3/6/2019, p. 6.
662. World Bank, *Implementation Completion and Results Report on Grants in the Amount of US\$623.9 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Afghanistan - System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition (SEHAT) Project*, 1/29/2019, i, pp. 1–2.
663. USAID, “Sector Accomplishments: 2015–2016,” 12/29/2016, p. 4.
664. USAID, “Sector Accomplishments: 2015–2016,” 12/29/2016, p. 4.
665. ARTF, *Administrator’s Report on Financial Status as of January 20, 2019*, 3/6/2019, p. 8.
666. World Bank, *Implementation Completion and Results Report on Grants in the Amount of US\$623.9 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Afghanistan - System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition (SEHAT) Project*, 1/29/2019, pp. 48–49.
667. World Bank, *Implementation Completion and Results Report on Grants in the Amount of US\$623.9 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Afghanistan - System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition (SEHAT) Project*, 1/29/2019, p. 49.
668. World Bank, *Implementation Completion and Results Report on Grants in the Amount of US\$623.9 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Afghanistan - System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition (SEHAT) Project*, 1/29/2019, p. 48.
669. World Bank, *Implementation Completion and Results Report on Grants in the Amount of US\$623.9 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Afghanistan - System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition (SEHAT) Project*, 1/29/2019, pp. 48–50.
670. World Bank, *Implementation Completion and Results Report on Grants in the Amount of US\$623.9 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Afghanistan - System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition (SEHAT) Project*, 1/29/2019, p. 50; Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, *Pentavalent Vaccine: Guide for Health Workers with Answers to Frequently Asked Questions*, 2012, pp. 2, 8.
671. World Bank, *Implementation Completion and Results Report on Grants in the Amount of US\$623.9 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Afghanistan - System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition (SEHAT) Project*, 1/29/2019, p. 49.
672. World Bank, *Implementation Completion and Results Report on Grants in the Amount of US\$623.9 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Afghanistan - System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition (SEHAT) Project*, 1/29/2019, p. 48.
673. World Bank, *Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund Grant Agreement – System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition Project*, 8/27/2013, p. 5; World Bank, *Implementation Completion and Results Report on Grants in the Amount of US\$623.9 Million to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Afghanistan - System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition (SEHAT) Project*, 1/29/2019, p. 50.
674. World Bank, “Afghanistan Sehatmandi Project,” n.d., <http://projects.worldbank.org/P160615?lang=en>, accessed 10/8/2018; World Bank, “Afghanistan: System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition Project,” n.d., <http://www.projects.worldbank.org/P129663/afghanistan-system-enhancement-health-action-transition-project?lang=en>, accessed 9/28/2018.
675. WHO, *Polio, Report by the Secretariat A70/14*, 4/24/2017, p. 1; *Guardian*, “Pakistan and Afghanistan Join Forces to Wipe Out Polio,” 4/5/2016; USAID, OHN, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/10/2017; CDC, *Principles of Epidemiology in Public Health Practice, Third Edition An Introduction to Applied Epidemiology and Biostatistics*, “Lesson 1: Introduction to Epidemiology,” <https://www.cdc.gov/ophss/csels/dsepd/ss1978/lesson1/section11.html>, accessed 10/16/2018.
676. USAID, OHN, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/10/2017 and 4/11/2017.
677. RFE/RL, “Taliban Announces ‘Ban’ On WHO, Red Cross Amid Vaccination Drive,” 4/12/2019.
678. Global Polio Eradication Initiative, “Where We Work–Afghanistan,” n.d., <http://polioeradication.org/where-we-work/afghanistan/>, accessed 3/28/2019; UNICEF and WHO, *Afghanistan Polio Update – October–December 2017*, 1/2018, p. 1; UNICEF and WHO, *Afghanistan Polio Update – October–December 2017*, 1/2018, p. 1; UN, *The Situation in Afghanistan and its Implications for International Peace and Security*, report of the Secretary-General, 2/28/2018, p. 11.
679. WHO, “Statement of the Nineteenth IHR Emergency Committee Regarding the International Spread of Poliovirus,” 11/30/2018.
680. USAID, OHN, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
681. The White House, “Poppy Cultivation and Potential Opium Production in Afghanistan,” press release, 4/11/2019, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/poppy-cultivation-potential-opium-production-afghanistan/>, accessed 4/12/2019.
682. UNODC, *Afghanistan Opium Survey 2018: Cultivation and Production*, 11/2018, pp. 5–6.
683. SIGAR, *Counternarcotics: Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan, SIGAR 18-52-LL*, 6/2018, pp. 30–31.
684. State, INL, *2019 Narcotics Control Strategy Report*, 3/2019, p. 95.
685. Office of Management and Budget, *A Budget for a Better America—President’s Budget FY 2020*, Table 30, pp. 82, 265, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/30-1-fy2020.pdf>, accessed 3/22/2019.

ENDNOTES

686. OSD(CN), response to SIGAR data call, 3/29/2019.
687. NIST, *The United States and the Metric System: A Capsule in History*, 1997, p. 8, <https://www.nist.gov/sites/default/files/documents/pml/wmd/metric/1136a.pdf>, accessed 10/6/2018.
688. DEA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
689. Lead IG, *Operation Freedom's Sentinel Lead Inspector General Report to the United States Congress, October 1, 2018–December 31, 2018*, 2/20/2019, p. 24. Prior quarterly reports have raised SIGAR's concerns about DOD's methodology regarding the campaign's financial impact on drug trafficking organizations resources and the potential risk to civilian populations. See SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 10/30/2018, p. 86; SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 7/30/2018, pp. 186–187; SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 1/30/2018, p. 195.
690. DOD, response to DOD OIG data call, 4/8/2019.
691. USFOR-A, 9 AETF, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
692. USFOR-A, TAAC-Air, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2019.
693. State, *Integrated Country Strategy: Afghanistan*, 9/27/2018.
694. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2018.
695. USFOR-A, response to SIGAR vetting, 7/13/2018; James Soiles, Deputy Chief of Operations, Drug Enforcement Administration, statement for the record before the House Subcommittees of Middle East and Africa, and Asia and Pacific Committee on Foreign Affairs, hearing on "After Withdrawal: The Way Forward in Afghanistan and Pakistan (Part III)," 12/14/2014.
696. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 9/21/2018.
697. See Appendix B of this report.
698. DOD, response to SIGAR vetting, 7/16/2016.
699. *Kabul 1TV Online*, "Afghanistan: President Ghani orders merger of counter-narcotics ministry with interior ministry," 1/27/2019; State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2019.
700. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019.
701. MEC, *Ministry-Wide Vulnerability to Corruption Assessment of the Ministry of Interior*, 1/2019, pp. 9–10.
702. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2019.
703. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2019.
704. UN, *The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security*, report of the Secretary-General, 9/12/2018, p. 13; State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019; State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019; SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 7/30/2018, p. 190.
705. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2019.
706. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019; Daily Mandegar, "Former MCN Employees In Abeyance After Merger Into MoI," 4/3/2019.
707. State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, pp. 95–97, 98.
708. State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, pp. 95–96. Prior to its dissolution, the Ministry of Counter Narcotics also suffered from a lack of capacity. For instance, INL suspended the Good Performers Initiative program in 2016 because of the MCN's inadequate technical capacity. (State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 6/22/2017).
709. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019; DOJ/Office of the Deputy Attorney General–INL Inter-Agency Agreement (December 30, 2016), Amendment One, Counter-Corruption, Major Crimes, Counter-narcotics, and National Security Investigation and Prosecution Program, *Quarterly Progress Report, Fourth Quarter, FY 2018 (October 2018–December 2018)*, pp. 13–14, 20.
710. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.
711. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019; DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 102; DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 6/2018, p. 103.
712. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.
713. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.
714. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 9/21/2018 and 12/20/2018; State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2019.
715. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019; DEA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
716. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019; DEA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; DEA, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/15/2019.
717. DEA, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2018; State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.
718. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 102.
719. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, pp. 100–101.
720. CSTC-A, response to DOD OIG data call, 7/10/2018.
721. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019; DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 86.
722. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, p. 88; SIGAR, *Counternarcotics: Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, SIGAR 18-52-LL, 6/2018, p. 20.
723. DOD, *Enhancing Security and Stability in Afghanistan*, 12/2018, pp. 44–45.
724. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019.
725. DEA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
726. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/12/2017.
727. DEA, response to SIGAR data call, 12/27/2017; OSD(CN), response to SIGAR data call, 12/21/2018.
728. OSD(CN), response to SIGAR data call, 3/29/2019.
729. NIST, *The United States and the Metric System: A Capsule in History*, 1997, p. 8, <https://www.nist.gov/sites/default/files/documents/pml/wmd/metric/1136a.pdf>, accessed 10/6/2018.
730. DEA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; DEA, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/15/2019.
731. DEA, Press Release, *Manhattan U.S. Attorney announces extradition of OFAC-sanctioned Afghan man for Narcoterrorism offenses*, 2/7/2019, <https://www.dea.gov/press-releases/2019/02/07/manhattan-us-attorney-announces-extradition-of-ac-sanctioned-afghan-man>, accessed 3/30/2019.
732. DEA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
733. DEA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, p. 97.
734. DEA, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019; The White House, Press Release, *Poppy Cultivation and Potential Opium*

ENDNOTES

- Production in Afghanistan*, 4/11/2019, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/poppy-cultivation-potential-opium-production-afghanistan/>, accessed 4/12/2019.
735. State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, p. 96.
736. DOJ/Office of the Deputy Attorney General–INL Inter-Agency Agreement (December 30, 2016), Amendment One, Counter-Corruption, Major Crimes, Counter-narcotics, and National Security Investigation and Prosecution Program, *Quarterly Progress Report, Third Quarter, FY 2018 (April 2018–June 2018)*, p. 23.
737. DOJ/Office of the Deputy Attorney General–INL Inter-Agency Agreement (December 30, 2016), Amendment One, Counter-Corruption, Major Crimes, Counter-narcotics, and National Security Investigation and Prosecution Program, *Quarterly Progress Report, Fourth Quarter, FY 2018 (October 2018–December 2018)*, p. 6.
738. SIGAR, *Counternarcotics: Lessons from the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan*, SIGAR 18-52-LL, 6/2018, pp. 79–80.
739. State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, p. 96; MOJ, Press Release, “The Government of Islamic Republic of Afghanistan Introduces New Penal Code,” 11/11/2017.
740. DOJ/Office of the Deputy Attorney General–INL Inter-Agency Agreement (December 30, 2016), Amendment One, Counter-Corruption, Major Crimes, Counter-narcotics, and National Security Investigation and Prosecution Program, *Quarterly Progress Report, Fourth Quarter, FY 2018 (October 2018–December 2018)*, p. 14.
741. DOJ/Office of the Deputy Attorney General–INL Inter-Agency Agreement (December 30, 2016), Amendment One, Counter-Corruption, Major Crimes, Counter-narcotics, and National Security Investigation and Prosecution Program, *Quarterly Progress Report, Fourth Quarter, FY 2018 (October 2018–December 2018)*, p. 15.
742. DOJ/Office of the Deputy Attorney General–INL Inter-Agency Agreement (December 30, 2016), Amendment One, Counter-Corruption, Major Crimes, Counter-narcotics, and National Security Investigation and Prosecution Program, *Quarterly Progress Report, Fourth Quarter, FY 2018 (October 2018–December 2018)*, pp. 13–14.
743. State, INL, *Governor Led Eradication Amended Implementing Instructions for the Letter of Agreement on Police, Criminal Justice, and Counternarcotics Support Programs of March 9, 2006 between the Government of the United States of America and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan*, 4/23/2014.
744. INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.
745. UNODC, *Afghanistan Opium Survey 2018: Cultivation and Production*, 11/2018, p. 35.
746. *Lashkar Gah Helmand National Radio and Television in Pashto*, 1630 Program, 4/2/2019; *Shamshad Television, Daily Hashte Subh (Pashto)*, 1900 News Hour Program, 4/3/2019.
747. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2019; State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019.
748. UNODC, *World Drug Report 2016*, 5/2016, Annex, xi; UNODC, *Afghanistan Opium Survey 2017: Cultivation and Production*, 11/2017, p. 8; UNODC, *Afghanistan Opium Survey 2018: Cultivation and Production*, 11/2018, p. 35.
749. State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, p. 93.
750. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 6/25/2018; State, INL, Press Release, “U.S. and Afghanistan Announce \$25.7 Million in Good Performers Initiative Awards for Provincial Counternarcotics Achievements,” 11/10/2010, <https://2009-2017.state.gov/t/pa/prs/ps/2010/11/150762.htm>, accessed 6/30/2018.
751. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 4/1/2016 and 6/22/2017.
752. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019.
753. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 4/1/2016 and 6/22/2017; State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/14/2016.
754. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019.
755. State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, p. 17.
756. State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, p. 95.
757. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 12/20/2018 and 3/20/2019.
758. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 3/20/2019; State, INL, *Letter of Agreement between U.S. Department of State’s Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs and the Colombo Plan*, 12/7/2018.
759. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2019.
760. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2019.
761. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/15/2019.
762. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 10/30/2018, p. 175; State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/15/2019.
763. State, INL, response to SIGAR data call, 6/25/2018 and 3/20/2019.
764. State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, p. 97.
765. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019; State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, p. 97.
766. State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, p. 98.
767. State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, p. 98; UNODC, *Quarterly Report, INL Funded Alternative Development Project Boost Alternative Development Intervention through Licit Livelihoods (BADILL), Period Covered: April to June 2018*, 2018, p. 3.
768. State, INL, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/12/2019.
769. State, INL, *International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, Volume I: Drug and Chemical Control*, 3/2019, p. 98.
770. UNDP, *Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects, Period covered by the report: First Quarter (Oct–Dec 2018)*, p. 1.
771. UNDP, *Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects, Period covered by the report: First Quarter (Oct–Dec 2018)*, p. 2.
772. UNDP, *Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects, Period covered by the report: First Quarter (Oct–Dec 2018)*, p. 2.
773. UNDP, *Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects, Period covered by the report: First Quarter (Oct–Dec 2018)*, p. 2.

ENDNOTES

774. UNDP, *Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects, Period covered by the report: First Quarter (Oct–Dec 2018)*, p. 1; USAID, *Contract 72030618C00013 between USAID/Afghanistan and DAI Global, LLC*, 8/2/2018, p. 1.
775. UNDP, *Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects, Period covered by the report: First Quarter (Oct–Dec 2018)*, p. 2.
776. UNDP, *Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects, Period covered by the report: First Quarter (Oct–Dec 2018)*, p. 2.
777. USAID, response to SIGAR vetting, 1/9/2018.
778. USAID, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2016.
779. USAID, *Afghanistan Value Chains–High Value Crops, Quarterly Performance Report, Quarter I, FY2019*, 1/30/2019, p. 1.
780. USAID, *Contract 72030618C00013 between USAID/Afghanistan and DAI Global, LLC*, 8/2/2018, p. 12.
781. USAID, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2018.
782. USAID, *Afghanistan Value Chains–High Value Crops, Quarterly Performance Report, Quarter I, FY2019*, 1/30/2019, pp. 1, 3–4.
783. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
784. USAID, *Contract 72030618C00011 between USAID/Afghanistan and DAI Global, LLC*, 6/9/2018, pp. 5, 11.
785. USAID, *Afghanistan Value Chains–Livestock, Quarterly Performance Report, October–December 2018*, 1/30/2019, p. 1.
786. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
787. USAID, *Grant and Cooperative Agreement AID-306-IO-17-00005 with Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations*, 10/20/2018, p. 1.
788. USAID, *Promoting Value Chains–Western Afghanistan, Semi-annual Progress Report, September 20, 2017 to March 31, 2018*, 5/29/2018, i, p. 1.
789. USAID, *Promoting Value Chains–Western Afghanistan, Annual Progress Report, September 20, 2017 to September 19, 2018*, 9/30/2018, pp. 6–7.
790. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 3/21/2019.
791. USAID, response to SIGAR vetting, 4/11/2019.
792. USAID, *Promoting Value Chains – Western Afghanistan, Semi-Annual Progress Report, September 20, 2017 to March 31, 2018*, 5/29/2018, pp. 5, 19–20; USAID, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2018.
793. USAID, *Promoting Value Chains–Western Afghanistan, Annual Progress Report, September 20, 2017 to September 19, 2018*, 9/30/2018, pp. 9–10.
794. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
795. USAID, *Commercial Horticulture and Agriculture Marketing Program (CHAMP), December 2018 Monthly Report*, pp. 3, 8.
796. USAID, *Commercial Horticulture and Agriculture Marketing Program (CHAMP), December 2018 Monthly Report*, p. 4.
797. USAID, *Commercial Horticulture and Agriculture Marketing Program (CHAMP), Quarterly Progress Report, July–September 2018*, 10/30/2018, p. 5.
798. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
799. USAID, response to SIGAR vetting, 10/11/2016.
800. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
801. USAID, *Mid-term Performance Evaluation of the Regional Agriculture Development Program in Afghanistan*, 2/2019, i.
802. USAID, *Mid-term Performance Evaluation of the Regional Agriculture Development Program in Afghanistan*, 2/2019, v.
803. USAID, *Mid-term Performance Evaluation of the Regional Agriculture Development Program in Afghanistan*, 2/2019, iii.
804. USAID, *Regional Agricultural Development Program—East (RADP-E), Activity Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, FY 2018*, 1/20/2018; USAID, *Regional Agricultural Development Program—East (RADP-E), Quarterly Report FY 2019, Quarter I (October–December 2018)*, 1/30/2019, p. 3.
805. USAID, *Regional Agricultural Development Program—East (RADP-E), Quarterly Report FY 2019, Quarter I (October–December 2018)*, 1/30/2019, pp. 1, 4–5.
806. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.
807. USAID, *Regional Agricultural Development Program (RADP)—North, Contract No. AID-306-C-14-00002, FY2018, Quarter 3 (April–June 2018)*, 7/31/2018, p. 8.
808. SIGAR, *Quarterly Report to the United States Congress*, 7/30/2018, p. 194.
809. USAID, *Regional Agricultural Development Program (RADP)—North, Contract No. AID-306-C-14-00002, FY2018, October Monthly Report*, 11/29/2018, pp. 7–8.
810. USAID, *Regional Agricultural Development Program (RADP)—North, Contract No. AID-306-C-14-00002, FY2018, November Monthly Report*, 12/31/2018, pp. 7–8.
811. USAID, *Regional Agricultural Development Program (RADP)—North, Contract No. AID-306-C-14-0002, FY2018, November Monthly Report*, 12/31/2018, p. 8.
812. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 12/23/2018.
813. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 12/23/2018.
814. USAID, response to SIGAR data call, 4/11/2019.



Nuts and dried fruit for sale by women farmers at the UNDP-funded Pilawary Farm in Kabul.
(UNDP photo by S. Omer Sadaat)

Quarterly Report Staff

Michael Bindell, Deputy Director of Research and Analysis Directorate
Theodore Burns, Funding Subject Matter Expert
Daniel Fisher, Economic and Social Development Subject Matter Expert
Clark Irwin, Lead Writer/Editor
Vong Lim, Visual Information Specialist
James Misencik, Security Subject Matter Expert
Olivia Paek, Senior Visual Information Specialist

Zaba Rashan, Student Trainee
Heather Robinson, Security Subject Matter Expert
Deborah Scroggins, Director of Research and Analysis Directorate
Omar Sharif, Project Coordinator
Solange Toura Gaba, Counternarcotics Subject Matter Expert
Daniel Weggeland, Governance Subject Matter Expert

SIGAR
SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL
FOR AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION

2530 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA 22202

www.sigar.mil

WASTE, FRAUD, OR ABUSE MAY BE REPORTED TO SIGAR'S HOTLINE

By phone: Afghanistan
Cell: 0700107300
DSN: 318-237-3912 ext. 7303
All voicemail is in Dari, Pashto, and English.

By phone: United States
Toll-free: 866-329-8893
DSN: 312-664-0378
All voicemail is in English and answered during business hours.

By fax: 703-601-4065
By e-mail: sigar.hotline@mail.mil
By Web submission: www.sigar.mil/investigations/hotline/report-fraud.aspx



SIGAR
Report Waste, Fraud, or Abuse