

Affirmative Action Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To capture agencies' affirmative action plan for persons with disabilities (PWD) and persons with targeted disabilities (PWTD), EEOC regulations (29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(e)) and MD-715 require agencies to describe how their affirmative action plan will improve the recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention of applicants and employees with disabilities.

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

EEOC regulations (29 CFR §1614.203(d)(7)) require agencies to establish specific numerical goals for increasing the participation of persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities in the federal government

1. Using the goal of 12% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|----|
| a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD) | Answer | No |
| b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD) | Answer | No |

GS-01 to GS-10 is 15.66% and GS-11 to SES is 15.33%.

*For GS employees, please use two clusters: GS-1 to GS-10 and GS-11 to SES, as set forth in 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(7). For all other pay plans, please use the approximate grade clusters that are above or below GS-11 Step 1 in the Washington, DC metropolitan region.

2. Using the goal of 2% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----|
| a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD) | Answer | No |

GS-1 to GS-10 was 2.95% and GS-11 to SES was 2.13%.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numarical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-1 to GS-10					
Grades GS-11 to SES					

3. Describe how the agency has communicated the numerical goals to the hiring managers and/or recruiters.

DLA has consistently communicated through Disability self-identification video and demographic charts. DLA also promotes National Disability Awareness Month presentations and seminars, which state our commitment to increase the representation of PWTDs to 2% and PWDs to 12% of our workforce.

Section II: Model Disability Program

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(1), agencies must ensure sufficient staff, training and resources to recruit and hire persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities, administer the reasonable accommodation program and special emphasis program, and oversee any other disability hiring and advancement program the agency has in place.

A. PLAN TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT & COMPETENT STAFFING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

1. Has the agency designated sufficient qualified personnel to implement its disability program during the reporting period? If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to improve the staffing for the upcoming year.

Answer Yes

DLA has a full-time DPM who works with seven Disability Program Coordinators (DPC) at the MSC EEO offices.

2. Identify all staff responsible for implementing the agency's disability employment program by the office, staff employment status, and responsible official.

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	8	0	3	Nancy Rivera, DLA DPM; nancy.rivera@dla.mil
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTB	9	0	0	Nancy Rivera, DLA DPM; nancy.rivera@dla.mil
Processing applications from PWD and PWTB	0	0	90	Pam Ries, SPPC; pamela.ries@dla.mil Michele Brandt, SPPC; Michele.Brandt@dla.mil
Section 508 Compliance	8	4	0	Christine Larsen, Program Manager J62LD, Christina.Larsen@dla.mil
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	0	0	2	Pam Ries, SPPC; pamela.ries@dla.mil Michele Brandt, SPPC; Michele.Brandt@dla.mil
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	0	7	Gus Zakhem, Chief of Facilities Sustainment and Equipment, Installation Operations, Gus.Zakhem@dla.mil

3. Has the agency provided disability program staff with sufficient training to carry out their responsibilities during the reporting period? If “yes”, describe the training that disability program staff have received. If “no”, describe the training planned for the upcoming year.

Answer Yes

The DPM and DPCs: 1. The DPM and all DPCs have attended a Disability Program Manager training course. 2. DO hosts a roundtable every other month to discuss RA, SEP, and AEP matters, conduct on-the-spot training, and share best practices, trends, and solutions. 3. DPM hosts a quarterly meeting to discuss solely RA issues.

B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

Has the agency provided sufficient funding and other resources to successfully implement the disability program during the reporting period? If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to ensure all aspects of the disability program have sufficient funding and other resources.

Answer Yes

DLA has a DPM and seven DPCs working full-time on the Disability Program.

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(i) and (ii), agencies must establish a plan to increase the recruitment and hiring of individuals with disabilities. The questions below are designed to identify outcomes of the agency’s recruitment program plan for PWD and PWTD

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

1. Describe the programs and resources the agency uses to identify job applicants with disabilities, including individuals with targeted disabilities.

Job applicants may use Schedule A hiring authority to apply for vacancy announcements. If hired with Schedule A hiring authority, selectees are required to complete SF-256 to identify their disability. DLA searches the WRP database to identify qualified PWD.

2. Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(a)(3), describe the agency’s use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A) to recruit PWD and PWTD for positions in the permanent workforce

DLA opens all vacancy announcements to PWD (Schedule A) and to 30% or more disabled veterans.

3. When individuals apply for a position under a hiring authority that takes disability into account (e.g., Schedule A), explain how the agency (1) determines if the individual is eligible for appointment under such authority; and, (2) forwards the individual’s application to the relevant hiring officials with an explanation of how and when the individual may be appointed.

Individuals requesting consideration through Schedule A hiring authority are required to provide a letter from a physician or other care provider certifying their eligibility for Schedule A hiring authority. Individuals who request consideration as a 30% or more disabled veteran are required to provide DD Form 214, Military Discharge and a letter from the Department of Veteran’s Affairs or branch of the armed forces certifying an overall service connected disability. Individuals must meet eligibility requirements for the appointment authority and minimum qualifications for the vacancy. HR refers qualified applicants to the selecting official in veteran’s preference order and then if they identify as being eligible for Schedule A hiring authority, for 30% or more disabled veteran’s authority, or both.

4. Has the agency provided training to all hiring managers on the use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A)? If “yes”, describe the type(s) of training and frequency. If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to provide this training.

Answer Yes

All new supervisors are trained on Schedule A hiring authority during the HRM class, which is refreshed every three years.

B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Describe the agency’s efforts to establish and maintain contacts with organizations that assist PWD, including PWTD, in securing and maintaining employment.

Organizations that assist PWD and PWTD with securing employment: DLA currently maintains contact with: • Department of Labor for the WRP • State Rehabilitation Service • Veteran Employment Centers • Gallaudet University • National Institute of the Blind • National Technical Institution of the Deaf • Disabled American Veterans • Social Security Administration • Wounded Warrior Project • Philadelphia Veterans Contact and Advocacy Program • Job Fairs that target PWD and PWTD populations, such as the Careers and the Disabled Expo. • Local college and university campus disability programs to inform them of job opportunities with DLA and to raise awareness of the different hiring authorities and programs. DLA also works with the Job Accommodation Network and the Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program who assist PWD and PWTD maintain employment.

C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)

1. Using the goals of 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD as the benchmarks, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires in the permanent workforce? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below.

- a. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) Answer Yes

PWD New Hires are 10.23% of all new hires, which is below the goal of 12% PWTD New Hires are 1.94% of all new hires, which is below the goal of 2%

New Hires	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
		Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)
% of Total Applicants					
% of Qualified Applicants					
% of New Hires					

2. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires for any of the mission- critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Triggers exist for PWD in the following MCOs: (Percent of new hires in that MCO.) MCOs with a * had a significant number of hires. 0089 (0%) Emergency Management 0340 (0%) Program Management *0343 (10.42%) Management Program Analysis 0391 (0%) Telecommunications 0401 (0%) General Biological Science 0501 (0%) Financial Administration and Program 0505 (0%) Financial Management 0510 (0%) Accounting 0511 (0%) Auditing 0560 (0%) Budget Analysis 0801 (0%) General Engineering 0810 (0%) Civil Engineering 0905 (0%) General Attorney 1301 (0%) General Physical Science 1515 (0%) Operations Research 1811 (0%) Criminal Investigating 2003 (0%) Supply Program Management *2030 (11.11%) Distribution Facilities & Storage Management Triggers exist for PWTD in the following MCOs: (Percent of new hires in that MCO.) MCOs with a * had a significant number of hires. 0080 (0%) Security Administration 0089 (0%) Emergency Management 0201 (0%) Human Resources Management 0340 (0%) Program Management 0343 (0%) Management Program Analysis 0391 (0%) Telecommunications 0401 (0%) General Biological Science 0501 (0%) Financial Administration and Program 0505 (0%) Financial Management 0510 (0%) Accounting 0511 (0%) Auditing 0560 (0%) Budget Analysis 0801 (0%) General Engineering 0810 (0%) Civil Engineering 0905 (0%) General Attorney 1035 (0%) Public Affairs 1101 (0%) General Business & Industry 1301 (0%) General Physical Science

1515 (0%) Operations Research 1811 (0%) Criminal Investigating 2003 (0%) Supply Program Management 2030 (0%) Distribution Facilities & Storage Management

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targetable Disability	
		Qualified Applicants (%)	New Hires (%)	Qualified Applicants (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	

3. Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the qualified internal applicants for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Triggers exist for PWD in the following MCOs: (Percent of qualified applicants in that MCO/Relevant Pool.) 0080 (9.59%/14.81%) Security Administration 0089 (7.78%/18.52%) Emergency Management 0201 (6.06%/17.86%) Human Resources Management 0260 (25.68%/50.68%) Equal Employment Opportunity 0301 (8.20%/16.59%) Miscellaneous Administration and Program 0340 (4.87%/15.15%) Program Management 0343 (10.60%/19.28%) Management Program Analysis 0346 (10.13%/18.13%) Logistics Management 0391 (0%/16.67%) Telecommunications 0401 (8.33%/20.00%) General Biological Science 0501 (10.71%/13.93%) Financial Administration and Program 0560 (8.93%/12.50%) Budget Analysis 0690 (2.70%/33.33%) Industrial Hygiene 0801 (2.65%/6.25%) General Engineering 0810 (0%/0%) Civil Engineering 0905 (2.74%/3.05%) General Attorney 1101 (8.31%/11.08%) General Business & Industry 1102 (7.27%/13.72%) Contracting 1104 (5.69%/19.22%) Property Disposal 1515 (4.55%/9.38%) Operations Research 2003 (7.69%/16.27%) Supply Program Management 2030 (7.49%/14.01%) Distribution Facilities & Storage Management 2210 (9.44%/17.05%) Information Technology Management Triggers exist for PWTD in the following MCOs: (Percent of qualified applicants in that MCO/Relevant Pool.) 0260 (7.43%/13.70%) Equal Employment Opportunity 0391 (0%/6.67%) Telecommunications 0401 (0%/20.00%) General Biological Science 1515 (2.27%/3.13%) Operations Research

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among employees promoted to any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. Promotions for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Triggers exist for PWD in the following MCOs in FY18: (Percent of promotions to that MCO.) MCOs with a * had a significant number of hires. 0089 (0%) Emergency Management 0340 (0%) Program Management 0346 (10.71%) Logistics Management 0401 (0%) General Biological Science 0505 (0%) Financial Management 0510 (6.06%) Accounting 0511 (0%) Auditing 0560 (0%) Budget Analysis 0690 (0%) Industrial Hygiene 0801 (5.88%) General Engineering 0905 (5.26%) General Attorney 1035 (0%) Public Affairs 1101 (4.69%) General Business & Industry 1301 (0%) General Physical Science 1811 (0%) Criminal Investigating 2030 (11.63%) Distribution Facilities & Storage Management Triggers exist for PTWD in the following MCOs in FY18: (Percent of promotions to that MCO.) MCOs with a * had a significant number of hires. 0080 (0%) Security Administration 0089 (0%) Emergency Management 0201 (0%) Human Resources Management 0340 (0%) Program Management 0343 (1.71%) Management Program Analysis 0346 (0%) Logistics Management 0391 (0%) Telecommunications 0401 (0%) General Biological Science 0505 (0%) Financial Management 0510 (0%) Accounting 0511 (0%) Auditing 0560 (0%) Budget Analysis 0690 (0%) Industrial Hygiene 0801 (0%) General Engineering 0810 (0%) Civil Engineering 0905 (0%) General Attorney 1035 (0%) Public Affairs 1101 (0%) General Business & Industry 1104 (1.05%) Property Disposal 1301 (0%) General Physical Science 1811 (0%) Criminal Investigating 2003 (1.45%) Supply Program Management 2030 (0%) Distribution Facilities & Storage Management

Section V: Plan to Ensure Advancement Opportunities for Employees with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(iii), agencies are required to provide sufficient advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities. Such activities might include specialized training and mentoring programs, career development opportunities, awards programs, promotions, and similar programs that address advancement. In this section, agencies should identify, and provide data on programs designed to ensure advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities.

A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

Describe the agency’s plan to ensure PWD, including PWTD, have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

Several of the DLA organizations use the Pathways to Career Excellence program, which is a 2-year entry-level program that include successfully completing performance based measures for advancement and promotions. Plans for additional programs in FY19: DO will continue to recommend improvements to track and advertise mentoring. The DLA Career Mapping Program continues to develop the DLA Career Guide, the DLA Career Pyramid, DLA Career Paths and DLA Career Checklists for specific job series, which will be available to all employees to assist them with advancement of their careers. The Career Mapping Program will continue to publish new career field specific tools, which will assist with planning employee’s career development and progression. DO also plans to start employee resource groups to identify areas of improvement that will advance PWDs. SPPCs and DO will partner to ensure career development opportunities are publicized to all PWTDs.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

1. Please describe the career development opportunities that the agency provides to its employees.

DLA Enterprise Tuition Assistance Program: Provides financial support for continued education courses at the undergraduate or graduate level. Permanent, full-time civilian employees are eligible after their initial one-year probationary/trial period in Federal civilian service. DLA Enterprise Leader Development Program: An Agency-wide leadership development program designed to build and enhance the leadership skills of DLA employees at all levels. The competencies include supervisory certification, coaching, mentoring, the use of leadership development guides, multi-source feedbacks, and behavior-based interviewing techniques. Defense Civilian Emerging Leader Program: A DoD cohort and competency-based leadership development program for entry level and emerging leaders. Permanent full-time, civilians in grades 7 through 12 are eligible, including Federal Wage System employees. DLA Enterprise Rotation Program (Cross-Organizational): Cross-organizational rotational assignments within DLA. (Intra-organizational rotations are also available) Rotational assignments were listed seeking GS-11 to GS-14 employee participation. Logistics for the 21st Century: A 5 ½-day course designed by the Institute for Defense and Business to provide early-career, high-potential logisticians with a comprehensive and tailored educational experience. GS-11 through GS-13 early-career civilian logisticians are eligible. DoD Defense Pricing and Contracting Acquisition Exchange Program: A unique developmental 6- to 9-month experience through rotational assignments for high caliber individuals in acquisition related career fields. Permanent civilian acquisition employees in grades GS 11 and above are eligible. OSD Sustainment Fellowship Program: A 12-month hands-on leadership and management program to enhance the career development of mid-level logistics professionals. Civilian logistics employees in grades GS-13 and GS-14 are eligible. In-House Coaching Program Pilot for FY19: Through in-house coaching, improve leadership capability across the agency. Employees who have completed ELDP Level 3 and managers are eligible. DLA Executive Development Program: A program that allows managers to nominate high potential, highly motivated individuals to attend up to two training programs, for approval by DLA’s executive board. Permanent civilians in grades GS-13 through GS-15 with at least 18-months of continuous service with DLA are eligible.

2. In the table below, please provide the data for career development opportunities that require competition and/or supervisory recommendation/ approval to participate.

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Internship Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fellowship Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mentoring Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coaching Programs	513	513	13.45	13.45	0.97	0.97
Training Programs	0	217	0	15.67	0	0.92
Detail Programs	74	52	24.32	23.08	2.70	3.85

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Other Career Development Programs	29	28	27.59	28.57	3.45	3.57

3. Do triggers exist for PWD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Selections (PWD) Answer No

13.45% of the 513 applicants to the coaching programs were PWD, which is below the permanent PWD workforce of 14.28%.

4. Do triggers exist for PWTD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. Applicants (PWTD) Answer Yes
- b. Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes

0.97% of the 513 applicants to the coaching programs were PWTD, which is below the permanent PWTD workforce of 2.25%.
0.92% of the 217 participants in the “training programs” were PWTD, which is below the permanent PWTD workforce of 2.25%.

C. AWARDS

1. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for any level of the time-off awards, bonuses, or other incentives? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD) Answer Yes

52.88% of Persons Without Disabilities (PWOD) received small Time-Off awards, whereas 50.96% of PWD received small Time-Off awards. 20.19% of PWOD received large Time-Off awards, whereas 20.01% of PWD and 16.85% of PWTD received large Time-Off awards. 58.58% of PWOD received small Cash awards, whereas 53.47% of PWD and 55.91% of PWTD received small Cash awards. 72.87% of PWOD received large Cash awards, whereas 73.30% of PWTD received large Cash awards.

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for quality step increases or performance- based pay increases? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- a. Pay Increases (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer Yes

3.78% of PWOD received a Quality Step Increase, whereas 2.93% of PWD and 1.61% of PWTD received a Quality Step Increase.

Other Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Performance Based Pay Increase	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3. If the agency has other types of employee recognition programs, are PWD and/or PWTD recognized disproportionately less than employees without disabilities? (The appropriate benchmark is the inclusion rate.) If “yes”, describe the employee recognition program and relevant data in the text box.

- a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD) Answer No
- b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) Answer No

DO and HR are not aware of other employee recognition programs.

D. PROMOTIONS

1. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. SES
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer No
- b. Grade GS-15
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer No
- c. Grade GS-14
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes
- d. Grade GS-13
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

The relevant applicant pool for SES is 12.89% PWD. 3.03% of applicants to SES were PWD. 0.00% were qualified. The relevant applicant pool for GS-15 is 13.13% PWD. 6.11% of applicants to GS-15 were PWD. Only 4.08% were qualified. The relevant applicant pool for GS-14 is 12.78% PWD. 6.59% of applicants to GS-14 were PWD. Only 5.21% were qualified and only 1.37% were selected. The relevant applicant pool for GS-13 is 15.93% PWD. 8.57% of applicants to GS-13 were PWD. Only 7.93% were qualified and only 4.42% were selected.

2. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If

“yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. SES
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer Yes
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer No
- b. Grade GS-15
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer No
- c. Grade GS-14
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes
- d. Grade GS-13
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes

The relevant applicant pool for SES is 1.28% PWTD. 0% of applicants to SES were PWTD. The relevant applicant pool for GS-14 is 1.35% PWTD. 4.17% of applicants to GS-14 were PWTD, and 2.83% were qualified, but 0% were selected. The relevant applicant pool for GS-13 is 2.34% PWTD. 5.05% of applicants to GS-13 were PWTD and 4.08% were qualified. Only 0.55% were selected.

3. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. New Hires to SES (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD) Answer Yes
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD) Answer Yes
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD) Answer Yes

The relevant applicant pool for SES is 12.89% PWD, but hires were 0% PWD. The relevant applicant pool for GS-15 is 13.13% PWD, but hires were 7.14% PWD. The relevant applicant pool for GS-14 is 12.78% PWD, but hires were 5.26% PWD. The relevant applicant pool for GS-13 is 15.93% PWD, but hires were 12.77% PWD.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. New Hires to SES (PWTD) Answer Yes
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD) Answer No
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD) Answer Yes

d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD) Answer No

The relevant applicant pool for SES is 1.28% PWTD, but hires were 0% PWTD. The relevant applicant pool for GS-14 is 1.35% PWTD, but hires were 0% PWTD.

5. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

Applicant flow data from OPM does not include supervisory status, so we substituted transactions data for this analysis, and used the inclusion rate for promotions among all employees. 0.17% of employees were promoted to an Executive position, but only 0.08% of PWD employees were promoted to an Executive position. 1.39% of employees were promoted to a Manager position, but only 0.99% of PWD were promoted to a Manager position. 1.06% of employees were promoted to a Supervisor position, but only 1.02% of PWD employees were promoted to a Supervisor position.

6. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes

Applicant flow data from OPM does not include supervisory status, so we substituted transactions data for this analysis, and used the inclusion rate for promotions among all employees. 0.17% of employees were promoted to an Executive position, but 0% of PWTD employees were promoted to an Executive position. 1.39% of employees were promoted to a Manager position, but only 0.18% of PWTD were promoted to a Manager position. 1.06% of employees were promoted to a Supervisor position, but only 0.72% of PWTD employees were promoted to a Supervisor position.

7. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. New Hires for Executives (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWD) Answer No
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) Answer No

Applicant flow data from OPM does not include supervisory status, so we substituted transactions data for this analysis, and used the inclusion rate for promotions among all employees. 0.47% of new permanent hires became Executives, but only 0.39% of new PWD permanent hires became Executives.

8. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD) Answer No
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD) Answer No
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) Answer Yes

Applicant flow data from OPM does not include supervisory status, so we substituted transactions data for this analysis, and used the inclusion rate for promotions among all employees. 1.15% of new permanent hires became Supervisors, but 0% of new PWTD permanent hires became Supervisors.

Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To be model employer for persons with disabilities, agencies must have policies and programs in place to retain employees with disabilities. In this section, agencies should: (1) analyze workforce separation data to identify barriers retaining employees with disabilities; (2) describe efforts to ensure accessibility of technology and facilities; and (3) provide information on the reasonable accommodation program and workplace assistance services.

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

1. In this reporting period, did the agency convert all eligible Schedule A employees with a disability into the competitive service after two years of satisfactory service (5 C.F.R. § 213.3102(u)(6)(i))? If “no”, please explain why the agency did not convert all eligible Schedule A employees.

Answer No

During FY18, four employees on Schedule A appointments were not converted to competitive status after two years of satisfactory service because their managers did not send the Request for Personnel Action to the respective Customer Accounts Manager. After the EEO office inquired, HR Services intervened and the employees were converted. HR Services is continuing to use their Schedule A suspense report, but is now placing a heightened level of awareness with their servicing customer teams. They are now engaging appointees’ supervisors 90 days before the employee reaches 2 years in the appointment.

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

- a. Voluntary Separations (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Involuntary Separations (PWD) Answer Yes

8.55% of PWD separated voluntarily, but only 6.38% of PWOD separated voluntarily. 0.56% of PWD separated involuntarily, but only 0.41% of PWOD separated involuntarily.

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
-------------	---------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------

3. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWTD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without targeted disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

- a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD) Answer Yes
- b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD) Answer No

9.32% of PWTD separated voluntarily, and 6.38% of PWOD separated voluntarily.

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
-------------	---------	-------------------------	---------------------------------

4. If a trigger exists involving the separation rate of PWD and/or PWTD, please explain why they left the agency using exit interview results and other data sources.

DLA does not conduct exit interviews, but does send exit surveys, and received about a 20% response rate (The response rate was 16% for PWD – 63 of the 395 PWD who left DLA). Of the 63 respondents with a disability: 47% Transferred to another Federal agency. (57% transferred for a promotion.) 35% Retired from the government. 10% Resigned to work in the state or local government or the private sector. 6% were departing due to their disability. 2% were following a relocating spouse. Of the 63 respondents with a disability, their primary reason for leaving was: 13% Promotion or Career Opportunities 10% Eligible for Retirement 10% Issues with Manager/Supervisor 8% for Health Reasons 6% Quality of Co-worker/Peer Interaction 6% Work Climate to Include Harassment 6% Higher Salary 6% Organizational Culture

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(4), federal agencies are required to inform applicants and employees of their rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794(b), concerning the accessibility of agency technology, and the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 4151-4157), concerning the accessibility of agency facilities. In addition, agencies are required to inform individuals where to file complaints if other agencies are responsible for a violation.

1. Please provide the internet address on the agency’s public website for its notice explaining employees’ and applicants’ rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

DLA web page www.dla.mil, has a link that reads “Accessibility/Section 508.” This link takes visitors to the DLA Section 508 page: <http://www.dla.mil/508.aspx>. This page instructs individuals who are having difficulty accessing any part of the DLA website to email the DoD Section 508 mailbox at DODSection508@osd.mil. Sending emails to the DoD mailbox starts the current complaint process.

2. Please provide the internet address on the agency’s public website for its notice explaining employees’ and applicants’ rights under the Architectural Barriers Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

<http://www.dla.mil/EEO/ABA/>

3. Describe any programs, policies, or practices that the agency has undertaken, or plans on undertaking over the next fiscal year, designed to improve accessibility of agency facilities and/or technology.

Facilities: No current plans. Technology: DLA Section 508 office is proactively ensuring that the revised 508 Standards is being included in all procurement processes. In order to improve accessibility on DLA's public website, which is hosted by the Defense Media Agency (DMA), when DLA refreshes the website in FY19, it will use DMA as the contractor so that the site developers are the same developers whom DMA uses to fix site-wide accessibility problems. The DLA Section 508 office has been engaging with the portfolio managers for 508 awareness and to ensure that the revised Section 508 is incorporated throughout the Information and Communication Technology life cycle activities, including enterprise architecture, design, development, testing, deployment, and ongoing maintenance activities. The DLA Section 508 has procured automatic testing software that identify potential accessibility issues. DLA is the first Agency in DoD to have a suite of CAC-authenticated 508 compliance checker tools. The software has two applications: one that scans an entire application and provide baseline metrics, and a browser-based plug-in that developers, testers, and end users can use to scan a web page or application page-by-page, to determine Section 508 compliance. Both tools test code for any Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 Level AA rules, the original technical Section 508 standards, or other accessibility standards. The Section 508 office is continuing to use Remedy tickets to track and monitor all 508 complaints. The Section 508 Office has provided assistive technology workshops to the DLA developer and tester communities and more workshops will be forthcoming throughout FY19. • The IT Business Systems Service Requirements Management office is implementing a three phase WCAG approach beginning in the next several months to ensure contractor compliance: o The first phase is development of contract language for inclusion in the Performance of Work Statement. o The second phase is COR/Program Manager training that will be introduced at IT quarterly COR training seminar. o The third phase is publishing guidelines on how IT Program Managers and CORs can ensure contractors are compliant.

C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(3), agencies must adopt, post on their public website, and make available to all job applicants and employees, reasonable accommodation procedures.

1. Please provide the average time frame for processing initial requests for reasonable accommodations during the reporting period. (Please do not include previously approved requests with repetitive accommodations, such as interpreting services.)

DLA processed 88% of all RAs within the 45-day timeframe during FY18, tracked through the RA Management system. RA requests were processed within an average of 18.9 workdays.

2. Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the agency's reasonable accommodation program. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests, timely providing approved accommodations, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring accommodation requests for trends.

DLA supervisors, managers, and employees are required to take RA training in LMS every two years. In addition, face-to-face training has been instituted to augment the RA training in LMS. DO holds quarterly DPC meetings to review the RA process. Factors that may result in a delay include vendor availability of needed equipment, and delays in obtaining medical documentation from the requestor.

D. PERSONAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES ALLOWING EMPLOYEES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKPLACE

Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(5), federal agencies, as an aspect of affirmative action, are required to provide personal assistance services (PAS) to employees who need them because of a targeted disability, unless doing so would impose an undue hardship on the agency.

Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the PAS requirement. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests for PAS, timely providing approved services, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring PAS requests for trends.

DO created a new webpage to explain PAS rights and procedures. (<http://www.dla.mil/EEO/Offers/PersonalAssistanceServices/>) The EEO offices have not yet received any PAS requests, but they are ready to provide PAS once requested. DO is working to update the DLA SOP 1440.01-01, RA for Individuals with Disabilities. DLA is working towards a decentralized contract that will provide the PAS to each MSC.

Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging harassment, as compared to the governmentwide average?

Answer Yes

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging harassment based on disability status result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

Answer Yes

3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

According to the FY18 462 report, DLA had 1 finding of discrimination with the issue of harassment in FY18. However, this finding was actually on the issue of Disparate Treatment, and should have been coded as "other" on the 462 report rather than as "harassment."

B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging failure to provide a reasonable accommodation, as compared to the government-wide average?

Answer No

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging failure to provide reasonable accommodation result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

Answer Yes

3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide a reasonable accommodation during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

No findings of discrimination during FY18.

Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

Element D of MD-715 requires agencies to conduct a barrier analysis when a trigger suggests that a policy, procedure, or practice may be impeding the employment opportunities of a protected EEO group.

1. Has the agency identified any barriers (policies, procedures, and/or practices) that affect employment opportunities for PWD and/or PWTD?

Answer Yes

2. Has the agency established a plan to correct the barrier(s) involving PWD and/or PWTD?

Answer Yes

3. Identify each trigger and plan to remove the barrier(s), including the identified barrier(s), objective(s), responsible official(s), planned activities, and, where applicable, accomplishments

<p>STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:</p> <p>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.</p> <p>How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?</p>	<p>1) Glass ceiling for PWTB above the GS-12 level. 2) 2.25% of the permanent workforce has reported a targeted disability, but 3.13% of the employees who voluntarily separated from DLA had reported a targeted disability.</p>				
<p>STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:</p>	<p><i>Barrier Group</i></p> <p>People with Targeted Disabilities</p>				
<p>BARRIER ANALYSIS:</p> <p>Provide a description of the steps taken and data analyzed to determine cause of the condition.</p>					
<p>STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:</p> <p>Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.</p>	<p>DLA policy documents are not accessible to all employees. DLAs, DLARs, DLAMs, and DLA SOPs do not pass the Adobe Acrobat accessibility checker.</p>				
<p>Objective</p>	<p>Ensure all DLA policy documents are accessible to all employees, consistent with the Rehabilitation act.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="483 926 776 1066"> <tr> <td>Date Objective Initiated</td> <td>Dec 1, 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Target Date For Completion Of Objective</td> <td>Sep 30, 2021</td> </tr> </table>	Date Objective Initiated	Dec 1, 2018	Target Date For Completion Of Objective	Sep 30, 2021
Date Objective Initiated	Dec 1, 2018				
Target Date For Completion Of Objective	Sep 30, 2021				
<p>Responsible Officials</p>	<p>Marcus Bowers Director, DLA Transformation (DT)</p> <p>Greg Wicklund Deputy Director, DLA Transformation (DT)</p> <p>Thomas Doyle Chief Policy Management & Oversight (DT)</p> <p>Todd Lloyd Chief Strategy Plans & Governance Division (DT-SPG)</p> <p>Michael Dingle DLA Issuances Program Manager (DT-PMO)</p> <p>Patricia Wright Enterprise Organizational Alignment Program Manager (DT-SPG)</p> <p>Sylvia Nance DLA Forms Program Manager (DT-PMO)</p> <p>Bryon Grosvalet DLA Agreements Program Manager (DT PMO)</p> <p>Heidi Daverede Director Enterprise Business Standards Office (J67B)</p> <p>Kathryn Hammer-Wells Division Chief (J72)</p> <p>Anne Burleigh Business Process Analyst (J72)</p> <p>Various HQ J/D code and MSC Issuing Authorities</p>				

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
12/01/2018	Identify all DLAI, DLARs, DLAMs, DTMs and DLA SOPs which do not meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (DT)	Yes		11/09/2018
12/01/2018	Identify all DLA GOs which do not meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d. (DT)	Yes		11/09/2018
02/28/2019	Alter the DLAI, DLAR, DLAM, DTM and DLA SOP templates to meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (DT)	Yes		01/30/2019
02/28/2019	Alter Enterprise Organizational Alignment procedures (DLAI 5010.05) to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring documents signed by the DLA Vice Director meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. Issuance must state: Current: 1) GO packages created/revised will be 508 compliant 2) DT will be responsible for making GO templates and resource documents compliant 3) HQ J/D codes and MSCs will be responsible for making their current Mission and Functions and *organization charts 508 compliant 4) *Organization charts will be depicted in the Missions and Functions document; a stand-alone organization chart is not required 5) HQ J/D codes and MSCs must provide DT a compliance completion action plan in accordance with TMT tasking suspense Historical (year 2000 and after): 1) Historical (non-current) GOs dated 2000 and after must be altered to be 508 compliant. 2) HQ J/D codes and MSCs must alter their historical (non-current) GOs to be 508 compliant. 3) HQ J/D codes and MSCs must provide DT	Yes		02/04/2019
02/28/2019	Alter DLAI 4000.19, Agreements Program, to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring all documents signed by the agency's senior designee meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. Issuance must state: 1) All agreements created/revised will be 508 compliant 2) HQ J/D codes and MSCs will be responsible for making supporting documentation 508 compliant. Organizational Support Agreements Managers will ensure their organization agreements and supporting documentation meet WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		01/09/2019
04/30/2019	Supervisors add relevant planned activities to the performance standards of their non-supervisory Responsible Officials. (All)	Yes		
06/01/2019	Alter Defense Logistics Management System documents to meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (J67B)	Yes		
06/30/2019	Alter all GO templates to ensure approved GO documents signed by the DLA Vice Director meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		
06/30/2019	HQ J/D codes and MSCs provide compliance action plans to DT for: 1) Policy and procedures 2) Current Mission and Functions 3) Historical (non-current) GOs (DT)	Yes		
08/31/2019	Alter DLA Acquisition Directive template to meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (J72)	Yes		
12/31/2019	Conduct a forms survey on active MSC-level forms for continued use, revision, and re-designating to DLA-level forms, or cancellation. (DT)	Yes		
12/31/2019	Conduct a forms survey on active DLA-level forms for continued use, revision, or cancellation. (DT)	Yes		

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
09/30/2021	Using the normal 3-year Issuance life cycle, replace all inaccessible policy and procedure documents with documents that meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		
09/30/2021	Replace historical inaccessible GOs with altered GOs that meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		
12/31/2018	Alter DLAI 7750.07, Forms Management Program, to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring all forms created/revised meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		02/04/2019
02/28/2019	Alter DLA Issuance procedures (DLAI 5025.01, DLAM 5025.01, DLAI 5025.13) to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring all policy and procedure documents signed by DT and J/D code/ MSC Issuing Authorities meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. Issuances must state: 1) All policy and procedure documents created/revised will be 508 compliant. 2) HQ J/D codes and MSCs will be responsible for making their existing policy and procedure documents 508 compliant. 3) HQ J/D codes and MSCs must provide DT a compliance completion action plan in accordance with TMT tasking suspense. DT will monitor and report on progress of compliance action plans to leadership on a quarterly basis. (DT)	Yes		02/04/2019
06/30/2019	Address 508 compliance requirements in planned revision of DLAI 5105.02, Annual Operating Plan, to ensure HQ J/D codes and MSC's Dynamic Operating Plans meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		
06/30/2021	HQ J/D codes and MSCs have to provide all altered policy and procedure documents to DT using the 3-year Issuance life-cycle from 2019-2021. (All)	Yes		
09/30/2021	Replace current inaccessible GOs and Mission and Function documents with altered documents that meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		

Fiscal Year	Accomplishments
2018	The barrier and its root causes were identified. The templates that the MSCs, J-codes, and D-codes are using to draft policies do not meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. No administrative control existed to ensure that the final document meets WCAG 2.0 guidelines.
2019	The D&I committee met repeatedly to discuss the barrier and how DLA should remove it.

4. Please explain the factor(s) that prevented the agency from timely completing any of the planned activities.

N/A – DLA did not have any planned activities in Part VII of the FY17 report.

5. For the planned activities that were completed, please describe the actual impact of those activities toward eliminating the barrier(s).

N/A – DLA did not have any planned activities in Part VII of the FY17 report.

6. If the planned activities did not correct the trigger(s) and/or barrier(s), please describe how the agency intends to improve the plan for the next fiscal year.

N/A – DLA did not have any planned activities in Part VII of the FY17 report.