

# Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Joint Report on Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan

Report to the Relevant Committees of Congress

April 2013

The estimated cost of report or study for the Department of Defense is approximately \$20,000 for the 2012 Fiscal Year. This includes \$15,000 in expenses and \$5,430 in DoD labor.  
Cost estimate generated on March 8, 2013 RefID: 7-FA25828

## Table of Contents

Congressional Report Requirement .....	3
Introduction.....	5
Section A - Department of State .....	8
Section B - Department of Defense .....	12
Section C - United States Agency for International Development .....	15

## **Congressional Report Requirement**

This report is submitted in response to section 863 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2011, P.L. 111-383, “Annual Joint Report and Comptroller General Review on Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan,” as amended by section 847 of the FY 2013 NDAA.

Requirement:

Except as provided below, beginning on February 1, 2011, and thereafter until February 1, 2015, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall submit to the relevant committees of Congress an annual joint report on contracts in Iraq or Afghanistan.

The report is required, at a minimum, to cover the following with respect to contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan during the reporting period:

- Total number of contracts awarded;
- Total number of active contracts;
- Total value of all contracts awarded;
- Total value of active contracts;
- The extent to which such contracts have used competitive procedures;
- Total number of contractor personnel working on contracts at the end of each quarter of the reporting period;
- Total number of contractor personnel who are performing security functions at the end of each quarter of the reporting period; and
- Total number of contractor personnel killed or wounded.

The report is also required to cover the following:

- The sources of information and data used to compile the required information;
- A description of any known limitations of the data reported, including known limitations of the methodology and data sources used to compile the report; and
- Any plans for strengthening collection, coordination, and sharing of information on contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan through improvements to the common databases identified under section 861(b)(4) of the FY 2008 NDAA (P.L. 110-181), as amended.

Each report shall cover a period of not less than 12 months.

The Secretaries and the Administrator shall submit an initial report under this subsection not later than February 1, 2011, and shall submit an updated report by February 1 of every year thereafter until February 1, 2015.

If the total annual amount of obligations for contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan combined is less than \$250,000,000 for the reporting period for all three agencies combined, the Secretaries and the Administrator may submit, in lieu of a report, a letter stating the applicability of this paragraph, with such documentation as the Secretaries and the Administrator consider appropriate.

In determining the total number of contractor personnel working on contracts, the Secretaries and the Administrator may use estimates for any category of contractor personnel for which they determine it is not feasible to provide an actual count. The report shall fully disclose the extent to which estimates are used in lieu of an actual count.

## Introduction

The Department of State (DOS), Department of Defense (DoD), and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) agree that reliable, meaningful data related to contracts and assistance instruments are a starting point for informing agency decisions and ensuring proper management and oversight. Each agency continues to strengthen collection, coordination, and sharing of information related to contingency contracts and contractors.

As detailed below, we have continued to improve our data collection process since last year's report. We are appreciative of the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) analysis and have addressed the primary issue raised in its September 2012 report, "Iraq and Afghanistan: Agencies Are Taking Steps to Improve Data on Contracting but Need to Standardize Reporting," and have standardized the methodologies used to obtain and present information to the best extent possible so that comparisons across agencies will be more accurate.

Similar to last year, this report is structured in three parts providing the required information for each agency in turn. The methodology and assumptions specific to each agency are contained within its respective section. Prior to data collection, the agencies agreed that the reporting period would be from October 1, 2011, to September 30, 2012, because financial and census data are generally reported using the fiscal year calendar.

We continue to see improvement in the accuracy of the data in the Synchronized Predeployment Operational Tracker (SPOT). This overall improvement in data reliability is a result of a number of factors, most notably a continued leadership emphasis to enforce compliance with existing policy on contractor accountability and a concerted effort by the SPOT program management office to clean up the data within the system and enhance the reporting capability of the Total Operational Picture Support System (TOPSS), which is the Business Intelligence Tool of the SPOT Enterprise Suite. SPOT also continues to be used in Iraq to manage the ongoing U.S. transition and consolidation.

As noted last year, registering local nationals in the SPOT database poses many challenges. However, steady progress continues to be made in capturing data on these contractors.

Through improvements made to SPOT this year, we are now able to better access data relating to contractor personnel who are performing security functions. Users had been using a variety of job titles for private security contractors (PSCs). SPOT now utilizes the standardized Department of Labor O\*NET job categories and functions. Consequently, all PSCs are now registered in SPOT under one of three job titles: Security Guard, Police Patrol Officer, or First-Line Supervisor of Police and Detectives. With PSC data standardized in SPOT, the SPOT Program Manager is able to refine a report in TOPSS that queries the system for all contractors with one of the three designated job titles and provide a meaningful report on PSC contractors in Iraq and Afghanistan.

As a testament to the increased data accuracy and improved SPOT functionality, the majority of DOS and DoD data for this year's report was derived from SPOT-generated reports. Specifically, the SPOT team provided each agency with a spreadsheet containing data including contract and competition information, cost data information from the TOPSS Contract Value Report, and the numbers of deployed contractor personnel and contractor personnel providing security functions by quarter. USAID is presenting contract information using the Global Assistance and Acquisition System (GLAAS) as it is the system they use for tracking this type of data.

We recognize the synergies that can be gained by leveraging the contract data which resides in SPOT and that which has been reported to the Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS) to improve reporting. We have continued to improve the fidelity and integration of data between SPOT and FPDS and are in the process of examining technical solutions within the Department that can more effectively leverage available authoritative sources of contract data. It is important to note, however, that while there is some degree of overlap in the contract data reported to each database, SPOT and FPDS serve different functional communities and therefore follow different reporting procedures for inputting data related to a specific contracting action executed by the Agencies. Minor differences in data collection procedures due to differing missions being served creates the unintended consequence of seeing contract data that would appear to be inaccurate or in conflict with one another, but rather is indeed accurate and simply serving its own unique mission and stakeholder community.

When SPOT is used as the baseline, the resulting dollar values will be limited to those contracts that meet SPOT registration requirements both in terms of deployment and financial thresholds (contracts, subcontracts, task orders, delivery orders, grants, or cooperative agreements involving work performed in Iraq or Afghanistan for a period longer than 30 days or all such contracts over the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (currently \$150,000)). This approach does not account for that portion of the money the agencies spend on contracts with a place of performance in Iraq or Afghanistan that have no actual contractor deployments, including, for example, the purchase of computer equipment, land and vehicle leases, and air freight services.

Gathering information on contractors who have been killed or wounded continues to be less an issue of functionality and more an issue of contractor compliance. As there are disparate systems that already require the contractor to input casualty data, it is more challenging to enforce SPOT as an additional mechanism. While SPOT has the functionality to hold this information, contractors are not properly reporting casualty information in the database and compliance with this specific requirement is poor; only a small number of contractor deaths have been recorded in SPOT. To standardize reporting this year, the agencies have decided to report killed and wounded data in a consolidated manner using the Department of Labor's Office of Workers' Compensation (OWCP) Defense Base Act (DBA) Case Summary Report. The report provides data on the total number of DBA cases created during the period from all employers.

Number of Contractor Personnel Killed or Wounded in FY 2012		
Location	Number Killed	Number Wounded
Afghanistan	247	2,406
Iraq	14	989

**Data Source:** *OWCP DBA Summary Report (for FY 2012, by nation)*  
*This report does not constitute the complete or official casualty statistics of civilian contractor injuries and deaths.*  
*Also contains natural deaths and accidents. The number wounded reflects those claims with a lost time of 4 days or more*

The agencies acknowledge the limitation of relying upon the Department of Labor’s OWCP DBA Case Summary Report. We recognize that because DBA is a workers’ compensation program, the Department of Labor’s statistics include cases such as those resulting from occupational injuries and do not provide a true reflection of how many contractor personnel were killed or wounded while working on qualifying contracts. However, in the absence of a better source for contractors of all nationalities, we believe that the data currently provides the most comprehensive statistics and thus continues to provide useful insights as well as highlights trends in contractor casualties.

The agencies again request clarification from Congress about the scope of the requirement to report the number of contractors who are killed or wounded, specifically whether the number of “killed or wounded” should include only those contractors who were killed or wounded as a result of hostile actions or should also include those who died or were injured in non-hostile incidents (e.g. car accident, heart attack).

We are continuing to make improvements to the common database in order to address identified remaining data and systems deficiencies. The SPOT program manager is introducing a number of system enhancements that will improve our ability to more fully rely on SPOT. For example, the DoD Task Order format will be standardized (following the rules prescribed by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement subpart 204.70), allowing us to match contracting actions at the contract and task order level with a higher rate of success and greater reliability for extracting contract values from the TOPSS Contract Value Report. Additionally, we will start to use the Global Force Management, the authoritative data source for the DoD Organizational Hierarchy, and are conducting an Afghanistan Site Cleanup within the system. Both the latter improvements will provide us more fidelity of location and agency reporting, eliminating potential duplications in data.

Representatives from each agency meet regularly to discuss SPOT issues and concerns and develop interagency solutions. All agencies participated in a quarterly Configuration Control Board in January to prioritize and vote on recommended changes to the database. Having refined our processes, we remain committed to the ongoing improvement of our oversight and accountability of contracts and contractors supporting U.S. efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

## Section A – Department of State

DOS provides the following charts in response to the primary matters to be covered in the report as defined in the legislation.

As outlined in the introduction, the data below was facilitated by the SPOT team, which provided each agency with a spreadsheet and charts. The results in these charts were compiled using the same methodology for all agencies, in an effort to standardize the reports in response to the GAO’s September 2012 report.

### **Information about DOS contracts awarded in Iraq and Afghanistan in FY 2012**

Number and value of DOS contracts awarded in Iraq and Afghanistan in FY 2012 and the extent to which they used competitive procedures:

<b>U.S. Department of State FY 2012 New Awards in Afghanistan and Iraq</b>				
Location	Number of Contracts Awarded	Base and All Options Value of Contracts	Number of Contracts Competitively Awarded	Base and All Options Value of Competitively Awarded FY 2012 Contracts
Afghanistan	29	\$961 million	27	\$895 million
Iraq	19	\$222 million	12	\$141 million

*Data Source: SPOT and TOPSS*  
*Shows the new DoS service contracts meeting SPOT threshold requirements that were awarded in FY 2012 (October 2011 – September 2012) and their associated estimated overall value, including option years*

### **Information about DOS active contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan in FY 2012**

Number and value of active DOS contracts and the extent to which these active DOS contracts have used the competitive procedures:

<b>U.S. Department of State FY 2012 Active Contracts in Afghanistan and Iraq</b>				
Location	Number of Active Contracts	Value of Obligations for Active Contracts	Number of Active Contracts Competitively Awarded	Value of Obligations for Active Contracts Competitively Awarded
Afghanistan	205	\$1.196 billion	186	\$1.085 billion
Iraq	127	\$1.325 billion	95	\$991 million

*Data Source: SPOT and TOPSS; Shows the DoS contracts meeting SPOT threshold requirements that were active in FY 2012 (October 2011 – September 2012) and their associated estimated obligation value.*



**Information about DOS contractor personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan in FY 2012**

US Department of State FY 2012		
	Total Contractor Personnel	Contractor Personnel Performing Security Functions
<b>First Quarter</b>		
Afghanistan	2,727	588
Iraq	5,904	2725
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,631</b>	<b>3313</b>
<b>Second Quarter</b>		
Afghanistan	2,590	631
Iraq	5,145	2471
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,735</b>	<b>3866</b>
<b>Third Quarter</b>		
Afghanistan	1,787	584
Iraq	3,467	2169
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,254</b>	<b>2753</b>
<b>Fourth Quarter</b>		
Afghanistan	1,878	809
Iraq	4,449	2039
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,327</b>	<b>2848</b>
<i>Data Source: SPOT database</i>		

**Limitations of Data**

In response to the GAO’s analysis report on September 2012, the Department of State met with the other agencies and agreed to adopt SPOT as the common database for reporting contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan in order to take steps to improve the need for standardized reporting.

Therefore, the data presented for the charts above relied on two primary sources of information: SPOT and TOPSS. As noted before, all the data and charts were provided by the SPOT team for the different agencies.

## Contract Data

The following methodology was developed to produce the data on contract value:

- A **basic report** was generated for all DOS contracts/task orders that had a SPOT place of performance of Iraq or Afghanistan.
- For the **FY 2012 Active Contracts**, any contract that had a period of performance in SPOT that ended before September 30, 2011, or started after October 1, 2012, were eliminated.
- For the **FY 2012 New Awards**, data was further filtered for contracts that started between October 1, 2011, and September 30, 2012.
- The resulting sets of data were compared to the TOPSS Contract Value Report to give the Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG) total obligations of contracts and task orders rolled up for the Active Contracts and the total value of contracts and task orders with Options for the New Awards. Some data did not return any values from FPDS-NG and DOS supplied the data for the contracts that could be found manually.
- Many contracts were not exclusively performed in Iraq and Afghanistan, so the contracts that were listed in SPOT multiple times with different place of performance were used to determine the percent of value to attribute to each country (Iraq and Afghanistan).

## Data Limitations

DOS identified limitations to this methodology. The SPOT system requires that awards be recorded when it involves deployments in Iraq or Afghanistan for a period longer than 30 days and when they are over the Simplified Acquisition Threshold of \$150,000. This eliminates all the contracts that do not have any deployments, such as the purchase of goods or services that do not require contractor personnel to deploy to such countries. This means that the amounts in the charts do not include the money spent on awards in these countries. DOS is presenting the data for all the contracts related to Iraq and Afghanistan -including Goods and Services, provided by the FPDS-NG system in Appendix A in order to fully comply with the requirement of the law.

The period of performance for awards may change as the result of subsequent contract modifications. Contracting Officers must be alert to include this changed period. A contract is considered active during an ongoing period of performance even if additional funding or orders are not placed against the contract; thus, an “active” contract may include a contract available for performance but without actual current work.

SPOT does not currently use a standardized format to input the contract numbers. SPOT contract numbering conventions should track to FPDS standards. While efforts were made to

discuss this with the SPOT Configuration Control Board, during this reporting period the contract numbers for DOS were still not fully standardized and it was difficult to match some of the numbers entered in SPOT with those of the FPDS-NG database to get the dollar amounts for every contract.

For those records without a match, we conducted a manual effort to find the amounts in the FPDS database system to the extent possible, but there were still records that had to be left out because it was impossible to know their correspondence between SPOT and FPDS-NG.

SPOT has the record of contracts that have deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan, but it does not necessarily mean that such contracts are exclusive for Iraq or Afghanistan. In many instances these contracts have task orders with other places of performance and it is difficult to tell at the contract level how much money was used for each of the countries. For this report, the SPOT team tried to assign a percentage of the money for each country depending on the number of deployments and places of performance that were recorded for each contract in this situation. This approach may have produced over- or under-estimations of the dollar values because it lacks the degree of detail that FPDS-NG could give at the task order level.

#### Contractor Personnel Census data

The contractor figures presented rely solely on the SPOT database. The SPOT team provided the numbers for each quarter by taking a snapshot of the last data available for each quarter and it was decided among all agencies involved that this would be a good representation of the status of deployments at every point in time.

## Section B – Department of Defense

DoD provides the following information in response to the primary matters to be covered in the report as defined in the legislation.

### **Information about DoD contracts awarded in Iraq and Afghanistan in FY 2012**

Number and value of DoD contracts awarded in Iraq and Afghanistan in FY 2012 and the extent to which they used competitive procedures:

<b>U.S. Department of Defense FY 2012 New Awards in Afghanistan and Iraq</b>				
Location	Number of Contracts Awarded	Base and All Options Value of Contracts	Number of Contracts Competitively Awarded	Base and All Options Value of Competitively Awarded FY 2012 Contracts
Afghanistan	1669	\$7.255 billion	1476	\$4.960 billion
Iraq	31	\$231 million	18	\$121 million

*Data Source: SPOT and TOPSS*  
*Shows the new DoD service contracts meeting SPOT threshold requirements (as stated in the introduction) that were awarded in FY 2012 (October 2011 – September 2012) and their associated estimated overall value, including option years*

### **Information about DoD active contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan in FY 2012**

Number and value of active DoD contracts and the extent to which these active DoD contracts have used the competitive procedures:

<b>U.S. DoD FY 2012 Active Contracts in Afghanistan and Iraq</b>				
Location	Number of Active Contracts	Value of Obligations for Active Contracts	Number of Active Contracts Competitively Awarded	Value of Obligations for Active Contracts Competitively Awarded
Afghanistan	4727	\$34.927 billion	4022	\$28.688 billion
Iraq	468	\$4.508 billion	350	\$4.033 billion

*Data Source: SPOT and TOPSS;*  
*Shows the DoD contracts meeting SPOT threshold requirements (as stated in the introduction) that were active in FY 2012 (October 2011 – September 2012) and their associated estimated obligation value.*

**Information about DoD contractor personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan in FY 2012**

<b>US Department of Defense FY 2012</b>		
	<b>Total Contractor Personnel</b>	<b>Contractor Personnel Performing Security Functions</b>
<b>First Quarter</b>		
<b>Afghanistan</b>	111,780	13,801
<b>Iraq</b>	21,888	519
<b>Total</b>	<b>133,668</b>	<b>14,320</b>
<b>Second Quarter</b>		
<b>Afghanistan</b>	117,239	18,079
<b>Iraq</b>	10,813	393
<b>Total</b>	<b>128,052</b>	<b>18,472</b>
<b>Third Quarter</b>		
<b>Afghanistan</b>	117,264	19,162
<b>Iraq</b>	9,063	2,151
<b>Total</b>	<b>126,327</b>	<b>21,313</b>
<b>Fourth Quarter</b>		
<b>Afghanistan</b>	105,577	19,454
<b>Iraq</b>	8,374	4,293
<b>Total</b>	<b>113,951</b>	<b>23,747</b>
<i>Data Source: SPOT database</i>		

**Limitations of Data**

The primary sources for the information provided in the charts above were SPOT, TOPSS, and the Department of Labor OWCP DBA Case Summary Report, as noted in each respective chart.

As mentioned in the introduction, the DoD endeavored to rely on the SPOT database to the maximum extent possible when compiling the data for the charts provided above.

**Contract Data**

Using SPOT as the baseline for new and active registered contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan during the reporting period, DoD developed the following methodology to provide data on contract values. A TOPSS (which pulls the data from SPOT) report was generated listing all registered active FY 2012 contracts with a place of performance of Iraq and Afghanistan. This report was then reconciled with the TOPSS Contract Value Report (which pulls contract values on matching actions reported to FPDS) to provide a report of total obligations for FY 2012 registered active contracts and total contracted value of the base and all option years for FY 2012 new awards. Since many contracts were not exclusively performed in

Iraq or Afghanistan, a SPOT report listing the total number of contractors deployed by contract and country of deployment was generated. These numbers were used in estimating the dollar value of the contract obligation in each country by apportioning the contract value by the percentage of total contractor personnel in each country.

There are limitations to this methodology. First, using SPOT as the baseline limits the data collection to only those contracts that meet SPOT registration requirements both in terms of financial and deployment thresholds. Therefore, contracts that do not require contractor personnel be registered in SPOT (for example, the purchase of computer equipment and uniforms, land and vehicle leases, and air freight services) are not included in the data presented above. Analysis indicates that using the SPOT baseline data for determining the competitiveness of new awards versus relying solely upon FPDS results in a difference of approximately \$2.5 billion (base and all options value) of new awards in Afghanistan and \$22 million in Iraq.

Second, there are also incidents where it is difficult to assign a dollar value to a contract that is registered in SPOT with deployments against it because the contract place of performance includes multiple countries. For instance, FPDS collects the primary place of performance of any contract/order award valued above the micro-purchase threshold (including those sourced to local vendors) and their subsequent modifications, whereas SPOT collects data where any performance occurs in Iraq/Afghanistan that also requires use of SPOT. In these cases, because the place of performance is reported in FPDS base upon the predominant location where work is to be performed, the value of the portion of the obligation in Iraq or Afghanistan cannot be determined. As a result, the total dollar value reported may be over-estimated.

SPOT was also used to provide the information regarding the number of contract actions and the extent to which such contracts have used competitive procedures. SPOT reports at the contract level, therefore the number of actions reported does not include individual task orders and modifications. Additionally, the competition field in SPOT is a yes/no binary option and does not provide the same degree of detail as FPDS.

#### Contractor Personnel Census Data

The contractor personnel figures presented above rely exclusively on the SPOT database. In previous years, DoD has reported quarterly contractor numbers using the U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) automated/manual hybrid process called "SPOT-Plus." SPOT-Plus consists of a manual reconciliation of data downloaded from SPOT. While the numbers reported here and the USCENTCOM quarterly census numbers were not exactly the same, the data in SPOT has reached a level of accuracy that we feel comfortable using the SPOT database as the source for contractor personnel information. We continue to refine the data and correct remaining discrepancies.

#### Data on Killed and Wounded Contractors

In spite of these limitations, we believe that the information presented in this report continues our effort to move forward in comprehensively using SPOT as the joint common database for contract and contractor data.

## **Section C – U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

USAID used Federal and Agency databases to provide the FY 2012 figures for this joint report. Databases included the USAID's GLAAS for acquisition and assistance (A&A) data, SPOT for information regarding the number of USAID contractor personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the OWCP DBA Summary Report for contractor personnel who were killed or wounded while working on qualifying contracts. USAID has determined that these are the most accurate sources for the data required by the National Defense Authorization Act.

As stated in the FY 2011 report, the web-based, real-time GLAAS worldwide system is able to capture all FY 2012 data and was used exclusively in this report for A&A data. For FY 2012, Afghanistan and Iraq were fully deployed on GLAAS. Because of the accuracy, efficiency, and effectiveness of GLAAS, A&A data is best drawn from GLAAS. The system also automates and integrates the major business functional areas of the A&A management process.

GLAAS also maximizes efficiency through online data collection, electronic routing, workflow, and workload management. This electronic requisition process culminates in the commitment of funds in our financial system, known as Phoenix. Submission of award data to FPDS-NG (for contracts) and award data for Federal Assistance Awards Data System (FAADS) (for grants and cooperative agreements) is accomplished via GLAAS. Hard-stops exist within the system for both FPDS-NG and FAADS, which ensures that all users submit and validate the data for reporting prior to finalizing the release of an award or action.

Currently, there are no known limitations to the data that has been provided in this report. As anticipated in the report for FY 2011, USAID has now fully deployed GLAAS, which is the Agency's official system of record for all A&A activities and is confident in the accuracy of the information contained in this report.

**Number and Value of FY 2012 New Contracts in Afghanistan and Iraq, Including Competition Status**

<b>USAID FY 2012 New Contracts in Afghanistan &amp; Iraq</b>				
<b>Location</b>	<b>Competition Status</b>	<b>Number of Contracts</b>	<b>Base and All Options Value of Contracts</b>	<b>Value of Obligations</b>
	Competed Under SAP	31	\$1.397 million	\$1.397 million
	Follow On to Competed Action	1	\$13.307 million	\$13.307 million
Afghanistan	Full and Open Competition	50	\$3.938 billion	\$147.095 million
	Full and Open Competition after Exclusion of Sources	2	\$16.235 million	\$2.315 million
	(blank)*	11	\$23.772 million	\$6.537 million
	Not Competed	18	\$35.896 million	\$35.109 million
	Not Competed Under SAP	17	\$1.167 million	\$1.167 million
	(blank)**	20	\$0.392 million	\$0.392 million
<b>Afghanistan Total</b>		<b>150</b>	<b>\$4.03 billion</b>	<b>\$207.32 million</b>
Iraq	Competed Under SAP	25	\$0.362 million	\$0.362 million
	Full and Open Competition	4	\$89.69 million	\$19.522 million
	Full and Open Competition After Exclusion of Sources	1	\$0.151 million	\$0.151 million
	(blank)*	12	\$0.017 million	\$0.017 million
	Not Competed	6	\$0.289 million	\$0.289 million
	Not Competed Under SAP	7	\$0.24 million	\$0.24 million
	(blank)**	6	\$0.00549 million	\$0.00549 million
<b>Iraq Total</b>		<b>61</b>	<b>\$90.753 million</b>	<b>\$20.586 million</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>211</b>	<b>\$4.121 billion</b>	<b>\$227.905 million</b>
<i>Data Source: GLAAS</i>				
<i>*Indicates that the award was competed, and the award's competition status was unavailable</i>				
<i>**Indicates that the award was not competed, and the award's competition status was unavailable</i>				



**Number and Value of FY2012 New Contracts in Afghanistan and Iraq, Including Competition Status (Excluding Personal Service Contracts)**

<b>USAID FY 2012 New Contracts in Afghanistan &amp; Iraq (Excluding Personal Service Contracts)</b>				
<b>Location</b>	<b>Competition Status</b>	<b>Number of Contracts</b>	<b>Base and All Options Value of Contracts</b>	<b>Value of Obligations</b>
	Competed Under SAP	31	\$1.397 million	\$1.397 million
Afghanistan	Follow On to Competed Action	1	\$13.307 million	\$13.307 million
	Full and Open Competition	22	\$3.932 billion	\$142.151 million
	Full and Open Competition after Exclusion of Sources (blank)*	1	\$15.975 million	\$2.065 million
	(blank)*	11	\$23.772 million	\$6.537 million
	Not Competed	8	\$33.944 million	\$33.942 million
	Not Competed Under SAP	17	\$1.167 million	\$1.167 million
	(blank)**	19	\$0.362 million	\$0.362 million
<b>Afghanistan Total</b>		<b>110</b>	<b>\$4.021 billion</b>	<b>\$200.928 million</b>
Iraq	Competed Under SAP	25	\$0.362 million	\$0.362 million
	Full and Open Competition	1	\$89.141 million	\$18.974 million
	(blank)*	12	\$0.017 million	\$0.017 million
	Not Competed	3	\$0.092 million	\$0.092 million
	Not Competed Under SAP	7	\$0.24 million	\$0.24 million
	(blank)**	6	\$0.00549 million	\$0.00549 million
<b>Iraq Total</b>		<b>54</b>	<b>\$89.857 million</b>	<b>\$19.69 million</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>164</b>	<b>\$4.111 billion</b>	<b>\$220.617 million</b>
<i>Data Source: GLAAS</i>				
<i>*Indicates that the award was competed, and the award's competition status was unavailable</i>				
<i>**Indicates that the award was not competed, and the award's competition status was unavailable</i>				

**Number and Value of FY 2012 Active Contracts in Afghanistan and Iraq, Including Competition Status**

<b>USAID FY 2012 Active Contracts in Afghanistan &amp; Iraq</b>			
<b>Location</b>	<b>Competition Status</b>	<b>Number of Contracts</b>	<b>Value of Obligations</b>
Afghanistan	Competed Under SAP	32	\$1.429 million
	Follow On to Competed Action	1	\$13.307 million
	Full and Open Competition	95	\$313.711 million
	Full and Open Competition after Exclusion of Sources	2	\$2.315 million
	Competitive Delivery Order Applying to Full and Open Competition	8	\$19.266 million
	(blank)*	11	\$6.537 million
	Not Competed	41	\$67.057 million
	Not Competed Under SAP	17	\$1.167 million
	Non-Competitive Delivery Order	3	\$6.44 million
	(blank)**	22	\$142.872 million
<b>Afghanistan Total</b>		<b>260</b>	<b>\$574.127 million</b>
Iraq	Competed Under SAP	30	\$0.361 million
	Full and Open Competition	23	\$132.588 million
	Full and Open Competition After Exclusion of Sources	27	\$37.372 million
	Competitive Delivery Order Applying to Full and Open Competition	1	\$0.000 million
	(blank)*	15	\$30.017 million
	Not Competed	12	\$0.23 million
	Not Competed Under SAP	17	\$0.226 million
	(blank)**	6	\$0.00549 million
<b>Iraq Total</b>		<b>137</b>	<b>\$200.8 million</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>397</b>	<b>\$774.926 million</b>
<i>Data Source: GLAAS</i>			
<i>*Indicates that the award was competed, and the award's competition status was unavailable</i>			
<i>**Indicates that the award was not competed, and the award's competition status was unavailable</i>			

**Number and Value of FY 2012 Active Contracts in Afghanistan and Iraq, Including Competition Status (Excluding Personal Service Contracts)**

<b>USAID FY 2012 Competitively Awarded Active Contracts in Afghanistan &amp; Iraq (Excluding Personal Service Contracts)</b>			
<b>Location</b>	<b>Competition Status</b>	<b>Number of Contracts</b>	<b>Value of Obligations</b>
Afghanistan	Competed Under SAP	32	\$1.429 million
	Follow On to Competed Action	1	\$13.307 million
	Full and Open Competition	53	\$308.181 million
	Full and Open Competition after Exclusion of Sources	1	\$2.065 million
	Competitive Delivery Order Applying to Full and Open Competition	8	\$19.266 million
	(blank)*	11	\$6.537 million
	Not Competed	13	\$65.674 million
	Not Competed Under SAP	17	\$1.167 million
	Non-Competitive Delivery Order	3	\$6.44 million
	(blank)**	21	\$142.842 million
<b>Afghanistan Total</b>		<b>184</b>	<b>\$566.907 million</b>
Iraq	Competed Under SAP	30	\$0.361 million
	Full and Open Competition	7	\$131.307 million
	Full and Open Competition after Exclusion of Sources	1	\$36.417 million
	Competitive Delivery Order Applying to Full and Open Competition	1	\$0.000 million
	(blank)*	15	\$30.017 million
	Not Competed	5	\$0.089 million
	Not Competed Under SAP	17	\$0.226 million
	(blank)**	6	\$0.00549 million
<b>Iraq Total</b>		<b>88</b>	<b>\$198.422 million</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>272</b>	<b>\$765.329 million</b>
<i>Data Source: GLAAS</i>			
<i>*Indicates that the award was competed, and the award's competition status was unavailable</i>			
<i>**Indicates that the award was not competed, and the award's competition status was unavailable</i>			

**Number and Value of FY 2012 New Assistance Awards in Afghanistan and Iraq, Including Competition Status**

<b>USAID FY 2012 New Awards in Afghanistan and Iraq</b>				
<b>Location</b>	<b>Competition Status</b>	<b>Number of New Assistance Awards</b>	<b>Base and All Options Value of New Assistance Awards</b>	<b>Value of Obligations of New Assistance Awards</b>
Afghanistan	Competed	12	\$17.53 million	\$10.388 million
	Not Competed	10	\$384.458 million	\$384.458 million
<b>Afghanistan Total</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>\$401.988 million</b>	<b>\$394.847 million</b>
Iraq	Competed	1	\$74.997 million	\$4.665 million
	Not Competed	1	\$79.913 million	\$10.0 million
<b>Iraq Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>\$154.91 Million</b>	<b>\$14.665 million</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>\$566.899 million</b>	<b>\$409.512 million</b>

*Data Source: GLAAS*

**Number and Value of FY 2012 Active Assistance Awards in Afghanistan and Iraq, Including Competition Status**

<b>USAID FY 2012 Active Awards in Afghanistan and Iraq</b>			
<b>Location</b>	<b>Competition Status</b>	<b>Number of Active Assistance Awards</b>	<b>Value of Obligations of Active Assistance Awards</b>
Afghanistan	Competed	17	\$30.388 million
	Not Competed	20	\$395.841 million
	(blank)***	42	\$564.97 million
<b>Afghanistan Total</b>		<b>79</b>	<b>\$991.199 million</b>
Iraq	Competed	8	\$72.665 million
	Not Competed	4	\$10 million
<b>Iraq Total</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>\$82.665 million</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>91</b>	<b>\$1.074 billion</b>

*Data Source: GLAAS*  
 \*\*\*Competition status of award unavailable

**Information about USAID contractor personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan in FY 2012**

<b>U.S. Agency for International Development FY 2012</b>		
	<b>Total Contractor Personnel</b>	<b>Contractor Personnel Performing Security Functions</b>
<b>First Quarter</b>		
<b>Afghanistan</b>	3,000	16
<b>Iraq</b>	1,269	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,269</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Second Quarter</b>		
<b>Afghanistan</b>	3,129	7
<b>Iraq</b>	1,284	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,413</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Third Quarter</b>		
<b>Afghanistan</b>	1,302	8
<b>Iraq</b>	935	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,237</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Fourth Quarter</b>		
<b>Afghanistan</b>	871	10
<b>Iraq</b>	894	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,765</b>	<b>26</b>
<i>Data Source: SPOT</i>		

**ERRATA SHEET:**

**Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Joint Report on Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan**

DATE: May 16, 2013

This errata sheet should be used as an addendum to the Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Joint Report on Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan. This document serves to provide additional clarification regarding Department of Defense data provided in the report.

Page 15

**Information about DoD contractor personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan in FY 2012<sup>(1)</sup>**

US Department of Defense FY 2012		
	Total Contractor Personnel	Contractor Personnel Performing Security Functions
<b>First Quarter</b>		
Afghanistan	111,780	13,801
Iraq	21,888	519 <sup>(2)</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>133,668</b>	<b>14,320</b>
<b>Second Quarter</b>		
Afghanistan	117,239	18,079
Iraq	10,813	393 <sup>(2)</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>128,052</b>	<b>18,472</b>
<b>Third Quarter</b>		
Afghanistan	117,264	19,162
Iraq	9,063	2,151
<b>Total</b>	<b>126,327</b>	<b>21,313</b>
<b>Fourth Quarter</b>		
Afghanistan	105,577	19,454
Iraq	8,374	2,254 <sup>(3)</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>113,951</b>	<b>21,708<sup>(4)</sup></b>
<i>Data Source: SPOT database</i>		

(1) These figures require additional clarification. Based upon a recommendation from the GAO, the three agencies (DOS, USAID and DoD) decided to report contractor population figures in FY12 using a shared methodology. The contractor personnel figures presented here, therefore, rely exclusively on the SPOT database. These numbers are different from the numbers DoD reports quarterly using the U.S. Central Command automated/manual hybrid process called “SPOT-Plus.” While this report contains a general caveat that the numbers presented in the report are not consistent with numbers reported quarterly by DoD, certain figures presented here require further explanation.

(2) The number of Contractor Personnel Performing Security Functions in Iraq in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters of FY12 was taken from the SPOT database, but does not reflect an accurate picture of

the number of Private Security Contractors (PSC) in Iraq at the time. During this time frame, many contractors believed that they did not need to register contractors in the SPOT database because Iraq was no longer considered a contingency operation. That assumption was incorrect and by the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of FY12, the SPOT and the CENTCOM Census numbers come into better alignment. The CENTCOM Quarterly SPOT-Plus Census indicates that there were 8,995 PSCs in Iraq in 1<sup>st</sup> quarter FY12 and 3,577 in 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter FY12. These numbers more accurately reflect the number of PSCs in Iraq and are the numbers that DoD uses to track contractor accountability from a management perspective. The large reduction in the number of contractors in Iraq from the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter FY12 to the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter FY12 is a result of the end of combat operations in Iraq.

- (3) This figure was erroneously presented as 4,293. The correct figure from the SPOT database is 2,254. This number tracks closely with the CENTCOM quarterly SPOT-Plus census.
- (4) Total figure corrected based on the change to the Iraq 4<sup>th</sup> quarter number.