

May 10, 2005



Infrastructure and Environment

**Defense Information Systems Agency
Data Call Submissions and Internal
Control Processes for Base Realignment
and Closure 2005 (D-2005-070)**

Department of Defense
Office of Inspector General

Quality

Integrity

Accountability

Additional Copies

To request additional copies of this report, contact Mr. Bruce A. Burton at 703-604-9071 (DSN 664-9071) or Ms. Dianna J. Pearson at 703-604-9063 (DSN 664-9063).

Suggestions for Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request 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 Office of the 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 20315-5000
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
DISA	Defense Information Systems Agency
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
OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense



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

May 10, 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY

SUBJECT: Report on Defense Information Systems Agency Data Call Submissions
and Internal Control Processes for Base Realignment and Closure 2005
(Report Project No. D-2005-070)

We are providing this report for information and use. No written response to this report is required, and none was received. Therefore, we are publishing this report in final form. We performed the audit in response to a 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. Bruce A. Burton at (703) 604-9071 (DSN 664-9071) or Ms. Dianna J. Pearson at (703) 604-9063 (DSN 664-9063). See Appendix E 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".

Mary L. Ugone
Assistant Inspector General
Acquisition and Technology Management

Department of Defense Office of the Inspector General

Report No. D-2005-070

May 10, 2005

(Project No. D2004-D000AB-0087.000)

Defense Information Systems 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 Defense Information Systems Agency management personnel should read this report. The report discusses the adequacy, completeness, and integrity of the data provided by the Defense Information Systems 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 DoD 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. We issued 37* site memorandums for the capacity analysis data call and 18 site memorandums for the second data call. Each memorandum summarized site visit results. This report summarizes issues related to the data calls as of May 2, 2005, for the Defense Information Systems Agency Base Realignment and Closure 2005 process.

* We visited 36 sites for the capacity analysis data call but had to revisit two sites because DISA omitted buildings located at the sites. Therefore, we prepared a total of 37 site memorandums for the 36 sites visited for the capacity analysis data call.

Defense Information Systems Agency. The Defense Information Systems Agency is a combat support agency responsible for planning, engineering, acquiring, fielding, and supporting global net-centric solutions to serve the needs of the President, Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, and other DoD Components, under all conditions of peace and war. The designated core missions of Defense Information Systems Agency are communication, joint command and control, defensive information operations, combat support computing, and joint interoperability support.

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 Defense Information Systems Agency internal control plans for 36 sites for the capacity analysis data call and 18 sites for the second data call (see Appendixes B and C for a list of the judgmentally selected sites visited for the two data calls). We also reviewed supporting documentation at Defense Information Systems Agency Headquarters for the scenario specific data calls for the Headquarters and Support Activities and Technical Joint Cross-Service Groups.

The Defense Information Systems Agency Base Realignment and Closure 2005 data call responses for the sites visited were generally supported, complete, and reasonable after corrections were made, but changes could have been made to the Joint Process Action Team Criterion Number 7 data after the site visits. In addition, the data collection processes generally complied with applicable internal control plans, and the Defense Information Systems Agency internal control plan properly incorporated and supplemented the requirements of the Office of the Secretary of Defense internal control plan. Further, data integrity existed between the Defense Information Systems Agency responses from their data collection tool and the Office of the Secretary of Defense database. However, the Defense Information Systems Agency did not support 67 questions for the capacity analysis data call and did not answer or support 42 questions for the second data call. For the 12 scenario specific data calls, the Defense Information Systems Agency partially supported 4 scenarios and did not support 8 scenarios. Subsequent to our site visit, the scenarios that we reviewed were either revised or deleted. In addition, the Defense Information Systems Agency allowed sites to certify data without reviewing supporting documentation; and Base Realignment and Closure 2005 data was not always marked, stored in a central location, or readily available for review. The issues identified should not affect the reliability or integrity of the overall Defense Information Systems Agency Base Realignment and Closure 2005 process.

Management Comments. We provided a draft of this report on April 22, 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	
Defense Information Systems Agency Base Realignment and Closure 2005 Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes	4
Appendixes	
A. Scope and Methodology	11
B. Capacity Analysis Data Call Sites Visited and Questions Reviewed	16
C. Second Data Call Sites Visited and Questions Reviewed	23
D. Prior Coverage	26
E. Report Distribution	33

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 addressed issues that affect common business-oriented support functions, examine functions in the context of facilities, and develop closure and realignment recommendations based on the 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), 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 with 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
 - The scenario specific data calls gathered data related to specific scenario conditions for realignment or closure.

Internal Control Plans. The internal control plans (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, and Defense agencies 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. The Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) prepared, "Internal Control Plan for Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) for 2005," on January 15, 2004, and then updated the ICP on July 20, 2004. The update was necessary to provide an exception for marking BRAC data. The DISA ICP requires that all BRAC data be marked with headers and footers. DISA used the Army's modified online automated data collection tool for the BRAC 2005 process, which printed the markings at the beginning of each question, and not in the headers and footers as required. Therefore, DISA allowed the exception so that data printed from the automated tool would be compliant.

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

DISA. DISA is a combat support agency responsible for planning, engineering, acquiring, fielding, and supporting global net-centric solutions to serve the needs of the President, Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, and other DoD Components, under all conditions of peace and war. The designated core missions of DISA are communication, joint command and control, defensive information operations, combat support computing, and joint interoperability support. We visited 36² sites for the capacity analysis data call, 18 sites for the second data call, and 1 site for the scenario specific data calls. See Appendix B

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 We visited 36 sites for the capacity analysis data call but had to revisit two sites because DISA omitted buildings located at the sites. Therefore, we prepared a total of 37 site memorandums for the 36 sites visited for the capacity analysis data call.

for a list of sites visited and the question numbers reviewed for the capacity analysis data call and Appendix C for a list of sites visited and the questions reviewed for the second data call.

Objectives

The overall objective of the audit was to evaluate the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of data that DISA collected and submitted for the BRAC 2005 process. In addition, we evaluated whether DISA complied with the OSD and DISA 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 and the review on the management control program related to the audit objectives. See Appendix D for prior coverage.

DISA BRAC 2005 Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes

The responses that the DISA sites visited provided were generally supported, complete, and reasonable, after corrections were made. Also, the sites generally complied with the ICP requirements and the DISA ICP properly incorporated and supplemented the requirements of the OSD ICP. Further, data integrity existed between the DISA responses from their data collection tool and the OSD database. However, DISA did not complete all recommended actions for the data calls and did not fully comply with the ICP requirements as shown below.

- DISA did not support responses to 67 questions at 8 of the 36 sites visited for the capacity analysis data call;
- DISA did not answer or support responses to 42 questions at 9 of the 18 sites visited for the second data call;
- DISA partially supported 4 scenario specific data calls and did not support 8 scenario specific data calls; however, subsequent to our visit, the scenarios that we reviewed were either revised or deleted;
- DISA allowed 4 sites for the capacity analysis data call and 4 sites for the second data call to certify data without determining the validity and integrity of supporting documentation; and
- DISA BRAC data was not always marked, stored in a central location, or readily available for review.

The issues identified should not affect the reliability or integrity of the overall DISA BRAC 2005 process.

DISA BRAC 2005 Data Call Submissions

The BRAC 2005 data reported by DISA sites visited were generally supported, complete, and reasonable, after corrections were made. For each site, DISA Headquarters forwarded specific targeted questions to the sites, and we evaluated the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of the responses. Specifically, we compared responses to supporting documentation and reviewed “not applicable” question responses to determine whether they were reasonable and not default responses.

Capacity Analysis Data Call. DISA sites visited for the capacity analysis data call provided reasonable responses and adequate support, after corrections were made. For the capacity analysis data call, DISA Headquarters received

753 questions from the OSD BRAC office. DISA Headquarters BRAC personnel reviewed the questions and targeted 165 of the 753 questions to 78 DISA locations in the United States. We evaluated the responses and support for 36 sites (see Appendix B for a list of sites visited and questions reviewed). In addition, we also reviewed the reasonableness and support for “not applicable” responses to ensure the response submitted was not an erroneous default. We determined that the “not applicable” responses were reasonable. However, at the sites visited, we identified responses with inadequate supporting documentation and inaccurate responses and, as a result, DISA personnel revised responses and provided documentation to support the changes. DISA agreed with the recommended action required but had not completed that action for 67 questions at 8 of the 36 sites visited. As of May 2, 2005, the following sites had questions that we still considered unsupported:

1. DISA Headquarters, Columbia Pike, Arlington, Virginia, had 5 unsupported questions (numbers 314, 316, 324, 327, and 462);
2. Defense Spectrum Office, Hoffman Building One, Alexandria, Virginia, had 3 unsupported questions (numbers 314, 316, and 462);
3. Defense Technical Information Center Headquarters, Fort Belvoir, Virginia, had 10 unsupported questions³ (numbers 314, 315, 319, 320, 325, 330, 456, 457, 463, and 465). In addition, Defense Technical Information Center Headquarters certified data for its Northeastern, Southwestern, Midwestern, and Western sites. As of May 2, 2005, question number 301 was unsupported for all four sites and question number 304 was unsupported for the Northwestern site;
4. DISA Continuity of Operations Test Facility, Slidell, Louisiana, certified data for the four liaison offices located at Army Communications and Electronics Command, Air Force Electronics Systems Command, Navy Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, and Army III Corps. As of May 2, 2005, the four liaison offices had 28 unsupported questions (numbers 199, 200, 301, 302, 304, 305, and 582 at the four sites);
5. DISA Headquarters Building 12, Arlington, Virginia, had 3 unsupported questions (numbers 314, 316, and 325);
6. DISA Headquarters, Skyline Building 5, Falls Church, Virginia, had 2 unsupported questions (numbers 314 and 462);
7. DISA Headquarters, Skyline Building 7, Falls Church, Virginia, had 5 unsupported questions (numbers 314, 316, 324, 327, and 462); and
8. White House Communications Agency, Washington, D.C., had 6 unsupported questions (numbers 11, 314, 317, 319, 325, and 582).

³ Responses for question numbers 330, 456, and 457 should be changed to “not applicable.”

We concurred with DISA rationale for the responses and the proposed action to revise documentation to support the responses but did not verify the revisions. We did not consider the issues to affect the reliability or integrity of data submitted for the BRAC 2005 analysis.

Second Data Call. The DISA sites visited for the second data call generally provided reasonable responses and adequate supporting documentation after corrections were made. The JCSGs targeted questions for the second data call and DISA Headquarters BRAC personnel reviewed the questions and forwarded the questions to DISA sites within the United States. We evaluated the responses and supporting documentation at 18 locations that we visited during the second data call. We also evaluated the “not applicable” responses for reasonableness and support to ensure that responses submitted were not an erroneous default. We determined that the “not applicable” responses were reasonable. However, we identified responses with inadequate support and inaccurate responses and, as a result, DISA sites revised their responses and provided documentation to support the changes. We also determined that DISA Headquarters did not provide COBRA question numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507 to the DISA sites visited. Further, as of May 2, 2005, DISA had not provided documentation to support its rationale for not responding. Based on our review, we determined that DISA had not completed action for 42 questions at 9 of the 18 sites visited for the second data call. Also, as of May 2, 2005, the following sites had questions that we still considered unanswered or unsupported:

1. DISA Headquarters, Columbia Pike, Arlington, Virginia, had 3 unanswered COBRA questions (numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507); and 1 unsupported H&SA JCSG supplemental capacity question (number 4096);
2. Computer Services Division Headquarters (certified data for Financial Management Liaison Office, which is also shown below), Denver, Colorado, had 3 unanswered COBRA questions (numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507);
3. Defense Enterprise Computing Center (certified for Defense Enterprise Computing Center, St. Louis, U.S. Transportation Command Support Office Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, which had no outstanding issues), Saint Louis, Missouri, had 3 unanswered COBRA questions (numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507);
4. Defense Spectrum Office, Hoffman Building One, Alexandria, Virginia, had 3 unanswered COBRA questions (numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507);
5. DISA Continuity of Operations Test Facility (certified data for 4 liaisons offices: Army Communications and Electronics Command, Air Force Electronics Systems Command, Navy Space And Naval Warfare Systems Command, and Army III Corps), Slidell, Louisiana,

had 3 unanswered COBRA questions (numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507) and 12 unsupported H&SA JCSG supplemental capacity questions at the 4 liaison offices (numbers 4072, 4073, and 4074 were unsupported at the 4 sites);

6. Financial Management Liaison Office, Pensacola, Florida, had 3 unanswered COBRA questions (numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507);
7. DISA Headquarters, Skyline Building 5, Falls Church, Virginia, had 3 unanswered COBRA questions (numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507) and 1 unsupported H&SA JCSG supplemental capacity question (number 4096);
8. DISA Headquarters, Skyline Building 7, Falls Church, Virginia, had 3 unanswered COBRA questions (numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507); and 1 unsupported H&SA JCSG supplemental capacity question (number 4096); and
9. Joint Spectrum Center, Annapolis, Maryland, had 3 unanswered COBRA questions (numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507).

The JPAT 7 made the decision to replace JPAT 7 question numbers 1418 and 1419 with question numbers 1420 and 1421. However, DISA did not provide the activities with the questions until after our site visits. Therefore, we did not verify documentation supporting the responses for question numbers 1420 and 1421. Further, we did not determine whether the support was reasonable or accurate for H&SA JCSG military value question numbers 1907⁴ and 1908⁵ because we were unable to validate the steps taken to generate the responses. As of May 2, 2005, DISA had not provided applicable documentation for the unanswered and unsupported questions.

Scenario Specific Data Calls. DISA provided reasonable responses but did not always provide documentation that fully supported the scenario specific data calls. However, as a result of our site visit, DISA Headquarters agreed to provide additional supporting documentation. For example, we requested documentation to show why DISA personnel data reported to the JCSGs differed from the personnel data shown on the official personnel records. DISA Headquarters received 12 scenario specific data calls from the JCSGs, 10 from the H&SA JCSG and 2 from the Technical JCSG, as of March 4, 2005. As of May 2, 2005, DISA had not provided the supporting documentation to adequately support the data calls. The status of the scenario specific data calls was shown below.

- Four H&SA JCSG scenario specific data calls were partially supported (HSA-0045, HSA-0046, HSA-0089, and HSA-0090);

⁴ The question asks for the number of meetings between an organization's senior officials, including flag and general officers, and senior officials from another organization located in the Washington, D.C., area.

⁵ The question asks for the number of meetings between an organization's senior officials, including flag and general officers, and Members of Congress or their staffs.

-
- Six H&SA JCSG scenario specific data calls were unsupported (HSA-0029, HSA-0030, HSA-0031, HSA-0088, HSA-0096, and HSA-0097); and
 - Two Technical JCSG scenario specific data calls were unsupported (TECH-0030 and TECH-0047).

Subsequent to our visit, the scenarios that we reviewed were either revised or deleted. Therefore, the documentation we requested is no longer applicable and no further action is required by DISA.

Internal Control Processes

The DISA sites generally complied with the applicable ICPs for data collection processes for the capacity analysis data call, the second data call, and the scenario specific data call. Further, the DISA ICP properly incorporated and supplemented the OSD ICP requirements for certifying, marking, storing, and providing access to data used for the BRAC 2005 process.

We evaluated the compliance with the DISA ICP at 36 sites for the capacity analysis data call, 18 sites for the second data call, and DISA Headquarters for the scenario specific data calls. We reviewed whether the sites visited completed nondisclosure agreements, marked BRAC data, and safeguarded data. However, we determined that DISA sites visited did not fully comply with the DISA and OSD ICPs as follows.

Certification of BRAC Data. Public Law 101-510, "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990," as amended, section 2903(c)(5) requires that all information used to develop and submit realignment and closure recommendations to the Secretary of Defense or the 2005 Defense BRAC Commission, or both, be certified as accurate and complete to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief. The DISA ICP properly incorporated the OSD ICP requirements to certify BRAC 2005 data for accuracy and completeness.

BRAC Data Collection and Certification. The DISA ICP provided guidance on the collection and certification of BRAC data within the agency's organizational structure. Based on the guidance, four DISA sites certified BRAC 2005 data from data entry sites for the capacity analysis data call and the second data call without reviewing supporting documentation. We reviewed the supporting documentation at two data entry sites for each data call. See Appendix A for a discussion on the sites that certified data without reviewing supporting documentation and for the status of our review on the sites. According to the DISA ICP, supporting documentation for each data call question only needs to be available at the site where the data were entered for review. However, because the certification site was different from the data entry site, the certifying site did not have access to the supporting documentation to validate the BRAC responses.

Compliance With OSD and DISA ICPs. Documentation supporting BRAC data was not always marked, stored in a central location, or readily available for review, as required by the ICP. According to the DISA ICP, documentation supporting the BRAC 2005 process must be properly marked with the required BRAC headers and footers. Because the tool that DISA used for collecting and reporting BRAC data printed the header and footer before each BRAC question, DISA revised its ICP to allow the exception for items printed from its tool. However, for each data call, we found that not all BRAC documentation was properly marked. Based on our discussions during the review, DISA sites agreed to mark all BRAC documentation in accordance with the ICP. In addition, DISA sites did not always store BRAC data in a central location, as required by the DISA ICP. However, DISA determined that the documentation would remain with the initiator of the data and not in a central location. Finally, data stored with the initiators of the data were not readily available for review. However, we determined that documentation that we reviewed was properly safeguarded at each site visited.

Data Integrity

Data integrity⁶ existed between the DISA 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 DISA data collection tool to the OSD database. From the 35,785 responses provided by DISA, the Data Mining Division identified the following discrepancies:

- 26 responses were in the DISA data collection tool but were not in the OSD database;
- 72 responses were in the OSD database but were not in the DISA data collection tool; and
- Text in 2 responses did not match.

We evaluated the discrepancies between the databases and determined that there should be no significant impact on the integrity of data or on the JCSGs' analyses.

⁶ Data integrity is the condition existing when data is unchanged from its source and has not been accidentally or maliciously modified, altered, or destroyed.

See Appendix A for a discussion of the details on the discrepancies. The DoD OIG Data Mining Division will be issuing a separate memorandum on their review of the DISA and OSD databases.

Conclusion

DISA BRAC 2005 data call responses for the sites that we visited were generally supported, complete, and reasonable, after corrections were made. However, DISA did not fully support 67 questions at 8 of 36 sites for the capacity analysis data call, had 42 unanswered or unsupported questions at 9 of 18 sites for the second data call, and did not fully support 12 scenario specific data calls at the 1 site visited. Subsequent to our visit, the scenarios that we reviewed were either revised or deleted. Therefore, the documentation we requested is no longer applicable and no further action is required by DISA. For the DISA sites visited, DISA generally complied with the ICPs. However, DISA allowed sites to certify data without reviewing supporting documentation and BRAC 2005 data were not always marked, stored in a central location, or readily available for review. The issues identified should not affect the reliability or integrity of the overall DISA BRAC 2005 process. We discussed the issues identified with DISA management. DISA concurred with the findings and stated that it will take action, as appropriate, to resolve the outstanding issues.

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

We evaluated the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of DISA BRAC 2005 data. The evaluation compared responses to supporting documentation and reviewed “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 DISA ICP incorporated and supplemented the requirements of the OSD ICP; whether site data collection procedures were in compliance with DISA 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. DISA Headquarters received 753 capacity analysis data call questions from the OSD BRAC office. DISA Headquarters reviewed the data call questions and targeted the data call questions to various DISA sites. We did not validate the selection process or the questions that were not forwarded to the sites. We identified 78 DISA sites that responded to the data call. However, we selected only those sites to review that had more than 25 people. Because of time and money constraints, we did not visit the DISA sites located in Hawaii. We also did not visit some sites whose data were certified by the sites that we visited. The sites that certified other sites for the capacity analysis data call follow.

- Defense Technical Information Center Headquarters, Fort Belvoir, Virginia, certified BRAC data for regional sites that included Northeastern, Southwestern, Midwestern, and Western sites. We did not verify or validate supporting documentation at the regional sites.
- Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Saint Louis, Missouri, certified BRAC data for an additional site, the Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Saint Louis, U.S. Transportation Command Support Office. We verified and validated supporting documentation at the additional site.
- DISA Continuity of Operations Test Facility, Slidell, Louisiana, certified BRAC data for DISA liaison offices located at Army III Corps, Army Communications and Electronics Command, Naval Warfare Systems Command, and Air Force Electronics Systems Command. We did not verify or validate BRAC data at the liaison sites.
- Joint Interoperability Test Command, Fort Huachuca, Arizona, certified for the Indian Head, Maryland, site. We verified and validated supporting documentation at both sites.

At each site visited, we reviewed the data call responses and the documentation supporting the responses. We issued 37 site memorandums to summarize the

results of the visits at 36⁷ sites. The DISA sites visited and the capacity analysis data call questions that DISA Headquarters targeted to the DISA sites are shown in Appendix B.

Second Data Call. DISA Headquarters received targeted questions from the JCSGs. Specifically, DISA responded to 31 H&SA JCSG military value questions (numbers 1900, 1904 through 1919, 1921, 1925, 1926, 1947, 1949 through 1951, 1953, 1956, 1958, and 1961 through 1964); 18 JPAT 7 questions⁸ (numbers 1400 through 1417), 13 H&SA JCSG supplemental capacity questions (numbers 4001, 4072 through 4074, 4079 through 4081, 4096, and 4099 through 4103); 8 COBRA questions (numbers 1500 through 1507); and 10 Technical JCSG military value questions (numbers 3001, 3002, 3004, 3012, 3013, 3019, 3021, and 3025 through 3027). DISA reviewed the questions and selected specific questions to further target to DISA sites. We did not validate the selection process or the questions that were not forwarded to the sites. However, except for COBRA question numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507, DISA generally complied with the OSD requirement for stand-alone facilities, which included the leased facilities, to answer the JPAT 7 and COBRA data call questions.

Because of time and funding constraints, we selected leased sites and sites that were located close to the leased sites to visit for the second data call. Therefore, we selected 18 sites to visit for the second data call. After our site visits, the JPAT 7 replaced question numbers 1418 and 1419 with question numbers 1420 and 1421. We did not revisit sites to validate responses or supporting documentation for the questions. Also, we did not determine whether the support was reasonable or accurate for H&SA JCSG military value question numbers 1907⁹ and 1908¹⁰ because we were unable to validate the steps taken to generate the responses. Further, we did not visit some sites whose data were certified by the sites that we visited. The sites that certified other sites for the second data call are shown below.

- Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Saint Louis, Missouri, also certified second data call BRAC data for the Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Saint Louis, U.S. Transportation Command Support Office. We verified and validated supporting documentation at the Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Saint Louis, U.S. Transportation Command Support Office for the second data call.

⁷ We identified 36 sites for the capacity analysis data call but had to revisit two sites because DISA omitted buildings located at the sites. Therefore, we prepared a total number of 37 site memorandums for the 36 sites visited for the capacity analysis data call.

⁸ JPAT 7 made the decision to replace JPAT 7 question numbers 1418 and 1419 with JPAT 7 question numbers 1420 and 1421.

⁹ The question asks for the number of meetings between an organization's senior officials, including flag and general officers, and senior officials from another organization located in the Washington, D.C., area.

¹⁰ The question asks for the number of meetings between an organization's senior officials, including flag and general officers, and Members of Congress or their staffs.

-
- DISA Continuity of Operations Test Facility, Slidell, Louisiana, also certified second data call BRAC data for DISA liaison offices located at Army III Corps, Army Communications and Electronics Command, Naval Warfare Systems Command, and Air Force Electronics Systems Command. We did not verify or validate BRAC data at the liaison sites for the second data call.
 - Joint Interoperability Test Command, Fort Huachuca, Arizona, also certified for the Indian Head, Maryland, site. We verified and validated supporting documentation at both locations for the second data call.
 - Computer Services Division Headquarters, Denver, Colorado, certified data for DISA Financial Management Liaison Office, Pensacola, Florida. We did not verify or validate BRAC data at the Pensacola location for the second data call.

At each site visited, we evaluated the data call responses and the documentation supporting the responses. We issued 18 site memorandums to summarize the results of those site visits. The DISA sites that we visited and the second data call questions are shown in Appendix C.

Scenario Specific Data Calls. As of the site visit on February 28, 2005, DISA Headquarters received 12 scenario specific data calls from OSD and submitted responses. We evaluated responses and followed up on outstanding issues from the capacity analysis and second data calls. The following identifies the scenario specific data calls reviewed and the additional followup from the previous data calls at DISA Headquarters.

- H&SA JCSG Scenario Specific Data Calls (scenario numbers HSA-0029, HSA-0030, HSA-0031, HSA-0045, HSA-0046, HSA-0088, HSA-0089, HSA-0090, HSA-0096, and HSA-0097);
- Technical JCSG Scenario Specific Data Calls (scenario numbers TECH-0030 and TECH-0047);
- Status on recommended action related to the 37 site memorandums for the capacity analysis data call; and
- Status on recommended action related to the 18 site memorandums for the second data call.

Documentation provided for the scenario specific data calls did not fully support the responses. However, subsequent to our visit, the scenarios that we reviewed were either revised or deleted. Therefore, the documentation we requested is no longer applicable and no further action is required by DISA.

Data Integrity. The DoD OIG Data Mining Division reviewed the integrity of the data transferred from the DISA data collection tool to the OSD database. The

35,785 responses in the DISA database were compared to the 35,801 responses in the OSD database. We reviewed the discrepancies between the databases to determine if the discrepancies would have a material impact on the JCSGs' analyses.

- **26 responses were in the DISA data collection tool but were not in the OSD database.** Of the 26 questions, DISA submitted a response of "not applicable" to 25 questions. The 25 questions were subsequently deleted from the OSD database. For the remaining question, the discrepancy occurred because OSD provided more columns for the response than required. We determined that the 26 discrepancies should have no material impact on the JCSGs' analyses.
- **72 responses were in the OSD database but were not in the DISA data collection tool.** Of the 72 questions, 61 discrepancies occurred because DISA submitted a response of "not applicable" in one column and did not provide responses for the remaining columns. The remaining 11 discrepancies also occurred because of "not applicable" responses. The 72 discrepancies should have no material impact on the JCSGs' analyses.
- **Text in 2 responses did not match.** DISA had no record of the responses in the OSD database. However, the 2 questions were "not applicable" to DISA. Therefore, the 2 discrepancies should have no material impact on the JCSGs' analyses.

We performed this audit from January 2004 through May 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 affect the results. DISA stated that the BRAC data were certified as accurate and complete to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief. Further, we did not review the automated data collection tools used. The Army Audit Agency evaluated the online automated 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 DISA management control program because its provisions did not apply to the one-time data collection process. However, we evaluated the

DISA 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 DISA used to develop, submit, and document data call responses. In addition, we reviewed the controls implemented to maintain BRAC documentation in accordance with applicable ICPs. Management controls were adequate as they applied to the audit objective. See the finding section for additional details.

Appendix B. Capacity Analysis Data Call Sites Visited and Questions Reviewed

DISA Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
Business Management Center, Computer Services – Logistics, and Operations, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania	23, 24, 27, 314, 318, 319, 321, 322, 324, 326, 465, and 582	11, 25, 28, 29, 40, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 303-305, 315-317, 320, 323, 325, 327, 330, 340, 455, 456, 457, 463, 467, 473-476, and 621
Computing Services Division Headquarters, Denver, Colorado	11, 24, 27, 210, 214, 219, 310, 311, 313, 314, 319, 321, 324, 327, 330, 445, 456, 457, and 582	23, 25, 28-31, 40, 198-200, 211-213, 215-218, 220-225, 230-238, 246, 247, 291-293, 297, 298, 315-318, 320, 322, 323, 325, 326, 340, 455, 473-476, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Columbus, Ohio	11, 23, 24, 27-29, 40, 238, 246, 301, 302, 304, 305, 314-319, 321-327, 330, 340, 455-457, 473, 474, and 582	25, 199, 200, 247, 303, 320, 475, 476, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania	11, 23-25, 27-29, 303-305, 314-322, 325-327, 330, 456, 457, 463, 465, 467, 582, and 590	40, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 323, 324, 340, 455, 473-476, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Ogden, Utah	11, 23-25, 27-29, 40, 199, 200, 246, 247, 301-305, 314-319, 321-324, 326, 327, 330, 340, 455-457, and 582	238, 320, 325, 473-476, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	11, 23-25, 27-29, 40, 301, 302, 304, 305, 314-316, 318-327, and 582	199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 303, 317, 330, 340, 455-457, 473-476, and 621

DISA Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Saint Louis, Missouri	23-25, 27-29, 210, 246, 310, 311, 314-317, 322, 325-327, 330, 340, 455-457, 473, 474, and 582	11, 30, 31, 40, 198-200, 211-225, 230-238, 247, 291-293, 297, 298, 313, 318-321, 323, 324, 445, 475, 476, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Saint Louis, Missouri, certified data for: Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Saint Louis, U.S. Transportation Command Support Office	23, 24, 27, 318, 321, and 322	11, 25, 28, 29, 40, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 301-305, 314-317, 319, 320, 323-327, 330, 340, 455-457, 473-476, 582, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Dayton, Ohio	23-25, 27-29, 301-303, 314-327, 456, and 582	11, 40, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 304, 305, 330, 340, 455, 457, 473-476, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Denver, Colorado	11, 23, 24, 27, 199, 200, 301-305, 314, 316, 317, 319, 321-327, 330, 456, 457, and 582	25, 28, 29, 40, 238, 246, 247, 315, 318, 320, 340, 455, 473-476, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Huntsville, Alabama	11, 23-25, 27-29, 40, 238, 246, 301, 303-305, 314, 316, 319, 321, 322, 324, 326, 327, 330, 455, 456, 582, and 621	199, 200, 247, 302, 315, 317, 318, 320, 323, 325, 340, 457, 473-475, and 476
Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Jacksonville, Florida	23-25, 27-29, 301-303, 314, 316-319, 321, 322, 324, 326, 327, 330, 455-457, 582, and 590	11, 40, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 304, 305, 315, 320, 323, 325, 340, 473-476, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment/Software Support Office, Montgomery, Alabama	11, 23-25, 27, 301-305, 315, 316, 318-322, 325, 326, 455-457, and 582	28, 29, 40, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 314, 317, 323, 324, 327, 330, 340, 473-476, and 621

DISA Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Norfolk, Virginia	23-25, 27-29, 301, 303, 314-327, 330, 456, and 582	11, 40, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 302, 304, 305, 340, 455, 457, 473-476, 590, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Rock Island, Illinois	11, 23, 24, 27, 40, 238, 246, 247, 301-305, 314-316, 318-323, 326, 327, 455, 456, and 582	25, 28, 29, 199, 200, 317, 324, 325, 330, 340, 457, 473-476, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, San Antonio, Texas	11, 23-25, 27-29, 40, 238, 246, 301, 302, 304, 305, 314-322, 326, 455-457, and 582	199, 200, 247, 303, 323-325, 327, 330, 340, 473-476, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, San Diego, California	11, 23, 25, 27-29, 301-303, 321, 324, 326, 327, 330, 456, 457, 582, and 590	24, 40, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 304, 305, 314-320, 322, 323, 325, 340, 455, 473-476, and 621
Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Warner Robins, Georgia	11, 23-25, 301, 302, 314, 316, 318, 320-322, 327, 456, 457, and 582	27-29, 40, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 303-305, 315, 317, 319, 323-326, 330, 340, 455, 473-476, and 621
Defense Information Technology Contracting Organization, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois	11, 199, 200, 301-303, 305, 340, 474, 476, and 582	40, 238, 246, 247, 304, 323-327, 330, 455-457, 473, 475, and 621
Defense Spectrum Office, Hoffman Building One, Alexandria, Virginia	23, 24, 27, 85, 314, 316, 319, 322, 324, 327, 462, 466, and 582	11, 25, 28-31, 40, 84, 198-200, 210-225, 230-238, 246, 247, 291-293, 297, 298, 310, 315, 317, 318, 320, 321, 323, 325, 326, 330, 340, 445, 455-457, 464, 473-476, and 621

DISA Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
Defense Technical Information Center Headquarters, Fort Belvoir, Virginia	23, 24, 27, 40, 304, 305, 314-316, 318-322, 325, 330, 456, 457, 463, 465, 467, and 621	11, 25, 28, 29, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 303, 317, 323, 324, 326, 327, 340, 455, 473-476, and 582
Defense Technical Information Center Headquarters, Fort Belvoir, Virginia, certified data for:		
Defense Technical Information Center, Northeastern, Southwestern, Midwestern, and Western	301 and 304	11, 199, 200, 302-305, 330, 455, and 582
DISA Continental United States, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois	11, 23-25, 27, 40, 301-303, 314, 316-322, 324, 326, 327, 455, and 582	28, 29, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 304, 305, 315, 323, 325, 330, 340, 456, 457, 473-476, and 621
DISA Continuity of Operations Test Facility, Slidell, Louisiana	11, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 40, 198, 219, 291, 292, 303, 310, 311, 314-319, 330, 445, 455-457, and 621	25, 28, 29, 84, 85, 199, 200, 210-218, 220-225, 230-238, 246, 247, 293, 297, 298, 304, 305, 313, 320-327, 340, 473-476, and 582
DISA Continuity of Operations Test Facility, Slidell, Louisiana, certified data for the liaisons offices below:		
Army Communications and Electronics Command, Air Force Electronics Systems Command, Navy Space And Naval Warfare Systems Command, and Army III Corps	11, 199, 200, 301-305, 330, 455, 582, and 590	
DISA, Fort Detrick, Maryland	324, 456, 463, and 465	11, 40, 84, 85, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 303-305, 323, 325-327, 330, 340, 455, 457, 467, 473-476, 582, and 621

DISA Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
DISA Field Security Operations, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania	11, 304, 456, 463, 465, and 467	40, 199, 200, 238, 303, 305, 321-327, 330, 340, 455, 457, 473-476, 582, and 621
DISA Headquarters, Building 1, Arlington, Virginia	11, 23, 24, 85, 317, 319, 456, 463, and 582	25, 27-29, 40, 84, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 303-305, 314-316, 318, 320-324, 325-327, 330, 340, 455, 457, 465, 467, 473-476, 590, and 621
DISA Headquarters, Building 2, Arlington, Virginia	11, 23-25, 27-29, 85, 314-319, 321, 322, 324-327, 456, 457, 463, 465, and 582	40, 84, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 303-305, 320, 323, 330, 340, 455, 467, 473-476, 590, and 621
DISA Headquarters, Building 12, Arlington, Virginia	11, 23-25, 27, 85, 314, 316, 317, 319-322, 324-327, 340, 456, 457, 463, 465, 474, and 582	28, 29, 40, 84, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 303-305, 315, 318, 323, 330, 455, 467, 473, 475, 476, 590, and 621
DISA Headquarters, Columbia Pike, Arlington, Virginia	23, 25, 27, 85, 314, 316, 317, 319, 322, 324, 327, 340, 456, 457, 462, 466, 474, and 582	11, 24, 28-31, 40, 84, 198-200, 210-225, 230-238, 246, 247, 291-293, 297, 298, 310, 315, 318, 320, 321, 323, 325, 326, 330, 445, 455, 464, 473, 475, 476, and 621
DISA, Pentagon, Arlington, Virginia	85, 468, and 582	11, 23-25, 27-29, 40, 84, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 303-305, 314-320, 321-326, 327, 330, 340, 455-457, 473-476, and 621

DISA Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
DISA Headquarters, Skyline Building 5, Falls Church, Virginia	23, 24, 27, 85, 314, 316, 317, 319, 322, 324, 456, 457, 462, 466, and 582	11, 25, 28-31, 40, 84, 198-200, 210-225, 230-238, 246, 247, 291-293, 297, 298, 310, 315, 318, 320, 321, 323, 325-327, 330, 340, 445, 455, 464, 473-476, and 621
DISA Headquarters, Skyline Building 7, Falls Church, Virginia	23-25, 27, 85, 314, 316, 317, 319, 324, 325, 327, 456, 457, 462, 466, 474, and 582	11, 28-31, 40, 84, 198-200, 210-225, 230-238, 246, 247, 291-293, 297, 298, 310, 315, 318, 320-323, 326, 330, 340, 445, 455, 464, 473, 475, 476, and 621
DISA Interoperability Directorate, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey	11, 303, and 456	40, 84, 85, 199, 200, 238, 246, 247, 304, 305, 323-327, 330, 340, 455, 457, 473-476, 582 and 621
Joint Interoperability Test Command, Fort Huachuca, Arizona (certified for Joint Interoperability Test Command, Indian Head, Maryland)	11, 86, 301, 324, 325, 455, 456, 582, 686-688, 690, 691, 700, 736, and 748	23-25, 27-29, 40, 85, 171, 198, 238, 246, 247, 254, 302-305, 314-323, 326, 327, 330, 340, 457, 473-476, 621, 689, 692, 693, 699, 701, 732, and 747
Joint Interoperability Test Command, Indian Head, Maryland	11, 40, 246, 688, 690-692, 700, 736, and 748	23-25, 27-29, 84-86, 171, 198-200, 238, 247, 254, 303-305, 314-323, 325-327, 330, 340, 455-457, 463, 465, 467, 473-476, 582, 590, 621, 686, 687, 689, 693, 699, 701, 732, and 747

DISA Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
Joint Spectrum Center, Annapolis, Maryland	11, 23, 24, 27, 40, 210, 214, 215, 219, 231, 232, 235, 236, 246, 291, 297, 310, 314, 316-322, 324-327, 445, 456, 457, 462, 466, and 582	25, 28-31, 198-200, 211-213, 216-218, 220-225, 230, 233, 234, 237, 238, 247, 292, 293, 298, 315, 323, 330, 340, 455, 464, 473-476, and 621
White House Communications Agency, Washington, DC	11, 23-25, 27-29, 40, 199, 200, 238, 246, 303-305, 314-327, 330, 455-457, 463, 465, 467, 582, and 621	247, 340, 473-476, and 590

Appendix C. Second Data Call Sites Visited and Questions Reviewed

DISA Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
Business Management Center, Computer Support – Logistics, and Operations, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania	1961	1962, 4072, 4073, 4074, and 4080
Computing Services Division Headquarters, Denver, Colorado ¹¹ (certified for Financial Management Liaison Office, Pensacola, Florida)	1400-1417, 1501, 1912, and 4096	1502, 1503, 1504, 1506, and 4080
Financial Management Liaison Office, Pensacola, Florida ¹¹	1400-1417, 1501, 1912, and 4096	1502, 1503, 1504, 1506, and 4080
Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania	1961, 1962, 1963, 4072, 4073, and 4080	4074
Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Saint Louis, Missouri ¹¹ (certified for Defense Enterprise Computing Center, St. Louis, U.S. Transportation Command Support Office Scott Air Force Base, Illinois)	1400-1417, 1501, 1912, 1961, 1962, 1963, and 4096	1502, 1503, 1504, 1506, and 4080
Defense Enterprise Computing Center, St. Louis, U.S. Transportation Command Support Office Scott Air Force Base, Illinois	1961	1962, 4072, 4073, 4074, and 4080
Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Denver, Colorado		4072, 4073, 4074, and 4080
Defense Information Technology Contracting Organization, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois	1918, 1921, 1953, 4072, 4073, 4074, and 4080	
Defense Spectrum Office, Hoffman Building One, Alexandria, Virginia ¹¹	1400-1417, 1501, 1503, 1504, 1506, 1912, 4096, 4099, 4100, 4101, 4102, and 4103	1502 and 4080
DISA Continental United States, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois	1961, 1962, 4072, 4073, 4074, and 4080	

¹¹ DISA Headquarters had not sent question numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507 to the sites that we visited.

DISA Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
DISA Continuity of Operations Test Facility, Slidell, Louisiana ¹¹	1400-1417, 1501, 1502, 1503, 1504, 1912, 1961, 1962, 1963, and 4096	1506 and 4080
DISA Continuity of Operations Test Facility, Slidell, Louisiana, certified data for the liaisons offices below: Army Communications and Electronics Command, Air Force Electronics Systems Command, Navy Space And Naval Warfare Systems Command, and Army III Corps		4072, 4073, and 4074
DISA Field Security Operations, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania		4072, 4073, 4074, and 4080
DISA Headquarters, Columbia Pike, Arlington, Virginia ¹¹	1400-1417, 1501, 1503, 1504, 1506, 1912, 4096, 4099, 4100, 4101, 4102, and 4103	1502 and 4080
DISA Headquarters, Skyline Building 5, Falls Church, Virginia ¹¹	1400-1417, 1501, 1503, 1504, 1506, 1912, 4096, 4099, 4100, 4101, 4102, and 4103	1502 and 4080
DISA Headquarters, Skyline Building 7, Falls Church, Virginia ¹¹	1400-1417, 1501, 1503, 1504, 1506, 1912, 4096, 4099, 4100, 4101, 4102, and 4103	1502 and 4080

¹¹ DISA Headquarters had not sent question numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507 to the sites that we visited.

DISA Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
Joint Interoperability Test Command, Fort Huachuca, Arizona (certified for Joint Interoperability Test Command, Indian Head, Maryland)	3001, 3002, 3003, 3004, 3012, 3013, 3019, 3021, 3025, 3026, 3027, 4277, 4278, 4279, 4283, 4284, 4285, and 4286	3006, 4072, 4073, 4074, and 4080
Joint Interoperability Test Command, Indian Head, Maryland	3013, 3019, 3021, and 3027	4072, 4073, 4074, and 4080
Joint Spectrum Center, Annapolis, Maryland ¹¹	1400-1417, 1501, 1503, 1504, 1912, 1961, 1962, 1963, and 4096	1502, 1506, and 4080

¹¹ DISA Headquarters had not sent question numbers 1500, 1505, and 1507 to the sites that we visited.

Appendix D. Prior Coverage

The following DoD OIG memorandums related to DISA BRAC 2005 and an Army Audit Agency audit report related to the automated data collection tool have been issued.

DoD OIG

Site Memorandums

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Saint Louis, Missouri, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 17, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Defense Enterprise Computing Center, St. Louis, U.S. Transportation Command Support Office, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 17, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From the Joint Spectrum Center, Annapolis, Maryland, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 17, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Financial Management Liaison Office, Pensacola, Florida, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 17, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From the Computing Services Division Headquarters, Denver, Colorado, to the Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 14, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency Continuity of Operations Test Facility, Slidell, Louisiana, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 14, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Business Management Center, Computer Support – Logistics, and Operations, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 14, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Field Security Operations, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 13, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency, Columbia Pike, Arlington,¹² Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 13, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency, Skyline Building 5, Falls Church, Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 13, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency Headquarters, Skyline Building 7, Falls Church, Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 13, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From the Defense Information Systems Agency,¹³ Hoffman Building One, Alexandria, Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 13, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Joint Interoperability Test Command, Indian Head, Maryland, to the Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 6, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency Continental United States, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," December 3, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency, Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, to Defense Information Systems Agency Headquarters for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," November 22, 2004

¹² The city should be listed as Falls Church instead of Arlington.

¹³ The site should be listed as the Defense Spectrum Office instead of Defense Information Systems Agency.

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Joint Interoperability Test Command Headquarters, Fort Huachuca, Arizona, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," November 22, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From the Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Denver, Colorado, to the Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment Closure 2005," November 19, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Business Management Center, Computer Support – Logistics, and Operations, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, to the Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," November 19, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Defense Information Technology Contracting Organization, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," November 19, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Second Data Call Submission From Field Security Operations, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," November 19, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency Chambersburg to the Defense Information Systems Agency Headquarters for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 10, 2004¹⁴

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency, Columbia Pike, Falls Church, Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 4, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency, Defense Enterprise Computer Center Detachment, Norfolk, to Defense Information Systems Agency Headquarters for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 4, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency Headquarters, Building 2, Arlington, Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 4, 2004

¹⁴ The report includes the two sites that we revisited during the second data call.

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency Headquarters, Building 12, Arlington, Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 4, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency Headquarters, Skyline 5, Falls Church, Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 4, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency, Skyline Building 7, Falls Church, Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 4, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Technical Information Center Headquarters, Fort Belvoir, Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 4, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Defense Spectrum Office, Hoffman Building One, Alexandria, Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 4, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From White House Communications Agency, Washington, D.C., to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 4, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Saint Louis, Missouri, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 3, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information System Agency, Defense Enterprise Computer Center Mechanicsburg to Defense Information Systems Agency Headquarters for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 3, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency, Fort Detrick, Maryland, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 3, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency Headquarters, Building 1, Arlington, Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 3, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency Pentagon, Arlington, Virginia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 3, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Technology Contracting Organization, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 3, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission from the Joint Interoperability Test Center,¹⁵ Fort Huachuca, Arizona, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 3, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Jacksonville, Florida, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 2, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Warner Robins, Georgia, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 2, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency Interoperability Directorate, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," June 2, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Computing Services Division Headquarters, Denver, Colorado, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 27, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Denver, Colorado, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment Closure 2005," May 27, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Huntsville, Alabama, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 27, 2004

¹⁵ Joint Interoperability Test Center should be listed as Joint Interoperability Test Command.

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, San Diego, California, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 27, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment/Software Support Office, Montgomery, Alabama, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 27, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency Continental United States, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 27, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information Systems Agency Continuity of Operations Test Facility, Slidell, Louisiana, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 27, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Joint Interoperability Test Command, Indian Head, to the Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 27, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Joint Spectrum Center, Annapolis, Maryland, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 27, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, San Antonio, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 24, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Information System Agency, Oklahoma City Defense Enterprise Computing Center to DISA Headquarters for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 24, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Dayton, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 19, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Enterprise Computing Center Columbus, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 14, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From the Defense Enterprise Computing Center Detachment, Rock Island, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 5, 2004

DoD OIG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission From Defense Enterprise Computing Center, Ogden, to Defense Information Systems Agency for Base Realignment and Closure 2005," May 5, 2004

Army Audit Agency

Army Audit Report Number A-2004-0184-IMT, "Review of Online Data Collection Tool: Process Controls," February 20, 2004

Appendix E. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Director, Base Realignment and Closures (Installations and Environment)

Other Defense Organization

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

Bruce A. Burton
Deborah L. Culp
Dianna J. Pearson
John Huddleston
Timothy Miller
Celeste McKay
Jeanette Owens
Kiana Silver
Jacqueline Pugh