Our 2018 “Strategic Effort Deliverables” to HAF were to evolve the AF Inspection System to emphasize and assess full-spectrum readiness and improve investigation, inquiry and oversight timeliness. And in terms of accomplishments, 2018 was a banner year for our IG Enterprise! Thank you to the incredible teammates on the IG Hq staff, AFIA (AF Inspection Agency), OSI (Office of Special Investigations), and DC3 (Defense Cyber Crimes Center). And of course, a special shout out and thank you to our MAJCOM and wing IGs, WIT (Wing Inspection Team) members and OSI units in the field ensuring mission readiness and lethality across the Total Force, where the rubber meets the road.

It’s been an honor to partner with Chief “PJ” Jones listening to and advocating for our Airmen (uniformed and civilian) as we visited every MAJCOM, ensuring your voice was heard. During our visits with MAJCOM and wing IGs, their senior leadership, OSI teams, and our lunches with Airmen, your inputs helped inform the decisions we make at the HAF level. We worked to “elevate our IG enterprise” by building trust and communicating that we are a helpful resourceful enterprise. Congratulations to Chief Ryan Bell (AETC/IG Superintendent) for his selection to fill Chief Jones’ role this summer. Like Chief Jones, Chief Bell comes with a wealth of experience in our IG enterprise and will seamlessly continue the work that Chief Jones has in progress.

Ongoing initiatives to elevate the IG Enterprise:

- Assess readiness. We will continue to train, teach, coach and mentor as we validate what mission readiness looks like for those with expeditionary missions as well as those mission sets “employed in-place.”
- Publish attachments 3 and 7 to AFI 90-201, as AFIs 90-201 and 90-301 were recently published.
- Distribute the Manpower Determinant to all MAJCOM A1 offices for your comments.
- Partner with AFIA to brief the group and wing CC courses at Maxwell on AFIS/readiness exercises and on lessons learned in complaints resolution.
- Promote our new IG enterprise website at www.afinspectorgeneral.af.mil. A huge thank you to MSgt Gant (SAF/IGE), who is now a webmaster. In addition to highlighting our directorates and agencies, it includes links for TIG Brief, Holding the Line, commentaries, and PACE (Profession of Arms Center of Excellence).
- Fund and execute the REAPER (Readiness Exercise Advanced Planning, Execution and Reporting) exercise training course.
- Advocate for our IG positions to be boarded positions for command. One of our current CCs said it best, “I have to say unequivocally that my experience as the IGI was the single greatest factor in preparing me for command.”
- Advocate for the Waiver Request System (developed by AFSPC, now residing in ACC) to be an AF-wide hosted tool providing a searchable database and waiver continuity for CCs.
• Advocate to centralize 10 USC 1034 Investigations at SAF/IGQ (modeled after the IGS process) to reduce timelines, multiple oversights, and offer quality standardized reports from the IGQ staff subject matter experts.

• Distribute “Holding the Line” to IGs, CCs and senior leaders (military and civilian) to educate them on general themes, trends and lessons learned from IGS and IGQ.

• Continue to get out and about at every level to communicate the IG message as the “Cultural conscience of the Air Force…Restoring Readiness and Lethality!”

• And much more for the year ahead!

During our travels, we’ve met a multitude of champion-level teammates whose incredible efforts kept us driving our IG enterprise flightpath priorities set by the SecAF, CSAF, and CMSAF. As I retire and Maj Gen Said takes the lead, I know our US Air Force is in great hands with YOU continuing to elevate our IG Enterprise! I thank you for your passion, for seeking and reporting the truth in inspections and investigations, and for your unrivaled service to our Airmen (uniformed and civilian), our Air Force and our Nation!

It’s been an honor to serve as your AF Inspector General!

Lt Gen Stayce D. Harris
Air Force Inspector General
Greetings, IG Enterprise. As we begin 2019, I am reminded of how many great things our team accomplished in 2018 and how grateful I am to have such amazing partners. There were many challenges, but together we developed solutions that strengthened IG roles and capabilities and improved the effectiveness and efficiency of the Air Force.

There are a couple of initiatives on the horizon to continue on this flight path and to help source the best qualified candidates for the IG Enterprise. Most of you are aware of our manpower study. When it is completed, it will provide the additional validation required to hire and retain great IG talent.

However, there were other things happening behind the scenes to help with our IG talent management. In December 2018, the MAJCOM IG Superintendents and I met to discuss and develop a SPECAT (Special Category Catalog) for our IG enlisted personnel. For those who are not familiar with a SPECAT, it is a catalog that contains supplemental information for certain requirements as advertised in EQUAL-Plus. It is not a stand-alone document and does not advertise vacant Special Duty positions. The main purpose for developing an IG SPECAT is to specify requirements for hiring IG personnel at all levels, allow wings (optional) to PCS enlisted personnel into funded IG billets, and prevent our IG shops from having to employ the “additional person” as they transition out of the military.

Looking to 2019, another area we plan to tackle is our IG Stabilize Tour Guide. A Stabilize Tour Guide is a document maintained by the Air Force Personnel Center, Assignments Procedure and Policy Branch. It identifies organizations authorized to use tour deferment Assignment Availability Codes. A stabilized tour is an authorized period of time by which Airmen must remain assigned to a particular unit to support unique missions. During a recent visit to AFPC, we learned that our Stabilize Tour Guide does not meet the requirements of how we currently perform IG duties. Our goal is to develop a new guide that meets our current requirements while allowing flexibility for our IG Airmen’s professional growth.

At the beginning of 2018, I challenged all of you to help build trust in the IG system. I asked you to get out from behind your desks to talk with our Airmen, visit them in their work environments, and change your posters to show that we have officers, enlisted, and civilians working in our IG offices. The goal is to pull Airmen towards us versus having them turn away and to let our Airmen know that we (IG Enterprise) are a helping agency. I am happy to report that our efforts are paying off—as TIG and I traveled across our Air Force, we have heard stories of Airmen gravitating towards the IG; we received questions from Airmen on how they can become a part of our enterprise and we are seeing IG depth of knowledge improve amongst our team. Thank you for accepting the challenge and for improving our IG Enterprise. We cannot rest on our laurels because there is still much work to be done and more Airmen that need to be reached, but teammates we are grateful for your efforts.

Finally, I want to close 2018 and begin the New Year by saying THANK YOU TEAM!!
The Secretary and Chief identified innovation as one of five Air Force priorities. Supporting the priority for innovation, TIG’s Strategic Objective of ‘Providing Actionable Cross-Tell to External Stakeholders’ obliges us to ask: “How can we do better?”

**Enterprise Trends** is a succinct update on IG enterprise activities that can help “ensure our Airmen are properly organized, trained, and equipped to fight and win” (*Squadron Revitalization Implementation Plan*). We encourage your input so that we can continue to improve TIGBrief@us.af.mil.

**Inspections Updates:**

- **Commander’s Inspection Program (CCIP).** Recent analysis shows an increase in integrated readiness assessments. This may indicate a trend towards more robust readiness exercises that cover all aspects of wing operational missions. AFIA will provide more insight as analysis capabilities grow and we implement the new AFI 90-201, _The Air Force Inspection System._

- **Personnel Reliability Assurance Program (PRAP) Observations from AFIA Oversight.**
  - Commissioning sources (detachments and installations) are not performing administrative qualification duties for new officers in a timely manner
  - Many problems appear to arise as a function of PRAP inspection inexperience

- Inconsistent inspection/continuous evaluation of PRAP during the UEI cycle at all levels

- **Master Question File (MQF).** Previously, level 2 questions were released to MAJCOM IGs only. In the interest of transparency, the Executive Steering Group (ESG) has made all MQF questions available to wings and units. The MQF questions are posted on the IG Toolkit

- **Major Graded Area (MGA) Weighting.** In support of SecAF and CSAF lethality and readiness priorities, the ESG directed rebalancing of the MGAs for CAPSTONE events. The new balance is: MGA 1 (Managing Resources)=20%, MGA 2 (Leading People)=20%, MGA 3 (Improving the Unit)=25%, MGA 4 (Mission Execution)=35%

**Capability updates:**

- **REAPER.** AFIA is hosting a MAJCOM/Wing users group to review readiness exercise syllabus products. The Beta Test is planned for Apr 19 and Mobile Training Teams (MTT) start in May

- **Hands-On Exercise Training.** In Dec 18 AFIA collaborated with AFSOC to accomplish a hands-on Exercise Planning Conference and in Apr 19 we will do a similar event with AFRC. Additional AFIA capacity is available and we welcome collaboration opportunities to improve your ongoing lethality and readiness efforts

- **IGEMS/MICT Software.** The next software release is scheduled for early Mar 19

- **IGEMS/MICT Functional Requirements Board (FRB).** Scheduled for 11-14 Feb 19.

- **IGEMS.** With the release of software version 1.2.2.20 (Nov 18), once a report is finalized and uploaded in IGEMS, any changes to the report will require an amendment generated within the system. IGEMS is the system of record for inspection reports and any changes

- **Security Classification Guide (SCG).** Please ensure you reference the SCG before putting any readiness-related findings in IGEMS! The SCG can be found on the IG World Classroom under “Publications/Policy.” [https://cs2.eis.af.mil/sites/12634/igc/default.aspx](https://cs2.eis.af.mil/sites/12634/igc/default.aspx)
Lately, my complaint box has seen an influx of “my boss is mean to me” complaints. By whatever name you want to give them—toxic, hostile, bully, etc.—complaints of this nature have been around, I’m certain, since former TIG John P. Flynn paved the way. But, why the recent rise? What’s going on in our Air Force today that so many airmen are making hostile work environment complaints? Are Air Force leaders more hostile? Do they bully Airmen more? Or, do our Airmen expect a softer and gentler Air Force?

On the face of it, it appears a generation gap is at the source of the growth. After giving these questions much analysis, I concluded that an organization or agency outside the Air Force IG Complaints Resolution system can more appropriately answer that question. After all, determining the root cause of the problem is not an IG’s issue to solve. In a time when our workload is at an all-time high, addressing these complaints swiftly and accurately is very important. So, what makes a hostile work environment complaint different today than in years past and what do we do with them?

I recently attended an IG training event where a highly regarded and respected member of the DoD IG team expounded vehemently, “I hate hostile work environment complaints!” Why, I wondered, would he have such disdain for a complaint of that nature? It is not an IG issue; so, refer it to command IAW AFI 90-301, Inspection General Complaints Resolution, Table 3.10, Rule 2. It is really that simple. Or, is it? “Hostile Work Environment” is not defined in the Air Force outside AFI 36-2706, Equal Opportunity (EO) Program Military and Civilian. Maybe, then, a hostile work environment allegation, not associated with an EO protected category, could be dismissed IAW Paragraph 3.26: “A complaint may be dismissed following a thorough complaint analysis if there is no assertion or evidence of a standard being violated.” Congratulations, both resolutions are correct and you have fulfilled SAF’s vision to be “timely.”

But, is it an “accurate” resolution. Only after you refer the issue and have the Referral Completion Report in hand, will you know whether you have made a good decision. To learn what the foundation of an “accurate” resolution requires, look no further than AFI 90-301, Paragraph 3.8. Although it is a Tier-1 requirement, the complaint clarification is the most neglected requirement in analyses I have reviewed. In the aforementioned complaint, asking “what makes the environment hostile” could be the difference in referring a legitimate allegation of a standard violated or the non-credible “feeling” an airman has about coming to work.

**Bottom-line:** while it is easy to push an airman’s problem off on the “Beating Heart of the Air Force” with an immediate referral, thoroughly understanding SSgt Millennial’s issue may uncover there is no violation, and result in dismissal of the complaint. Your extra 30-minute complaint clarification effort could save a commander countless hours, keeping the squadron focused on cohesiveness, readiness, and the agility the Air Force requires.

*Mr. Chris Senkbeil, Chief, Complaints and Inquiries Division, PACAF/IG*
The commander’s inspection program is built on the premise that units can—and must—assess themselves. As the IG, not only are we charged with informing commanders and higher headquarters on our self-assessment programs, but we also report on our compliance. These responsibilities rely heavily on the use of the Management Internal Control Kit (MICT) database system as a “communication tool” to track and relay progress and highlight any issues or challenges. The communication chain runs from the flight level through squadron, group and wing levels up to our functional program managers and finally higher-level IG. So, if you were to place yourself in the shoes of a wing commander for one second, after seeing the data output from our current MICT reporting, you may ask yourself: “How good is my Self-Assessment Program?”

Take a look at the MICT commander dashboard, for example, and you will see something like the “Compliance Breakdown” diagram to the left. What does this actually tell you? How much confidence do you have in this self-reported assessment of compliance? Is your unit improving? Is your unit degrading? I suspect that you will find that there is not enough information here to answer your questions, but yet this is the first thing commanders see.

**How Much Confidence Do You have in Self-Reported Assessment of Compliance?**

If you do not have confidence in how data is collected and you cannot trust the fundamental inputs of a system, then any decision you make with that data is fundamentally flawed. In manufacturing and acquisitions testing as comparison, one must talk about the margins of error associated with any measurements used to test a product. Looking at the diagram again, the 97% compliance means that Airmen within the unit answered “Yes” to 97% of the questions within the database. If this is our fundamental measurement, what confidence do you have in your Airman answering them correctly? Also, when was the last time the questions were answered and were they accurate back then?

At Yokota Air Base, Japan, we developed a process assigning a value to how much confidence you have in a unit’s reported compliance. This process is built entirely on basic statistical sampling concepts. If you sample randomly and use a structured assessment approach, you can provide statistical confidence and validate the results. For example, let us say we want to take a look at one squadron and assess how “good” they are performing their self-assessment and reporting. It is well known practice from the field of statistics that one can (if certain conditions are met), sample a population and report on the outcomes with a confidence level and confidence interval. In our case, we are looking to validate how well a unit has answered “Yes” or “No” questions. This proves to be a case well-suited for the Binomial Model in Probability Theory.
“The Binomial Distribution with parameters n and p is the Discrete Probability Distribution of the number of successes in a sequence of n independent experiments each asking a Yes/No question, and each with its own Boolean-valued outcome: a random variable containing a single bit of information: Success/Yes/True/One (with probability p) or Failure/No/False/Zero (with probability q = 1 – p).”


If we randomly sample a unit’s checklists with a “Yes” or “No” outcome, then we can use that to our advantage and report with meaningful statistical confidence. We must, however, accept that this is an approximation since our outcome is not truly independent because assessors of a given unit often answer many different questions. Nonetheless, this is a good approximation for our purposes. If we are willing to accept this, then we are able to sample a smaller portion of a unit’s self-assessment program and draw conclusions about the entire population. But, we must ensure we really are randomly selecting the checklists’ “Yes” or “No” questions, which is relatively straight-forward within MICT.

What if we want to know: “How accurate is my unit’s self-reporting?” We answer this by sampling a statistically-significant sample size dictated by how much confidence you desire and the confidence interval you wish to report. We could sample a unit and tell a commander exactly how much confidence they can have in the self-reported numbers displayed in the “Compliance Breakdown” diagram. We could report that the unit has an x% accuracy with a 90% confidence level and a ± 5% confidence interval. In other words, if I were to conduct an assessment on this unit 100 times using a randomly generated sample each time, I would report an accuracy within ± 5% of the initial x%, 90 times out of that 100.

Let us choose a unit that has 713 MICT questions. If we want a 90% confidence level and a ± 5% interval, it requires a sample of 196 questions as shown in Table 1 above. Since we sample the total checklists and we are randomly sampling, we are not able to dictate any characteristics of the sample population. We are not looking at the accuracy of any sub-population in the sample; one cannot break down the results and apply them into any sub-units. The number of Yes/No/UA/NA questions are generated randomly and tend to hold similar characteristics to the overall population. As you can see in the pie charts, the sample population is similar to the overall population in terms of Yes/No/UA/NA questions. However, there is no requirement that this be the case as long as the sampling is random. Additionally, because we are assessing the accuracy of the program as a whole, we don’t necessarily sample every checklist. The distribution of samples amongst the checklists is dictated by the ‘luck of the draw’ and illustrated in the vertical bar chart. Each blue line represents an individual Self-Assessment Checklist (SAC) and the orange bars represent the number of random samples taken. The entire chart is sorted left to right on the x axis by the size (# of questions) of the SAC.

Although random sampling will tend to match the distribution of the checklists, it is not a
perfect match. There are many checklists with no sampling at all and many that may only have one or two questions sampled. This can be acceptable as long as we are not looking to answer the accuracy of any individual checklist and are only speaking to the accuracy of the program overall. The end result is a repeatable, statistically-defensible technique, which informs commanders exactly how accurate (within a given interval) a unit is reporting its self-compliance. Because the random sampling is scalable and repeatable, if a unit is inspected using the same methodology at a later point in time, one is able to make a direct comparison between the two inspections.

Similar statistical techniques could be applied to datasets at all levels, enabling leadership to have greater insight into aggregate datasets. Data could also be sliced in many different ways, and MAJCOM IGs could even conduct Unit Effectiveness Inspections (UEI) using this methodology as a way to compare wings relative to one another. Keep in mind, that random sampling is critical in this regard, as wings have varying mission sets and varying checklists inhibiting direct comparisons using other methods. If UEIs were conducted using randomization, it would allow a statistically-valid method to compare programs. Such comparisons could be made to different units or within the same unit over time—all to provide greater insight into the health of the units and potential systematic risks. Lastly, sampling methodologies could be programmed into existing IG toolkits at all levels and databases like MICT and the Inspector General Management System (IGEMS).

The Yokota IG office has a “One Button” solution to sample our units, executed by exporting MICT data with the assistance of Excel macros. In the future, MICT and IGEMS could be programmed to provide a one-click sampling solution that generates samples and the associated checklists with automated results. This approach would allow for standardization in reporting units while not solely relying on the mathematical prowess of any individual unit. This could also become the “tip of the iceberg” as such methodologies could be employed throughout the IG system to include Risk Based Sampling Strategies (RBSS) and upcoming readiness evaluations. As we aim to answer just how good our self-assessment program is, we must keep in mind that we are also validating the confidence in our Airmen and their hard work—“one-click” at a time.
Compliance and mission readiness are closely related, but require a balanced prioritization in the development of a successful Commander’s Inspection Program (CCIP). To underscore this relationship, the PACAF Inspector General team, the Bearcats, make a conscientious effort to relate identified non-compliance areas directly back to mission readiness during our UEI’s. That being said, measuring and validating mission readiness is an understandably complex and dynamic problem for wing commanders and their IG teams. In several of our UEI visits over the last year, we are seeing room for improvement in the way some of our units are doing readiness reporting and building readiness exercises. Here are two helpful things to remember for wings in developing successful CCIPs that emphasize mission readiness vs simple compliance.

1. Readiness Reporting. AFIA inspectors and Air Staff members shared with me that major decisions are being made at the strategic level based on the red-green-yellow “chiclet” charts and commanders’ comments in Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS) and other readiness reporting systems. Wing IGs should be familiar with—and point commanders to AFI 10-201, Force Readiness Reporting, which outlines reporting in three major readiness categories: Resource, Unit Type Code and Capabilities. Resource and Unit Type Code (UTC) readiness reporting is objective and fairly clear-cut, but capabilities readiness, as captured in DRRS, is more subjective in nature, and is where we seem to get most of the confusion in the field.

One piece of advice to commanders and Wing IG’s about unit DRRS reports is that an accurately painted picture should be able to stand up to the “5-Why’s.” Units tend to provide their “scores” or “ratings” in DRRS, but provide very little information in the commander’s comments section to answer the “Why” questions. Progressively asking “why” over and over should allow commanders to highlight a root-cause or present specifics on how they are assessing their readiness. Too often, we find these reports are vague or incomplete, which forces much discussion on the ground during our MAJCOM/IG validation site visits. Ultimately, commanders need to remember that DRRS reporting informs HHQ strategic thinkers, planners, and inspectors. Unit commanders must provide concise, informative comments to back up DRRS ratings. More clarity in commander’s comments sections will help HHQ decision makers more expeditiously address readiness issues at the wing level.

We found many unit commanders who are very familiar with DRRS have little confidence that senior leaders and executives are using information from those systems to assess compliance and mission readiness. It is understandable how this perception grows since feedback mechanisms do not exist in DRRS. One commander suggested that even a simple review acknowledgement in DRRS from HHQ/Staff agencies might correct this misperception.

2. Risk-based Readiness Evaluations. We also found a second area for improvement; readiness exercise planning. Wing IGs appear to struggle evaluating mission readiness, especially when it comes to building exercises. The first challenge is balancing in-garrison requirements versus warfighting mission readiness. This challenge is further complicated under the wartime readiness umbrella when considering the numerous warfighting functions with which a wing may be tasked. Wings across PACAF were uncertain when answering these questions:

**Major Steven King, Chief, Airlift Inspections, PACAF/IG**
• Should the scenario be based on the most deadly or most likely Enemy Course of Action?
• Which OPLAN(s) should I focus on most?
• Should we only exercise and evaluate the wing’s most arduous tasks?

But there are tools available for planning/building more effective readiness exercises. The 51 FW/IG at Osan AB developed a simple tool based on the Risk Based Sampling Strategy (RBSS) Matrix to articulate mission readiness priorities in a meaningful way. Developing an RBSS product similar to this can help answer those questions and provide actionable, data-driven feedback to AF senior leaders. Refining this product further to include OPLAN specifics, named operations, Combatant Command (COCOM) taskings and Mission Essential Tasks (MET) found in DRRS could be the next step towards rebuilding a wing Commander’s confidence in evaluating mission readiness and validating its readiness reports.

The need for RBSS tools such as the Osan’s became apparent as tensions grew in the Pacific during 2017 and 2018 and long-standing PACAF priorities changed regularly. Additionally, the Agile Combat Employment (ACE) concept was released by PACAF that induced even further workload on our wing exercise and inspection divisions. There were a lot of important, but competing priorities. Not only were we focused on achieving a very specific level of wartime mission readiness, but we were also expecting wings to develop innovative processes to address compounding tactical problems in our theater. In the end, the Airmen in PACAF demonstrated that they are some of the most innovative, hard-working people on the globe, but

Major Steven King, Chief, Airlift Inspections, PACAF/IG
they were strained and stretched very thin as everything tied to *readiness* suddenly became a priority. This fatigue was evident as we heard commanders’ at all levels ask COMPACAF:

- How much do you want me focused on ACE?
- More or less on OPLANs?
- How much do you want me to focus on the other mission sets?
- How do I balance all these competing/different priorities?

COMPACAF’s response to similar questioning during a recent MAJCOM Wing/CC Conference was that wings need to balance the diversity in exercise priorities and that he needed wing commander feedback on what, when and where the MAJCOM needed to knock things off.

This is why a RBSS-based tool such as Osan’s can be so useful. If a wing can clearly articulate an RBSS for mission readiness, I believe it will be in a much better position to provide better feedback to command leadership on LIMFACs and assumed areas of risk. Striking a balance between the numerous readiness requirements and limited resources will require wing IGs to apply AFIS concepts such as RBSS.

Improved readiness reporting and more effective and efficient exercise planning are keys to mission readiness. PACAF/IG has found that wings in our MAJCOM that use RBSS to help plan readiness assessments also had Highly Effective CCIPs. Be ready, stay ready!

TSgt. Ryan Hyslop, a Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape specialist, applies camouflage during a combat search and rescue training exercise at Andersen AFB, Guam. (USAF Photo/SSgt Joshua Smoot)
Management Inspection Trends

Here is a brief update on trends AFIA’s management inspection team noted during the last 6 months from an MGA 1 and MGA 3 perspective.

**MGA 1: Strategic Planning and Governance**

We observed improved strategy-to-task constructs for Strategic Plans. The majority of MAJCOMs had a strategic plan with clear objectives and HAF/SAF directors usually had a list of priorities for the directorate. Several MAJCOMs conducted strategy-to-task activities and were executing with objectives assigned to owners, developed tasks, regular reviews on progress by senior leadership, and periodic updates of the strategic plan. A smaller number of organizations had priorities, but no clear path forward for conducting a more detailed strategy-to-task analysis. Although quality varied, MAJCOM directorates had plans in development to support MAJCOM strategic plans and HAF flight plans. These documents were key to ensuring directorates stayed on track to meet MAJCOM key priorities/objectives while balancing directorate-level day-to-day execution activities.

We found that all inspected organizations are struggling with developing and using strategic metrics. A few organizations were using quality metrics to measure progress against strategic priorities or objectives. In addition, outside of readiness metrics, overarching mission execution metrics or functional metrics were rarely aligned to strategic priorities or objectives. Of note, AFMC had robust mission execution metrics that were reviewed on a regular basis by senior leadership and AFSOC had metrics linked to each of the strategic plan elements. We recommend MAJCOM’s develop metric expertise within the A9 to support the staff.

Publication maintenance is another area fraught with challenges across most organizations. Typically, only 40% to 60% of publications were current. The root causes could be attributed to the following: lack of senior leadership involvement to ensure effective update process; pubs review and update were low priorities; staff reductions eliminated pubs manager positions and staffs lost corporate knowledge on the publication process. Success stories were usually attributable to concerted sustainment efforts and rigorous follow-up.

**MGA 3: Process Operations**

There were no significant or trendable issues within key work process; however two MAJCOMs standout as having strong key work processes. AFGSC’s Production Management System provided a visual display of priorities, initiatives, and metrics in the A4 War Room, supporting leadership decisions for new weapons system funding, civilian hiring, and resource execution. AFMC’s task management system was agile and user friendly and they automated data call on cost and performance of sustainment programs for HAF leadership.

On average, continuous process improvement (CPI) programs lacked attention. Typically, organizations had not appointed sufficient trained Green and Black Belts to meet the AFI requirement and, in some cases, did not identify a master process owner.

*Col Dawn Nickell, Director, Inspections Directorate, Air Force Inspections Agency*
**IG Class Dates**

**MAJCOM/Wing/Management Inspection IGTC Class Dates**

*The location for courses, unless location noted otherwise, is 9700 G Ave SE, Bldg. 24499, Room 357, Kirtland AFB, NM 87117-5670.

Check IG World classroom (https://cs2.eis.af.mil/sites/12634/igc/default.aspx) for the most current schedule; classes are subject to change.

- 23-25 Jan 19--IGTC MAJCOM
- 29-31 Jan 19--IGTC Wing
- 5-7 Feb 19--IGTC Wing
- 12-14 Feb 19--IGTC MAJCOM
- 5-7 Mar 19--IGTC MAJCOM
- 12-14 Mar 19--IGTC Wing
- 26-28 Mar 19--IGTC Wing

**NSI Class Dates**

- 11 Feb 19
- 8 Mar 19

**FY18 IGQ Class Dates**

*The location for all IGQ classes is the National Conference Center in Lansdowne, VA.

- Course 19B: 28 Jan-1 Feb 19
- Course 19C: 18-22 Mar 19
- Course 19D: 17-21 Jun 19
- Course 19E: 22-26 Jul 19
- Course 19F: 19-23 Aug 19

RESERVE YOUR SLOTS NOW THROUGH YOUR MAJCOM POC!! (Exceptions: JFHQ-assigned IGs send requests directly to SAF/IGQ, Mr. Corpuz; ANG Wing IGs must sign up through ANG/IG, Mr. Darrell Randolph).
If You Would Like the TIG Brief Delivered to Your Personal or Organizational Inbox, Please Drop us an email at TIGBRIEF@US.AF.MIL