
May 10, 2005



Infrastructure and Environment

**Missile Defense Agency Data Call
Submissions and Internal Control
Processes for Base Realignment and
Closure 2005
(D-2005-063)**

Department of Defense
Office of Inspector General

Quality

Integrity

Accountability

Additional Copies

To request copies of this report, contact Mr. Rudolf Noordhuizen at (703) 604-8959 (DSN 664-8959) or Mr. Bruce A. Burton at (703) 604-9071 (DSN 664-9071).

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
DoD OIG	Department of Defense Office of Inspector General
H&SA	Headquarters and Support Activities
ICP	Internal Control Plan
JCSG	Joint Cross-Service Group
JPAT 7	Joint Process Action Team Criterion Number 7
MDA	Missile Defense Agency
NCR	National Capital Region



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

May 10, 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY

SUBJECT: Report on Missile Defense Agency Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes for Base Realignment and Closure 2005 (Report No. D-2005-063)

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 request from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the staff. Questions should be directed to Mr. Rudolf Noordhuizen (703) 604-8959 (DSN 664-8959) or Ms. Mary Hoover at (703) 604-9054 (DSN 664-9054). See Appendix F 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, appearing to read "Mary L. Ugone", is positioned above the typed name.

Mary L. Ugone
Assistant Inspector General
Acquisition Management and Technology

Department of Defense Office of Inspector General

Report No. D-2005-063

May 10, 2005

(Project No. D2004-D000AB-0086.000)

Missile Defense Agency 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 data calls, and Missile Defense Agency management personnel should read this report. The report discusses the adequacy, completeness, and integrity of the data provided by Missile Defense Agency to assist the Secretary of Defense in Base Realignment and Closure 2005 recommendations.

Background. Base Realignment and Closure 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 Base Realignment and Closure 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, that provided for the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General review of the accuracy of Base Realignment and Closure data and the certification process.

The Base Realignment and Closure 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. This report summarizes issues related to the entire Missile Defense Agency Base Realignment and Closure 2005 process as of March 17, 2005.

Missile Defense Agency. To counter the threat of ballistic missiles carrying weapons of mass destruction, the DoD established the Missile Defense Agency to manage and integrate all missile defense programs and technologies into the Ballistic Missile Defense System. The mission of the Missile Defense Agency is to develop, test, and prepare for fielding a missile defense system. The Missile Defense Agency has 33 offices in 5 states and personnel in 11 locations throughout the world.

Results. We evaluated the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of Base Realignment and Closure 2005 data and compliance with the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Missile Defense Agency internal control plans at six 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). Missile Defense Agency Base Realignment and Closure 2005 data were generally supported, complete, and reasonable after corrections were made; the data collection processes generally complied with applicable internal control plans; and the Missile Defense Agency internal control plan properly incorporated and supplemented the Office of the Secretary of Defense internal control plan. Data integrity existed between Missile Defense Agency responses from their data collection tool and the Office of the Secretary of Defense database. However, the Missile Defense Agency did not support all responses submitted to Office of the Secretary of Defense. Twenty-nine capacity analysis responses were partially supported with documentation, and three scenario specific responses used in three scenario specific data calls were partially supported with documentation. After our site visit, the Joint Process Action Team Criterion Number 7 requested that the Missile Defense Agency change several responses. We did not verify those changes; therefore, the issues related to those questions may no longer be valid. These issues should not affect the overall reliability or integrity of the Missile Defense Agency Base Realignment and Closure 2005 process.

Management Comments. We provided a draft of this report on April 19, 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	
Missile Defense Agency Base Realignment and Closure 2005 Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes	4
Appendixes	
A. Scope and Methodology	9
B. Capacity Analysis Data Call Questions Reviewed	14
C. Capacity Analysis Data Call Immaterial Partially Supported Responses	18
D. Second Data Call Questions Reviewed	21
E. Prior Coverage	23
F. Report Distribution	25

Background

Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 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 inside the United States and its territories. 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 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. The Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) established seven Joint Cross-Service Groups (JCSGs)-Education and Training, Headquarters and Support Activities (H&SA), 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 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 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 analysis 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, savings, and payback (formerly known as return on investments) of proposed realignment and closure actions.

-
- 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 and
 - The scenario specific data call gathered data related to specific scenario conditions for realignment or closure.

Internal Control Plans (ICPs). The ICPs outlined management controls designed to provide accountability for information used in the BRAC 2005 process. Before the BRAC data calls were released, OSD required the Services, Defense agencies, and Defense-Wide Organizations to prepare ICPs that incorporated and supplemented the OSD ICP. The OSD ICP was issued in 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. To comply with these requirements, the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) prepared, "Missile Defense Agency (MDA) 2005 Facility Board Internal Control Plan (ICP)," December 24, 2003. For both the capacity analysis data call and the second data call, MDA used a modified version of the Army's on-line data collection tool.

Department of Defense Office of Inspector General (DoD OIG)

Responsibility. Pursuant to the "Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC 2005) Policy Memorandum One-Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures," April 16, 2003, the DoD OIG provided advice and recommendations on ICP development and implementation, reviewed the BRAC data for accuracy, and evaluated the certification process. In addition, DoD OIG personnel assisted the JCSGs and DoD Components as needed. This report summarizes issues related to the MDA BRAC 2005 process.

MDA. To counter the threat of ballistic missiles carrying weapons of mass destruction, the DoD established the MDA to manage and integrate all missile defense programs and technologies into the Ballistic Missile Defense System. The mission of MDA is to develop, test, and prepare for fielding a missile defense system. The MDA has 33 offices in 5 states and MDA personnel in 11 locations throughout the world. The MDA BRAC officials are located in the MDA National Capital Region (NCR), Washington, D.C. During the capacity analysis data call, we visited 6 sites to review responses collected from the 33 major MDA offices. During the second and scenario specific data calls, MDA Headquarters collected and submitted the BRAC responses. See Appendix B for information related to the capacity analysis questions reviewed and Appendix D for information related to the second data call questions reviewed.

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

Objectives

The overall objective of the audit was to evaluate the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of data that MDA collected and submitted for the BRAC 2005 process. In addition, we evaluated whether MDA complied with the OSD and MDA 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 audit scope and methodology related to the objective. See Appendix E for prior coverage.

Missile Defense Agency Base Realignment and Closure 2005 Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes

The responses provided to the BRAC 2005 data calls for MDA sites visited were generally supported, complete, and reasonable after corrections were made as a result of our site visits. In addition, the MDA sites visited generally complied with the ICPs, and the MDA ICP properly incorporated and supplemented the OSD ICP. Data integrity existed between MDA responses from their data collection tool and the OSD database. However, the capacity analysis data call and scenario specific data call contained responses that were partially supported. Specifically:

- Responses to 29 capacity analysis data call questions at 6 sites were partially supported with documentation.
- Responses to 3 scenario specific data calls used information that was partially supported with documentation. Personnel at 2 sites used in 3 scenarios, leases at 2 sites used in 1 scenario, and special space at 2 sites used in 3 scenarios were partially supported with documentation.

These issues should not affect the overall reliability or integrity of the MDA BRAC process.

MDA BRAC 2005 Data Call Submissions

After we completed our review, the BRAC 2005 data call responses that MDA reported were generally supported, complete, and reasonable. After receiving the questions, MDA Headquarters targeted specific questions to the 33 major MDA offices. During our site visits, we evaluated their validity, integrity, and supporting documentation. Specifically, we compared responses to supporting documentation and reviewed the “not applicable” responses to determine whether they were reasonable and not default responses.

Capacity Analysis Data Call. After our review, the MDA sites that we reviewed for the capacity analysis data call generally provided accurate, reasonable responses and support. The MDA Headquarters received 753 capacity analysis data call questions from the OSD BRAC office. MDA BRAC officials reviewed those questions and selected 86 specific questions to forward to each of the 33 major MDA offices within the United States. We evaluated the responses and

support at the six MDA sites² (see Appendix B for a list of offices visited and questions reviewed). We identified responses with inadequate support and responses that were inaccurate. In addition, we reviewed each question with a “not applicable” response to the data call to determine whether the response was reasonable and not a default response. We determined that the “not applicable” responses were reasonable. However, as a result of our visits, the MDA sites revised their responses and provided the necessary supporting documentation. We verified and concurred with the majority of changes. In some cases, MDA personnel determined that the original responses were correct although no additional supporting documentation was provided. Responses to 29 questions were partially supported with documentation. Although there was no documentation to fully support the responses, MDA BRAC officials determined the responses to be correct. We do not consider the partially supported responses to be material. See Appendix C for the list of partially supported responses for the capacity analysis data call.

Second Data Call. After our review, the MDA site reviewed for the second data call provided responses that were generally supported, complete, and reasonable. We evaluated the responses and support at the MDA Headquarters, Washington, D.C., site. The MDA Headquarters site received targeted questions from the JCSGs. The MDA BRAC officials reviewed the applicability of the questions and further targeted the questions to six MDA sites³ (see Appendix D for a list of sites and questions reviewed). We evaluated the responses and supporting documentation at MDA Headquarters where all MDA targeted sites forwarded their responses and supporting documentation. All stand-alone facilities and host installations including leased facilities answered the JPAT 7 data call questions; however, the Alabama responses were provided by Redstone Arsenal, the Colorado responses were provided by Schreiver Air Force Base, and the NCR responses by Henderson Hall. We did not audit the accuracy or the supporting documents for the Alabama, Colorado, or the NCR responses that Redstone Arsenal, Schreiver Air Force Base, and Henderson Hall provided to MDA. We did not review the COBRA questions because MDA was advised by the COBRA point of contact not to respond to those questions even though MDA is located in leased facilities. Although contrary to OSD BRAC guidance, the information was later obtained as part of the scenario data call. The answers were generally supported, complete, and reasonable, with the exception of the following:

- H&SA JCSG military value responses for question numbers 1913 and 1917 were supported with memorandums for the record. We were unable to verify the accuracy of these responses because no additional supporting documentation existed. In addition, responses to H&SA JCSG military value questions 1907 and 1908 were not verified because we were unable to validate the steps taken to generate those responses.

² The six MDA sites visited included the responses from all 33 major MDA offices.

³ The six sites include Alabama, Alaska, California, Colorado, NCR, and New Mexico.

-
- Technical JCSG military value responses from multiple MDA locations for question numbers 3008 through 3015, 3017, 3018, and 3023 were supported with memorandums for the record. We were unable to verify the accuracy of those responses because no additional documentation existed.
 - H&SA JCSG supplemental capacity responses for question numbers 4099, 4100, 4101, 4102, and 4103 were supported by memorandums for the record. We were unable to verify the accuracy of those responses because no additional documentation existed.

After our site visit, JPAT 7 requested MDA to revise some of its responses based upon new guidance. We did not review the supporting documentation for the changed responses.

Scenario Specific Data Call. After our review, the MDA site that we visited for the scenario data call generally provided reasonable responses and adequate support. We evaluated the responses and support at the MDA Headquarters, Washington, D.C., site. As of March 17, 2005, at the request of the JCSGs, the OSD forwarded four scenario specific data calls to MDA Headquarters requesting responses from five MDA sites.⁴ The four scenario specific data calls included two from the H&SA JCSG and two from the Technical JCSG. The JCSGs asked MDA to provide the number of personnel occupying each building, leased space information, one-time moving costs, and special space requirements for the four scenarios. However, we were unable to verify the following information based on the documentation provided for the scenario specific data call.

- Personnel breakdowns for Alabama and Colorado were partially supported with memorandums for the record which stated that personnel numbers were obtained by physical counts. The Alabama personnel numbers were used in H&SA-0047, TECH-0002, and TECH-0018. The Colorado personnel numbers were used in TECH-0002 and TECH-0018.
- Leased space information for Alabama was partially supported with memorandums for the record. The Alabama lease information was used in H&SA-0047.
- Special space requirements were partially supported by a memorandum for the record for one Alabama location and by an unreadable floor plan (due to the small size) for the Colorado location. The Alabama special space information was used in H&SA-0047, TECH-0002, and TECH-0018. The Colorado special space information was used in TECH-0002 and TECH-0018.

⁴ The five MDA sites include Alabama (two sites), Colorado, NCR, and New Mexico.

No additional documentation was available at the time of the review to support the scenario specific data call responses. Based on our review, MDA made changes to the scenario specific data call responses. We verified and concurred with the changes. MDA BRAC officials resubmitted the corrected scenario specific data call responses.

Internal Control Processes

The site data collection processes for the first data call, second data call, and scenario specific data call generally complied with applicable ICPs. The MDA ICP properly incorporated and supplemented the OSD ICP.

We evaluated compliance with MDA ICP at six sites for the capacity analysis data call, one site for the second data call, and one site for the scenario specific data call. During the capacity analysis data call, we visited six MDA sites that included responses from the 33 major MDA offices (see Appendix A for a list of sites visited). During the second and scenario specific data calls, we visited the MDA Headquarters to evaluate responses from Alabama, Alaska, California, Colorado, NCR, and New Mexico. At each site visited, we evaluated the MDA BRAC 2005 data collection processes to determine whether they complied with OSD and MDA ICPs, whether the MDA ICP incorporated and supplemented the OSD ICP, and whether sites completed nondisclosure agreements, marked BRAC data, and safeguarded BRAC data.

Completeness of ICPs. The MDA BRAC 2005 ICP provides a uniform set of management controls designed to provide accountability for each sub-element of information and analysis used in the BRAC 2005 process. The ICPs established the BRAC 2005 responsibilities of MDA organizations and control mechanisms to safeguard MDA BRAC information. The ICPs outlined requirements for document marking, information and communication controls, public affairs guidance, and the MDA data collection plan. Specifically, the ICPs included direction on completing nondisclosure agreements, close-hold requirements for BRAC information, marking and storing BRAC information, and data certification requirements.

Compliance with ICPs. MDA sites were generally compliant with the ICP procedures. The site data collection processes for the capacity analysis, second, and scenario specific data calls generally complied with applicable ICPs. During the capacity analysis and second data calls, we verified that MDA personnel participating in the BRAC process signed nondisclosure agreements, documented deliberative meeting minutes, and collected, marked, stored, and maintained data in compliance with the OSD and MDA ICPs. During the capacity data call and the second data call, we noted minor ICP compliance deficiencies such as not signing nondisclosure agreements and inadequate marking of BRAC information.

Each site corrected the deficiencies during our site visit. We consider those deficiencies corrected and immaterial.

Data Integrity

Data integrity⁵ existed between the MDA responses from their data collection tool and the OSD database. The DoD OIG Data Mining Division reviewed the integrity of the data transferred from the MDA data collection tool to the OSD database. From the 17,682 responses provided by MDA, the Data Mining Division identified the following discrepancies:

- 57 responses were in the MDA data collection tool that were not in the OSD database,
- Text in 3 responses did not match, and
- 15 responses were in the OSD database but were not in the MDA data collection tool.

We evaluated each of the discrepancies and determined there would be no significant impact on the JCSGs analysis or integrity of the data. (See Appendix A for additional details.) The DoD OIG Data Mining Division will be issuing a separate memorandum on their comparison between the MDA data and the OSD database.

Conclusion

After our review, the MDA BRAC 2005 data call responses for the sites visited were generally supported, complete, and reasonable. In addition, the data collection processes generally complied with applicable internal control plans, and the MDA ICP properly incorporated and supplemented the OSD ICP. However, MDA did not fully support all responses submitted to OSD: 29 capacity analysis responses were partially supported with documentation, and 3 areas in 3 scenario specific data calls were partially supported with documentation. In addition, we were unable to determine the validity of the responses for 20 military value questions. After our site visits, JPAT 7 requested MDA to change several responses. We did not verify those changes, therefore the issues related to these questions may no longer be valid. We discussed the outstanding unsupported responses with MDA management. MDA concurred

⁵ Data integrity is the condition existing when data is unchanged from its source and has not been accidentally or maliciously modified, altered, or destroyed.

with the findings. These issues should not affect the overall reliability and integrity of the MDA BRAC 2005 process.

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

We evaluated the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of MDA BRAC 2005 data. The evaluation included comparing responses to supporting documentation and reviewing “not applicable” responses to determine whether they were reasonable and not default responses. Questions had either an answer or a “not applicable” response; a “not applicable” response was for questions that did not apply to a site. We evaluated whether the MDA ICP incorporated and supplemented the requirements of the OSD ICP; whether site data collection procedures were in compliance with MDA ICP procedures for collecting, storing, accessing, and controlling BRAC information; and whether BRAC information was certified for accuracy and completeness. In addition, we interviewed the personnel responsible for preparing and certifying the responses to the data calls.

Capacity Analysis Data Call. MDA Headquarters received 753 capacity analysis data call questions from the OSD BRAC office. MDA BRAC officials reviewed the data call questions and determined which questions applied to the various MDA offices. MDA Headquarters targeted 86 questions that applied to the MDA. MDA BRAC officials forwarded those 86 questions, as applicable, to the 33 major MDA offices. We did not validate the selection process or the questions that were not forwarded to the sites.

We evaluated the MDA targeted data call questions at each MDA site that we visited. The targeted data call questions were sent to 33 major MDA offices located in the continental United States. We visited six sites, including the NCR, Alabama (2 sites), Colorado, California, and New Mexico. The capacity analysis data call responses at those six sites included all 33 major MDA office locations. We issued six site memorandums to summarize the results of those site visits. The MDA offices and the capacity analysis data call questions that MDA targeted to the MDA offices are shown in Appendix B.

Although we performed data validation at only 6 MDA sites, the data for those sites included responses from all 33 major MDA offices. MDA personnel are located in 11 locations that include Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Marshall Islands, Massachusetts, New Mexico, and the NCR. Table 1 illustrates the 11 MDA sites, including MDA Headquarters, that provided responses to the capacity analysis data call. We performed data validation for the capacity analysis data call in five locations, including NCR, Alabama, California, Colorado, and New Mexico. Table 1 includes the MDA’s two letter abbreviations which denotes individual program offices (see Appendix B for a listing of those offices).

Table 1. Major MDA Office Locations

**NCR	**Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	**California	**Colorado	Hawaii	Marshall Islands	Massachusetts	**New Mexico	Other
* AB * AS * BC * CF * CT * DB * DC * DS * DT * GC * GM * HR * IC * IO	* KI * LA * MP * PI * QS * RM * SB * SE * SI * SN * SR * TC * TE * TR	* GM * GM * SI	* AS	* SS * GM * AL * SE * QS	* GM * IC * BC	* QS	* GM	* GM	* AL * TC	* SE

*Two letter office abbreviation

**For the capacity analysis data call, we visited six sites that included Alabama (2 sites), California, Colorado, NCR, and New Mexico.

Second Data Call. MDA Headquarters received targeted questions from the JCSGs. Specifically, MDA received 14 H&SA JCSG military value questions (1901, 1905, 1907 through 1917, and 1959); 6 H&SA JCSG supplemental capacity questions (4081, 4099, 4100, 4101 through 4103); 28 Technical JCSG questions (3000 through 3027); 10 Technical JCSG supplemental capacity questions (4277 through 4286); and 20 JPAT 7 questions (1400 through 1417, 1420, 1421). MDA Headquarters reviewed the targeted data call questions and further targeted those questions to major MDA office sites. We did not validate the MDA Headquarters' selection process. However, MDA did not comply with the requirement for all stand-alone facilities and host installations, which included leased facilities, to answer JPAT 7 and COBRA data call questions. MDA did request all stand-alone facilities and host installations to answer the JPAT 7 data call questions, however, the Alabama responses were provided by Redstone Arsenal, Colorado responses were provided by Schriever Air Force Base, and the

NCR responses were provided by Henderson Hall. We did not audit the accuracy or the supporting documents for the Alabama, Colorado, or the NCR responses that Redstone Arsenal, Schreiver Air Force Base, and Henderson Hall provided to MDA. In addition, the COBRA point of contact advised MDA not to respond to the COBRA questions even though some MDA offices were located in leased facilities. Although this is contrary to OSD BRAC guidance, OSD obtained the information as part of the scenario data call as applicable.

MDA Headquarters targeted the second data call questions to six sites that included the major MDA offices located in NCR, Alabama (2 sites), California, Colorado, and New Mexico. All responses and supporting documentation for the second data call from the sites located outside the NCR were provided to the MDA Headquarters, Washington, D.C. Therefore, we evaluated the responses and supporting documentation at MDA Headquarters. The MDA second data call questions are shown in Appendix D. We did not verify the accuracy of the responses and supporting documentation for:

- H&SA JCSG military value responses for question numbers 1913 and 1917, which were supported with memorandums for the record. We were unable to verify the accuracy of these responses because no additional supporting documentation existed. In addition, responses to question numbers 1907 and 1908 were not verified because we were unable to validate the steps taken to generate the responses.
- Technical JCSG military value responses from multiple MDA locations for question numbers 3008 through 3015, 3017, 3018, and 3023 were supported with memorandums for the record. We were unable to verify the accuracy of those responses because no additional documentation existed. Also, for the response to question number 3003 we selected a judgmental sample of 47 people, which contained 110 entries, from the universe of 217 people, which included 464 entries.
- H&SA JCSG supplemental capacity responses for question numbers 4099, 4100, 4101, 4102, and 4103 were supported by memorandums for the record. We were unable to verify the accuracy of those responses because no additional documentation existed.

In addition, after our site visit, JPAT 7 requested MDA to update some of its responses based upon new guidance. We did not review the supporting documentation for the changed responses.

In addition to reviewing the second data call responses, we followed up on outstanding issues from the capacity analysis data call. Because of time and funding constraints, we conducted this review at the MDA Headquarters, Washington, D.C. We evaluated the following initial capacity analysis questions at MDA Headquarters for the following major MDA offices:

-
- **Airborne Laser System Program Office located in New Mexico:** Edwards Air Force Base question numbers 301, 687, 690, 691, 692; and Kirkland Air Force Base question number 690.
 - **Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Joint Program Office located in Alabama:** question numbers 690, 691, and 692.
 - **Joint National Integration Center located in Colorado:** question numbers 686, 687, and 690.
 - **Major MDA Offices located in the NCR:** question number 301 for 2 of 28 major MDA offices; question number 311 for 3 of 28 major MDA offices; question numbers 314, 316, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 326, 327, 328, 329 for 1 of 28 major MDA offices; question number 446 for 2 of 28 major MDA offices; question numbers 461 and 462 for 1 of 28 major MDA offices; question number 690 for 28 of 28 major MDA offices; question number 691 for 7 of 28 major MDA offices; and question number 692 for 2 of 28 major MDA offices.
 - **Space Tracking and Surveillance System Program Office located in California:** question numbers 301 and 690.
 - **Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Program Office located in Alabama:** question numbers 461, 690, 691, and 692.

We issued one site memorandum to summarize the results of the second data call site visit. For a list of the question numbers reviewed for each location, see Appendix D.

Scenario Specific Data Call. As of March 17, 2005, MDA Headquarters received four scenario specific data calls from two JCSGs. Specifically, MDA received two H&SA JCSG Scenario Specific Data Calls; H&SA-0048 and H&SA-0049. MDA also received two Technical JCSG Scenario Specific Data Calls; TECH-0002 and TECH-0018. We evaluated the responses and support at the MDA Headquarters, Washington, D.C., site.

Data Integrity. The DoD OIG Data Mining Division reviewed the integrity of the data transferred from the MDA data collection tool to the OSD database. The 17,682 responses in the MDA data collection tool were compared to the 17,640 responses in the OSD database. We evaluated the discrepancies at the MDA Headquarters.

- **57 responses were in the MDA data collection tool but not in the OSD database.** 31 were COBRA responses that MDA did not respond to, 25 were capacity analysis data call questions that OSD deleted, and one response was a duplicate record that did not affect the integrity of the data transfer.

-
- **Text in 3 responses did not match.** Two updates were not sent to the OSD BRAC office. The omission of these two updates caused the three discrepancies. However, these discrepancies will not have a material impact on the JCSG analysis.
 - **15 responses were in the OSD database but not in the MDA data collection tool.** 6 responses were for question number 1909 that was not applicable to MDA, and 9 responses were for question number 3015 for one MDA site that did not provide a response.

We evaluated each of the discrepancies and determined there would be no significant impact on the JCSG's analysis.

We performed this audit from February 2004 through March 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 answers to data call questions because of time constraints. Potential inaccuracies in the data could affect the results. However, the BRAC data were certified as accurate and complete to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief. We did not review the data collection tools used. The Army Audit Agency evaluated the data collection tool and identified no material weaknesses.

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 Federal Real Property and the DoD Support Infrastructure Management high-risk areas.

Management Control Program Review

We did not review the MDA management control program because its provisions did not apply to the one-time data collection process. However, we evaluated the MDA 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 the procedures that MDA used to develop, submit, and document data call responses. In addition, we reviewed the controls implemented to certify and maintain BRAC documentation in accordance with applicable ICPs. Internal controls were adequate as they applied to the audit objective (see the finding for additional details).

Appendix B. Capacity Analysis Data Call Questions Reviewed

Major MDA Offices Two Letter Designations	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
Aegis BMD (AB)	461, 462, 690 and 691	11, 21, 22, 145-149, 301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 314, 317, 354-356, 360, 362-366, 371, 372, 378, 379, 381-387, and 455-457
Airborne Laser (AL) System Program Office	301, 686, 687, and 690-692	4, 11, 21, 22, 145-149, 302, 310, 311, 313, 314, 317, 354-356, 360, 362-366, 371, 372, 378, 379, 381-387, 455-457, 461, and 462
Advanced Systems (AS)	461, 690, and 691	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, and 692
BM/C2 (BC)	311, 461, 462, 690, and 691	11, 301, 302, 310, 313, 314, 317, 455-457, 466, and 692
Cooperative Programs and Allied Support (CF)	311, 371, 386, 387, 461, 690, and 691	301, 302, 310, 313, 462, and 692
Contracting (CT)	461, 462, and 690	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 446-448, 691, and 692
BMDS Executive Officer (DB)	446, 461, and 690-692	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 447, 448, and 462
Director of Communications (DC)		301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 446-448, 461, 462, 690-692
Deputy Director (DD)	461 and 690	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 446-448, 462, 691, and 692
Chief of Staff (DS)	461 and 690	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 446-448, 462, 691, and 692

Major MDA Offices Two Letter Designations	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
Technical Director (DT)	461 and 690	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 446-448, 462, 691, and 692
Executive Director (DX)	461 and 690	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 446-448, 462, 691, and 692
General Counsel (GC)	301, 461, and 690	170, 172, 173, 302, 310, 311, 313, 446-448, 462, 691, and 692
Ground-Based Midcourse Defense (GM)	145-149, 301, 310, 311, 314, 455-457, 462, 687, 690-692	11, 313, and 461
Workforce Management (HR) ¹	446, 461, and 690-692	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 316, 321, 447, 448, 462, 478, 480-482
Joint National Integration Center (IC)	145-149, 301, 310, 314, 317, 354, 356, 362, 364, 371, 382, 385-387, 461, 686, 687, 690-692	11, 22, 302, 311, 313, 355, 360, 363, 365, 366, 372, 378, 379, 381, 383, 384, 455, 456, 457, and 462
Chief Information Officer (IO)	23, 24, 27, 311, 314-316, 318, 319, 321-329, 446, 461, 462, and 690	25, 301, 302, 310, 313, 317, 320, 447, 448, 691, and 692
KE Interceptors (KI)	461 and 690	11, 22, 301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 314, 317, 455-457, 462, 691, and 692
Legislative Affairs (LA)	446, 461, and 690	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 447, 448, 462, and 691, 692
Producibility and Mantech (MP)	461 and 690	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 462, 691, and 692
Program Integration (PI)	301, 446, 461, 462, and 690	302, 310, 311, 313, 447, 448, 691, and 692

¹ The Office of Workforce Management (HR) provided the personnel responses for all offices located in the National Capital Region.

Major MDA Offices Two Letter Designations	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
Safety, Quality, and Mission Assurance (QS)	301, 311, 461, 462, and 690	302, 310, 313, 446, 447, 448, 691, and 692
Resource Management (RM) ²	354, 362, 371, 378, 382, 386, 387, 446, 461, 462, 464, 466, 468, 471, 690, and 691	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 314, 317, 326, 352, 355, 356, 360, 363-366, 372, 379, 381, 383, 384, 385, 447, 448, 455-457, 582, and 692
Small Business (SB)	446, 461, and 690	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 447, 448, 462, 691, and 692
Systems Engineering and Integration (SE)	311, 461, 462, 690, and 691	301, 302, 310, 313, 314, 317, 466, and 692
Security, Intelligence, and Special Programs (SI)	301, 446, 461, 462, and 690	302, 310, 311, 313, 447, 448, 455-457, 691, and 692
BMDS Sensors (SN)	461 and 690	11, 301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 314, 317, 455-457, 462, 691, and 692
Strategic Relations (SR)	461 and 690	11, 301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 446, 447, 448, 462, 691, and 692
Space Tracking and Surveillance System (SS)	301, 461, and 690-692	22, 302, 310, 311, 313, 314, 317, 354-356, 360, 362-366, 371, 372, 378, 379, 381-387, 455-457, and 462
Targets and Countermeasures (TC)	301, 311, 461, and 690-692	4, 11, 21, 22, 302, 310, 313, 314, 317, and 462.

² Resource Management (RM) provided the facility square footage responses for all offices located in the National Capital Region.

Major MDA Offices Two Letter Designations	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
Test and Assessment (TE)	461, 690, and 691	4, 11, 21, 22, 172, 173, 301, 302, 310, 311, 313, 462, and 692
Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (TH)	311, 313, 461, and 690-692	4, 11, 21, 22, 301, 302, 310, 314, 317, 354-356, 360, 362-366, 371, 372, 378, 379, 381-387, 455-457, and 462
Force Structure Integration and Deployment (TR)	461 and 690-692	301, 302, 310, 311, 313, and 462

Appendix C. Capacity Analysis Data Call Immaterial Partially Supported Responses

The Chief Information Office, a major MDA office in the NCR, provided partial support for the responses to question numbers 314, 316, 318, 324, and 329. Specifically, the following responses remain partially supported:

- 80,646 square feet remain unsupported for question number 314,
- 3 contractors remain unsupported for question number 316,
- 6.08 terabytes of maximum data storage capacity and 4.256 terabytes of capacity in use remain unsupported for question number 318,
- 1 contractor remains unsupported for question number 324, and
- 20 users remain unsupported for question number 329.

The System Engineering office, a major MDA office located in the NCR, provided partial support for the responses to question numbers 311 and 462. Specifically, the following responses remain partially supported:

- 422 usable square feet remain unsupported for question number 311,
- 1 contractor remains unsupported for question number 311, and
- 40 contractors remain unsupported for question number 462.

Security, Intelligence and Special Programs, a major MDA office located in the NCR, provided partial support for the responses to question numbers 461 and 462. Specifically, the following responses remain partially supported:

- 30 contractors remain unsupported for question number 461, and
- 10 contractors remain unsupported for question number 462.

All MDA NCR offices partially supported the responses for personnel education levels on question number 690 with documentation from informal surveys.

Seven major MDA offices³ in the NCR provided responses to question number 691 for acquisition workforce function/certification levels of civilian detailees that were partially supported with documentation from informal surveys.

Two major MDA offices⁴ located in the NCR provided responses to question number 692 for military detailees that were partially supported with documentation from informal surveys.

The Airborne Laser Program Office responses from Edwards Air Force Base for question numbers 301, 690, 691, and 692 were not supported because the unit manning document was not available at the time of the site visit. Although this document has been obtained we did not verify those responses because the document is located at Kirkland Air Force Base and we did not revisit that site.

The Airborne Laser Program Office response from Kirkland Air Force Base for question number 690 were partially supported with documentation from informal surveys.

The Space Tracking and Surveillance System Program Office provided partial support for responses to question numbers 301 and 690. Specifically, the following responses remain partially supported:

- the number of gross square feet was not supported by the diagram provided for question number 301,
- contractors was partially supported by a telephone roster for question number 301, and
- education level of Government employees was partially supported by an informal survey for question number 690.

The Joint National Integration Center did not have supporting documentation for the major and unique research, development, test, evaluation, and acquisition equipment and facilities responses for question numbers 686 and 687. Also, the response to question number 690 was partially supported with documentation from informal surveys.

The Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Joint Program Office responses to question number 690, 691, and 692 were partially supported with documentation from informal surveys.

³ The seven major MDA offices include Advanced Systems, Aegis BMD, BM/C², Cooperative Programs and Allied Support, BMDS Executive Officer, Systems Engineering and Integration, and Targets and Countermeasures.

⁴ The two major MDA offices are the BMDS Executive Officer and Targets and Countermeasures.

The Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Program Office responses to question number 461 were from a physical count. Also, responses to question numbers 690, 691, and 692 were partially supported with documentation from informal surveys.

Appendix D. Second Data Call Questions Reviewed

All MDA stand-alone facilities and host installations including leased facilities answered the JPAT 7 data call questions 1400-1417, 1420, and 1421; however, the responses were provided by Redstone Arsenal for Alabama, Schreiver Air Force Base for Colorado, and Henderson Hall for the NCR. We did not audit the accuracy or the support for the Alabama, Colorado, or the NCR responses provided to MDA by Redstone Arsenal, Schreiver Air Force Base, and Henderson Hall. In addition, JPAT 7 decided to replace JPAT 7 questions 1418 and 1419 with JPAT 7 questions 1420 and 1421.

Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
MDA NCR Headquarters, Washington, DC	1400-1417, 1420, 1421, 1905, 1907, 1908, 1913, 1916, 1917, 3000-3006, 3009-3012, 3016, 3017, 3019-3024, 3026, 4081, 4099, 4100, 4101, 4102, 4103, and 4277-4282	1901, 1909-1912, 1914, 1915, 1959, 3007, 3025, and 3027
MDA Alabama office, Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Program Office (THAAD PO) and Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Joint Program Office (GMD JPO), Huntsville, Alabama	1400-1417, 1420, 1421, 3000-3004, 3008-3015, 3019-3021, 3024, 3026, 4277-4279, 4283, 4284, and 4286	3007, 3025, and 3027
MDA Alaska office, Ground- Based Midcourse Defense Joint Program Office (GMD JPO), Shemya, Alaska	3000-3004, 3008-3015, 3019-3021, 3024, 4277- 4279, and 4286	3007, 3025, and 3027
MDA California office, Space Tracking and Surveillance System Program Office (SS SPO), Los Angeles, California	3000, 3004, 3009-3015, and 4286	3007, 3025, and 3027

Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
MDA Colorado office, Joint National Integration Center (JNIC), Colorado Springs, Colorado	1400-1417, 1420, 1421, 3000-3004, 3006, 3008-3015, 3018-3021, 3024, 4277-4279, and 4283-4286	3007, 3025, and 3027
MDA New Mexico office, Airborne Laser System Program Office (ABL SPO), Albuquerque, New Mexico	3000, and 3010-3012	3007, 3025, and 3027

Appendix E. Prior Coverage

The following DoD OIG site memorandums were issued for the MDA BRAC 2005, and the Army Audit Agency audit report was issued for the automated data collection tool used.

DoD OIG

Site Memorandums

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From the Missile Defense Agency Offices of the Joint National Integration Center, Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Program, Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Joint Program Office, Space Tracking and Surveillance System Program Office, Airborne Laser System Program Office, and the offices located in the National Capital Region to the Missile Defense Agency Headquarters for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," February 23, 2005

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Missile Defense Agency Offices Located in the National Capital Region to the Missile Defense Agency Headquarters for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 12, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Airborne Laser System Program Office to the Missile Defense Agency Headquarters for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 11, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Ground-Based Midcourse Joint Program Office to the Missile Defense Agency Headquarters for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 6, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Joint National Integration Center to the Missile Defense Agency Headquarters for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 3, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Program Office to the Missile Defense Agency Headquarters for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," April 30, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Space Tracking and Surveillance System Program Office to the Missile Defense Agency Headquarters for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," April 29, 2004

Army Audit Agency

Army Audit Agency Memorandum No. A-2004-0184-IMT, "Review of Online Data Collection Tool: Process Controls," February 20, 2004

Appendix F. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Director, Base Realignment and Closure (Installations and Environment)
Director, Missile Defense Agency

Non-Defense Federal Organization

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, Acquisition Management and Technology prepared this report. Personnel of the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General who contributed to the report are listed below.

Deborah L. Culp
Bruce A. Burton
Rudolf Noordhuizen
Mary Hoover
Kendall Alexis
Jacqueline Pugh