
April 13, 2005



Infrastructure and Environment

American Forces Information Service's
Data Call Submissions and Internal
Control Processes for Base Realignment
and Closure 2005
(D-2005-050)

Department of Defense
Office of Inspector General

Quality

Integrity

Accountability

Additional Copies

To request copies of this report, contact Ms. Kimberley A. Caprio at (703) 604-9202 (DSN 664-9202) or Ms. Rhonda L. Ragsdale at (703) 604-9347 (DSN 664-9347).

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 (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

AFIS	American Forces Information Service
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
COBRA	Cost of Base Realignment Actions
DA&M	Director, Administration and Management
DoD OIG	Department of Defense Office of Inspector General
DWO	Defense-Wide Organizations
HSA	Headquarters and Support Activities
ICP	Internal Control Plan
JCSG	Joint Cross Service Group
JPAT 7	Joint Process Action Team Criterion Number 7
OSD	Office of Secretary of Defense



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

April 13, 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION
SERVICE

SUBJECT: Report on American Forces Information Service's Data Call Submissions
and Internal Control Processes for Base Realignment and Closure 2005
(Report No. D-2005-050)

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 appreciate the courtesies extended to the staff. Questions should be directed to Ms. Kimberley A. Caprio at (703) 604-9202 (DSN 664-9202) or Ms. Rhonda L. Ragsdale at (703) 604-9347 (DSN 664-9347). 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, reading "Richard B. Jolliffe", is positioned above the typed name.

Richard B. Jolliffe
Acting Director
for Contract Management

Department of Defense Office of Inspector General

Report No. D-2005-050

April 13, 2005

(Project No. D2004CB-0108.000)

American Forces Information Service'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 American Forces Information Service management personnel should read this report. The report discusses the validity and integrity of the data provided by American Forces Information Service 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, which states that the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General 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, Joint Process Action Team Criterion Number 7, and scenario specific. The supplemental capacity, military value, Cost of Base Realignment Actions, and Joint Process Action Team Criterion Number 7 data calls are collectively known as the second data call. We issued two memorandums summarizing the audit results for the capacity analysis and second data calls. This report summarizes issues related to the entire American Forces Information Service BRAC 2005 process, as of February 1, 2005.

With headquarters at Alexandria, Virginia, the American Forces Information Service, a Defense-Wide Organization,* is the principal internal information organization within DoD. The American Forces Information Service works directly for the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs to provide high-quality news, information, and entertainment to United States Forces around the world and comprises 11 components. American Forces Information Service responsibilities include publishing the *Stars & Stripes* newspaper that is printed at six sites overseas and provides a free flow of information to U.S. military personnel, DoD civilians, and their families. Except for the

* Defense-Wide Organization is a collective term used for 11 Defense organizations.

capacity analysis data call, American Forces Information Service Headquarters responded for each of its 11 components.

Results. We evaluated the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of BRAC 2005 data and compliance with the Office of the Secretary of Defense's and the Defense-Wide Organizations' internal control plans at two sites for the capacity analysis data call, one site for the second data call, and one site for the scenario specific data call (see Appendix A for a list of sites visited). As of our January 18, 2005, site visit, the American Forces Information Service had received and we reviewed two scenario specific data calls. Subsequent to our site visit, the Joint Process Action Team Criterion Number 7 group may have requested further changed responses; however, we will not review those responses. Once corrections were made, American Forces Information Service responses to the BRAC 2005 data calls were generally supported, complete, and reasonable; however, American Forces Information Service did not have supporting documentation for responses to one scenario specific data call question. The American Forces Information Service's data collection processes generally complied with applicable internal control plans. Furthermore, the Defense-Wide Organizations' internal control plan, used by the American Forces Information Service, properly incorporated the Office of the Secretary of Defense's internal control plan. The lack of supporting documentation for one question in the scenario specific data calls was not material and should not impact the reliability of the American Forces Information Service data in BRAC 2005 analysis.

Management Comments. We provided a draft of this report on March 15, 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	3
Finding	
American Forces Information Service BRAC 2005 Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes	4
Appendixes	
A. Scope and Methodology	8
B. Report Distribution	12

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 of Defense 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, is to examine and implement opportunities for greater joint activity. Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) established seven Joint Cross Service Groups (JCSG): Education and Training, Headquarters and Support Activities (HSA), Industrial, Intelligence, Medical, Supply and Storage, and Technical. The JCSGs address issues that affect 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 they 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), Joint Process Action Team Criterion Number 7 (JPAT 7), and scenario specific. 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 (DWO) used either automated data collection tools or a manual process to collect data call responses. Each data call had a specific purpose as follows.

- The capacity analysis data call gathered data on infrastructure, current workload, surge requirements, and maximum capacity.
- The supplemental capacity data call clarified inconsistent data gathered during the initial capacity data call.
- The military value data call gathered data on mission requirements, land and facilities, mobilization and contingency, and cost and manpower.
- The COBRA data call gathered data to develop costs associated with realigning or closing specific functions or bases;

-
- The JPAT 7 data call gathered data to assess the community’s ability to support additional forces, missions, and personnel associated with individual scenarios.¹
 - The scenario specific data call gathered data related to scenarios for realignment or closure.

Department of Defense Office of Inspector General Responsibility. The “Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC 2005) Policy Memorandum One—Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures,” April 16, 2003, requires the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General (DoD OIG) to provide internal control plan (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 OIG personnel to assist the JCSGs and DoD Components as needed. This report summarizes the results of the DoD OIG efforts related to the American Forces Information Service (AFIS) BRAC 2005 process.

DWOs. DWO is a collective term for 11 Defense organizations.² AFIS is one of the 11 DWOs. The OSD Director, Administration and Management (DA&M) led the DWO BRAC 2005 process, and was responsible for collecting and submitting BRAC data for the DWOs. The OSD DA&M was the primary data repository for all DWO data collections and requests and assembled and forwarded BRAC-related data to the OSD BRAC Office and the JCSGs.

ICPs. An ICP outlined internal control procedures designed to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and integration of all information and analytical processes used in the BRAC 2005 process. Before the BRAC data calls were released, OSD required the JCSGs, Services, Defense agencies, and DWOs to prepare ICPs 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,” April 16, 2003. The OSD DA&M prepared the “Defense-Wide Organizations Internal Control Plan for the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Process,” dated January 15, 2004. The overall DWO ICP and Appendixes L and M of the DWO ICP apply to the 11 DWOs. Each DWO was responsible for preparing an organization-specific appendix, to supplement the overall DWO ICP; Appendix J applied to AFIS. The DWO ICP was updated on August 2, 2004, and the DWOs changed from a manual process to the data gathering tool.³ For the second and scenario specific data calls, AFIS used the August 2, 2004, DWO ICP.

¹ A description of one or more potential closure or realignment actions identified for formal analysis by either a JCSG or a Military Department.

² The 11 organizations that comprise the DWOs are OSD, Joint Chiefs of Staff, DoD OIG, Office of Economic Adjustment, Department of Defense Education Activity, Defense Human Resource Activity, TRICARE Management Activity, American Forces Information Service, Defense Prisoner of War/Missing Personnel Office, Defense Technology Security Administration, and Washington Headquarters Services.

³ A modified Microsoft Access tool for those not using an automated data collection tool.

AFIS. With headquarters at Alexandria, Virginia, AFIS is the principal internal information organization within DoD. AFIS works directly for the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs to:

- provide high-quality news, information, and entertainment to U.S. Forces;
- train all public affairs, broadcast, visual information professionals, military, and DoD civilians; and
- provide U.S. military commanders with communications management, distribution, and technical services to support their internal information objectives.

AFIS is composed of 11 different components⁴ to guarantee a well-informed military that promotes an effective and committed military. Under one component, AFIS publishes the *Stars & Stripes* newspaper that is printed at six sites overseas and provides a free flow of information to U.S. military personnel, DoD civilians, and their families. We visited two sites for the capacity data call, and one site for the second and scenario specific data calls. We visited only one site for the second and scenario specific data calls because AFIS Headquarters responded for each of the 11 components. See Appendix A for a list of sites visited and questions reviewed for each data call.

Objectives

The overall objective of the audit was to evaluate the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of data that AFIS collected and submitted for the BRAC 2005 process. In addition, we evaluated whether AFIS complied with the OSD and DWO ICPs. 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 audit coverage related to the objectives.

⁴ The 11 different information components are Armed Forces Radio and Television, Defense Information School, Defense Visual Information Directorate, Defense Visual Information Center, Joint Visual Information Services Distribution Activity, Information Operations Directorate, Policy and Alliances Directorate, Stars and Stripes, Television-Audio Support Activity, Resources Management Directorate, and Information Resource Management Directorate.

American Forces Information Service BRAC 2005 Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes

After corrections were made, AFIS responses to the BRAC 2005 data calls were generally supported, complete, and reasonable; however, AFIS did not have supporting documentation for responses to one scenario specific data call question. AFIS sites generally complied with both the OSD and the AFIS ICPs and had properly incorporated the OSD ICP. The lack of supporting documentation for one question in the scenario specific data calls was not material and should not impact the reliability of the AFIS data for use in BRAC 2005 analysis.

AFIS BRAC 2005 Data Call Submissions

As a result of our review, the responses provided by AFIS to the BRAC 2005 data calls were generally supported, complete, and reasonable; and the “Not Applicable” responses were reasonable. For the capacity analysis, second, and scenario specific data calls, AFIS provided either an answer or a “Not Applicable” response to the questions. A “Not Applicable” response was provided when AFIS management determined that the question did not apply to AFIS. To ensure accuracy, we compared the AFIS responses to supporting documentation and reviewed the responses to ensure reasonableness and completeness.

Capacity Analysis Data Call. As a result of our review, the two AFIS sites visited for the capacity analysis data call provided responses that were supported, complete, and reasonable; and the “Not Applicable” responses were reasonable. OSD DA&M forwarded to AFIS Headquarters 75 capacity analysis data call questions. AFIS BRAC officials reviewed the questions and selected specific questions to forward to the Stars and Stripes site and questions for AFIS Headquarters to answer. Specifically, AFIS Headquarters answered 75 questions for Headquarters and all components except Stars and Stripes and forwarded 74 questions to Stars and Stripes.

We evaluated the responses and supporting documentation at AFIS Headquarters, Alexandria, Virginia, and Stars and Stripes, Washington, D.C. At the two sites, we identified responses lacking reasonable support and responses that were inconsistent with support provided. Based on our review and discussions with the AFIS BRAC official, the AFIS sites revised inconsistent responses and provided supporting documentation to correct each of the issues raised. We verified and

concluded with the revisions. AFIS Headquarters forwarded the revised responses to the OSD DA&M; however, we did not verify that the responses made it into the OSD Database.

Second Data Call. AFIS Headquarters responded for all components to 53 questions received from OSD DA&M and, after corrections were made, the responses were generally supported, complete, and reasonable. Specifically, the answers were supported, complete, and reasonable; and the “Not Applicable” responses were reasonable. We evaluated the responses and identified those lacking reasonable support or that were inconsistent with the support provided. Based upon our review and discussions with the AFIS BRAC official, AFIS revised inconsistent responses and provided supporting documentation to correct each of the issues raised. We verified and concurred with the revisions. AFIS Headquarters forwarded the revised responses to the OSD DA&M; however, we did not verify that the responses made it into the OSD Database.

During the January 18, 2005, scenario specific data call site visit, we also reviewed JPAT 7 questions from an error and omissions report prepared by the JPAT 7 group, dated January 3, 2005, for the AFIS responses identified as either blank or out of the ordinary. We reviewed the errors and omissions identified by the JPAT 7 report and determined whether AFIS had taken actions to resolve the identified errors and omissions. Based on our review and discussion with the AFIS BRAC official, AFIS Headquarters resolved each of the identified errors and omissions. We verified and concurred with the resolutions. AFIS Headquarters forwarded the revised responses to the OSD BRAC Office; however, we did not verify that the responses made it into the OSD Database. Subsequent to our site visit, the JPAT 7 group may have requested further changed responses; we did not review those responses.

Scenario Specific Data Call. AFIS Headquarters responded for all AFIS components to the two scenario specific data calls received and the responses were generally supported, complete, and reasonable. For each scenario specific data call, AFIS was required to respond to the same three questions. We evaluated the responses and supporting documentation and identified responses lacking reasonable support. Specifically, AFIS did not provide reasonable support for responses to Section 6.1.1. The responses to Section 6.1.1 were used to respond to both scenario specific data calls. Section 6.1.1 required the listing of unusual support equipment and the weight of each piece of equipment. The AFIS BRAC official listed and estimated the weights of the unusual support equipment needed by AFIS, but did not adequately document how the weights were determined. Based on our review and discussions with the AFIS BRAC official, AFIS provided supporting documentation to correct each of the issues raised, except for those relating to Section 6.1.1 for both scenario specific data call questions. We verified and concurred with the changes; however, the AFIS

response to Section 6.1.1 remained unsupported as of February 1, 2005. The AFIS BRAC official initially certified the responses to the scenario specific data calls; however, any revised responses were not certified.

Internal Control Processes

The AFIS site data collection process for the second data call and the scenario specific data call complied with applicable ICPs. However, during the capacity analysis data call, AFIS did not initially fully comply with ICP procedures. The AFIS ICP properly incorporated the OSD ICP. We evaluated compliance with the OSD and AFIS ICPs at two sites for the capacity analysis data call, one site for the second data call, and one site for the scenario specific data call. We evaluated whether sites completed nondisclosure agreements, properly maintained e-mail information, appropriately marked and safeguarded BRAC data, and maintained completed BRAC data files and ensured that the AFIS ICP incorporated the OSD ICP.

Compliance with ICPs. AFIS sites were generally compliant with the ICP procedures with one exception. The ICP procedures required that hard copies of BRAC 2005 data, information, documents, reports, and backup materials be maintained and be adequately safeguarded, as well as all BRAC 2005 data be deemed and marked as draft deliberative or sensitive, or both. We determined that AFIS Headquarters personnel did not properly mark documentation as draft deliberative documents. However, during our review, AFIS properly marked the BRAC 2005 documentation in accordance with the DWO ICP. Furthermore, in accordance with the OSD and AFIS ICPs, the AFIS BRAC officials completed nondisclosure agreements, properly maintained e-mail information, appropriately safeguarded BRAC data, and maintained complete BRAC data files.

Completeness of ICPs. The AFIS ICP outlined management controls designed to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and integration of all information and analytical processes upon which DWO submits documents, data, and information used in the BRAC 2005 process. The ICP established BRAC 2005 responsibilities of AFIS organizations and control mechanisms to safeguard AFIS BRAC information. The ICPs outlined requirements for verifying the accuracy of data and information. In addition, the ICP identified required documentation to justify changes made to data and information received from subordinate levels of the organization. Specifically, the ICP included direction on the completion of nondisclosure agreements; the maintenance of e-mail information; and the collection, marking, safeguarding, and maintenance of BRAC data.

Conclusion

Once corrections were made, prior to the conclusion of our review, AFIS BRAC 2005 data calls were generally supported, complete, and reasonable; however, AFIS did not have supporting documentation for one scenario specific data call question. The AFIS data collection processes generally complied with applicable ICPs and the AFIS ICP properly incorporated the OSD ICPs. Finally, we consider the lack of supporting documentation for one question in the scenario

specific data calls to be immaterial and therefore will not impact the reliability of the AFIS data for use in BRAC 2005 analysis.

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

We evaluated the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of AFIS BRAC 2005 data. The evaluation included comparing question responses to supporting documentation and reviewing “Not Applicable” responses to determine whether they were reasonable. Questions required either an answer or a “Not Applicable” response; a “Not Applicable” response was provided when AFIS BRAC officials determined that the questions did not apply to a location. We reviewed AFIS responses to the JPAT 7 errors and omissions report, dated January 3, 2005. We evaluated whether the DWO ICP incorporated the requirements of the OSD ICP. We also evaluated site data collection processes to determine whether they were in compliance with the DWO ICP by completing nondisclosure agreements and maintaining e-mail information; and collecting, marking, safeguarding, and maintaining BRAC data. In addition, we interviewed the personnel responsible for answering, reviewing, and certifying the responses to the data calls. We did not verify that the responses made it into the OSD Database.

Capacity Analysis Data Call. A January 23, 2004, OSD DA&M memorandum directed DWO BRAC officials to answer 75 of 752 capacity analysis data call questions identified as applicable to DWOs by the HSA JCSG. OSD DA&M also directed the DWO trusted agents to review the rest of the questions to determine if any were applicable. OSD DA&M forwarded to AFIS Headquarters 75 capacity analysis data call questions. Specifically, AFIS Headquarters answered the 75 questions and targeted 74 questions to Stars and Stripes. AFIS did not review the remaining questions to determine if any were applicable to them. We did not validate the selection process of the OSD DA&M or the questions that were not forwarded to the sites.

We evaluated the data call responses at the two AFIS sites visited. We visited AFIS Headquarters, Alexandria, Virginia, and Stars and Stripes, Washington, D.C., in the continental United States. AFIS Headquarters data call responses included all AFIS components, except Stars and Stripes. We issued one site memorandum to summarize the results of these site visits. The table below identifies the questions reviewed at each site.

Capacity Analysis Data Call Questions Reviewed

AFIS Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
AFIS Headquarters, Alexandria, Virginia	461-462, 466, 468, and 471	311, 313-329, 347-388, 393, 446-448, 464, 478, 480-482, and 582
National Press Building (Stars and Stripes), Washington, D.C.	462, 466, 468, and 471	311, 313-329, 347-388, 393, 446-448, 464, 478, 480-482, and 582

Second Data Call. The OSD DA&M provided guidance to the AFIS BRAC official, dated June 18, 2004, June 23, 2004, and July 22, 2004, to answer 11 of 83 HSA JCSG military value questions (1905, 1907 through 1911, and 1913 through 1917); 9 HSA JCSG supplemental capacity questions (4079 through 4081, 4096, 4099, and 4100 through 4103); 8 COBRA questions (1500 through 1507); and 20 JPAT 7 questions (1400 through 1417 and 1420 through 1421). OSD DA&M also directed the DWO trusted agents to review the remaining HSA JCSG military value questions to determine if any were applicable. AFIS reviewed the remaining HSA JCSG military value questions and responded to five additional HSA JCSG military value questions (1900, 1904, 1906, 1912, and 1918). We did not validate the selection process or the questions not forwarded to the sites. However, AFIS complied with the OSD requirement to have all stand-alone facilities, which included leased facilities, answer JPAT 7 and COBRA data call questions. AFIS Headquarters was in a leased facility.

We evaluated the data call responses at AFIS Headquarters, which responded for all AFIS components. Specifically, we reviewed the following question responses and support at AFIS Headquarters and issued one site memorandum to summarize the results:

- JPAT 7 questions 1400 through 1417, 1420, and 1421;* COBRA questions 1501 and 1503 through 1505; HSA JCSG military value questions 1904 through 1908, 1911 through 1913, and 1916 through 1918; and HSA JCSG supplemental capacity questions 4099 through 4103 with responses.

* The JPAT 7 group made the decision to replace JPAT 7 questions 1418 and 1419 with JPAT 7 questions 1420 and 1421.

-
- COBRA questions 1500, 1502, 1506, and 1507; HSA JCSG military value questions 1909, 1910, 1914, and 1915; and HSA JCSG supplemental capacity questions 4079 through 4081 and 4096 with a “Not Applicable” response.

Scenario Specific Data Call. As of our site visit on January 18, 2005, AFIS Headquarters received two scenario specific data calls from the JCSGs and submitted responses. We evaluated the responses, as well as reviewed JPAT 7 questions from an errors and omissions report prepared by the JPAT 7 group, dated January 3, 2005, for AFIS responses that were either left blank or out of the ordinary. We reviewed the following at AFIS Headquarters:

- scenario specific data calls HSA-0071 and HSA-0104; and
- AFIS Headquarters JPAT 7 errors and omissions questions 1401, 1405, and 1406.

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

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. Potential inaccuracies in the data could impact the results. However, the appointed certifying official certified the AFIS BRAC data as accurate and complete to the best of the certifier’s knowledge and belief. We did not review the data gathering tool used by AFIS.

Government Accountability Office High-Risk Areas. The Government Accountability Office has identified several high-risk areas in DoD. This report provides coverage of the Management of Real Property and DoD Support Infrastructure Management high-risk areas.

Management Control Program Review

We did not review the AFIS management control program because its provisions were not deemed applicable to the one-time data collection process. However, we evaluated the AFIS internal control procedures for preparing, submitting, documenting, and safeguarding information associated with the BRAC 2005 data calls, as directed by the applicable ICPs. Specifically, we reviewed procedures that AFIS used to develop, submit, and document its data call responses. In addition, we reviewed the controls implemented to safeguard the premature

disclosure of AFIS BRAC data before responses were forwarded to the OSD BRAC Office. Internal control procedures were adequate as they applied to the audit objective (see finding for additional details).

Prior Coverage

During the last 5 years, the DoD Inspector General has issued two memorandums related to AFIS BRAC 2005.

DoD IG

Site Memorandums

DoD IG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission of American Forces Information Service for Base Realignment and Closure 2005,"
November 17, 2004

DoD IG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission of American Forces Information Service for Base Realignment and Closure 2005,"
April 28, 2004

Appendix B. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Director, Base Realignment and Closure (Installations and Environment)
Director, American Forces Information Service

Non-Defense Federal Organizations

Government Accountability Office*

* Only Government Accountability Office 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, Contract Management prepared this report. Personnel of the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General who contributed to the report are listed below.

Richard B. Jolliffe
Kimberley A. Caprio
Deborah L. Culp
Rhonda L. Ragsdale
Robert P. Goldberg
Patrice L. Berry
Leon D. Bryant
Maurice L. Foster
Rachel M. Miller
Meredith H. Johnson