



Department of the Army Inspector General

2021 Senior Official Front Office Exportable Training Package

OGC Review: 14 July 2021
OTJAG Review: 20 July 2021





Purpose

- Provide a collective training tool and best practices gathered from Department of the Army Inspector General (DAIG) observations.
- Avoid common pitfalls associated with personal/support staff actions.
- Provide vignettes inspired by real-world allegations of impropriety.
- Leverage lessons learned from DAIG observations and investigations.
- Provide a resource to prepare senior leaders and their staff to correctly make informed decisions based on regulations and or policy.





*Background

- Many problems and issues arise from the actions of a senior official's (SO) personal staff; most are due to the desire to accomplish the mission and ignorance of the rules and regulations.
- There are no ARs or Army doctrinal references that address "Senior Official Front Office Operations."
- A training resource is needed—not an all-encompassing package—but one that will facilitate/drive discussion and understanding of issues that can lead to allegations (or perceptions) of impropriety.

*Note, this training package is a revision and replacement for DAIG's 2016 SO Front Office Exportable Training Package. This version contains updated and new vignettes, as well as updates to relevant policies, regulations, instructions, etc.





Important Disclaimers

This training package is NOT:

- Establishing or changing Army policy.
- Directive in nature.
- A substitute for Army-mandated ethics training events.
- To be used as a substitute for staff research or a legal opinion.

The training package is:

- Representing **Army** policy and the implementation of DOD/Statutory guidance, but does **NOT** necessarily apply to Joint Commands or other Services.
- Designed to address a **narrow range** of ethical/policy issues often encountered by personal/support staff.

CRITICAL NOTE: This package is based on the Army's interpretation of several current statutes, DOD directives, Army regulations (ARs) and policies. Always ensure you are using the most current Army/DOD guidance **before** making a recommendation/decision regarding the issues discussed in this product.

Things to Consider



- What formal training has your aide/executive officer (XO)/chief of staff (COS) received?
- When was the last time your personal staff conducted collective training on “Front Office Operations”?
- On your “worst” day, are you confident that your staff would advise you not to do something because it violates policy?
- Does your personal staff understand where the “red-lines” are? Are you sure?
- Trust your instincts to tell you when something is wrong. However, use of effective processes and standard operating procedures will minimize misinterpretation.



Recommended Audience



The intent of this training package is to provide an SO and their front office (personal/support staff) with a collective training event, led/moderated by the SO.

The recommended training audience follows:

- COS,
- XO,
- Secretary of the General Staff,
- Aide-de-camp,
- Enlisted aide,
- Administrative assistant/secretary,
- Staff judge advocate/command ethics advisor,
- G-8/resource management representative,
- Command inspector general, and
- Protocol officer/NCOIC.





Contents

Situation 1: Whistleblower Reprisal

Situation 2: Involvement with a Non-Federal Entity (NFE)

- Invitation to attend/participate, or speak at an NFE-sponsored event

Situation 3: Official Travel (Spouse/MILAIR)

- Use of MILAIR for Official Travel
- Spouse Accompaniment on Official Travel

Situation 4: Personal Travel in Conjunction with TDY, Use of Resources/GOV-Furnished Rental Car

- Attend a personal event in conjunction with official travel
- Use of GOV or Rental Car on Official Travel

Situation 5: Use of GOV Personnel and Resources

- Use of personal/support staff member to conduct personal errands

Situation 6: Command Climate and Failure to Act

Situation 7: Gesture of Thanks/Receipt of Gift

Situation 8: Contractor Interactions and Staff vs. Personal Responsibility

Situation 9: Prohibited Personnel Practices



Situation 1: Reprisal



An SO is conducting a “Senior Slate” review with his/her staff considering future moves for lieutenant colonels (LTCs) in their organization with the XO, the deputy commander (general officer), the command sergeant major (CSM), and the G–1. The G–1 begins the review with LTC Smith who is being considered for a move into a key developmental position within the organization. At that point, the SO interrupts the G–1 with the following, “Bob, I think we need to hold off on discussing a move for LTC Smith at this time. I realize that based on her record, she is a top-tier candidate for this job; heck, as of last week I would have said that she was hands down the front-runner for the position. However, COL (P) Hatman approached me yesterday with some troubling news. He alleges that LTC Smith has been working to undermine his command.”

At this point the deputy adds, “Roger. I heard the same thing from COL(P) Hatman after the awards ceremony on Monday. Apparently, he (COL(P) Hatman) is convinced that the congressional inquiry that came down last week about the 123d Training Group* was motivated by a conversation LTC Smith had with Representative Taylor during the congressional delegation in June, and that he was going to “look into it all.” COL(P) Hatman seemed pretty upset and asked if we could hold off on any moves until he was sure of where LTC Smith’s loyalties truly lie.” At this point, the meeting is interrupted by a priority phone call, and the SO tells all present they will reconvene after lunch.

Please Discuss: If you were the XO, and you were reviewing the meeting with the CSM later that afternoon would anything worry you? Do the conclusions reached comply with all relevant statutes/DOD instructions (DODIs) and ARs? Do you see any larger issues at work here other than a simple reassignment?

* Fictional battalion-sized organization assigned to COL(P) Hatman’s Command.





Reprisal Discussion*

1. Background: For this scenario, it is essential that you understand the concepts outlined below.

a) Definition of Whistleblower Reprisal. In accordance with Section 1034, Title 10, United States Code (10 USC 1034), Whistleblower Reprisal is the act of taking (or threatening to take) an unfavorable personnel action or withholding (or threatening to withhold) a favorable personnel action because the Service member made or was thought to have made a protected communication (e.g., lawful communication reasonably believed to be true by the complainant) to:

- Members of Congress;
- Inspectors general (IG);
- DOD audit, inspection, investigation, or law enforcement organizations;
- Any person or organization in the chain of command;
- Any other person designated pursuant to regulations or established administrative procedures to receive such communications (e.g., Equal Opportunity, Safety Office, etc.); or
- As part of a court-martial proceeding, specifically, complaints of sexual assault or sexual harassment.

Note: Any communication to a Member of Congress, or an IG, no matter the topic, is a protected communication. Communication to the other listed individuals or agencies are only protected when presenting a violation of statute, regulation, rule, etc.

*This is a highly simplified discussion of a complex topic that is governed by a wide range of statutes and policies. **DO NOT** use this slide as a legal/regulatory/policy reference.





Reprisal Discussion*

b) The Four Elements of Proof. Key to understanding Whistleblower Reprisal is an understanding of the four elements of proof a Whistleblower Reprisal investigator must consider in the course of their investigation:

- **Element #1: Protected Communication-Did the complainant make, or was perceived to make a “protected communication”?** A protected communication can be verbal, written, or electronic and even includes statements that a complainant is simply preparing to make a protected communication (e.g., “I am going to write my congressman.”). For a Whistleblower Reprisal investigation to be substantiated the answer for Element #1 must be **“Yes.”**
- **Element #2: Personnel Action-Was there an unfavorable personnel action, the threat of an unfavorable personnel action, the withholding of a favorable personnel action or the threat of withholding a favorable personnel made against the complainant?** Did the suspect take or threaten to take any personnel action** against a member of the Armed Forces that affects, or has the potential to affect, that member’s current position or career? For a Whistleblower Reprisal investigation to be substantiated the answer for Element #2 must be **“Yes.”**

**Defense Directive 7050.06, “Military Whistleblower Protection,” April 17, 2015, defines a “personnel action” as, “any action taken on a Service member that affects, or has the potential to affect, that member’s current position or career. Such actions include promotion; disciplinary or other corrective action; transfer or reassignment; a performance evaluation; decisions concerning pay, benefits, awards, or training, relief and removal; separation; discharge; referral for mental health evaluations in accordance with DOD Instruction 6490.04[...]and any other significant change in duties or responsibilities inconsistent with the Service member’s grade.”

*This is a highly simplified discussion of a complex topic governed by a wide range of statutes and policies. **DO NOT** use this slide as a legal/regulatory/policy reference.



Reprisal Discussion*



- **Element #3: Knowledge-Did the suspect of the Whistleblower Reprisal allegation know about the Protected Communication made by the complainant before they took the unfavorable personnel action?** For a Whistleblower Reprisal investigation to be substantiated the answer for Element #3 must be **Yes.**
- **Element #4: Causation-Would the same personnel action(s) have been taken, withheld, or threatened absent the Protected Communication?** Would the suspect have taken, threatened to take, withheld or threatened to withhold the same personnel action absent the Protected Communication made by the complainant? This is often the question that determines the outcome of the investigation. It is often the most difficult question to determine, as it requires the investigator to make a conclusion about the suspect's state of mind regarding the personnel action in question. To do this the investigator must consider all of the following:
 - The reason the suspect undertook the personnel action.
 - The suspect's motive for the personnel action.
 - The timing between the Protected Communication and the personnel action.
 - Was there disparate treatment in how the suspect dealt with other Soldiers in similar situations?

For a Whistleblower Reprisal investigation to be substantiated the answer for Element #4 must be **NO.**

*This is a highly simplified discussion of a complex topic governed by a wide range of statutes and policies. **DO NOT** use this slide as a legal/regulatory/policy reference





Reprisal Discussion*

2. **Scenario Discussion.** If the SOs in this scenario ultimately decided to hold off on moving LTC Smith, and you were the XO testifying under oath months later as part of a Whistleblower Reprisal investigation how would you answer the following questions?

a) **Did LTC Smith make, or was perceived to make a “protected communication”?**

“Apparently COL(P) Hatman is convinced that the congressional inquiry that came down last week about the 123d Training Group was inspired by a conversation LTC Smith had with Representative Taylor during the congressional delegation in June.”

Answer: **“YES”** (Element #1: Protected Communication)

b) **Did LTC Smith have a favorable personnel action withheld?** “I think we need to hold off on discussing a move [into a key developmental billet] for LTC Smith at this time.”

Answer: **“YES”** (Element #2: Personnel Action)

*This is a highly simplified discussion of a complex topic governed by a wide range of statutes and policies. **DO NOT** use this slide as a legal/regulatory/policy reference





Reprisal Discussion*

c) **Did the SOs know about the Protected Communication made by the Complainant before they took the unfavorable personnel action?** “COL(P) Hatman approached me yesterday with some troubling news,” **and** “I heard the same thing from COL(P) Hatman after the awards ceremony on Monday. Apparently, he is convinced that the Congressional Inquiry that came down last week about the 123d Training Group was inspired by a conversation LTC Smith had with Representative Taylor during the congressional delegation in June.”

Answer: “**YES.**” (Element #3: Knowledge)

c) **Does a preponderance of credible evidence establish that the SOs would have withheld the same favorable personnel action absent the protected communication?** “I realize that based on her [LTC Smith’s] record, she is a top tier candidate for this job; heck, as of last week I would have said that she was hands down the front-runner for the position.”

Answer: “**NO.**” (Element #4: Causation)

3. Bottom Line: In this scenario, the preponderance of credible evidence would likely establish that all three SOs (the commander, the deputy, and COL(P) Hatman) committed Whistleblower Reprisal by withholding LTC Smith’s favorable personnel action because of a protected communication LTC Smith had with a Member of Congress.

*This is a highly simplified discussion of a complex topic governed by a wide range of statutes and policies. **DO NOT** use this slide as a legal/regulatory/policy reference





Whistleblower Reprisal*

1. Common Issues/Problems: If you **ever** find yourself having this conversation with yourself or with others:

“I want to [do something unfavorable / withhold something favorable] with [Subordinate X] because they were disloyal and went behind my back by having a conversation with [Official Y].”

Stop!
Think before you act!

2. If you act and [Official Y] is on the **long** list of individuals your subordinate has a **right** to communicate with, then you are likely committing Whistleblower Reprisal.

*This is a highly simplified discussion of a complex topic that is governed by a wide range of statutes and policies. **DO NOT** use this slide as a legal/regulatory/policy reference.



Situation 2: Involvement with a Non-Federal Entity (NFE)



An SO asked their staff to review an email titled, “End of Year Business,” which they intend to send via official email account. In this email, the SO discusses a variety topics, and near the end of the email the SO mentions the local contributions made by the Association of Community Members Supporting the Army (ACMSA*). The email states, “The impact of ACMSA on our local military community is undeniable. In the past year, the local chapter of ACMSA provided 70 local Army families with \$25,000 in emergency assistance. Their national organization has tirelessly advocated for better military pay and benefits. I believe that part of being a professional is giving back to the community. Giving to organizations like ACMSA is a great place to start.” At the conclusion of the email, SO mentions accepting an invitation to be the keynote speaker at ACMSA’s upcoming Valentine’s Day Dinner & Silent Auction and then says, “I look forward to shaking your hand in the reception line for this worthy event.” At the bottom of the email, there is a hyperlink to the ACMSA membership webpage and the email address of the local ACMSA membership/fundraising coordinator. When the XO clicks the hyperlink, he sees a picture of the SO in their Army uniform followed by their official rank, name, and current DOD position (under the SO’s name was their official email address). In addition to this information, the webpage also references the SO as the ACMSA state membership drive co-chairman.

Please Discuss: Is this draft email appropriate and compliant with all relevant statutes/DODIs and ARs?

* A fictional organization aimed at advocating (not an advocating lobbyist) to Congress for various military causes.



NFE Involvement Scenario

Discussion (1 of 2)



1. Does this email “cross the line” and endorse an NFE?
Yes. Although SO doesn’t say it outright, it is clear that the SO is encouraging membership and or donations to ACMSA.* The SO, in his/her official capacity, is **prohibited** from encouraging his/her subordinates to join a specific NFE (JER/DOD 5500.07-R, par. 3-209). In addition, the SO should **not** have included the email for the local ACMSA membership/fundraising coordinator (5 CFR 2635.101(b)(8)).
2. Is it okay for an SO to encourage subordinates to become members in an NFE?
No. An SO is free to encourage NFE membership/fundraising in his/her **personal** capacity to his/her friends but **not** subordinates (see 5 CFR 2635.702(a)-(b)). Even if the SO had only addressed his/her personal friends in the message, it would **not** be appropriate to send the email via a Government email account.
3. Is it appropriate for the SO to greet attendees as they arrive at the ACMSA* Dinner?
No. Having the SO greet individuals as they arrive at an NFE event, (e.g., “stand in the reception line”) which involves fundraising, gives the appearance that ACMSA is using the SO as a “draw” to the fundraising event, which is prohibited by ethics rules (5 CFR 2635.808 and JER 3-210).

* A fictional organization aimed at advocating (not an advocating lobbyist) to Congress for various military causes.



NFE Involvement Scenario

Discussion (2 of 2)



4. Is it appropriate for the SO to give an official speech at the ACMSA* fundraising event?
Yes, but with limitations. The ethics rules at 5 CFR 2635.808(a)(3) and the JER (DOD 5500.07-R, par. 3-211) allow DOD employees to speak at events sponsored by NFEs when, among other factors, “the speech expresses an official DOD position in a public forum in accordance with public affairs guidance.” However, because this is a fundraising event, the SO should consider perception issues that could arise from speaking at the dinner, even if it is on an official topic. **(The SO should obtain a written ethics opinion before proceeding.)**

5. Should the SO mention ACMSA fundraising/membership goals in his/her official speech?
No. Ethics rules prohibit active and visible participation in fundraising for a private organization is prohibited by ethics rules. The SO may deliver an official speech only as discussed above (5 CFR 2635.808 and JER 3-210 and 3-211).

6. Was the use of SO’s image, name, rank/duty title, and official email on the ACMSA webpage acceptable?
No. The use of SO’s name and rank is likely permissible, but use of the current duty title implies governmental sanction or endorsement (5 CFR 2635.702(b) and (c) and 807(b)). Also, the SO should **not** use his/her official email address for NFE membership or fundraising activities.


* A fictional organization aimed at advocating (not an advocating lobbyist) to Congress for various military causes.





Processes and Responsibilities for receipt of an invitation to attend/speak at an NFE-sponsored event

(5 CFR 2635/DOD JER/AR 360-1)



Record the Circumstances of the Invitation:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>a) Gather Information about the NFE-sponsored event (e.g., defense contractor, tax-exempt status, NFE membership criteria).</p> <p>b) Is NFE offering to pay SO's attendance/meal fees? If so, how much are the fees?</p> <p>c) Is NFE inviting the SO's spouse/significant other?</p> <p>d) Is NFE asking the SO to speak at the event? On what topic? Will SO be in uniform?</p> | <p>e) Is the event free, or is there an attendance fee?</p> <p>f) Is NFE offering to pay any travel costs?</p> <p>g) Is the event open to the general public or only to a select audience?</p> <p>h) How many, or are any other, DOD speakers on the agenda?</p> <p>i) What admission fees, if any, are being charged to other attendees?</p> |
|---|--|



Points of Discussion: Receipt of an Invitation to Attend or Speak at an NFE-Sponsored Event

(5 CFR 2635/DOD JER 3-211/AR 360-1)



1. Common Issues/Problems:

- a) SO fails to consult a legal advisor to evaluate requests for logistical support to NFEs. (For more information, see DOD JER 3-211.)
- b) SO accepts a gift of attendance at a widely attended NFE event (in a personal capacity) without reporting it on the Office of Government Ethics (OGE) Form 278e [Public Financial Disclosure Report] as required, or without first getting a legal review/memo and approval to attend. (For more information, see OGE 278e instructions.)
- c) SO accepts a gift of travel expenses from an NFE without obtaining proper approval. (For more information, see 31 USC 1353 and DOD JER Chapters 3 & 4.)
- d) Invitation comes from an Army office or official rather than from the NFE itself, with no evidence of Secretary of the Army-level co-sponsorship approval.
- e) SO wishes to speak at an NFE conference; however, the majority of speakers are Army.
- f) SO wishes to speak at an NFE event that is a fundraiser; NFE seeks to use the SO as a draw.

2. Proper handling of invitations with adherence to the ethics rules:

- a) Invitations to attend NFE-sponsored events should be formally recorded and evaluated as potential gifts.
- b) All invitations to NFE-sponsored events should receive a legal review **before** acceptance.
- c) SO may, or may not, be able to attend depending on the circumstances.
- d) If SO can (and does) attend in a personal capacity, he/she may have to report the gift of free attendance on the OGE 278e if it exceeds the gift reporting threshold.
- e) If SO will participate, the invitation should also be evaluated by an ethics counselor under the DOD JER, par. 3-211.



Points of Discussion: Receipt of an Invitation to Attend or Speak at an NFE-Sponsored Event

(5 CFR 2635/DOD JER 3-211/AR 360-1)



3. Appropriate speaker support for NFE-entity events:

- a) SO can speak at an NFE conference if legal requirements are met, Army conference policy is followed, and , he/she serves as logistical support to the event, or “the speech expresses an official DOD position in a public forum in accordance with public affairs guidance” (DOD 5500.07-R, par. 3-211a or c)).
- b) SO may not be able to speak at the conference if it costs more than \$804 to attend, and more than 20 percent of the speakers are DOD, or if it costs less than \$804 and the percentage of DOD speakers is more than 50 percent. In all cases, we recommend a thorough legal review. SO may be able to speak at a fundraiser as long as he/she makes an official speech, does not participate in fundraising, does not serve as a draw (e.g., does not ask for donations and does not stand in receiving line), and does not appear to endorse the NFE (5 CFR 2635.808 and DOD 5500.07-R).
- c) SO and spouse/significant other might be able to accept gift of registration fees/meal if SO is speaking.
- d) Security and policy review of the speech is required in certain instances; consult DODI 5230.29 and AR 360-1.
- e) See also <https://dodsoco.ogc.osd.mil/ETHICS-TOPICS/Travel-and-Transportation/Toolbox-Travel-and-Transportation/>



Situation 3: Official Travel (Spouse/MILAIR)



An SO, stationed in the Southwest, is invited to attend the Army Soldier and Family Resilience Conference (ASFRC) (a “service-endorsed” conference/training event) in Washington, DC. The conference organizers asked the SO’s spouse to participate in several working groups/training events (all included in the conference agenda) related to discussing ways to expand job opportunities for Army Family members through community outreach. The spouse, an unaffiliated civilian, is scheduled to be in Kansas City, MO, at a family reunion just before the conference.

The SO asked the staff to develop some travel courses of action (COAs) to consider before he/she makes a decision on attending the event. The SO’s staff produces the following two travel COAs:

a) Military Air (MILAIR) round trip: Use MILAIR to fly the SO to Fort Leavenworth, KS, to pick up his/her spouse (traveling on a non-reimbursable, non-interference basis) and continue on MILAIR to Washington, DC. After the event, return both to home station also using MILAIR. The staff justified this COA because of the reduced cost (no cost to the organization) and scheduling (it’s more convenient for the SO’s schedule than commercial travel given layovers for connecting flights).

b) Commercial air round trip: Fly the SO to the conference and return using commercial air. Fly the SO’s spouse from Kansas City, MO, to Washington, DC, and then back to home station. The staff justified this COA as “other spouse travel,” and by citing an invitational travel authorization (ITA) from the conference sponsor.

Please Discuss: Are these COAs both appropriate and compliant with all relevant statutes/DODIs and ARs?





Spouse Travel/MILAIR Discussion

1. Who must approve the SO spouse's official travel?

Every instance of spouse travel is considered an “exception to policy.” In this example, this course has been designated as “Service endorsed,” (a process that requires Army G-3 Training Directorate endorsement and SECARMY approval). Thus, the SO's spouse may travel at the U.S. Government expense as an authorized exception to policy.

2. Is the MILAIR COA viable and supportable?

No...see below.

a) Who can approve the SO's MILAIR request ?

In accordance with (IAW) DODD 4500.56 and DODI 4500.43, in most cases, an official who is “one organization level or higher,” must approve a MILAIR request. This generally means that an SO cannot “self-approve” this request, unless he or she is the SECARMY or CSA.

b) Justification:

Using MILAIR because it is more convenient for the SO is not a valid justification. IAW DODD 4500.56 and DODI 4500.43, the SO must show why commercial air and or ground resources cannot meet mission requirements before using MILAIR.

c) Unauthorized Diversion:

Even if the SO had a valid justification and approval for MILAIR was received from one organization level higher, stopping in Fort Leavenworth to pick up the spouse would be an unauthorized diversion (stopping to pick up the spouse is **not** “non-interference”).

3. Is the Commercial Air COA viable and supportable?


Yes. Because this is a “Service-endorsed” course/briefing and the SO's spouse has been issued an invitational travel authorization by the conference organizer, this is considered other spouse travel and the spouse can travel on an independent basis.





Use of MILAIR for Official Travel/Spouse Accompaniment on Official Travel

(31 USC 1344, 1349 /DODD 4500.56 IC 3 /OMB Circular A-126/AD 2007-01/JTR/DODI 4500.43/DODI 4515.13/AD 2007-01)



Record the Circumstances of Travel:

- Is the SO requesting to travel via MILAIR for official travel? If so, why?
- Why is commercial air not a viable option to meet mission requirements? (e.g., pandemic, timing, location, mission, etc.)
- Is the SO's spouse accompanying him/her? If so, under what circumstance? (e.g., invitational travel, "unofficial travel," etc.)
- Will spouse travel interfere with, cause deviations to, or modify the SO's travel plans?



Use of MILAIR for Official Travel

(JTR /DODD 4500.46 IC 3 (24 Jun 14)/DODD 4500.43/DODI 4515.13/AD 2007-01)



1. Common Issues/Problems.

- a) SO wants to use MILAIR for official travel without proper approval/justification.
- b) SO wants to bring his/her spouse on MILAIR for official travel.
- c) Attempt to justify MILAIR based on the size of the traveling party and not through justification of each SO's needs.
- d) Policy concerning joint and combatant command use of operational and operational support aircraft differs considerably from what is outlined here. See DOD 4500.56 for details.

2. Use of MILAIR must be IAW regulatory guidance.

- a) SO may be able to use MILAIR for official travel if it is cost effective or mission critical, with proper approval.
- b) SO may be unable to have his/her spouse accompany them on MILAIR.
- c) SO may be able to have his/her spouse accompany him/her on MILAIR if accompanying spouse travel is authorized as an exception to policy. The SO may also be able to have his/her spouse accompany him/her on a space-available basis in a mission non-interference status only. See DODD 4500.46 (Incorporating Change 5, 3 April 2019), and Army Directive 2017-05 (Secretary of the Army Policy for Travel by Department of the Army Senior Officials).



Spouse Accompaniment on Official Travel

(31 USC 1344, 1349 /DODD 4500.46 IC 5/OMB Circular A-126/AD 2007-01)



1. Common Issues/Problems:

- a) SO seeks spouse to accompany on commercial air, at Government expense, without prior approval or justification.
- b) SO seeks to bring spouse on official foreign travel without proper approval or justification.
- c) SO seeks to bring spouse on MILAIR without proper approval or justification.
- d) Perception that SO is inappropriately scheduling travel for/to accommodate his/her spouse.

2. Spousal travel must be IAW all rules:

- a) The SO's spouse may travel in an "accompanying spouse" status as an exception to policy. In limited circumstances, the SO's spouse may also accompany on unofficial travel, which is on a "non-interference (reimbursable)" basis (See par. 5 of DODD 4500.46, IC 3; and Army Directive (AD) 2007-01).
- b) Spouse travel **should** receive a prior legal review even though there is no *requirement* to do so.
- c) See also: <https://dodsoco.ogc.osd.mil/ETHICS-TOPICS/Travel-and-Transportation/Toolbox-Travel-and-Transportation/>.





Situation 4: Personal Travel in conjunction with TDY, Use of Resources/GOV-Furnished Rental Car

An SO is planning to travel with his command sergeant major (CSM) (on TDY) from OCONUS to CONUS for an Army-approved conference that is set to end on Friday at 1230 hours. The SO is scheduled to speak at the conference and then attend two working groups. One working group is scheduled for Friday morning. Due to the availability of flights, the itinerary calls for the SO and CSM to stay overnight after the last conference event (the only other flight option would mean missing the Friday conference activities to arrive at the airport for an 0830 flight OCONUS). The SO's authorizations include lodging, a rental car, and the conference fee.

The day before the trip (after the morning huddle), the SO and his XO are reviewing the schedule for the next few days. The SO summarizes his travel plans as follows:

“Shannon (the XO), we already covered the conference schedule, so let's just review our travel plans. CSM Thomas and I fly out at 0800. I was just going to drive to the airport myself, but since CSM Thomas and I both live on post, he volunteered to drive for both of us. CSM Thomas is going to swing by my quarters in his POV at 0500hrs and pick me up on the way to the airport. I will offer to cover the cost of the gas, but you know CSM Thomas, he never takes me up on it. We have a direct flight, and I will pick up the rental car at the airport. We fly back on Saturday, and I will ride home with CSM Thomas. Fairly straight forward except for having to stay over Friday night because of flight availability. There is one silver lining about the lay-over though. My brother lives about 50 miles from the conference hotel. Once the conference wraps up, I plan on driving up to his place on Friday night to catch up and buy him dinner.”

Please Discuss: Is the SO's plan appropriate and compliant with all relevant statutes, DODIs, and ARs? Should the SO offer to “pay for the gas” for the trip to the airport and back? Could there be any “perception” issues arising from the SO's trip to see his relative? What expenses can the SO use a Government Travel Charge Card (GOVCC) to pay for on Friday evening? Can the SO use his Government-furnished rental car to drive to the relative's home?





Airport Transport Discussion

- 1. Was it appropriate for the SO to ride in CSM Thomas' POV to and from the airport?** Per 5 CFR 2635 .302(b), the SO can only do so if he/she reimburses the staff member (at market rates) for the gift of convenience (his time/gas, etc.) or if the CSM receives mileage for the POC travel to and from the airport (with authorizing official approval, both travelers could claim mileage and parking, or commercial transportation costs for travel to and from the airport on their travel vouchers, but only one should file if both ride in the same POV). There is also a potential perception issue where observers might believe that the subordinate was "volun-told" to give the SO a ride to the airport.
 - Is the airport located where other means of transportation (e.g., DOD or public transportation) are unavailable?
 - If other means of transportation are available, do they meet mission requirements? (i.e., is public transportation available for a flight departing at 2300 hours?)**Bottom Line—avoid this situation.**
- 2. Would it have been proper if CSM Thomas had obtained a GOV and picked the SO up at his/her quarters on the way to the airport?** **Probably not.** Exceptions exist when they are "necessary because of emergency situations or to meet security requirements, terminals are located in areas where commercial methods of transportation cannot meet mission requirements in a responsive manner, [...] because other methods of transportation cannot reliably or adequately meet mission requirements, based on a case-by-case factual assessment." However, in most cases Army policy doesn't allow this. Always get a legal review before using a GOV for domicile to duty/transportation hub. (For further clarity, see AR 58-1, par. 2-3i and 2-3j.)
- 3. Would it make a difference if CSM Thomas and the SO had met at the headquarters and departed for the airport in a GOV?** **Maybe.** Under limited circumstances, as outlined in AR 58-1 (par. 2-3i regarding emergencies and security requirements), as authorized in the Pentagon area in accordance with (IAW) DOD Administrative Instruction (AI) 109 (see slide 30) and SECARMY Memorandum (Non-Tactical Vehicle Policy Guidance), 27 September 2019 (see slide 32), it **may** be permissible to use a GOV/NTV for transportation to a commercial or military transportation terminal. SOs and their staff should keep in mind that cost to the Government is never a consideration when making AR 58-1 or DOD AI 109 determinations. Always obtain a legal review before using a GOV for transportation to a transportation hub.

DOD AI 109 stipulates that if DOD personnel in the Pentagon area are required to take transportation for official business, they should use the following methods below, in the order shown, to the extent that they meet mission requirements.

- During Normal Published Duty Hours: (1) DOD-scheduled shuttle service, (2) Scheduled public transportation (rail or bus), (3) DOD vehicle, (4) Voluntary use of POV on a reimbursable basis, and (5) Taxicab/Uber/Lyft on reimbursable basis.
- Before or After Normal Published Duty Hours: (1) DOD-scheduled shuttle service, (2) Scheduled public transportation (rail or bus), (3) Voluntary use of POV on a reimbursable basis, (4) Taxicab/Uber/Lyft on reimbursable basis, and (5) DOD vehicle.



Personal Travel in conjunction with TDY Scenario Discussion




1. **What expenses can the SO pay for using their GOVCC on Friday evening?**
The SO can only pay for his/her **own** dinner (not the relative's...even if the SO intends to use per-diem funds to "pay back" the GOVCC account when the SO submits a travel voucher), the SO's lodging, and the gasoline used for the Government-furnished rental car (when used for official purposes).
2. **Would using a Government-furnished rental car to visit a relative be acceptable?**
No. The rental car's use is limited to official purposes. A 50-mile drive to visit a relative is not official.
 - a) **Would it matter if the rental had unlimited mileage? No.**
 - b) **Would it matter if the SO uses personal funds to pay for the rental car gas used on Friday night? No.**
 - c) **What if it was 3 miles to the relative's house instead of 25 miles? Maybe.** Short deviations that support "subsistence, health or comfort" **may** be allowed...**get a legal opinion first.**
3. **What actions could the SO take to ensure their visit to the relative adhered to regulations/standards?**
Ask the relative to come visit/pick up the SO in a POV, or the SO could rent a separate car, using personal funds (and **not** using the GOVCC), to drive to see the relative.
4. **Could any "perception" issues arise from the SO's trip to see the relative?**
Yes. Even though the personal staff know that the timing of the return flight was dictated by conference activities and airline schedules, an outside observer might perceive the SO extended the trip a day for the sole purpose of visiting their relative. A memorandum for record (MFR) might be advisable to address this.





Processes and Responsibilities for Airport Transport/Personal Travel in Conjunction with TDY/Use of GOV-Furnished Rental Car/Use of GOV Resources

(5 CFR 2635/DOD Joint Ethics Regulation/DODI 1315.09/Joint Travel Regulation/AR 600-8-10/AR 58-1)



Record the Circumstances of the Official Travel:

- What official event(s) are scheduled?
- What personal activities are scheduled?
- Will attendance at personal events impact/modify the travel plan? *(If yes-proceed with extreme caution.)*
- Can attendance at personal events be perceived as impacting/modifying the travel plan? *(consider MFR)*
- Will the SO take leave in conjunction with TDY?
- How will the SO get to the airport? Get home from the airport? *(Consult AR 58-1, par. 2-3i and DOD Administrative Instruction 109 before tasking GOV individuals/equipment to support.)*
- When does the SO plan to use a GOV-provided rental vehicle, and where?
- What will the SO use their GOVCC to pay for?

Note: Obtain legal review **before** tasking GOV individuals to support.

Note: Obtain legal review **before** travel begins.



Use of a GOV on Official Travel to Terminals

(AR 58-1/JTR, SECARMY Memo (Non-Tactical Vehicle Policy Guidance))



SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
WASHINGTON


27 SEP 2019

MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Non-Tactical Vehicle Policy Guidance

1. Reference Army Regulation 58-1 (Management, Acquisition, and Use of Motor Vehicles), 3 April 2019.
2. This memorandum clarifies Army policy regarding the use of non-tactical vehicles (NTVs) to transportation terminals, including in the National Capital Region, by affirming the capacity of approving officials to assess whether such use is appropriate and necessary on a case-by-case basis. This guidance, which has been coordinated with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, is effective immediately.
3. Current Army policy regarding NTV use to transportation terminals is sufficiently flexible to permit broad usage decisions when factually supportable, but it has been severely constricted in practice and interpretation. Accordingly, new language will expressly affirm approving officials' exercise of reasoned discretion to determine whether NTV use to transportation terminals is appropriate.
4. Army Regulation 58-1, paragraph 2-3i(1) will be modified to add subparagraph (f) to expressly authorize discretion to determine that NTV use to transportation terminals is "[n]ecessary because other methods of transportation cannot reliably or adequately meet mission requirements, based on a case-by-case factual assessment."
5. The upcoming revision to the regulation, and this interim guidance, are consistent with statutory, Office of the Secretary of Defense, and U.S. General Services Administration requirements. Appropriate NTV use will always be fact-specific and subject to scrutiny. See the enclosure for examples of appropriate and inappropriate NTV use. Decisions to use NTVs for transportation to terminals, including within the National Capital Region, will always require analysis and justification, and should be exercised by exception, not as ordinary practice. All other NTV policy provisions, including the prohibition on NTV use based solely on reasons of rank, position, prestige, or personal convenience, remain in effect.

Encl


Ryan D. McCarthy
Acting

DISTRIBUTION:
(See next page)

EXAMPLES

1. Examples of appropriate non-tactical vehicle (NTV) use to transportation terminals include, but are not limited to:
 - a. A sergeant major was required to attend an official meeting that went longer than planned. He would have missed his temporary duty (TDY) flight departing from the local commercial airport if he had taken public transportation.
 - b. A first lieutenant made a permanent change of station to Germany for the first time with her family (spouse, three children, two dogs, and many suitcases). She would have been unable to successfully navigate German public transportation if her sponsor had not picked them up in an NTV.
 - c. A general officer attended an official meeting requiring his participation, which he had to continue by telephone because of the need to travel to the local commercial airport for a TDY flight.
2. Examples of inappropriate use include, but are not limited to:
 - a. A general officer preferred to be driven to the airport for TDY travel solely because it was more convenient than public transportation.
 - b. A staff sergeant did not look into public transportation options for traveling to the local airport for a scheduled, routine TDY trip, opting instead to use an NTV.
 - c. An Army Senior Executive Service member landed at the commercial airport at the TDY location and was picked up in an NTV for a meeting at a nearby joint base that was scheduled to occur several hours later.

Enclosure





Attending a Personal Activity in conjunction with Official Travel

(5 CFR 2635/DOD JER/JTR/AR 600-8-10)

1. Common Issues/Problems:

- a) SO wants to travel early or extend official travel to attend a personal activity in conjunction with official travel; appropriate leave/pass provisions apply.
- b) SO seeks to go on official travel primarily to attend personal event.
- c) SO seeks to use a rental car to travel to the personal event.
- d) Perception that SO is scheduling official travel simply to attend a personal event.

2. Attendance at personal activities during travel must be IAW rules, and may not be at any additional cost to the Government.

- a) The primary purpose of the travel must be official.
- b) SO may be able to travel early or extend official travel but will have to take leave during the personal activity portion.
- c) SO is personally responsible for any additional costs that result from rescheduling commercial air travel and lodging to accommodate the personal activity.
- d) Government-funded rental car usually cannot be used to support attendance at the personal activity.
- e) **Caution!** The SO **cannot** use his/her GOVCC to pay for a hotel room during the personal activity with the intention of paying the Government back during the TDY settlement process. This would still be considered using Government funds for personal activities. It is **strongly** recommended the SO check out of the hotel and pay with the GOVCC, then check back into the hotel using a personal payment method for the duration of the personal activity. This will result in two invoices, one clearly related to Government activities and a second clearly related to personal travel/events.



Situation 5: Use of GOV Personnel and Resources



An unmarried SO was just injured in a way that will prevent them from driving for a significant period of time. Once the SO is released from the hospital, they must attend daily physical rehabilitation/therapy requirements at a civilian clinic located 15 miles from the installation. The SO's XO has assembled the staff to, "figure out how we are going to take care of the SO to allow them to focus on the mission."

The staff war-gamed the situation and made the following recommendations to the SO:

- a) Hospital Transportation: Once the SO is released from the hospital, the aide-de-camp will use the organization's GOV to retrieve the SO from the hospital and then drive them back to headquarters.
- b) Transportation to and from work: Since the SO is not authorized domicile-to-duty transportation, the XO has instructed the SO's secretary to arrange for a vehicle for hire to pick them up at home at the same time every morning. Whenever the SO is ready to leave in the evening, the secretary would then call and arrange to have a vehicle for hire waiting to drive them home. The secretary would also coordinate with the SO each evening and call for/reserve a vehicle for hire for any "off-duty" travel the SO needed to accomplish before the beginning of the next duty day.
- c) Medical appointments: For the daily physical therapy appointments, XO tasked the aide-de-camp to drive the SO back and forth using the organization's GOV.
- d) Errands: For miscellaneous errands the SO needs to accomplish (laundry, groceries, lunch, etc.), the XO encouraged the staff to "pitch in and help the SO out," but "only do so if you were planning to go to that location anyway."

Please Discuss: Are the recommendations outlined above appropriate and compliant with all relevant statutes/DODIs and ARs?





Use of Resources Discussion

1. Is the XO's plan, as briefed in the scenario, IAW Army/DOD Policy?

- a) The aide-de-camp picking the SO up at the hospital: **No.**
- b) The secretary arranging for transportation to and from work: **No.**
- c) The aide-de-camp ferrying the SO to and from medical appointments: **No.**
- d) The staff (not aide-de-camp) running errands: **No.** An SO should avoid accepting voluntary services from personal staff/aide-de-camp for personal (non-official) purposes. Voluntarily services from personal staff/aides are gifts of convenience, which the SO **must** reimburse the personal staff/aide at market rates. Accepting these services can also create perceptions of coercion both inside and outside the staff.

2. Bottom line:

IAW the U.S. Code, Comptroller General opinions (e.g., commuting to work is the personal responsibility for all Federal employees) and DOD 5500.07-R (see below), most of the actions the XO outlined in the plan violate a statute/policy.

JER/DODD 5500.07-R, par. 3-303, "Because of the potential for significant cost to the Federal Government, and the potential for abuse, DOD employees, such as secretaries, clerks, and military aides, may not be used to support the unofficial activity of another DoD employee in support of non-Federal entities, nor for any other non-Federal purposes." [except in a few limited circumstances not involving this scenario].

3. Perhaps the real question the staff, and the SO's supervisor, should ask is, "Why isn't the SO on Convalescent Leave"?





Use of Personal Staff for Personal Errands

(e.g., Get Lunch, Pick-up Prescriptions/Laundry, etc.)

(5 CFR 2635/DOD Joint Ethics Regulation/AR 614-200/DODI 1315.09)

1. Common Issue/Problem:

- a) SO generally cannot require personal staff to perform errands that are unrelated to performance of official duties.
- b) GOs may require aides-de-camp to occasionally perform certain errands, the performance of which would enable the GO to perform a specific official duty. For example, the GO may ask his aide-de-camp to get laundry so the GO has enough time to travel to the airport for official travel. The GO **cannot**, however, require the aide-de-camp to get laundry on a routine basis.
- c) GOs may require enlisted aides to, “perform tasks that aid the GO in accomplishing military and official responsibilities, including performing errands for the GO [. . .]” (AR 614-200, par. 8-11).

2. Government personnel may only be used for official purposes.


- a) AR 614-200, par. 8-11, outlines appropriate uses of enlisted aides.
- b) The GO can use administrative support services to prepare papers for association or society events, or to be published in journals if certain requirements are met (e.g., the Army derives some benefit).





Processes and Responsibilities for use of Personal Staff for Personal Errands

(e.g., Get Lunch, Pick-up Prescriptions/Laundry, etc.)
 (5 CFR 2635/DOD Joint Ethics Regulation/AR 614-200/DODI 1315.09)



*The roles and responsibilities of XO, secretaries, or other staff officers are separate and distinct from that of an aide-de-camp or enlisted aide. An XO, secretary, or other staff officer **cannot** be used for an SO's personal tasks. Depending on the circumstances, an SO **may** use an aide-de-camp or enlisted aide for personal tasks that directly relate to the SO's official duties and responsibilities.

BOTTOM LINE: Analyze the circumstances of the request **BEFORE** executing.



Situation 6: Command Climate/Failure to Act



An SO is meeting with his CSM and a subordinate brigade commander to review the results of a command climate survey the subordinate brigade commander recently conducted on their organization.

“Sir, I never liked these surveys much, which is why this is the first one I’ve conducted after 20 months in command, but I have to say that, with the exception of a few bad apples, this was a very positive result.”

After summarizing the encouraging high points of the survey results, the subordinate commander moved on to ‘the bad news’:

“Sir, unfortunately with the good comes the bad. There were several comments that appeared on the survey that just make the organization look bad. Many of them seem to center around that incident last September where a certain NCO got their feelings hurt at the Organizational Ball. One anonymous comment, probably by SSG Thomas or one of her disciples, says that, ‘Several female Soldiers and NCOs were singled out, harassed and called, insulting/sexist names by several male NCOs and officers at the Organizational Ball.’ Sir, I was there, and this didn’t happen, and I told SSG Thomas that when she asked to see me last month under the open-door policy where she said basically the same thing. She even had it all written out and tried to leave a copy with me. Sure there was some horseplay and good-natured ribbing, but nothing threatening, nothing I haven’t already heard in the halls of the headquarters a time or two. I wish SSG Thomas would just let this drop and move on...it’s starting to make me think she needs to be moved to less visible job where her newly minted bad attitude won’t impact the organization as much.”

Please Discuss: If you were the CSM in this room, would this conversation bother you? If, after the subordinate commander left, the SO asked you, “Sergeant Major, what do you make of all that?” What would you say to the SO? If you were the SO would you have taken any immediate actions after the conclusion of the brigade commander’s briefing?





Command Climate/Failure to Act Discussion

1. **Does the commander decide whether a command climate assessment is warranted and when it should be scheduled?** **No.** AR 600-20 (Army Command Policy), Appendix E (Command Climate Assessment) specifies commanders will conduct a Command Climate Assessment within 60 days of assuming command and annually thereafter.
2. **Should the SO accept that the events at the Organizational Ball described by the anonymous survey comment and SSG Thomas were just “good-natured ribbing and some horseplay” and therefore excusable?** No. IAW AR 600-20, “Hazing, bullying, online misconduct, and other acts of misconduct, undermine trust, violate our [Army] ethic, and negatively impact command climate and readiness.” When SSG Thomas complained of harassment at the open-door meeting, the brigade commander had an obligation to act on this information. IAW AR 600-20, “when commanders are apprised of complaints or accusations against military personnel, they are expected to inquire into the matter and attempt a resolution. When a written complaint or accusation is received against military personnel, COs of units will take action [...]” In addition to taking action, once the brigade commander learned of the alleged misconduct, he/she is always required to demonstrate exemplary conduct. IAW 10 USC 7233 and AR 600-20, par. 1-6d, “All commanding officers and others in authority in the Army are required:
 - To show in themselves a good example of virtue, honor, patriotism, and subordination;
 - To be vigilant in inspecting the conduct of all persons who are placed under their command;
 - To guard against and suppress all dissolute and immoral practices, and to correct, according to the laws and regulations of the Army, all persons who are guilty of them; and
 - To take all necessary and proper measures, under the laws, regulations, and customs of the Army, to promote and safeguard the morale, the physical well-being, and the general welfare of the officers and enlisted persons under their command or charge.”

Additionally, SOs should be mindful where civilian employees are concerned. AR 690-12, Equal Employment Opportunity, Appendix D, requires management officials who receive a complaint for an employee to initiate an investigation of the allegation regardless of whether the harassment rises to the level of being severe or pervasive. Supervisors and managers will promptly address allegations of harassment with the employees directly involved in the incident along with any witnesses who might have first-hand information.





Command Climate/Failure to Act Discussion

3. In addition to paragraph 2 (in the preceding slide), the brigade commander is required to demonstrate exemplary conduct. IAW 10 USC 7233 and AR 600-20, par. 1-6.d, “All commanding officers and others in authority in the Army are required—
 - a) To show in themselves a good example of virtue, honor, patriotism, and subordination.
 - b) To be vigilant in inspecting the conduct of all persons who are placed under their command.
 - c) To guard against and suppress all dissolute and immoral practices, and to correct, according to the laws and regulations of the Army, all persons who are guilty of them.
 - d) To take all necessary and proper measures, under the laws, regulations, and customs of the Army, to promote and safeguard the morale, the physical well-being, and the general welfare of the officers and enlisted persons under their command or charge.
4. Does it matter that this was a social setting and not in the workplace? **No.** IAW AR 600-20, “Harassment is prohibited in all circumstances and environments, including off-duty and unofficial unit functions and settings.”
5. Would there be any issues if the brigade commander were to act on his plan and, “moved [SSG Thomas] to less-visible job”? **Yes.** If the brigade commander acted on this plan, SSG Thomas could make a complaint against the brigade commander for Whistleblower Reprisal (AR 600–20, par. 5-12; see also vignette #1 of this packet) and or Retaliation (AR 600–20, par. 5-13)— and it would be very likely an investigation would occur.





Command Climate/Failure to Act Discussion

6. **Does the brigade commander have a responsibility to maintain a positive command climate?** **Yes.** IAW AR 600–20 par. 1-6.c, “Commanders and other leaders will treat their subordinates with dignity and respect at all times and establish a command and organizational climate that emphasizes the duty of others to act in a similar manner toward their subordinates in accomplishing the unit mission.” And later in par. 6-2.a, “Commanders and organizational leaders will foster and maintain positive command climates. A positive command climate is an environment free from personal, social, or institutional barriers that prevent Soldiers from rising to the highest level of responsibility for which they are qualified. Soldiers are evaluated on individual merit, performance, and potential.”
7. **Are there indications in this vignette that this brigade commander may have command climate issues...or worse?** **Yes,** even though the majority of the results from the command climate assessment seemed, “very positive,” there are indications of poor command climate, especially among female Soldiers. However, beyond just command climate issues, there are also indications (“[...] nothing I haven’t already heard in the halls of the headquarters a time or two”) that this brigade commander may have allowed a hostile work environment to develop within his headquarters. IAW AR 600–20, par. 6-2b-c, “The Army will provide an environment that is free of unlawful discrimination. Discrimination occurs when someone, or a group of people, is harassed, intimidated, insulted, humiliated, or is treated less favorably than another person or group, because of their race, color, sex (to include gender identity), national origin, religion, or sexual orientation. It includes use of disparaging terms with respect to a person’s race, color, sex (to include gender identity), national origin, religion, or sexual orientation which contributes to a hostile work environment. When discrimination is alleged, commanders will take immediate and appropriate action to investigate the allegations and correct any unlawful discriminatory practices. In substantiated cases, commanders will consider appropriate disciplinary action.”



Command Climate/Failure to Act Discussion



8. OK...but the brigade commander is not an SO, so why is this vignette included in this packet?
- This vignette is included because now that the SO knows of the circumstances surrounding the Organizational Ball, SSG Thomas's allegations, and brigade command climate survey, **the SO has the same obligation to act as the brigade commander.**
 - If the SO decides to not take action, he/she will also very likely be in violation of all the provisions of AR 600-20, as outlined in the previous discussion slides.



Situation 7: Gesture of Thanks/Receipt of Gift



A nominative CSM wanted to procure new Personal Protection Equipment (PPE) for Soldiers working on a pandemic response mission. She assembled a team of NCOs who reviewed the requirement, and after research, they identified three commercially available options that met guidelines established by the Centers for Disease Control. After reviewing the recommended options, the CSM selected one, but directed the team to review the matter with legal, G-4, and G-8. None of the offices identified any concerns with the purchase. As a result, the GOVCC holder for the command's front office used the GOVCC to purchase \$2,400 of PPE from the selected local vendor.

A week after the PPE was delivered, the retailer sent the GOVCC holder an unsolicited gift of a Tactical Assault Pack (with a list price of \$65 in the retailer's catalog) as a gesture of thanks for the order. The vendor included a note with the assault pack that said, "With thanks to the [organization] command team for another order. Stay safe!" The GOVCC holder gave the assault pack to the CSM, since it was the CSM's idea to make the initial purchase. The CSM and the commander (an SO) decided to use the assault pack to carry briefing products and snacks during official travel.

Please Discuss: Are the actions of the card holder, the CSM, and commander compliant with all relevant statutes/DODI and ARs? Can the CSM and commander use the assault pack during official travel? If not, what should the GOVCC card holder do with the assault pack?





Gesture of Thanks/Receipt of Gift Discussion

1. **Can the organization accept use the tactical assault pack?** IAW 5 CFR 2635.204, key to this discussion are the circumstances surrounding the offer of the gift of the tactical assault pack:
 - a) If the gift of the tactical assault pack was part of a widely available promotion offered to the public (or other commercial purchasers, e.g., “Buy \$300 from our catalog and receive a free tactical assault pack!”), then the organization can accept the tactical assault pack, but it is considered Government property, just like the ordered PPE.
 - b) If the gift of the tactical assault pack was offered to members of a group or class in which membership is related to Government employment, or if the same offer is broadly available to large segments of the public through organizations of similar size (e.g., “All Active Military and Veterans,” or “All State and Federal Government entities”), then the organization can accept the assault pack, but it is considered Government property, just like the ordered PPE.
 - c) If the gift was offered due to one’s official position, or on a basis that favors those of higher rank or rate of pay (i.e., because of their rank or position), then the tactical assault pack is an improper gift and should be returned to the vendor.

2. **So can the commander and the CSM use the tactical assault pack? (most likely) No.** In this case it appears the vendor **did not** offer the tactical assault pack to the public at large, did they offer it to a membership-based group. However, the vendor did offer it based on rank or position (e.g., “With thanks to the [organization] command team”), and therefore, the tactical assault pack is an improper gift and must be returned to the vendor. The commander and CSM **cannot** retain or use the gift.



Gesture of Thanks/Receipt of Gift Discussion



3. Common Issues/Problems:

- a) SO or staff accepts a gift from a prohibited source (e.g., contractors, vendors). (For more information, see 5 CFR 2635.202.)
- b) SO or staff accepts inappropriate gifts from subordinates. (For more information, see DOD JER par. 2-203 and 5 CFR 2635.302.)
- c) SO or staff accepts gifts of services from subordinates. (For more information, see 5 CFR 2635.302.)
- d) SO or staff fails to account for gifts to his/her spouse or child. (For more information, see DOD JER Chapter 3, Section 4; OGE 278e instructions.)
- e) SO or staff fails to have gifts from foreign officials evaluated by legal. (For more information, see DOD JER 2-300 and DODD 1005.13.)

4. Proper disposition of gifts IAW ethics rules.

- a) Gifts should be formally recorded (photographs are recommended). (see next slide for an example).
- b) Gifts **MAY** have to be paid for by the SO, returned, or proffered to the SecArmy Office of the Administrative Assistant (OAA) for possible acceptance by the Army (5 CFR 2635.206).
- c) Gift disposition should have a legal review.
- d) When determining a gift's market value or "the retail cost of similar items of like quality" (5 CFR 2635.205) (if a receipt is unavailable), a best practice would be to obtain three price estimates from major retailers and use the average price.





Suggested Gift Log Format


Donor and Gift	Picture of Gift	Donor Category	Value of Gift	Legal Analysis	Disposition of Gift
Donor: IMCOM Chapter of the Field Artillery Association Event: Luncheon Date: 29 Nov 20 Gift: Admission Fee	N/A	NFE Not a prohibited source	\$55.00	Acceptable under 5 CFR 2635.204g, employee assigned to speak at an NFE-sponsored event on behalf of the agency. Gift to agency so not OGE 278e reportable	Accepted
Donor: Egyptian Chief of Staff Event: The Inspector General's (TIG) official visit to troops stationed in South West Asia Date: 15 Mar 20 Gift: Gold bracelet for TIG's spouse		Foreign Government Official	\$800.00	Gift exceeds \$415 limit on gifts from foreign governments IAW DODD 5500.7-R, para. 2-300; 5 USC 7342; DODD 1005.13; Title 41, CFR parts 101-49 and 101-45; and GSA Federal Management Regulation of part 102-42.	Coordinate with the Office of the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army Gifts Point of Contact
Donor: Event: Date: Gift:					





Receipt of a Gift

(5 CFR 2635.206/DOD Joint Ethics Regulation)



Key Issue: Execute all gift disposal activities as soon as practicable after receipt of gift.

Record Circumstances Surrounding the Receipt of the Gift:

- a) Record the who, what, when, where and why gift was accepted by SO.
- b) Take picture of the gift.
- c) Enter gift into gift log.
- d) Estimate the value of the gift (online resources, local or national experts, must be U.S. value).
- e) Obtain legal review as soon as possible, and act on the legal review's disposition recommendations immediately.





Situation 8: Contractor Interactions & Staff vs. Personal Responsibilities

An OCONUS-based SO has assembled their staff to discuss a busy week, which ends with the SO and their spouse's official travel to the Army Soldier and Family Resilience Conference (ASFRC) (a "service-endorsed" conference/training event) and the Association of Community Members Supporting the Army (ACMSA*) Annual Conference being held simultaneously in Washington, DC. After reviewing all of the current hot topics, the SO goes around the room to capture any alibis/additional issues:

SJA: "Sir, no issues for the staff. On a personal note, after sitting down with your spouse and reviewing your finances, I have finished filling out your OGE 278e [Public Financial Disclosure]. If you could log onto the Integrity program and digitally sign it, we can knock it out for this year.

Aide-de-Camp: "Sir, I think I have a handle on why your Government Travel Card is maxed out, the Level 25 reviewer for your last CONUS Defense Travel System Voucher returned the voucher with some questions about the rental car. I used your card (CAC) to log onto your account to tweak the voucher, but it's going to take a week or so to get your settlement. Since we were already using the Centrally Billed Account to purchase your spouse's airline ticket due to her attendance at ASFRC, I went ahead and used it to buy your airline ticket as well."

Secretary: "Sir, I received a call from LTG(R) Tom Watson to ask if you could drop by when you are in Washington for the ACMSA* Annual Conference. LTG(R) Watson suggested meeting up at the Dynamo Corporation's reception at the Hilitz Hotel on Friday night. He said that as the chief operating officer, he could certainly swing you a ticket to the reception so he can hear from you if the Dynamo contractors were hitting it out of the park for you like he had expected. LTG(R) Watson also said that he wanted to buy you and Pat (SO's Spouse) dinner later that evening, "So you can both tell lies about how great you were as young captains together in Germany." I know you two go way back, so I have penciled the reception in on your itinerary."

Please Discuss: Are the staff's solutions, as discussed above, appropriate and compliant with all relevant statutes/DODIs and ARs?

* A fictional organization aimed at advocating (not an advocating lobbyist) to Congress for various military causes.



Contractor & Staff vs. Personal Responsibility Discussion



- 1) **OGE 278e (Public Financial Disclosure):** Completion of the OGE 278e is a personal responsibility. While an SO may appoint an aide or legal advisor as a delegee to complete the report, the filer is responsible for all information contained, or missing, from this report. If there is a problem with the OGE 278e, the SO will be responsible—it doesn't matter who "helped" fill it out.
- 2) **DTS Travel:** DTS is a personal responsibility. DOD policy and the JTR requires GOVCC users to charge official travel expenses to the card and not to a Centrally Billed Account. The SO, not the aide-de-camp, would be responsible for any DTS travel irregularities in the SO's account. Also, sharing personal accounts or authenticators (passwords or PINs) is prohibited (AR 25-2, par. 4-5).

Bottom Line: SO actions based on poor staff work or incorrect legal opinions DO NOT excuse the SO of responsibility/consequences arising from their decisions.





Contractor & Staff vs. Personal Responsibility Discussion

- 3) **May the SO attend the reception with the Dynamo Corporation's chief operating officer? Yes, with limitations.** If the food offered does not comprise a meal and alcohol is not offered, then the SO may legally accept this offering. If the food comprises a meal or alcohol is included, provided the contractor does not offer more than \$20 worth of drinks/refreshments per person (or provided the commercial price of the reception ticket is not over \$20), and provided that the SO will not accept more than \$50 worth of gifts from the contractor (meaning the contractor company as well as its employees) during the calendar year, the SO can attend the reception and accept the free drinks/refreshments. However, just because the SO **can** does not mean they **should**. It is never inappropriate to refuse a gift from a prohibited source (e.g., a DOD contractor). Here, since the SO oversaw a project performed by the DOD contractor in question, it is likely prudent and appropriate for the SO to decline the offer to attend the reception or receive the associated free drinks/refreshments since it could create the perception that the SO is, or could be, biased in favor of the DOD contractor whose project he oversaw. In this case, it's also possible that if the SO provided feedback on the Dynamo contractors' job performance, the SO would be improperly sharing non-public information with the contractor.

- 4) **Can the SO go to dinner with his old friend LTG (R) Tom Watson: Yes, with limitations.** The invitation to dinner seems to be a social, not business-related event. However, LTG (R) Watson is still a prohibited source (a DOD Contractor) so for appearance purposes, SO cannot accept more than \$20 worth of drinks/refreshments, or more than \$50 worth of gifts from the contractor (meaning the contractor company as well as its employees) during the calendar year. In this case, the SO could go to dinner with an old friend, but the SO and their spouse should not discuss contract-related business, and they should decline LTG(R) Watson's offer to buy dinner and pay for both their meals using personal funds.

Bottom Line: Meetings with DOD contractors, even if they happen to be personal friends, can create issues with perception and preference. This is especially true when they "buy dinner," present gifts, etc.—**Proceed with extreme caution and always obtain a legal review.**



Contractor & Staff vs. Personal Responsibility Discussion



5. What if, at the dinner, LTG (R) Watson asked the SO about his post-retirement plans and the SO responded that working for Dynamo Corporation as a senior project manager was a possibility in the future? It is crucial for the SO to recognize at what point they are, “seeking employment” vis-à-vis this dinner. Federal employees trigger the financial conflict of interest statute (18 US Code 208), and the ethics rules (5 CFR 2635.601-607), which result in potential conflicts of interest, if they are “seeking employment.” This statute prohibits participating personally and substantially in any particular matter that will have a direct and predictable effect on an NFE with which a Federal employee is “seeking employment.” A Federal employee is likely “seeking employment” when he/she makes an unsolicited communication regarding potential future employment, engages in negotiation for employment, or responds to an unsolicited communication regarding possible employment other than to make an immediate and clear rejection.

Bottom Line: Though this dinner is a social occasion, if the discussion turns to the possibility of future employment with a prohibited source (Dynamo Corporation), the SO may cross the line into “seeking employment,” in which case he must disqualify himself from personal and substantial participation in any particular matter pertaining to that prohibited source, unless the SO clearly and immediately rejects any offers of employment.





Meeting Request by a Contractor

(18 USC 208/5 CFR 2635/DOD Joint Ethics Regulation/Federal Acquisition Reg. and Supplements)

1. Common Issues/Problems:

- a) SO meets with the contractor and then improperly endorses the contractor's product.
- b) SO creates a perception of a procurement integrity violation by meeting with the contractor.
- c) SO shares non-public information.
- d) SO meets with a contractor that is a bidder or offeror in an ongoing procurement.
- e) Contract employees or employees of companies doing business with the DOD, that are also personal friends of the SO, may be problematic.

2. Proper handling of contractor meetings:


- a) While there is no prohibition on meeting with a contractor (especially if also a personal friend), SOs must be very careful to avoid actions that are prohibited, or could create a negative perception.
- b) The SO may want to decline the request to meet.
- c) Perceptions (both public and internal/subordinates) should be considered.
- d) Maintain a level playing field/avoid the appearance of favoritism.
- e) No inside information can be released.
- f) No endorsement.
- g) If a prohibited source makes **any** overture/offer of employment, SO must immediately and clearly reject the offer.





Meeting Request by a Contractor

(18 US Code § 208/5 CFR 2635/DOD Joint Ethics Regulation/Federal Acquisition Regulation and Supplements)



Record the Circumstances of the Request:

1. Is the SO/the organization currently involved in any contracts with the contractor's firm?
2. Is the SO/the organization soliciting, or considering soliciting, a contract that might involve the contractor's firm?
3. What does the contractor want to talk about with the SO? Solicitation? Complaint? Employment?
4. If the meeting pertains to a solicitation of the contractor's products, is the SO willing to meet with the other competing contractors as well?
5. Will the meeting create the perception of favored treatment of the contractor or firm?
6. Consult with legal advisor **BEFORE** accepting a meeting with a prohibited source.





Situation 9: Prohibited Personnel Practices

An installation recently received funding that would allow the garrison commander to hire new Department of the Army Civilians to staff a new program that the installation senior commander has been advocating. The senior commander, excited by the prospects to shape this brand new program, has asked the garrison commander (the hiring authority for the new positions) to meet with him, the chief of staff, and the command sergeant major to discuss the timeline for establishing this new capability. The senior commander began the meeting with the following guidance:

“Ed (garrison commander), I want to rapidly establish this new office. Do not allow these new hires to get bogged down in bureaucracy. Do whatever you can to streamline the process, like finding a way to make these all direct hires and skipping the whole hiring panel step. In short, I need you to move out—I want butts-in-seats in weeks not months.

This is a new program, and I think it needs new thinking. It shouldn't be a landing zone for Soldiers looking for a retirement job or the “next step” in some reassigned Department of the Army Civilian's 20-year career. We need fresh faces that will bring best practices from the civilian world into our planning. I think we need to look for young professionals with 3 to 5 years' experience in industry to fill these positions and perhaps one or two high speed mid-career NCOs that decided to leave the service but still want to serve. You know, like SSG (R) Perfection from your office, Ed. I know he had to leave the Army due to a family issue, but I would absolutely love to see Mr. Perfection sitting behind one of these new desks. In fact I saw him downtown last week so I know he is still local...maybe you can reach out and encourage him to apply. It can't be that hard to create a position description that looks for skills that Mr. Perfection already has in abundance.

I also want to see a diverse workforce that ‘looks like our Soldiers’ in this new office. We need to make sure at least one hire is African American and one hire is Hispanic. I also don't want to see an office full of men. If a female Soldier walks into this office and sees anything less than 30 percent of the desks filled by females, they are not going to use this office to seek out help.”

Please Discuss: If you were the COS, and you were reviewing the meeting with the CSM later that afternoon would anything about this guidance worry you? Do you feel the senior commander's guidance is correct and appropriate?



Prohibited Personnel Practices Discussion



1. Is it possible for the garrison commander to find, “a way to make these all direct hires and skip the whole hiring panel step”? **Unlikely...**

Title 5, USC, 9905 grants direct hire authority for certain, specific competitive service positions in the Department of Defense. If an organization, or a particular type of position within that organization, is not currently designated as having direct hire authority, you probably cannot, “make it happen” just because you want to fill the position quickly. If your organization does have direct hire authorities, proceed with caution as the absence of the usual “guardrails” (e.g., impartial panels, “the rule of three”, etc.) in the hiring process can lead to perceptions/accusations of favoritism, preferential treatment, or other abusive hiring practices.

2. Is it appropriate for the senior commander to direct the hiring authority to not consider “Soldiers looking for a retirement job,” or existing Department of the Army Civilians for these positions? **No.**

IAW 5 USC 2302(b)(6) (Prohibited Personnel Practices), any Government employee who has authority to take, direct others to take, recommend, or approve any personnel action, shall not, with respect to such authority, grant any preference or advantage not authorized by law, rule, or regulation to any employee or applicant for employment (including defining the scope or manner of competition or the requirements for any position) for the purpose of improving or injuring the prospects of any particular person for employment.

3. Is it appropriate for the senior commander to direct the hiring authority to give preference to “young professionals”? **No.**

IAW 5 USC 2302, giving preference to “young” applicants would injure the prospects of older applicants and is thus prohibited.



Prohibited Personnel Practices Discussion



4. Is it appropriate for the senior commander to attempt to...strongly...influence the garrison commander into hiring Mr. Perfection into one of the new positions? **No.**

Once again, IAW 5 USC 2302(b)(6), giving preference to Mr. Perfection would injure the prospects of all other applicants and is thus prohibited. Also, 5 CFR 2635.101, par. (b)(8) is clear that the senior commander must act impartially and not give preferential treatment to any private organization or individual. Paragraph (b)(14) further states that the senior commander “shall endeavor to avoid any action creating the appearance that they are violating the law or the ethical standards set forth in this part.” Thus, even the **appearance** of impropriety in hiring Mr. Perfection can result in a finding of misconduct against the senior commander.

5. Is it appropriate for the senior official to instruct the garrison commander to create a position description that favors the, “skills that Mr. Perfection already has in abundance”? **No.**

Once again, 5 CFR, 2635.101 is clear that that senior commander must act impartially and not give preferential treatment to any private organization or individual. Custom designing a position description to create an advantage for Mr. Perfection is preferential treatment.

6. Is it appropriate for the senior commander to direct the hiring of one African American and one Hispanic individual into the new positions? **No.**

Although seeking a diverse workforce is not impermissible, diversity must be accomplished consistent with existing law and policy. It doesn't matter that the senior commander is seeking “diversity,” they cannot direct that, “race, color, religion, sex, national origin, reprisal, disability, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, [or] status as a parentage” be used as a criteria for, or against, hiring a particular candidate (5 USC 2302(b)(6) (Prohibited Personnel Practices) and AR 690-12 (Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity), par. 1-6).

7. Is it appropriate for the senior commander to direct the hiring of at least 30 percent females into the new positions? **No.**

Once again, it doesn't matter that the senior commander's intent is to obtain a balance between male and female employees in the office. 5 USC 2302 and AR 690-12 prohibit the senior commander from using sex as a criteria for hiring or not hiring a candidate.



Civilian Hiring Process



1. Common Issues/Problems.

- a) SO is unfamiliar with 5 USC 2302(b)(6) (Prohibited Personnel Practices) and 5 CFR, Section 2635.101 (Basic Obligation of Public Service).
- b) SO and staff are unfamiliar with Civilian Personnel Advisory Center practices and requirements.
- c) SO attempts to steer the hiring process to favor a skilled or valued (by the SO) job candidate, “for the good of the organization.”
- d) SO attempts to steer the hiring process to favor an individual whom they may know from current or prior assignments (e.g., “SFC Knowsall is retiring and we need to retain his skill set in the organization”).
- e) Lack of clear communication across the organization to prevent the “appearance” of preferential treatment.

2. Hiring civilian employees must always adhere to statutory/regulatory guidance.

- a) SO should never make adjustments to the hiring process that are designed (or appear to be designed) to benefit a certain job applicant.
- b) Title 5 USC 2302(b)(6) (Prohibited Personnel Practices) states, “(b) Any employee who has authority to take, direct others to take, recommend, or approve any personnel action, shall not, with respect to such authority-(6) grant any preference or advantage not authorized by law, rule, or regulation to any employee or applicant for employment (including defining the scope or manner of competition or the requirements for any position) for the purpose of improving or injuring the prospects of any particular person for employment.”
- c) 5 CFR 2635.101 states in par. (b)(8) that employees shall act impartially and not give preferential treatment to any private organization or individual. Paragraph (b)(14) states, “employees shall endeavor to avoid any action creating the appearance that they are violating the law or the ethical standards set forth in this part. Whether particular circumstances create an appearance that the law or these standards have been violated shall be determined from the perspective of a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts.”





References

Situation 1: Whistleblower Reprisal

- 5 USC 2302
- 10 USC 1034
- 10 USC 1587
- 10 USC 2409
- PPD-9, Change 3
- DODD 1401.03, “DoD Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality (NAFI) Employee Whistleblower Protection,” 13 June 2014
- DODD 7050.06, “Military Whistleblower Protection,” 17 April 2015
- DFAR, Subpart 203.9
- AR 20-1 (The Inspector General System), 23 March 2020
- AR 600-20 (Army Command Policy), 24 July 2020
- Assistance and Investigations Guide, Part Two, Chapter 9

Situation 2: Involvement with a Non-Federal Entity (NFE)

- 31 USC 1353
- 5 CFR 2635. 101 (b)(8)/.702(b)/.808
- JER (3-210/3-211)/DOD 5500.07-R
- DODI 5230.29, “Security and Policy Review of DoD Information for Public Release,” 14 April 2017
- DODI 4515.13, “Air Transportation Eligibility,” 23 October 2020
- AR 360-1 (The Army Public Affairs Program), 25 May 2011
- <https://dodsoco.ogc.osd.mil/ETHICS-TOPICS/Travel-and-Transportation/Toolbox-Travel-and-Transportation/>





References, con.

Situation 3: Official Travel

- DOD 4500.56, "DoD Policy on the Use of Government Aircraft and Air Travel," 14 April 2009, IC [Interim Circular] 5, 3 April 2019
- JER/DOD 5500.07-R
- DODI 1315.09, "Utilization of Enlisted Aides (EAS) on Personal Staffs of General and Flag Officers (G/FOS)," 6 March 2015, IC 1, 1 December 2017
- DODI 4500.43 (Operational Support Airlift (OSA)), 18 May 2011
- DOD Administrative Instruction 109, 31 March 2011, ICI 1, 22 May 2017
- <https://dodsoco.ogc.osd.mil/ETHICS-TOPICS/Travel-and-Transportation/Toolbox-Travel-and-Transportation/>
- AR 58-1 (Management, Acquisition and Use of Motor Vehicles), 23 March 2020
- AR 600-8-10 (Leaves and Passes), 3 June 2020
- AD 2017-05 (Secretary of the Army Policy for Travel by Department of the Army Senior Officials), 18 January 2017.

Situation 4: Personal Travel

- 5 CFR 2635
- JER/DOD Directive 5500.07-R
- DODI 1315.09, "Utilization of Enlisted Aides (EAS) on Personal Staffs of General and Flag Officers (G/FOS)," 6 M 2015, IC 1, 1 December 2017
- DOD Administrative Instruction 109
- JER: <https://www.defensetravel.dod.mil/Docs/perdiem/JTR.pdf>
- AR 58-1 (Management, Acquisition and Use of Motor Vehicles), 23 March 2020
- AR 600-8-10 (Leaves and Passes), 3 June 2020
- OMB Circular No. A-126, "Improving the Management and Use of Government Aircraft"

Situation 5: Use of GOV Personnel and Resources

- 5 CFR 2635
- Joint Ethics Regulation/DOD Directive 5500.07-R
- DODI 1315.09
- AR 614-200 (Enlisted Assignments and Utilization Management), 25 January 2019





References, con.

Situation 6: Command Climate/Failure to Act

- 10 USC 7233
- AR 600-20 (Army Command Policy), 24 July 2020

Situation 7: Gesture of Thanks/Receipt of Gift

- 5 CFR 2635
- JER/ DOD 5500.07-R
- DOD 1005.13, "Gifts and Decorations from Foreign Governments," 19 February 2002

Situation 8: Contractor Interactions and Staff vs. Personal Responsibility

- 18 USC 208
- 5 CFR 2635
- JER/ Regulation/DOD 5500.07-R
- AR 25-2 (Army Cybersecurity), 4 April 2019
- Federal Acquisition Reg. and Supplements

Situation 9: Prohibited Personnel Practices

- 5 USC 9905
- 5 USC 2302(b)(6)
- 5 CFR 2635.101
- AR 690-12 (Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity)

