
March 11, 2005



Infrastructure and Environment

Pentagon Force Protection Agency's
Data Call Submissions and Internal
Control Processes for Base
Realignment and Closure 2005
(D-2005-039)

Department of Defense
Office of Inspector General

Quality

Integrity

Accountability

Additional Copies

To request copies of this report, contact Ms. Karen J. Lamar at (703) 604-9005 (DSN 664-9005) or Mr. Donald A. Bloomer at (703) 604-8863 (DSN 664-8863).

Suggestions for Future Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact Audit Followup and Technical Support at (703) 604-8940 (DSN 664-8940) or fax (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

ODIG-AUD (visit ATTN: AFTS Audit Suggestions)
Department of Defense Inspector General
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, VA 22202-4704

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

hotline

To report fraud, waste, mismanagement, and abuse of authority.

Send written complaints to: Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1900
Phone: 800.424.9098 e-mail: hotline@dodig.osd.mil www.dodig.mil/hotline

Acronyms

BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
COBRA	Cost of Base Realignment Actions
ICP	Internal Control Plan
JCSG	Joint Cross Service Group
JPAT 7	Joint Process Action Team Criteria Number 7
OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense
PFPA	Pentagon Force Protection Agency



INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-4704

March 11, 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, PENTAGON FORCE PROTECTION AGENCY

SUBJECT: Report on Pentagon Force Protection Agency's Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes for Base Realignment and Closure 2005 (Report No. D-2005-039)

We are providing this report for information and use. No written response to this report was required, and none was received. Therefore, we are publishing this report in final form. We performed this audit in response to an Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics request.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the staff. Questions should be directed to Ms. Karen J. Lamar at (703) 604-9005 (DSN 664-9005) or to me at (703) 604-8863 (DSN 664-8863). See Appendix B for the report distribution. The team members are listed inside the back cover.

By direction of the Deputy Inspector General for Auditing:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Donald A. Bloomer".

Donald A. Bloomer
Acting Assistant Inspector General
for Readiness and Logistics Support

Department of Defense Office of Inspector General

Report No. D-2005-039

March 11, 2005

(Project No. D2004-D000LA-0084)

Pentagon Force Protection Agency's Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes for Base Realignment and Closure 2005

Executive Summary

Who Should Read This Report and Why? Office of the Secretary of Defense personnel responsible for deciding the realignment or closure of military installations based on the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) data calls and Pentagon Force Protection Agency management personnel should read this report. The report discusses the adequacy, completeness, and integrity of the data provided by the Pentagon Force Protection Agency to assist the Secretary of Defense in BRAC 2005 recommendations.

Background. BRAC 2005 is the formal process outlined in Public Law 101-510, "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990," as amended, under which the Secretary of Defense may realign or close military installations inside the United States and its territories. As part of BRAC 2005, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics issued "Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC 2005) Policy Memorandum One-Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures," April 16, 2003, stating that the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General will review the accuracy of BRAC data and the certification process.

The BRAC 2005 process was mandated for the United States and its territories and was divided into the following data calls—capacity analysis, supplemental capacity, military value, Cost of Base Realignment Actions, and Joint Process Action Team Criteria Number 7. The supplemental capacity, military value, Cost of Base Realignment Actions, and Joint Process Action Team Criteria Number 7 data calls are collectively known as the second data call. This report summarizes issues related to the Pentagon Force Protection Agency's BRAC 2005 process.

Pentagon Force Protection Agency. The Pentagon Force Protection Agency provides force protection, security, and law enforcement services for the people, facilities, infrastructure, and other resources at the Pentagon and for DoD organizations and DoD-occupied facilities within the National Capital Region not under the jurisdiction of a military department. The Pentagon Force Protection Agency provided the Office of the Secretary of Defense BRAC Office with one data submission in response to the capacity analysis data call and one in response to the second data call.

Results. We evaluated the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of BRAC 2005 data and compliance with the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Pentagon Force Protection Agency internal control plans and concluded that the data was generally supported, complete, and accurate. In addition, the Pentagon Force Protection

Agency complied with applicable internal control plans when preparing, submitting, documenting, and safeguarding BRAC 2005 data.

Management Comments. We provided a draft of this report on February 18, 2005. No written response to this report was required, and none was received. Therefore, we are publishing this report in final form.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Background	1
Objectives	2
Finding	
Pentagon Force Protection Agency's BRAC 2005 Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes	3
Appendixes	
A. Scope and Methodology	6
Management Control Review	8
Prior Coverage	8
B. Report Distribution	9

Background

Base Realignment and Closure 2005. Public Law 101-510, “Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990,” as amended, establishes the procedures under which the Secretary of Defense may realign or close military installations. The law authorizes the establishment of an independent commission to review the Secretary’s recommendations for realigning and closing military installations. The Secretary of Defense established and chartered the Infrastructure Executive Council and the Infrastructure Steering Group as the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 deliberative bodies responsible for leadership, direction, and guidance. The Secretary of Defense must submit recommendations to the independent commission by May 16, 2005.

Joint Cross Service Groups. A primary objective of BRAC 2005, in addition to realigning base structure, was to examine and implement opportunities for greater joint activity. The Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) established seven Joint Cross Service Groups (JCSGs)—Education and Training, Headquarters and Support Activities, Industrial, Intelligence, Medical, Supply and Storage, and Technical—to address issues that are common business-oriented support functions; examine functions in the context of facilities; and develop closure and realignment recommendations based on force structure plans of the Armed Forces and on selection criteria. To analyze the issues, each JCSG developed data call questions to obtain information about the functions that it reviewed.

BRAC Data Calls. The BRAC 2005 data collection process, mandated for the United States and its territories, was divided into the following data calls: capacity analysis, supplemental capacity, military value, Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA), and Joint Process Action Team Criteria Number 7 (JPAT 7). The supplemental capacity, military value, COBRA, and JPAT 7 data calls are collectively known as the second data call.

The Services, Defense agencies, and Defense-wide organizations used either automated data collection tools or a manual process to collect data call responses. For the capacity analysis data call, the Pentagon Force Protection Agency (PFPA) used a manual process to collect BRAC data; for the second data call, PFPA used the Data Gathering Tool, a modified Microsoft Access database developed for those not using an automated process. Specifically, the data calls were to accomplish the following.

- The capacity analysis questions gathered data on infrastructure, current workload, surge requirements, and maximum capacity.
- The supplemental capacity questions clarified inconsistent data gathered with the initial capacity questions.
- The military value questions gathered data on mission requirements, land and facilities, mobilization and contingency, and cost and personnel.

-
- The COBRA questions gathered data to develop cost savings and return on investments of proposed realignment and closure actions.
 - The JPAT 7 questions gathered data to assess the community's ability to support additional forces, missions, and personnel associated with individual scenarios.

Internal Control Plans. Before BRAC data calls were released to the Military Departments and Defense agencies, OSD required the JCSGs, Military Departments, and Defense agencies to prepare an internal control plan (ICP) that incorporated and supplemented the OSD ICP. The OSD ICP was distributed under the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics' memorandum, "Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC 2005) Policy Memorandum One—Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures" (Policy Memorandum One), April 16, 2003. To comply with that requirement, the PFPA prepared "Pentagon Force Protection Agency (PFPA) Internal Control Plan (ICP) for 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Process," December 2, 2003.

Department of Defense Office of Inspector General Responsibility. Policy Memorandum One requires the DoD Office of Inspector General to provide ICP development and implementation advice, review the relevance and completeness of BRAC data, and evaluate the data certification processes. In addition, the memorandum requires DoD Office of Inspector General personnel to provide assistance as needed to the JCSGs and DoD Components. This resulting report summarizes issues related to the PFPA BRAC 2005 process.

Pentagon Force Protection Agency. PFPA was established in response to the September 11, 2001, attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and subsequent terrorist threats facing the DoD workforce and facilities. PFPA provides force protection, security, and law enforcement services for the people, facilities, infrastructure, and other resources at the Pentagon and for DoD organizations and DoD-occupied facilities within the National Capital Region not under the jurisdiction of a military department. The BRAC data submitted by PFPA officials included information for seven office locations—the PFPA headquarters, located in the Pentagon, and the six PFPA sites located throughout the National Capital Region. PFPA provided the OSD BRAC Office with one data submission for the capacity analysis data call and one for the second data call.

Objectives

The overall objective of the audit was to evaluate the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of data that PFPA collected and submitted for the BRAC 2005 process. In addition, we evaluated whether PFPA complied with the OSD and PFPA ICPs. We also reviewed the management controls for preparing, submitting, documenting, and safeguarding BRAC 2005 data. This report is one in a series on data call submissions and internal control processes for BRAC 2005. See Appendix A for a discussion of the scope and methodology, our review of management controls, and prior coverage related to the objectives.

Pentagon Force Protection Agency's BRAC 2005 Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes

PFPA reported BRAC 2005 data that was generally supported, complete, and accurate. PFPA complied with the OSD and PFPA ICPs and had properly incorporated the OSD ICP management controls into the PFPA ICP for preparing, submitting, documenting, and safeguarding BRAC 2005 data.

Data Call Submissions

The BRAC 2005 data reported by PFPA was generally supported, complete, and accurate. We evaluated the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of the responses PFPA made to all of the questions it received. Specifically, we compared question responses with supporting documentation and reviewed “not applicable (N/A)” responses to determine whether the responses were reasonable.

Capacity Analysis Data Call. For the capacity analysis data call, PFPA provided responses that were generally supported, complete, and reasonable, once corrections were made. PFPA received 753 capacity analysis data call questions from the OSD BRAC Office. PFPA BRAC officials reviewed those questions and determined that 14 questions applied to PFPA. The responses for 7 of the 14 capacity analysis data call questions were generally supported and reasonable, while 5 were not and 2 contained calculation errors. PFPA officials took action to correct the calculation errors; however, additional support for the five responses could not be provided. At the conclusion of our review of the capacity analysis data call, we considered those responses not properly and reasonably supported; however, in September 2004, we revalidated those responses and now consider them as generally supported and reasonable based on the best support available. We also reviewed the 739 questions that PFPA responded to as N/A and consider those responses reasonable.

Second Data Call. For the second data call, PFPA provided responses that were generally supported, complete, and reasonable, once corrections were made. PFPA received specific questions from the JCSGs, as well as COBRA and JPAT 7 questions, that were to be answered by stand-alone or host activities, which included leased facilities. For the second data call, we reviewed the supporting documentation for the responses to 18 supplemental capacity, 11 military value, 8 COBRA, and 20 JPAT 7 questions. We considered most of the answers and the N/A responses to be generally supported and reasonable. A printout of an online calendar for the Director, PFPA supported the responses for the Headquarters and Support Activities JCSG military value question numbers 1907¹ and 1908.² We were unable to validate the steps taken to generate this

¹The question asked for the number of meetings between an organization's senior officials, including Flag officers, and senior officials from another organization located in the Washington, D.C., area.

data; therefore, we are not making a determination as to the supportability or reasonableness of the answers for those two questions.

At the conclusion of our visit to PFPA headquarters, responses provided by PFPA for the capacity analysis and second data calls were generally supported and reasonable, and no further action was required.

Internal Control Processes

PFPA complied with the OSD and PFPA ICPs and had properly incorporated the OSD ICP management controls into the PFPA ICP for preparing, submitting, documenting, and safeguarding BRAC 2005 data.

We evaluated compliance with the PFPA ICP for the capacity analysis and second data calls. During the data calls, we evaluated PFPA BRAC 2005 data collection processes to determine whether they complied with OSD and PFPA ICPs. The evaluation included reviewing whether the PFPA ICP incorporated the OSD ICP requirements and whether officials working with BRAC data had completed nondisclosure agreements and safeguarded and marked BRAC data. Specifically, we reviewed the completeness of the PFPA headquarters' BRAC book,³ ensured that BRAC information was secured in locked containers, and validated that PFPA maintained accountability of the BRAC data.

Compliance With ICPs. PFPA headquarters was compliant with OSD and PFPA ICP procedures. In addition, the site data collection processes for the capacity analysis and second data calls complied with the PFPA ICP.

PFPA officials implemented the procedures identified in their ICP. We determined that reasonable assurance was provided that PFPA's BRAC data was safeguarded against unauthorized access during the data collection, certification, and submission process, to include the completion of nondisclosure agreements.

Completeness of PFPA ICP. The PFPA ICP had properly incorporated the OSD ICP management controls for preparing, submitting, documenting, and safeguarding BRAC 2005 data. The PFPA ICP provided management controls for the accountability of information during the BRAC process, as well as controls to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and integration of all information and analytical processes of the submitted information. The PFPA ICP established BRAC 2005 responsibilities of PFPA organizations and control mechanisms to safeguard PFPA BRAC information. The ICP outlined requirements for verifying the accuracy of data and information and included direction on the completion of nondisclosure agreements and the collection, marking, safeguarding, and maintaining accountability of BRAC data.

²The question asked for the number of meetings between an organization's senior officials, including Flag officers, and members of Congress or their staff.

³The BRAC book is a printout of the questions, supporting documentation, memorandums for record, and certification pages.

Conclusion

PFFPA reported BRAC 2005 data that was generally supported, complete, and accurate, after corrections were made, and the data collection processes that PFFPA used generally complied with the ICPs. We determined that the data provided by PFFPA for BRAC 2005 was reasonable based on the best support available, and no further action was required. The processes used by PFFPA to collect BRAC data complied with its ICP, which included adequately marking and safeguarding BRAC data. We discussed our findings with PFFPA personnel throughout the process, and they concurred with our findings.

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

We evaluated the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of PFPA BRAC 2005 data. The evaluation included comparing question responses with supporting documentation and reviewing N/A responses to determine whether the responses were reasonable. Questions had either an answer or an N/A response; an N/A response was for questions determined not to apply to a site.

We ensured that the PFPA ICP incorporated the requirements of the OSD ICP. We evaluated site data collection procedures to determine whether they were in compliance with PFPA ICP procedures, to include the completeness of the PFPA headquarters' BRAC book, that BRAC information was secured in locked containers, and that PFPA maintained accountability of all BRAC data. In addition, we interviewed the personnel responsible for preparing and certifying the responses to the data calls.

The BRAC data submitted by PFPA officials included information for seven office locations—the PFPA headquarters, located in the Pentagon, and the six PFPA sites located throughout the National Capital Region. We issued site memorandums that summarized the results of PFPA headquarters capacity analysis and second data call site visits.

We revalidated PFPA responses to five capacity analysis data call questions in September 2004. As of February 2005, we had not conducted any additional revalidations of the capacity analysis or second data calls, and PFPA had not received any JCSG scenario-specific data calls.

Capacity Analysis Data Call. PFPA headquarters received 753 capacity analysis data call questions and provided responses for all PFPA locations. PFPA provided the OSD BRAC Office with one data submission for the capacity analysis data call. We evaluated the data call responses by PFPA headquarters. Specifically, we reviewed:

- answers to capacity analysis data call question numbers 28, 29, 85, 327, 330, 456, 457, 460, 461, 462, 466, 467, 468, and 471 and compared those answers with the supporting documentation;
- the 739 N/A responses to determine whether the responses were reasonable; and
- calculations used for capacity analysis data call answers.

Second Data Call. PFPA headquarters received targeted questions from the JCSGs. PFPA received 18 supplemental capacity questions (17 questions from the Headquarters and Support Activities JCSG and 1 question from the Education and Training JCSG), 11 military value questions from the Headquarters and

Support Activities JCSG, 8 COBRA¹ questions, and 20 JPAT 7² questions. The following table shows the targeted question responses we reviewed.

Question Responses Reviewed for Second Data Call		
	Question Number	
	Answered	N/A
Headquarters and Support Activities JCSG Supplemental Capacity	4081, 4099, 4100, 4101, 4102, and 4103	4072, 4073, 4074, 4079, 4080, 4096, 4242, 4243, 4244, 4245, and 4246
Education and Training JCSG Supplemental Capacity	None	4000
Headquarters and Support Activities JCSG Military Value *	1905, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1913, 1914, 1915, and 1916	1917
COBRA	1505	1500, 1501, 1502, 1503, 1504, 1506, and 1507
JPAT 7**	1400, 1401, 1402, 1403, 1404, 1405, 1406, 1407, 1408, 1409, 1410, 1411, 1412, 1413, 1414, 1415, 1416, 1417, 1420, and 1421	None
<p>*We reviewed the responses provided for question numbers 1907 and 1908; however, we were unable to make a determination as to whether the responses were reasonable and accurate based on the source documents available.</p> <p>**The JPAT 7 replaced question numbers 1418 and 1419 with question numbers 1420 and 1421.</p>		

In addition to reviewing the second data call responses, we followed up on outstanding issues from our review of the capacity analysis data call responses. We re-evaluated the initial responses to capacity analysis question numbers 330, 460, 466, 467, and 468 and determined that all issues had been resolved.

We performed this audit from March 2004 through February 2005 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

¹COBRA questions were to be answered by stand-alone or host activities, which included leased facilities.

²JPAT 7 questions were to be answered by stand-alone or host activities, which included leased facilities.

Use of Computer-Processed Data. We did not test the accuracy of the computer-processed data used to support an answer to a data call question because of time constraints, and we did not review the data gathering tool used. Potential inaccuracies in the data could impact the results; however, the PFPA plans officer, trusted agent, and certifying official certified that the BRAC data was accurate and complete to the best of their knowledge and belief.

Government Accountability Office High-Risk Area. The Government Accountability Office has identified several high-risk areas in DoD. This report provides coverage on Managing Federal Real Property and DoD Support Infrastructure Management high-risk areas.

Management Control Review

We evaluated the PFPA management controls for preparing, submitting, documenting, and safeguarding information associated with the BRAC 2005 data calls, as directed by the applicable ICPs. Specifically, we reviewed nondisclosure agreements to ensure that officials working with BRAC data had agreed to protect the information from unauthorized disclosure, the process used to collect and report BRAC data, the storage container where BRAC data was stored, and the access logs maintained for accessing BRAC information. Management controls were adequate as they applied to the audit objective (see Finding for additional detail). We did not review the PFPA management control program because its provisions were deemed not applicable to the one-time data collection process.

Prior Coverage

During the last 5 years, the Department of Defense Inspector General (DoD IG) has issued two site memorandum reports discussing the PFPA BRAC 2005 data call submissions and internal control processes.

Site Memorandums

DoD IG Memorandum, “Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From the Pentagon Force Protection Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005,” October 1, 2004

DoD IG Memorandum, “Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Pentagon Force Protection Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005,” April 14, 2004

Appendix B. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Director, Base Realignment and Closure (Installations and Environment)

Other Defense Organizations

Director, Pentagon Force Protection Agency
Deputy Director, Program Integration

Non-Defense Federal Organization

Government Accountability Office*

*Only personnel involved in the BRAC process are to receive the report.

Team Members

The Department of Defense Office of the Deputy Inspector General for Auditing, Readiness and Logistics Support prepared this report. Personnel of the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General who contributed to the report are listed below.

Deborah L. Culp
Donald A. Bloomer
Karen J. Lamar
Elizabeth N. Shifflett