Audit Report

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUP FOR DEPOT MAINTENANCE 1995 DEFENSE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE PROCESS

Report No. 95-173

April 13, 1995

Department of Defense

Additional Copies

To obtain additional copies of this report, contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit, Audit Planning and Technical Support Directorate, at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 224-8937) or FAX (703) 604-8932.

Suggestions for Future Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Planning and Coordination Branch, Audit Planning and Technical Support Directorate, at (703) 604-8939 (DSN 664-8939) or FAX (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

Inspector General, Department of Defense
OAIG-AUD (ATTN: APTS Audit Suggestions)
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, Virginia 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; or by writing the Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1900. The identity of each writer and caller is fully protected.

Acronyms

BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure

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

Report No. 95-173

April 13, 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (LOGISTICS)

SUBJECT: Joint Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Process (Project No. 4CG-5016.01)

Introduction

We are providing this final report for your information and use. This report is one in a series of reports that discusses the review of the Joint Cross-Service Groups' implementation of the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Steering Group (the Steering Group) internal control plan for managing the data used in the identification of DoD cross-Service realignment and closure opportunities. Six Joint Cross-Service Groups implemented the internal control plan to ensure the adequacy, completeness, and integrity of the information upon which the Secretary of Defense recommendations for realignments and closures to the 1995 Commission on Defense Base Closure and Realignment are based. The Deputy Secretary of Defense directed the Office of the Inspector General, DoD, to review the adequacy and implementation of the internal control plan over this process. The report focuses on the adequacy of implementation of the plan by the Joint Cross-Service Group (the Cross-Service Group) for Depot Maintenance.

Audit Results

The Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance complied with the Steering Group internal control plan.

Audit Objectives

The overall audit objective was to assess the adequacy of the Steering Group internal control plan for managing the data used in the identification of DoD cross-Service realignment and closure opportunities. The specific objective for this audit was to determine whether the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance adequately implemented the Steering Group internal control plan. A summary report will discuss the overall audit objective.

Scope and Methodology

We reviewed the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance process for implementing the Steering Group internal control plan. Our review was conducted at the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics) and the Cross-Service Group. We also reviewed the tasking submitted to the support group that assisted the Cross-Service Group. We did not review the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force or the U.S. Marine Corps (the Services) data collection process used to respond to the Cross-Service Group's request for certified data. The adequacy of the internal controls over the Services' data collection process is discussed in a separate report.

Data Requirements and Collection Review. We attended meetings of the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance and helped establish the data elements and measures of merit that would be used in its 1995 BRAC data call request. We reviewed the formal minutes and briefing charts of the meetings to verify that decisions made by the Cross-Service Group were adequately documented. We also reviewed the Cross-Service Group 1995 BRAC Analysis Plan for compliance with the Steering Group's internal control plan.

Data Consolidation and Verification. We conducted tests to ensure that only certified data were used in the 1995 BRAC process. We controlled the data received from the Services and conducted tests to determine whether the data entered in the computer-processed data base for the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance was entered completely and correctly. The Cross-Service Group data base was used to perform all analyses to support the Cross-Service Group recommendations. We reviewed the results of the support group taskings for accuracy, completeness, and compliance with the internal control plan. Our tests of the support group results were completed before the support group submitted its results for approval to the Cross-Service Group or to the Steering Group's optimization model. Specifically, we reviewed the support group's excess capacity analysis, functional value scoring, and process for identifying Cross-Service Group recommendations.

Data Security. We conducted physical security tests to ensure that the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance data would not be compromised. We tested and controlled access to safes, work site and computer hardware, programs, and results.

Audit Standards and Locations. This program audit was conducted from January 1994 through March 1995. The audit was conducted in accordance with auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD. Accordingly, we included tests of internal controls considered necessary. The organizations visited and contacted are listed in Enclosure 2.

Internal Control Plan

Internal Control Plan Reviewed. On April 13, 1994, the Steering Group issued its internal control plan for the 1995 BRAC process that all Cross-Service Groups were required to implement. The objective of the internal control plan was to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and integrity of the information upon which the Secretary of Defense recommendations for realignments and closures would be based. The internal control plan established two principal mechanisms to control the process: organizational and documentation.

Implementation of Organizational Controls. Organizational controls consisted of three organizations that were separated by distinct functional boundaries and levels of decisionmaking authorities. An Office of the Inspector General, DoD, summary report will discuss the implementation of organizational controls.

Implementation of Documentation Controls. Documentation controls were divided into the following control elements: data information and collection, use of certified data, record keeping and analysis process, oral briefings, outside studies, technical experts, and access to records. We reviewed the implementation of those controls by the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance.

Prior Audits and Other Reviews

No prior audit coverage of the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance has occurred.

Audit Background

The Deputy Secretary of Defense memorandum, "1995 Base Realignment and Closures (BRAC 95)," January 7, 1994, establishes policy, procedures, authorities, and responsibilities for selecting bases for realignment or closure under Public Law 101-510, as amended by Public Laws 102-190 and 103-160. To enhance opportunities for consideration of cross-Service tradeoffs and multi-Service use of the remaining infrastructure, the memorandum established a Review Group, a Steering Group, and six Joint Cross-Service Groups.

Review Group Responsibilities. Chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Defense and composed of senior DoD managers, the Review Group was established to oversee the entire 1995 BRAC process. Authorities of the Review Group included reviewing 1995 BRAC analysis policies and procedures, reviewing

excess capacity analyses, and establishing realignment or closure alternatives and numerical excess capacity reduction targets for consideration by the DoD Components.

Steering Group Responsibilities. The Steering Group assisted the Review Group to exercise its authorities, review DoD Component supplementary 1995 BRAC guidance, and develop an internal control plan. The Review Group was chaired by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Economic Security) and composed of representatives from the Joint Staff, the Services, the six Joint Cross-Service Groups, and other DoD Components.

Joint Cross-Service Groups Responsibilities. The Joint Cross-Service Groups were established in six areas with significant potential for cross-Service impacts in the 1995 BRAC process. The Joint Cross-Service Groups were chaired by DoD senior officials, members from the Services, and other DoD Components. The Cross-Service Group process established policies and criteria through which DoD could identify opportunities for cross-Service asset sharing and single Military Department support of joint DoD missions. The Inspector General, DoD, role in the Joint Cross-Service Group process was to ensure that the requirements of the Steering Group internal control plan were implemented.

Discussion

The Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance was chaired by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics) with representatives from each Service. The purpose of the Cross-Service Group was to identify opportunities for consolidation, closure, or downsizing of 24 DoD depot maintenance activities.

To assist the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance, a support group was formed to identify, collect, and analyze data. The support group consisted of personnel from the Office of the Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Maintenance Policy), who represented the Office of the Secretary of Defense; the Base Closure and Utilization Office under the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Economic Security); primary and alternate representatives from each of the Services; a member of the Joint Staff; and two members of the Inspector General, DoD. The support group was also assisted by personnel from the Logistics Management Institute, a federally funded research and development center. Our review of the Cross-Service Group and its subordinate support group found that the Cross-Service Group had implemented the Steering Group internal control plan, and the Cross-Service Group process was effective.

Data Information and Collection. The Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance developed and implemented a data collection process that ensured complete and useful data were used in its analysis. To ensure it received complete and useful data, the Cross-Service Group issued a uniform data call April 4, 1994, to the Services.

The data call provided a basis to obtain compatible Service data. The data call requested each Service to provide ongoing and projected work load for its maintenance depots for 14 major work categories (for example, aircraft airframes, ground combat vehicles, and sea systems), which were defined as commodities. The commodities the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance chose represented the major current and projected work loads that would be serviced by DoD maintenance depots. The commodities are similar to the DoD standard work breakdown structure for identifying common work loads. The 14 commodities were further subdivided for a total of 51 commodities selected for review.

The data call required each depot to determine the direct labor hours for each commodity for current capacity, maximum potential capacity, and "CORE" work load requirements, assuming a one-shift, 40-hour workweek. Current capacity is the depot maintenance work load that could currently be performed, and maximum potential capacity is the maximum work load that a depot could accomplish assuming the current workload mix remains the same and no additional facilities are built. CORE requirements are the mission-essential maintenance capabilities, measured in direct labor hours maintained within DoD, to ensure that a ready and controlled source of technical competence and resources is available to ensure that an effective and timely response to national Defense contingency situations exists. In addition to workload information, the data call included measures of merit to assess each depot's inherent capability to perform the work loads.

The measures of merit consisted of depot-specific information such as location, unique or peculiar facilities, acreage available for building, and administrative office space. As part of the data call, the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance had to determine what the measures of merit were going to be and the value that its analysis would place on the measures. For each commodity performed at a depot, the Cross-Service Group assigned a functional value ranging from 0 through 100. The functional values were calculated using information contained in the measures of merit. Functional value represents the relative value of a depot activity to perform a specific function based on resources available. Functional value consisted of several attributes, with each attribute awarded points either by Service judgment or through a mathematical calculation. Functional values were inputted into the optimization model to identify the most desirable depots to which work loads could be performed.

To ensure that consistent and useful data were requested and obtained, the support group met daily for 2 months before the final approval of the data call by the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance on April 4, 1994. We attended the meetings to ensure that Service input was heard and that the data requests were based on the best information that could be obtained on a cross-Service basis. Our review verified that the results of the support group meetings were reflected in the data call. In our opinion, the process for preparing the data call was fair, consistently applied, and ensured that accurate and useful data could be obtained.

Use of Data Call. The Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance accepted only Service-certified data in response to its data call. Data submitted by the Services were certified as complete and accurate, to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief, and were used by the Cross-Service Group in its analysis. The Services' data call responses were based on input submitted from their activity commanders. Following initial processing and verification of the responses, the activity commanders forwarded data call responses to the next higher command. The higher commands reviewed the responses for accuracy and consistency. Each Service selected an official to be responsible for certifying data sent to the Cross-Service Group.

Within the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance, Service representatives reviewed their Service data for reasonableness and completeness, and when required, made requests for revisions and clarifications or both. The Cross-Service Group processed 27 requests for revisions or clarifications through the applicable Service official. The last response to its request for clarification was processed by the Cross-Service Group on November 2, 1994.

To ensure that only certified data were used in the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance process, we maintained control over the original certified data call responses and maintained a written log of all data changes. Integrity of the data was maintained by ensuring that only authorized personnel reviewed the data before the Cross-Service Group accepted the data on November 2, 1994. We also verified that all the Service-certified data were included in the Cross-Service Group data base. However, we did not validate the accuracy of the certified data submitted to the Cross-Service Group. That requirement rested with the Service audit agencies.

Recordkeeping and Analysis Process. The recordkeeping and analysis process used by the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance complied with the Steering Group internal control plan. The Cross-Service Group also effectively documented the results of their review.

Recordkeeping. The Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance implemented the policies and procedures for recordkeeping contained in the internal control plan. As required in the internal control plan, the Chair of the

Cross-Service Group assigned the preparation and maintenance of minutes of meetings to a member of the Base Closure and Utilization Office in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Economic Security). The minutes of the meetings consisted of a synopsis of items discussed, copies of overheads presented, and a list of attendees. Members of the Cross-Service Group approved the official minutes of the meetings. We attended the Cross-Service Group and support group meetings, and validated that the minutes of meetings were adequately prepared, approved, maintained, and secured.

Analysis Process. The Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance developed and implemented an analysis process that complied with the requirements of the Steering Group internal control plan. The support group prepared an analysis plan that defined the process by which the support group would determine alternatives for base realignments and closures. Although the analysis plan was not formally approved by the Chair of the Cross-Service Group, the support group complied with the Cross-Service Group analysis plan. The analysis plan included a methodology for determining excess capacity and functional values and provided a process for controlling the optimization results and reporting the results to the Services.

Excess Capacity Analysis. In compliance with the analysis plan, the support group performed an excess capacity analysis that identified reduction target goals for the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance. Excess capacity, as used by the Cross-Service Group, was defined as the difference in direct labor hours between current capacity and CORE requirements. Excess capacity was determined for each Service, depot, and commodity. The support group computed excess capacity based on the Service data available in October 1994. The Cross-Service Group approved reduction targets based on the support group's excess capacity analysis on October 24, 1994. We did not identify errors in the calculations used to identify the reduction targets.

Functional Value Assessment. The functional value assessment process complied with the process defined in the analysis plan. Functional value was composed of an assessment of 14 separate attributes (measures of merit), which were assigned different point values, with a maximum combined point score of 100. Attributes were scored by judgment and through computer-processed conventions or mathematical weight distributions.

Service representatives of the support group used their judgments in awarding points based on their assessment of the importance of the work load at each maintenance depot. The support group discussed the Service judgment scores for every commodity at each depot to normalize the scores. To ensure fairness, a representative from every Service had to be present at meetings when functional values were discussed, and a neutral party had to record the values given by the Service representative. Points were also given based upon the number of other Services performing a particular commodity, and whether that

maintenance function had unique or peculiar facilities for that commodity. The analysis plan included the scoring scheme for unique or peculiar commodities. In performing the calculations, the support group had to factor in a few subjective scores to ensure all commodities and depots were scored fairly and consistently. The subjective scores were known as conventions and were agreed to by the support group. The other method of applying scores was through mathematical weights based on the number of direct labor hours for that commodity. Most of the functional value scores were assigned by the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance based on the mathematical calculations.

Logistics Management Institute developed a computer program to score the conventions and apply the mathematical weighted scores. Logistics Management Institute also entered the judgmentally assigned scores into the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance data base to come up with a functional value score from 0 through 100 for every commodity at each depot.

We were present when functional values were discussed, and we recorded the Service judgment scores as well as the conventions agreed upon. The Service representatives verified their own scores in the data base. We also verified all of the Service judgment scores and how the conventions were computed and found them to be accurate. The functional values were put into the Steering Group's optimization model upon approval of the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance on October 25, 1994.

Controlling Optimization Results. The Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance implemented the analysis plan for controlling the optimization results to ensure that only authorized runs were made using authorized data. The optimization runs were based on a computer program model that would distribute the work load among the maintenance depots to accomplish one or more of the following objectives: minimize excess capacity, minimize number of depots, maximize functional value, and maximize military site values. The optimization model was run at the Center for Naval Analyses, and was used by all of the Cross-Service Groups. Two members of the support group had the authority to submit data to the optimization model or to request computer runs to be made on the optimization model. The support group reviewed the results of the optimization runs to ensure that only accurate certified and approved data were used.

We verified that only certified data were input into the optimization model. No discrepancies were noted. We also ensured that all computer runs and requests were properly controlled and the results secured.

Reporting Results. The Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance implemented the analysis plan for reporting results to the Services. The support group made recommendations based on a fair assessment of the optimization results. The reporting process also provided for timely feedback

and evaluation of the Service's concurrences and nonconcurrences with the Cross-Service Group recommendations. The support group used its knowledge and judgment when reviewing the optimization model results. The support group recommendations for maintenance depot workload realignment and closures were based on an assessment of possible realignment alternatives. The Cross-Service Group approved the support group recommendations and sent them to the Services for their review and cost analysis on November 22, 1994. The Services reviewed the Cross-Service Group recommendations, and briefed the Cross-Service Group of their concurrence or nonconcurrence with the recommendations during December 1994 and February 1995, with their final recommendations provided to the Cross-Service Group on February 10, 1995. The Cross-Service Group reviewed the Service responses to the recommendations to reconcile differences and to offer other alternatives, if applicable.

We reviewed the process for developing the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance recommendations and the reconciliation process with the Services. We found that the process was fair and appropriately documented.

Oral Briefings. The Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance appropriately documented in the minutes of the meetings, all oral briefings presented to the group. Oral briefings were given on support group activities, Service maintenance depot work load, and various other issues, such as the use of functional values and the optimization model in the analysis of workload alternatives.

Our review of the minutes of those meetings noted that all oral briefings were appropriately documented and briefing charts were attached as required by the internal control plan.

Outside Studies. The Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance did not use the results of outside studies to formulate its recommendations for closure or realignment to the Services.

Technical Experts. The Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance complied with the internal control plan requirement to use technical experts. The Chair of the Cross-Service Group appropriately notified the Steering Group when the Cross-Service Group planned to use the Logistics Management Institute during the group's analysis process. The Logistics Management Institute created and maintained the Cross-Service Group data base and helped the support group calculate functional values and excess capacity analysis. Logistics Management Institute was not the source of any data to the Cross-Service Group that required Logistics Management Institute's certification.

Our review of Logistics Management Institute's procedures and processes was limited to verifying that the data base Logistics Management Institute used

contained certified data and that the data base was secured by the Logistics Management Institute. We did not find any discrepancies in Logistics Management Institute procedures or processes that compromised the accuracy, reliability, or integrity of the data.

Access to Records. The Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance implemented appropriate internal control plan procedures to ensure access to records was limited to only those authorized. The Cross-Service Group implemented adequate physical controls over the data call responses, data base, project office, and the optimization model runs.

Controls Over the Data Call Responses. Physical controls over the data call were adequate to protect unauthorized access of the Service responses to the data call. Each Service's response was secured separately in a safe. Only the Office of the Secretary of Defense members of the support group and the Inspector General, DoD, personnel had access to the safes. Every night, Office of the Secretary of Defense members of the support group locked the safes and checked all desktops for data.

To control the integrity of the Service responses, we hand-numbered each page of the original responses to the data call, including the 27 requests for clarification. To maintain control over the Service responses, the Service representatives were not allowed to take data out of the project office unless accompanied by a member of the Office of the Secretary of Defense or the Inspector General, DoD.

Controls Over the Data Base. Physical controls over the data base were adequate to protect unauthorized access. Two computers were used to input data into the data base, but the data base was maintained on only one. The data base was protected by a password known only to the Logistics Management Institute personnel. The computers were not networked nor were they hooked up to modems, so the data could not be transmitted or accessed remotely.

We attempted to access the data base and determined that the physical controls were adequate to prevent unauthorized access.

Controls Over the Project Office. Physical controls over the project office were adequate to protect against unauthorized persons entering. The project office was locked every night; however, each of the Services were issued a key to the project office. Because the data were kept in safes, the Services could not access the data unless someone from the Office of the Secretary of Defense assigned to the support group or an Inspector General, DoD, audit team member was present. Only authorized persons were allowed to enter the project office, and a detailed record was kept of who entered the project office and when they were there.

Through our observations and testing of the physical controls at the project office, we determined that the controls were adequate to keep unauthorized persons from entering. In addition, those that entered the project office appropriately recorded in the control log their entrance and departure.

Controls Over the Optimization Model Runs. The physical controls over the optimization model runs were adequate to protect against unauthorized access. The results of the optimization model were hand-carried by support group members from the Center for Naval Analyses in sealed envelopes. At night, all papers containing optimization model results were stored in the safes.

Our review showed that the Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance adequately implemented controls to ensure that only those authorized had access to the optimization model results.

Management Comments

We provided a draft of this report to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations) on March 15, 1995. Because the report contained no findings or recommendations, written comments were not required. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations) concurred with the report. The reply is contained in Enclosure 1.

The courtesies extended to the audit staff are appreciated. If you have any questions on this report, please contact Mr. Christian Hendricks, Audit Program Director, at (703) 604-9140 (DSN 664-9140).

The distribution of this report is in Enclosure 3. The list of audit team members is on the inside back cover of the report.

David K. Steensma

David K. Steensma
Deputy Assistant Inspector General
for Auditing

Enclosures

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
3300 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3300

ECONOMIC SECURITY

06 APR 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SUBJECT: Draft Audit Report on Joint Cross-Service Group for Depot Maintenance, 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Process (Project No. 4CG-5016.01)

I have reviewed the draft report and concur in the auditor's description of the process used by the Joint Cross-Service Group (JCSG) for Depot Maintenance to develop alternatives for consideration by the Military Departments during their BRAC analyses.

The Inspector General, DoD, has been a key part of the Department's BRAC process by providing advice and review of organizational and internal management controls for JCSG activities. The involvement of the Inspector General enhanced the process by helping to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and integrity of the information used as a basis for development of functional alternatives by the Joint Cross-Service Groups.

Robert E. Bayer
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
Installations

Organizations Visited or Contacted

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Assistant Secretary of Defense (Economic Security)
  Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations)
    Director, Base Closure and Utilization
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics)
  Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Maintenance Policy, Programs, and Resources)

Department of the Army

Auditor General, Department of the Army

Department of the Navy

Auditor General, Department of the Navy

Department of the Air Force

Auditor General, Department of the Air Force

Non-Government Organizations

Center for Naval Analyses, Arlington, VA
Logistics Management Institute, McLean, VA

Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Economic Security)
  Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations)
    Director, Base Closure and Utilization
Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics)

Department of the Army

Secretary of the Army
Auditor General, Department of the Army

Department of the Navy

Secretary of the Navy
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management)
Auditor General, Department of the Navy

Department of the Air Force

Secretary of the Air Force
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force

Other Defense Organizations

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency
Director, Defense Logistics Agency
  Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange
Director, National Security Agency
  Inspector General, National Security Agency
Inspector General, Central Imagery Office

Non-Defense Federal Organizations and Individuals

Office of Management and Budget
Technical Information Center, National Security and International Affairs Division, General Accounting Office
Chairman and ranking minority member of each of the following congressional committees and subcommittees:

- Senate Committee on Appropriations
- Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
- Senate Committee on Armed Services
- Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
- House Committee on Appropriations
- House Subcommittee on National Security, Committee on Appropriations
- House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
- House Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
- House Committee on National Security

Audit Team Members

This report was prepared by the Logistics Support Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, Department of Defense.

Shelton R. Young
Christian Hendricks
Jennifer L. Stephens