

**A**udit



**R**eport

YEAR 2000 HIGHER LEVEL TESTING  
SCHEDULE DATA REPORTED TO DOD

Report No. 00-015

October 20, 1999

Office of the Inspector General  
Department of Defense

### **Additional Copies**

To obtain additional copies of this audit report, contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit of the Audit Followup and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 664-8937) or fax (703) 604-8932 or visit the Inspector General, DoD, Home Page at: [www.dodig.osd.mil](http://www.dodig.osd.mil).

### **Suggestions for Future Audits**

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

OAIG-AUD (ATTN: AFTS Audit Suggestions)  
Inspector General, Department of Defense  
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)  
Arlington, VA 22202-2884

### **Defense Hotline**

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, contact the Defense Hotline by calling (800) 424-9098; by sending an electronic message to [Hotline@dodig.osd.mil](mailto:Hotline@dodig.osd.mil); or by writing to the Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1900. The identity of each writer and caller is fully protected.

### **Acronyms**

Y2K

Year 2000



INSPECTOR GENERAL  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE  
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-2884

October 20, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE DEFENSE (COMMAND,  
CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS, AND  
INTELLIGENCE)

SUBJECT: Audit Report on Year 2000 Higher Level Testing Schedule Data  
Reported to DoD (Report No. 00-015)

We are providing this report for your information and use. Because this report contains no recommendations, written comments were not required. However, the Principal Director, Year 2000, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) provided comments. We considered management comments on a draft of this report when preparing the final report

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the audit staff. For additional information on this report, please contact Mr. Raymond A. Spencer at (703) 604-9071 (DSN 664-9071) ([rspencer@dodig.osd.mil](mailto:rspencer@dodig.osd.mil)) or Mr. Thomas S. Bartoszek at (703) 604-9014 (DSN 664-9014) ([tbartoszek@dodig.osd.mil](mailto:tbartoszek@dodig.osd.mil)). See Appendix C for the report distribution. Audit team members are listed inside the back cover.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert J. Lieberman".

Robert J. Lieberman  
Assistant Inspector General  
for Auditing

## Office of the Inspector General, DoD

Report No. 00-015  
(Project No. 9AB-0043.00)

October 20, 1999

### Audit of Year 2000 Higher Level Testing Schedule Data Reported to DoD

#### Executive Summary

**Introduction.** This report is one in a series being issued by the Inspector General, DoD, in accordance with an informal partnership with the Chief Information Officer, DoD, to monitor DoD efforts in addressing the year 2000 computing problem. For a listing of audit projects addressing the issue, see the year 2000 webpage on the IGnet at <http://www.ignet.gov>. Higher level testing refers to an evaluation in an operational environment as to how information technology will operate during the year 2000, including the ability of systems to access and transmit information from point of origin to point of termination. Public Law 105-261, "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999," Section 334(b), directs that the Secretary of Defense ensure that "all mission-critical systems that are expected to be used if the Armed Forces are involved in a conflict in a major theater of war are tested in at least two exercises." The DoD Year 2000 Management Plan outlines the requirements for mission-critical systems that require two higher level tests and for mission-critical systems that only require one higher level test.

**Objectives.** The overall audit objective was to determine whether DoD mission-critical systems are being appropriately scheduled for higher level year 2000 testing. Specifically, the audit compared the inventory of mission-critical systems to the list of systems scheduled for higher level testing and assessed the controls for assuring compliance with statutory and DoD Year 2000 Management Plan requirements. This audit did not address 365 intelligence or special operations systems, which are being reviewed separately.

**Results.** The Services and DoD agencies have made progress scheduling and conducting higher level testing on all mission-critical date-dependent systems. However, additional efforts were needed to complete the DoD year 2000 testing database. When the audit was initiated in April 1999, DoD and the Joint Staff Year 2000 Program Offices had yet to obtain complete visibility over the higher level test schedule for the 2,107 mission-critical systems listed in the DoD year 2000 database and the 694 mission-critical systems listed on the Commanders in Chief thinline threads. To help clarify what appeared to be not scheduled for higher level testing, during the course of the audit we provided the DoD Program Office the results of our analysis of mission-critical systems for which the DoD year 2000 testing database lacked information on scheduling for higher level testing. Our most recent analysis was as of October 1999 and indicated that the database still needs scheduling input only for

46 Navy systems and one Defense Threat Reduction Agency system (Appendix B). For details of the audit results, see the Finding section of the report.

**Management Comments.** Although not required to comment, the Principal Director for the DoD Year 2000 Program Office, Assistant Secretary of the Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) concurred with the conclusions in the draft audit report . The Principal Director stated that his office was working with the Services and agencies to populate the DoD test database and ensure that the information provided is current and correct. The complete text of management comments is in the Management Comments section.

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Executive Summary</b>	i
<b>Introduction</b>	
Background	1
Objectives	1
Related Audit Work	1
<b>Finding</b>	
Year 2000 Higher Level Testing	2
<b>Appendixes</b>	
A. Audit Process	
Scope	6
Methodology	7
Summary of Prior Coverage	7
B. List of Mission-Critical Systems Not Scheduled For Higher Level Testing	8
C. Report Distribution	10
<b>Management Comments</b>	
Assistant Secretary of the Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence)	13

---

## Background

On completion of the testing of the individual systems' year 2000 (Y2K) readiness, DoD embarked on a series of higher level testing, or operational readiness assessments, required by DoD guidance and Public Law.

**The "DoD Y2K Management Plan" December 1998.** Operational Readiness Assessment, provides guidance on implementing the Deputy Secretary of Defense memorandum on "Y2K Verification of National Security Capabilities," dated August 24, 1998. Appendix I outlines requirements for systems that require two higher level tests and for systems that only require one higher level test. The memorandum states that the Military Departments must certify that they have tested the Y2K capabilities of their respective Component's information technology and national security systems in accordance with the "DoD Y2K Management Plan".

**Public Law.** Public Law 105-261, "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999," October 17, 1998, Section 334(b), directs that the Secretary of Defense ensure that "all mission-critical systems that are expected to be used if the Armed Forces are involved in a conflict in a major theater of war are tested in at least two exercises." In addition, Section 334(d) states, "In the case of an information technology or national security system for which a simulated Y2K test as part of a military exercise described in subsection (c) is not feasible or presents undue risk, the Secretary of Defense shall test the system using a functional end-to-end test or through a Defense Major Range and Test Facility Base."

## Objectives

The overall audit objective was to determine whether DoD mission-critical systems are being appropriately scheduled for higher level Y2K testing. Specifically, the audit compared the inventory of mission-critical systems to the list of systems scheduled for higher level testing and assessed the controls for assuring compliance with statutory and DoD Y2K Management Plan requirements. See Appendix A for a discussion of the audit scope and methodology and summary of prior coverage.

## Related Audit Work

We did not review the validity of information in the Y2K database since separate reviews were conducted on reported Y2K system certification levels in the DoD database. In addition, we did not review the information included in the testing database since a separate review will address mission critical items recorded and data reported in the Y2K testing database. Also, we did not review Special Operations Command systems or intelligence systems with a USI designation because of the ongoing audits of the intelligence functional area, Y2K end-to-end Testing, and the audit of the Special Operations Command. Subsequent audit reports will address these areas.

---

## **Year 2000 Higher Level Testing**

While the DoD Program Office and reporting organizations made progress in scheduling and testing date dependent mission-critical systems, additional efforts were needed to complete the DoD Y2K testing database that records on what and where mission-critical systems were tested, and what was not tested and why. When the audit was initiated, the DoD and the Joint Staff Y2K Program Offices had yet to obtain complete oversight of the higher level test schedule for the 2,180 mission-critical systems listed in the DoD Y2K database and the 694 mission-critical systems listed on the Commanders in Chief thinline threads. To help clarify what appeared to be not scheduled for higher level testing during the course of the audit, we provided the DoD Program Office the results of our analysis of mission-critical systems for which the database lacked scheduling information. As of October 1999, scheduling data was still lacking for 46 Navy systems. Unless DoD has a reliable audit trail that can readily determine what has been tested, where, and with what results, as well as why exceptions were made, DoD cannot credibly demonstrate that the Congressional and DoD testing requirements have been met.

### **DoD Guidance on Higher Level Testing**

The "DoD Y2K Management Plan," first issued in April 1997 and updated in January 1999, states that all mission-critical systems expected to be used if Armed Forces are involved in a conflict must be tested in two exercises before September 30, 1999. This is in concert with Public Law 105-261, FY 1999 DoD Authorization Act. DoD can accomplish the two tests with two Commanders in Chief operational evaluations, or one operational evaluation and either a Service integration test or a functional end-to-end test. The three tests collectively cover the Y2K events necessary to demonstrate the Y2K readiness of DoD mission, functions, and operational capability. Systems that do not have date-related processes, are stand alone, or are excluded because the systems will be tested using alternate methods are exempt from higher level testing. DoD must evaluate in either a Service integration test or a functional end-to-end test all other mission-critical systems at least once.

### **DoD Y2K Databases**

The DoD Y2K Management Plan requires DoD to gather and maintain the data necessary to support the decision-making processes in the DoD Y2K database. The DoD Y2K database is the single DoD official reporting source to support senior DoD management and the regular Office of Management and Budget reports for all mission-critical systems. The only testing data included in the DoD Y2K database is a field that listed the number of higher level tests required and for most systems the data in this field is omitted. Specific system testing data was not added to the DoD Y2K database because of the security classification. DoD proposed to eliminate this problem by creating another

---

database, called the testing database, to collect the mission-critical system testing data. The testing database would be part of the DoD database. Unfortunately, DoD was unable to provide testing data on the 2,180 mission-critical systems at the time of our review. The testing data in this report was obtained from DoD Agencies and Service components.

## Commander in Chief Thinline Threads

The Joint Staff and the Commanders in Chief identified the minimum number of integrated automated information platforms and systems required to perform critical tasks or missions from sensor to shooter. These systems became the Commander in Chief thinline threads critical to a major theater of war, for which the public law requires at least two exercises. As of March 30 1999, the Joint Staff and the Commanders in Chief identified 715 systems that were mission-critical. Of the 715 systems, only 320 were listed in the DoD Y2K database as mission critical. The Joint Staff and the Commanders in Chief have continued to review the systems listed in the Commander in Chief thinline threads. Table 1 shows the change in numbers for thinline thread systems being reviewed.

**Table 1. Joint Staff and Commander in Chief Mission-Critical Systems**

<u>Dates</u>	<u>Thinline Systems</u>	<u>Thinline Systems in DoD Y2K Database</u>
March 1999	715	320
May 1999	694	Not determined
August 1999	452	340
September 1999	452	372

## Higher Level Testing

As of May 19, 1999, the DoD Y2K database listed 2,180 mission-critical systems. Our review did not include 30 Special Operations Command systems and 335 intelligence systems because of separate ongoing audit work in those areas. Of the remaining 1,815 mission-critical systems there were 967 systems not planned for higher level testing because the DoD Component identified systems as not date dependent, stand alone, in development, or scheduled for retirement or replacement. The 848 remaining systems required either one or two higher level testing to verify functional and operational readiness. As of October 5, 1999, there were 47 mission-critical systems for which the database lacked scheduling information. The progress made between May and October is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2. DoD Agency and Service Component Higher Level Testing from Schedules Provided**

DoD Agency or Service Component	As of May 1999		As of July 1999		As of October 1999	
	Systems Requiring Testing	Schedule Data Missing	Systems Requiring Testing	Schedule Data Missing	Systems Requiring Testing	Schedule Data Missing
Air Force	189	85	231	0	198	0
Army	225	62	191	36	168	0
Central COM	5	unknown	5	5	5	0
DeCA	4	4	4	4	4	0
DFAS	42	0	42	0	42	0
DHRA	2	0	2	0	2	0
DISA	42	8	42	3	41	0
DLA	34	29	34	20	24	0
DTRA	4	0	4	0	5	1
EUCOM	2	1	2	1	0	0
Joint Forces COM	12	unknown	12	8	9	0
Joint Staff	1	0	1	0	2	0
Marine Corps	61	12	61	12	36	0
Navy	196	66	195	42	201	46
OASD/HA	11	3	11	1	11	0
Pacific COM	4	0	4	0	10	0
Southern COM	3	unknown	3	2	3	0
Space COM	6	unknown	5	0	5	0
WHS	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>848</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>854</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>772</b>	<b>47</b>

COM Command  
DeCA Defense Commissary Agency  
DFAS Defense Finance and Accounting Service  
DHRA Defense Human Resource Activities  
DISA Defense Information Systems Agency  
DLA Defense Logistics Agency  
DTRA Defense Threat Reduction Agency  
EUCOM European Command  
OASD/HA Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense/Health Affairs  
WHS Washington Headquarters Service

The Defense Threat Reduction Agency did not provide schedule data for the Compliance Monitoring Tracking System. In addition, the Navy did not provide schedule data for the 46 systems shown in Appendix B. Navy officials stated that they did not plan to test 45 of the 46 systems because they were not

---

on a Commander in Chief thinline threads critical to a major theater of war. The Navy claimed that they had a verbal agreement with the Principal Director for the DoD Y2K Program Office who exempted the systems from higher level testing. The Principal Director stated that the DoD policy requires that all mission-critical systems to be tested at least one time unless the Service provides justification in the remarks field of the DoD Y2K database. The Navy has not yet provided justification in the DoD database for the 45 systems. The Principal Director also indicated that merely stating that the systems were not on the "thinline" was not adequate justification to exempt them from testing.

## **Recent Action by DoD**

As of July 29, 1999, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command Control, Communications, and Intelligence) Y2K Director, Testing, identified that critical testing data was not being updated into the DoD Y2K Testing Database. In addition, the number of systems critical to a major theater of war was changing, even though many of the Commanders in Chief operational evaluations were completed. The Director, Y2K Testing also identified the need to account for the status of systems undergoing testing. The DoD Y2K testing database should provide the testing status of each system and other vital information. As of July 1999, many of the fields in the database were incomplete, and system information, such as systems evaluations status and test results, and evaluation dates and retest dates, was not complete for most of the mission-critical systems undergoing testing.

In briefing the Deputy Secretary of Defense on August 11, 1999, the Program Office committed itself to resolving the testing data reporting problem before mid-September 1999. Therefore, this report contains no recommendations.

## **Conclusion**

Higher level testing will be used to evaluate DoD functional and operational capability and will help DoD identify and manage risks related to operation of systems. To ensure compliance with statutory requirements and the DoD Y2K Management Plan, a single DoD Y2K testing database was created. As of October 1999, the DoD Y2K testing database still lacked information for a few mission-critical systems.

## **Management Comments**

Although not required to comment, the Principal Director for the DoD Year 2000 Program Office concurred with the conclusions in the audit report and provided comments. The Principal Director stated that he was working with the Services and agencies to populate the DoD test database and ensure that the information provided is current and correct.

---

## Appendix A. Audit Process

This report is one in a series being issued by the Inspector General, DoD, in accordance with an informal partnership with the Chief Information Officer, DoD, to monitor DoD efforts to address the Y2K computing challenge. For a listing of audit projects addressing this issue, see the Y2K webpage on Iagnet at <http://www.ignet.gov>.

### Scope

**Work Performed.** We reviewed and evaluated the progress of DoD and the Services in performing higher level testing on mission-critical systems. We evaluated their Y2K efforts compared with the DoD Y2K Management Plan and legislation; conducted discussions with technical, business, and contracting officials; and evaluated Y2K documentation.

**DoD-Wide Corporate-Level Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Goals.** In response to the Government Performance and Results Acts, the DoD has established 2 DoD-wide goals and 7 subordinate performance goals. This report pertains to achievements of the following goals (and subordinate performance goals):

**Goal 2:** Prepare now for an uncertain future by pursuing a focused modernization effort that maintains U.S. qualitative superiority in key warfighting capabilities. Transform the force by exploiting the Revolution in Military Affairs, and reengineer the Department to achieve a 21<sup>st</sup> Century infrastructure. **Performance Goal 2.2:** Transform U.S. military forces for the future. (00-DoD-2.2)

**DoD Functional Area Reform Goals.** Most major DoD functional areas have also established performance improvement reform objectives and goals. This report pertains to achievement of the following functional area objective and goal:

#### **Information Technology Management Functional Area.**

**Objective:** Provide services that satisfy customer information needs.

**Goal:** Upgrade technology base. (ITM-2-3)

**General Accounting Office High-Risk Area.** In its identification of risk areas, the General Accounting Office has specifically designated risk in resolution of the Y2K problem as high. This report provides coverage of that problem and of the overall Information Technology Management high-risk area.

---

## Methodology

**Audit Type, Dates, and Standards.** We performed this economy and efficiency audit from April 1999 through October 1999, in accordance with auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD. We relied on computer-processed data without performing tests of system general and application controls to confirm the reliability of the data. We did not establish reliability of the data because the reliability DoD Y2K database mission-critical system certification levels was being assessed under Inspector General, DoD, Audit Project number 9AS-0090.06, "Reported Y2K System Certification Levels." However, not establishing the reliability of the database will not affect the results of our audit. We did not rely on statistical sampling procedures to develop conclusions on this audit.

**Contacts During the Audit.** We visited or contacted individuals and organizations within DoD. Further details are available on request.

**Management Control Program Review.** We did not review the management control program related to the overall audit objective because DoD recognized the Y2K issue as a material management control weakness area in the FY 1998 Annual Statement of Assurance.

## Summary of Prior Coverage

**General Accounting Office and the Inspector General, DoD.** The General Accounting Office and the Inspector General, DoD, have conducted multiple reviews related to Y2K issues. General Accounting Office reports can be accessed over the Internet at <http://www.gao.gov>. Inspector General, DoD, reports can be accessed over the Internet at <http://www.dodig.osd.mil>.

## Appendix B. Mission-Critical Systems Still Needing Scheduling Input (as of October 1999)

	<u>Description of Mission-Critical System</u>	<u>Identification Number</u>
Navy		
1	Advanced Combat Direction System (LHA 2 & 4 Only)	12765
2	Advanced Cryptologic Carry-on Exploitation System	5509
3	Advanced Tractability & Control-Navy	5833
4	AN/WLQ-4(V) SEA NYMPH	8549
5	Automated EOD Publications System	12214
6	BUPERS Support System	10225
7	Central Ships Characteristics Database Ver 1.X	12211
8	Circuit Mayflower Ashore	5531
9	Commercial Asset VIS	5842
10	Common Source Routing File System	7932
11	CNET Automated Budget System	9470
12	CNET Program Automated Tracking System	7325
13	Custom Ship File Generation And Maintenance Ver 1.18	12209
14	Enhanced Terminal Voice Switch	6495
15	EP-3E Aries II Ground Support Station	6107
16	ES-3A Operational Flight/System Maintenance Program OFP/SMP	9765
17	Fire Control System MK 117 C4.1V1	11395
18	Headquarters Locator Module Ver 3.X	12204
19	Integrated Voice Communications Switching System (IVCSS)	6487
20	Material Financial Control System	5841
21	Micro Organization Maintenance Management System	6492
22	Micro Organizational Maintenance Management System	5595
23	NALCOMIS OMA	5559
24	NAVMTO Operations & Management Information Systems	7691
25	Navresruitcom Integrated Recruit Info Mgmt Support	7285
26	Navy Base Telephone Switches	17365
27	Navy Campus Management Information System	9471
28	Navy EHF Satcom Program (NESP) Adaptation and Ephemeris Data Support System	10646
29	Navy Enlisted Advancement System	9472
30	Navy Integrated Training Resources Administration System	9473
31	Navy Ionospheric Monitoring System (NIMS) Auxiliary Command and Monitoring System	10645
32	Navy Training Master Planning System	9478
33	Oceanographic Information System	8035
34	Officer Programs Management Information System	9474
35	Operations Asset Management System Ver 3.X	12206
36	Precise Time and Time Interval	8241
37	Reserve Financial Management System	8330
38	Residual Asset Management	5829
39	Retail Ordnance Logistics Management System	8918
40	Ship Configuration and Logistics Support/CDMD Open architecture/Radcom	8928
41	Standard Emergency Communication System (ECS)	6486
42	Standard Training Activity Support System-Recruit Training Module	9476
43	Student Training and Tracking System	9477

---

44	Technical Support Systems	8987
45	Total Force Manpower Management System	8120
46	Very Long Baseline Interferometry – Mark IV Correlator	15645

## **Defense Threat Reduction Agency**

47	Compliance Monitoring Tracking System	1
----	---------------------------------------	---

---

## **Appendix C. Report Distribution**

### **Office of the Secretary of Defense**

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology  
Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange  
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)  
Deputy Chief Financial Officer  
Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)  
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence)  
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance, and Space Systems)  
Deputy Chief Information Officer and Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Chief Information Officer Policy and Implementation)  
Principal Deputy - Y2K  
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs)  
Director, Defense Human Resource Activities  
Director, Washington Headquarters Service

### **Joint Staff**

Director, Joint Staff

### **Department of the Army**

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development, and Acquisition)  
Chief Information Officer Department of the Army  
Inspector General, Department of the Army  
Auditor General, Department of the Army

### **Department of the Navy**

Chief of Naval Operations  
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller)  
Auditor General, Department of the Navy  
Chief Information Officer, Department of the Navy  
Chief Information Officer, Marine Corps  
Inspector General, Department of the Navy Auditor General  
Inspector General, Marine Corps

---

## **Department of the Air Force**

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)  
Chief Information Officer, Department of the Air Force  
Inspector General, Department of the Air Force  
Auditor General, Air Force Audit Agency

## **Unified Commands**

Commander in Chief, US Pacific Command  
Commander in Chief, US Joint Forces Command  
Commander in Chief, US Southern Command  
Commander in Chief, US Central Command  
Commander in Chief, US Space Command

## **Other Defense Organizations**

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency  
Director, Defense Commissary Agency  
Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service  
Director, Defense Information Systems Agency  
Inspector General, Defense Information Systems Agency  
Director, Defense Logistics Agency  
Director, National Security Agency  
Inspector General, Defense Intelligence Agency  
Inspector General, Defense Threat Reduction Agency  
Inspector General, National Imagery and Mapping Agency  
Inspector General, National Reconnaissance Office  
Inspector General, National Security Agency

## **Non-Defense Federal Organizations and Individuals**

Office of Management and Budget  
Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs  
General Accounting Office  
National Security and International Affairs Division  
Technical Information Center  
Director, Defense Information and Financial Management Systems, Accounting and Information Management Division

## **Congressional Committees and Subcommittees, Chairman and Ranking Minority Member**

Senate Committee on Appropriations  
Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations  
Senate Committee on Armed Services

---

## **Congressional Committees and Subcommittees, Chairman and Ranking Minority Member (cont'd)**

Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs

Senate Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem

House Committee on Appropriations

House Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations

House Committee on Armed Services

House Committee on Government Reform

House Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology,  
Committee on Government Reform

House Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs and International  
Relations, Committee on Government Reform

House Subcommittee on Technology, Committee on Science

# Assistant Secretary of the Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) Comments



COMMAND, CONTROL,  
COMMUNICATIONS, AND  
INTELLIGENCE

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
6000 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-8000

5 OCT 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT DIRECTORATE,  
INSPECTOR GENERAL, DOD

SUBJECT: Proposed Audit Report on Year 2000 Higher-Level Testing Schedule Data Reported  
to DoD (Project No. 9AB-0043), August 17, 1999

The responses below address those issues identified in the conclusion paragraph of the  
proposed audit document (page 5). The Conclusions of the draft report, reformatted as points are  
as follows:

- With September 30, 1999 approaching, the DoD Y2K testing database still lacks information for mission-critical systems.
- Without complete data, DoD has insufficient assurance that the statutory deadline for higher-level testing will be met; that the high-level testing program will be as comprehensive as necessary; and that the required report to Congress will be accurate.

Concur with both Statements with Comment: The Services and Agencies are diligently working to put the Services and Functional Test Data in the DoD Y2K database. This data is being constantly reviewed by the Y2K Program Office. In addition, we have added an improvement process to correct any inconsistencies between the DoD Y2K Database and the Services and PSA's Testing Databases. Members of the Testing and Technical Services Directorates are conducting meetings with teams from the Services and Agencies to ensure that all testing information entered into the DoD Y2K Database is accurate. This process will validate and ensure that the Y2K Testing Database reflect the most current and correct information on Y2K testing of mission critical systems.

My point of contact for any addition information regarding the disposal of sensitive DoD property is Dr. Raymond Paul at (703) 602-0980, Ext. 143, e-mail: Raymond.Paul@osd.pentagon.mil.

  
William A. Curtis  
Principal Director, Year 2000



# **Audit Team Members**

The Acquisition Management Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, DoD, prepared this report.

Thomas F. Gimble  
Patricia A. Brannin  
Raymond A. Spencer  
Thomas S. Bartoszek  
Julius L. Hoffman  
Thelma E. Jackson  
Rudolf Noordhuizen  
Lisa E. Novis  
Herbert K. Braun  
Vonna D. Holbrook  
Noble White  
Karen J. Lamar  
Michael P. Klein  
Chanda D. Lee  
Jenshel D. Marshall