Audit Report

YEAR 2000 ISSUES WITHIN THE U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND'S
AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY
III MARINE EXPEDITIONARY FORCE

Report No. 99-086 February 22, 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

Suggestions for Future Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Planning and Coordination Branch of 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; 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

MEF	Marine Expeditionary Force
PACOM	U.S. Pacific Command
Y2K	Year 2000

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

February 22, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS, AND INTELLIGENCE)
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)

SUBJECT: Audit Report on Year 2000 Issues Within the U.S. Pacific Command's Area of Responsibility, III Marine Expeditionary Force (Report No. 99-086)

We are providing this report for your information and use. This is a follow-on audit to Inspector General, DoD, Report No. 99-031, "U.S. Pacific Command Year 2000 Issues," November 3, 1998. Because this report contains no findings or recommendations, no comments were requested and none were received. Therefore, we are publishing this report in final form.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the audit staff. Questions on the audit should be directed to Mr. Robert M. Murrell at (703) 604-9210 (DSN 664-9210) (rmurrell@dodig.osd.mil) or Ms. Nancee K. Needham at (703) 604-9209 (DSN 664-9209) (nkneedham@dodig.osd.mil). See Appendix B for the report distribution. The audit team members are listed inside the back cover.

Robert J. Lieberman
Assistant Inspector General
for Auditing

Office of the Inspector General, DoD

Report No. 99-086 **February 22, 1999**
(Project No. 8CC-0049.01)

Year 2000 Issues Within the U.S. Pacific Command's Area of Responsibility

III Marine Expeditionary Force

Executive Summary

Introduction. This is one in a series of reports 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 year 2000 computing challenge. For a listing of audit projects addressing the issue, see the year 2000 web page on the IGnet at http://www.ignet.gov.

Objectives. The overall audit objective was to evaluate whether the U.S. Pacific Command had adequately planned for and managed year 2000 risks to avoid undue disruption to its mission. Specifically, we reviewed year 2000 risk assessments, contingency plans for mission-critical systems, and continuity of operations plans to perform core mission requirements of the III Marine Expeditionary Force. The review included major DoD communications systems operated within the U.S. Pacific Command's area of responsibility.

Results. The III Marine Expeditionary Force had taken a proactive approach to ensuring that its information systems will be compliant in the year 2000. The III Marine Expeditionary Force had made progress with actions to assess system compliance, implement corrective actions, and accurately report status issues for potential year 2000-related failures. When the III MEF year 2000 conversion effort is completed, including participation in further testing and operational evaluations, the risk of mission capability impairment because of year 2000 problems should be low.

Management Comments. We provided a draft of this report on January 15, 1999. Because this report contains no findings or recommendations, written comments were not required, and none were received. Therefore, we are publishing this report in final form.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i

Introduction

Background 1
Objectives 2

Discussion

III Marine Expeditionary Force Year 2000 Program 3

Appendixes

A. Audit Process 9
Scope 9
Methodology 10
Summary of Prior Coverage 10
B. Report Distribution 11

Audit Background

The year 2000 (Y2K) problem is the term most often used to describe the potential failure of information technology systems to process or perform date-related functions before, on, or after the turn of the century. The Y2K problem is rooted in the way that automated information systems record and compute dates. For the past several decades, systems have typically used two digits to represent the year, such as 98 representing 1998, to conserve on electronic data storage and reduce operating costs. However, the year 2000 is indistinguishable from the year 1900 with the two-digit format. As a result of the ambiguity, computers and associated system and application programs that use dates to calculate, compare, or sort could generate incorrect results when working with years following 1999. Calculation of Y2K dates is further complicated because the year 2000 is a leap year, the first century leap year since 1600. The computer systems and applications must recognize February 29, 2000, as a valid date.

DoD Y2K Management Plan. In his role as the DoD Chief Information Officer, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) issued the "DoD Year 2000 Management Plan" (DoD Management Plan) in April 1997. The DoD Management Plan provides the overall DoD strategy and guidance for inventorying, prioritizing, fixing, or retiring systems, and for monitoring progress. The DoD Management Plan states that the DoD Chief Information Officer has overall responsibility for overseeing the DoD solution to the Y2K problem. Also, the DoD Management Plan makes the DoD Components responsible for implementing the five-phase Y2K management process. The DoD Management Plan includes a description of the five-phase Y2K management process.

The Executive Order, "Year 2000 Conversion," February 4, 1998, mandates that Federal agencies do what is necessary to ensure that no critical Federal program experiences disruption because of the Y2K computing problem. The Executive Order also requires that the head of each agency ensure that efforts to address Y2K issues receive the highest priority.

The Secretary of Defense issued the memorandum "Year 2000 Compliance" on August 7, 1998, which reiterates that the Y2K computer problem is a critical national defense issue. The memorandum indicates that Military Departments are responsible for ensuring that their lists of mission-critical systems are accurately reported in the DoD Y2K database effective October 1, 1998. On August 24, 1998, the Deputy Secretary of Defense directed that the Military Departments provide plans for Y2K-related end-to-end testing of their respective functional processes by November 1, 1998.

U.S. Pacific Command. The U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) is the largest of the nine unified commands in the Department of Defense. The PACOM area of responsibility includes 50 percent of the earth's surface and two-thirds of the world's population. It encompasses more than 100 million square miles,

stretching from the west coast of North and South America to the east coast of Africa, and from the Arctic in the north to the Antarctic in the south. It also includes Alaska, Hawaii, and eight U.S. territories. The overall mission of PACOM is to promote peace, deter aggression, respond to crises, and, if necessary, fight and win to advance security and stability throughout the Asia-Pacific region.

The PACOM, located at Camp H.M. Smith, Hawaii, is supported by Component commands from each Service: U.S. Army Pacific, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Marine Forces Pacific, and U.S. Pacific Air Forces. In addition, PACOM exercises combatant control over four sub-unified commands within the region. The sub-unified commands are U.S. Forces Japan, U.S. Forces Korea, Alaskan Command, and Special Operations Command Pacific.

III Marine Expeditionary Force, Okinawa, Japan. The III Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) is the only forward-deployed MEF. The mission of the III MEF is to plan, direct, and coordinate the employment of Marine air, ground, and logistics forces and to form the nucleus of a combined Joint Task Force headquarters for theater contingencies. The III MEF mission areas are divided into three categories: combined Joint Task Force for disaster relief, humanitarian assistance, and lesser regional conflicts; Marine Expeditionary Unit for amphibious raid, disaster relief, humanitarian assistance, and noncombatant evacuation; and The Pacific Theater Operation Plans for large-scale military conflicts and low- to high-intensity conflicts. The III MEF forward-deployed logistics base has a 50-million-gallon fuel capacity, more than 5,000 pieces of equipment in storage, and includes a port in Okinawa that can simultaneously handle two large deck amphibious ships and five smaller ships pierside. The III MEF participates in approximately 70 combined, joint, and bilateral exercises annually.

Objectives

The overall audit objective was to evaluate whether the U.S. Pacific Command had adequately planned for and managed Y2K risks to avoid undue disruption to its mission. Specifically, we reviewed Y2K risk assessments, contingency plans for mission-critical systems, and continuity of operations plans to perform core mission requirements of the III MEF. The review included major DoD communications systems operated within the PACOM area of responsibility.

III Marine Expeditionary Force Year 2000 Program

The III MEF had taken a proactive approach to ensuring that its information systems will be Y2K compliant in the year 2000. The III MEF had initiated several positive actions to assess system compliance, implement corrective actions, and accurately report on the status of issues concerning potential Y2K-related failures. Marine Corps officials at the III MEF were aggressively pursuing documentation of certifications of Y2K- compliant systems and regularly reporting the status to both subordinate command elements and higher headquarters. When the III MEF Y2K conversion effort is completed, risk of impaired III MEF mission capability should be low.

Commandant of the Marine Corps Year 2000 Plan

The Commandant of the Marine Corps Year 2000 Plan requires full involvement of all Marine Corps personnel. The plan requires designating a Y2K point of contact, developing a plan of action to remedy Category I and Category II systems, making regular progress checks on Y2K remediation, and monitoring progress on Y2K issues. The plan also states that Force Commanders are required to report progress in solving Y2K problems monthly to the Commandant of the Marine Corps. Also, the Marine Corps established a web site (http://issb-www1.quantico. usmc.mil) that explains the Marine Corps approach to the Y2K problem and gives detailed Y2K guidance.

Year 2000 Action Plan

The III MEF established a year 2000 action plan to minimize the adverse impact of Y2K and leap year problems. The III MEF Y2K action plan establishes procedures for conducting system inventories, prioritizing system renovations or replacements, providing updates of systems, and monitoring progress. The plan uses the DoD Management Plan phase definitions, as shown in the following list, for appropriate Y2K reporting of systems. The target completion dates for the phases are included in parentheses.

- Phase I – Awareness. Organization and planning take place. (September 1, 1998)
- Phase II – Assessment. Scope of Y2K impact is identified and system level analysis takes place. (November 1, 1998)

- Phase III – Renovation. Required system fixes are accomplished. (December 31, 1998)
- Phase IV – Validation. Systems are confirmed as Y2K compliant through assorted testing-and-compliance processes. (May 1, 1999)
- Phase V – Implementation. Systems are fully operational after being certified as Y2K compliant. (June 1, 1999)

The III MEF action plan is based on the:

- DoD Management Plan,
- Commandant of the Marine Corps Year 2000 Plan,
- Marine Forces Pacific Management Plan, and
- guidance from the Commanding General, III MEF.

Marine Corps Systems Categories

The Marine Corps information technology systems are grouped into four categories. The following table shows the categories and descriptions.

Marine Corps Information Technology Systems Categories and Descriptions

Category	Description
I	Marine Corps centrally sponsored and managed program of record systems
II	Local command-sponsored systems
III	Other DoD Component-sponsored systems
IV	End user-sponsored systems

III MEF Y2K Approach

The III MEF was focused on assessing and coordinating Y2K compliance, improving operational awareness, tracking and assessing progress of all categories of systems, computers and communication devices, solving software problems for Category II systems, and preparing to write continuity of operations plans.

The III MEF appointed Y2K points of contact for all subordinate commands and created an emergency response team to test all of the III MEF computer systems.

The III MEF completed the Y2K assessment of its Category II and IV inventory, and it was monitoring and tracking the status of Category I and III systems. As of October 1998, the III MEF had tested 53 percent of 5,624 computers. Of those 5,624 computers, 1,509 were found to be compliant, 889 were non-compliant, 608 were to be retired, and 2,618 remained to be checked. Of 116 devices, including routers, hubs, networks, and switches, 111 were certified compliant by the manufacturers and 5 remained to be assessed. The III MEF identified 27 non-compliant systems at the 1st Marine Aircraft Wing, 5 non-compliant systems at the 7th Communication Battalion, 2 non-compliant systems at the 3rd Force Service Support Group, and no non-compliant systems in the Facilities Maintenance Branch. The III MEF had budgeted for or procured Y2K-ready systems such as servers, workstations, and laptop computers. The III MEF was tracking contingency plans for Category I and III systems and initiating continuity of operations plans for mission-critical systems.

The III MEF was running Basic Input-Output System checks on all Category II computer systems. The Basic Input-Output System is the program a personal computer's microprocessor uses to get the computer system started after it is turned on. The system also manages the data flow between the computer's operating system and attached devices such as the hard disk, video card, keyboard, mouse, and printer. The Basic Input-Output System check determines Y2K compliance of a personal computer. Non-compliant computer systems will receive software upgrades, be replaced, or be retired. In addition to having an action plan and a command-wide Y2K coordinator, the III MEF was keeping its major subordinate commands informed of Y2K policy and guidance issued by Marine Corps headquarters and had involved its major subordinate commands in Y2K issues.

Y2K Status of Selected III MEF Subordinate Commands

1st Marine Aircraft Wing. The mission of the 1st Marine Aircraft Wing (the Wing) is to conduct air operations in support of the III MEF and to participate as a Component of a Joint Task Force when directed by the Commander in Chief, PACOM. The Wing Y2K efforts focused on identifying locally developed Category II systems, assessing and repairing commercial off-the-shelf and Government off-the-shelf network infrastructure, and tracking the status of Category I telecommunications and aviation equipment.

Assessment of Systems. The Wing was tracking the Y2K status of 97 Wing mission-critical systems. As of October 1998, 27 of those systems were assessed as non-compliant, but all mission-critical systems are projected to be compliant by March 1999.

The Wing had inventoried its Category II systems and identified 1,093 desktop computers, of which 709 were assessed as Y2K compliant. The remaining 384 needed to be replaced. The Wing identified 184 laptops, of which 51 were compliant and 133 needed to be replaced. Of 42 servers, 39 were compliant and 3 needed to be replaced.

In addition, the Wing Y2K coordinator had assessed all of the 169 fixed-wing and rotary aircraft for Y2K compliance and determined that those aircraft were scheduled for Y2K renovations in January 1999.

Availability of Funding. The Wing had determined that it will cost $648,772 just to replace the non-compliant desktop and laptop computers. The entire FY 1999 information technology budget for the Wing is $400,000. If the Wing spends the entire $400,000 budget on replacing the computers, there would still be a shortage of funds amounting to $248,772 and the Wing would not be able to maintain the 10-year-old information infrastructure, perform repairs or purchase replacements for servers when they fail, or train personnel to maintain the infrastructure. If Marine Corps FY 1999 funds are not reprogrammed to provide additional Y2K funding, commands may be forced to pay costs out of their operation and maintenance funds to fix or replace non-compliant Y2K assets and that may impact mission readiness.

7th Communication Battalion. The mission of the 7th Communication Battalion (the Battalion) is to provide communications support, thus ensuring the Task Force Commander has the means to command and control his forces in combat. The Battalion is a self-sustaining organization with a headquarters group directing four companies. The Battalion provides high- to low-capacity terrestrial transmission systems, ground mobile force capabilities, field mobile communications and switching equipment, and other field-located systems and services.

The Battalion Y2K coordinator inventoried and assessed 42 Battalion mission-critical systems, comprising 7 messaging, 17 radio, 5 switching, and 13 transmission systems. Of the 42 systems, 37 were Y2K compliant.

During October 1998, the Battalion was renovating the five systems that were not compliant and was awaiting test and fix guidance from the system program office on the HP 750-satellite system upgrade. All Battalion-owned hardware had been tested for Y2K compliance and reported to higher headquarters personnel as Y2K compliant.

3rd Force Service Support Group. The 3rd Force Service Support Group (the Group) provides combat service support in 24 functional areas that include intermediate-level maintenance, supply support, transportation, landing support operations, automated data processing, disbursing, legal services, medical and dental care, and engineer support. The Group is an integral member of the III MEF air, ground, and logistics team, providing support both in garrison and to forward-deployed units throughout the Western Pacific. The Group conducted Y2K awareness training, assessed systems vulnerable to Y2K, renovated vulnerable systems, and was implementing software solutions to the Y2K problems. To further minimize the adverse impact of Y2K on its computer systems, the Group issued a Year 2000 Operations Order that included guidance for preparing contingency plans in the event of Y2K-related disruptions or failures. The Group Y2K coordinator identified five Group mission-critical systems and found three of the five systems to be Y2K compliant. The remaining two systems were scheduled for Y2K renovations in December 1998. The Group also completed its inventory of 152 Marine Corps Enterprise Systems, 78 of which were Y2K compliant and 74 were not. Of the 152 systems, 47 had completed all of five phases. Five systems were in the assessment phase, 32 were in the renovation phase, 39 were in the validation phase, and 29 were in the implementation phase. The 78 Y2K-compliant systems comprised 36 in the completed phase, 7 in the implementation phase, 15 in the validation phase, and 20 in the renovation phase.

The Group was able to leverage the Y2K vulnerabilities of locally written software as an opportunity to eliminate software that was rarely used and difficult to maintain. By identifying inefficient systems for elimination, the Group was able to significantly reduce its portfolio of less effective systems and to rely instead on common services provided by Category I systems.

Facilities Maintenance Branch, Facilities Engineering. A Y2K program manager was appointed for facilities infrastructure and equipment for Marine Corps Base Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, and Marine Corps Air Station, Futenma, Japan. A Y2K project team was appointed and the infrastructure inventory was completed in May 1998. The assessment phase was completed in July 1998. The implementation phase was ongoing. A total of 4,088 high-priority facility systems were assessed, reported, and made Y2K compliant. Camp Butler was on schedule with all Y2K milestone requirements. However, new systems were being identified by both in-house personnel and Marine Corps headquarters, which will involve further inventory and assessment. Other unique requirements, such as validation of foreign-made equipment and systems, impacted the ability to acquire the information needed for system assessment.

Facilities Engineering had assessed 90 percent of its systems. All of the systems were Y2K compliant. Three of those systems are mission-critical: fire alarm; security; and airfield lights. The Facilities Engineering Y2K project team established a contingency plan to address the unexpected loss of a facility system due to a Y2K problem.

Operation Evaluations

The III MEF was transitioning from the renovation phase into the validation phase. A system-of-systems test plan was being developed by Marine Corps headquarters and the Marine Corps Operational Test and Evaluation Activity planned to conduct an operational evaluation between January and September 1999. However, the III MEF did not have a scheduled exercise that would be suitable for the evaluation. Therefore, III MEF officials appointed a Y2K Operational Evaluation planner to design a III MEF Y2K operational evaluation test scenario. The test scenario will be coordinated with Marine Corps headquarters, the other MEFs, and Marine forward-deployed activities.

Conclusion

We commend the leadership of the III MEF for taking a proactive approach to solving Y2K problems. They addressed the Y2K problem with numerous positive actions and reemphasized the importance of the problem to their subordinate commands. Because of the diligent efforts of the III MEF to search out system assessments, compliance certifications, and solutions to the problems, as well as implementing and testing its own systems, we regarded the III MEF as the most proactive PACOM command we visited. Additional efforts are needed to complete the III MEF Y2K conversion efforts, and unfunded requirements need to be addressed. When the III MEF Y2K conversion effort is completed, including participation in further testing and operational evaluations, risk of mission capability impairment because of Y2K problems should be low.

Appendix A. Audit Process

This is one in a series of reports 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 the issue, see the Y2K web page on the IGnet at http://www.ignet.gov.

Scope

We reviewed and evaluated the III MEF Y2K program. We met with the III MEF Y2K coordinator and information systems personnel to obtain Y2K compliance status of the mission-critical systems. During those meetings, we obtained the Commandant of the Marine Corps Y2K Plan, a memorandum describing the action taken by the III MEF to solve its Y2K problems, an inventory of mission-critical systems, and documentation to support systems that were determined to be Y2K compliant.

DoD-Wide Corporate Level Government Performance and Results Act Goals. In response to the Government Performance and Results Act, the Department of Defense has established 6 DoD-wide corporate-level performance objectives and 14 goals for meeting the objectives. This report pertains to achievement of the following objective and goal.

- **Objective:** Prepare now for an uncertain future.
  Goal: Pursue a focused modernization effort that maintains U.S. qualitative superiority in key war fighting capabilities. **(DoD-3)**

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 objectives and goals in the Information Technology Management Functional Area.

- **Objective:** Become a mission partner.
  Goal: Serve mission information users as customers. **(ITM-1.2)**

- **Objective:** Provide services that satisfy customer information needs.
  Goal: Modernize and integrate DoD information infrastructure. **(ITM-2.2)**

- **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 Management and Technology high-risk area.

Methodology

Audit Type, Dates, and Standards. We performed this program audit from September to December 1998 in accordance with auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD. We did not use computer-processed data to perform this audit.

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

Management Control Program. 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

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. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)
  Deputy Chief Financial Officer
  Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)
Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence)
  Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, 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 (Public Affairs)
Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange

Joint Staff

Director, Joint Staff

Department of the Army

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Army
Chief Information Officer, Army
Inspector General, Department of the Army

Department of the Navy

Commandant of the Marine Corps
  Commander, Marine Forces Pacific
  Commanding General, III Marine Expeditionary Force
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Navy
Chief Information Officer, Navy
Inspector General, Department of the Navy
Inspector General, Marine Corps

Department of the Air Force

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

Unified Commands

Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command
Commander In Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command

Other Defense Organizations

Director, Defense Information Systems Agency
  Inspector General, Defense Information Systems Agency
  Chief Information Officer, Defense Information Systems Agency
  United Kingdom Liaison Office, Defense Information Systems Agency
Director, National Security Agency
  Inspector General, National Security Agency
Inspector General, Defense Intelligence Agency
Inspector General, National Imagery and Mapping Agency
Inspector General, National Reconnaissance Office

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
  Accounting and Information Management Division
    Director, Defense Information and Financial Management Systems

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
Senate Committee on Government 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, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, Committee on Government Reform

Audit Team Members

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

Paul J. Granetto
Robert M. Murrell
Nancee K. Needham
Peter J. Larson
Charles R. Johnson
John R. Huddleston
Elizabeth Lavallee
Elizabeth Ramos