

Audit



Report

REPORTED YEAR 2000 SYSTEM CERTIFICATION LEVELS

Report No. 99-241

August 23, 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 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

CIO	Chief Information Officer
DISA	Defense Information Systems Agency
OASD(C ³ I)	Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence)
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
Y2K	Year 2000



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

August 23, 1999

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

SUBJECT: Audit Report on Reported Year 2000 System Certification Levels
(Report No. 99-241)

We are providing this report for your information and use. We considered management comments on a draft of this report when preparing the final report.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) comments conformed to the requirements of DoD Directive 7650.3; therefore, additional comments are not required.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the audit staff. For additional information on this report, please contact Mr. John J. Jenkins at (703) 604-9088 (DSN 664-9088) (jjenkins@dodig.osd.mil) or Ms. Mary Lu Ugone at (703) 604-9049 (DSN 664-9049) (mugone@dodig.osd.mil). See Appendix C for the report distribution. The 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. 99-241
(Project No. 9AS-0090.06)

August 23, 1999

Reported Year 2000 System Certification Levels

Executive Summary

Introduction. This report is one in a series of reports that the Inspector General, DoD, is issuing in accordance with an informal partnership with the Chief Information Officer, DoD, to monitor DoD efforts to address the year 2000 computing challenge.

Objectives. The overall objective of the audit was to evaluate the reliability and consistency of the centralized reporting of year 2000 system certification-levels, as reported by DoD Components into the DoD Year 2000 Database. A certified system is a system that the system administrator has signed off on as year 2000 compliant via the Year 2000 checklist in Appendix G of the DoD Management Plan.

Results. The detailed DoD year 2000 system certification-level data reported into the DoD Year 2000 Database was unreliable because of inconsistencies in certification-level definitions. The DoD Year 2000 Management Plan encouraged but did not require the use of its sample Year 2000 compliance checklist. Therefore, some individual Components used checklists with different certification-level definitions than the December 1998, DoD Year 2000 Management Plan "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist." In addition, the DoD Year 2000 Management Plan included inconsistent definitions of certification levels. This created the problem that, even if the Components converted their unique certification levels to equivalent DoD certification levels before reporting into the DoD Year 2000 Database, there was no way to determine which DoD policy document was used as the guideline. Inconsistent certification-level data in the DoD Year 2000 Database hampered its utility as a tool for analytical purposes. If management saw value in collecting this data, stronger measures were needed to ensure data reliability. See the finding section for additional discussion.

Summary of Recommendations. We recommend that the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) correct the certification-level reporting inconsistencies contained in the DoD Year 2000 Management Plan and require the certification-level information, for certified systems, to be verified and corrected based on the updated reporting guidance.

Management Comments. The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) concurred with the recommendations, stating that Year 2000 Program Office has corrected the certification-level inconsistencies cited in the report. The Year 2000 Program Office has also coordinated with the DoD Components to ensure certification-level information is correctly reported. See the finding section for a summary of management comments and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) Comments section for the complete text of the comments.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	
Background	1
Objectives	2
Finding	
Certification-Level Reporting	3
Appendixes	
A. Audit Process	
Scope	10
Methodology	11
Summary of Prior Coverage	11
B. Compliance Checklist Comparison	12
C. Report Distribution	13
Management Comments	
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) Comments	17

Background

Year 2000 Reporting Requirements. On March 12, 1997, the Chief Information Officer (CIO), DoD, issued the memorandum "Year 2000 Refined Reporting Requirements for DoD," that established quarterly reporting requirements for year 2000 (Y2K) assessment and progress across DoD. The purpose of the reporting requirements was to ensure a thorough and successful transition to Y2K compliance for all systems.

On June 19, 1998, the Senior Civilian Official, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) (OASD[C³I]), issued the memorandum, "Year 2000 Database Reporting," which stated that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) required monthly Y2K reports to successfully monitor the Federal Government's compliance efforts. The DoD Y2K Database was to be used to satisfy the reporting requirements. Because of this, the memorandum stated that the Y2K database should be populated with current updates to ensure accurate and timely information is provided to the OMB. In addition, on September 23, 1998, the Senior Civilian Official, OASD(C³I), issued the memorandum, "Year 2000 (Y2K) Compliance - FY 1999 Reporting Requirements," which stated that the Military Departments, the Commanders in Chief, and the Defense Agencies are responsible for consistent, accurate, and timely submission of Y2K information for the DoD Y2K Database. It also stated they must ensure adherence to the June 19, 1998, memorandum.

DoD Y2K Management Plan. The OASD (C³I) issued the most recent DoD Y2K Management Plan, version 2.0, in December 1998. The DoD Y2K Management Plan discusses reporting requirements and names the DoD Deputy CIO as the focal point for consolidating and coordinating all DoD-wide Y2K reporting requirements. The Deputy CIO, DoD, also establishes Y2K reporting requirements and maintains the DoD Y2K Database. DoD Components must provide accurate and timely input to the DoD Y2K Database.

DoD Component Y2K Plans. According to the DoD Y2K Management Plan, the DoD Components shall plan for and execute corrective actions to ensure Component-wide Y2K compliance. The DoD Components are required to establish and maintain a Component-wide Y2K management plan for mission and function.

DoD Y2K Database. The DoD Y2K Database was designed to provide a composite picture of DoD Y2K information and is the centralized repository of Y2K management data for the DoD. The database is used to meet forecast reporting requirements. It also provides a summary-level Y2K management and analysis tool. The DoD Y2K Database can be accessed only by registered users through a secure website on the Internet, but those users include personnel from units, commands, and other organizations throughout the DoD. It is the only source for the current status of mission-critical and mission-essential systems throughout DoD. As stated in the DoD Y2K Management Plan, the DoD Y2K Database information is the official source for reporting the status of systems to

senior management and the OMB. The database also provides data and structure for supporting future Office of the Secretary of Defense analysis requirements regarding Y2K readiness.

Objectives

The overall objective of the audit was to evaluate the reliability and consistency of the centralized reporting of Y2K system certification levels, as reported by DoD Components into the DoD Year 2000 Database. See Appendix A for a discussion of the audit scope, methodology, and prior coverage.

Certification-Level Reporting

Certification-level information for DoD systems was not consistently reported into the DoD Y2K Database and is reported using varying levels of detail. Consistency was lacking because the DoD Y2K Management Plan encouraged but did not require the use of its sample Y2K compliance checklist. Therefore, some individual Components used checklists with different certification-level definitions than the December 1998, DoD Y2K Management Plan “Y2K Compliance Checklist.” In addition, DoD guidance included inconsistent definitions of certification levels. Further, even if DoD Components converted their unique certification levels to match the DoD Y2K Management Plan certification-levels before reporting, it would be uncertain which version of the DoD Y2K Management Plan definitions were used for conversion. Because of these reporting inconsistencies, the detailed Y2K system certification data in the DoD Y2K Database was unreliable and could not be effectively used for analytical purposes.

Review of Certification Checklists and Reported Certification Levels

DoD Y2K Management Plan Section 4.0, “Management Strategy and Processes,” calls for centralized policy and decentralized implementation/execution. It allows each DoD Component maximum flexibility to implement solutions deemed appropriate. Section 5.6, “DoD Component responsibilities,” states that the Components will establish and maintain Component-wide Y2K management plans appropriate for their missions and functions. In addition, Appendix A, section 4.5, “Y2K Compliance Certification,” states that Appendix G, “Year 2000 Compliance Checklist,” is a sample and does not require its use.

The December 1998, DoD Y2K Management Plan defined a certified system as a system that the system administrator has signed off on as Y2K compliant. The certification levels specified in December 1998, DoD Y2K Management Plan Appendix G, "Y2K Compliance Checklist," are:

- Level 0: System retired or replaced;
- Level 1: Full independent testing;
- Level 1a: Full independent testing completed using a four-digit year format;
- Level 1b: Full independent testing completed using a two-digit year format;
- Level 2: Independent audit;
- Level 2a: Independent audit of system and existing testing completed using a four-digit year format;
- Level 2b: Independent audit of system and existing testing completed using a two-digit year format;
- Level 3: Self-Certification;
- Level 3a: Self-certification with full use of four-digit century date fields;
- Level 3b: Self-certification indicates risk due to use of two-digit century fields;
- Level 3c: Self-certification indicates risk due to ambiguous usage of dates;
- Level 3d: Self-certification indicates potential problems (system needs additional work before Y2K processing can be assured with any level of reliability);
- Level 4: Not certified or system requires additional work; and
- Level 5: Does not process date-related data.

We reviewed the reported certification-level definitions and checklists for DoD and four DoD Components—the Department of the Army, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of the Navy, and the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA)—to determine whether reporting definitions were consistently used. Each Component plan was compared to the DoD Y2K Management Plan, version 2.0, Appendix G, "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist," December 1998 (See Appendix B). These four DoD Components accounted for 84 percent of the systems (67 percent of the mission-critical systems) included in the DoD Y2K Database.

The Y2K plans that were compared to the DoD Y2K Management plan are: "US Army Year 2000 Action Plan, Revision II," (June 1998); "Department of the Air Force Year 2000 Guidance Package," (April 1997); "Department of the Navy Year 2000 Action Plan;" and the "DISA Y2K Compliance Checklist," (December 1998). We did not review whether the DoD Components attempted to convert their certification levels to the DoD certification levels.

Department of Defense. DoD guidance was inconsistent in its definitions of certification levels. Within the December 1998, Version 2.0 of the DoD Y2K Management Plan are contradictory definitions for four certification levels. Appendix G, "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist," of the DoD Y2K Management Plan defines certification-level 1a as "Full independent testing completed using a four-digit year format" and level 1b as "Full independent testing completed using a two-digit year format." In contrast, Appendix J, "Year 2000 Database Guidance," of the DoD Y2K Management Plan reverses the two- and four-digit year format definitions for the certification-levels. The same is true for certification-levels 2a and 2b. In addition, Appendix J states that certification levels 1, 2, and 3 are acceptable for the database, but these values are not possible certification-levels on the Appendix G, "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist."

In addition to the differences within Version 2.0, the April 1997, Version 1.0 of the DoD Y2K Management Plan included a checklist that did not distinguish between two- or four-digit year formats. It also did not include a certification-level 5 (defined as "Does not process date related data" in the December 1998 DoD Y2K Management Plan).

Also, the For Signature Draft Version 2.0, June 1998, of the DoD Y2K Management Plan included a compliance checklist at Appendix G that defined certifications levels with opposite two- and four-digit year format definitions from the December 1998 DoD Y2K Management Plan "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist." The June 1998, Appendix G, "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist," also defines certification-levels 2a and 2b, but does not include them as certification-levels on the checklist. Instead, the June 1998, Appendix G, "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist" has a certification-level 2, which is not defined.

Department of the Army. There are three areas of discrepancies between the December 1998 DoD Y2K Management Plan, Appendix G, "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist," and the Army Y2K Action Plan Compliance Checklist. The discrepancies and number of systems related to those discrepancies during the period of May 13 to May 19, 1999, are listed below:

- The Army Y2K Compliance Checklist includes certification-levels 1, 2, and 3 with a distinction between independent testing, independent audit, and self-certification. The DoD Y2K Management Plan "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist" has certification-levels that distinguish between those categories but requires information on whether the testing was completed with two- or four-digit year formats (levels 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, and 3b). As a result, even a conversion of the Army certification-levels to equate them with the DoD Y2K Management Plan would not produce a level of detail equivalent to the DoD Y2K Management Plan "Year

2000 Compliance Checklist.” Systems certified at level 1, 2, or 3 account for 535 of 1168 (46 percent) of the total Army systems and 235 of 413 (57 percent) of the Army mission-critical systems;

- The Army Action Plan defines certification-level 0 as “System does not process date data,” which is equivalent to the DoD certification-level 5. In the DoD Y2K Management Plan, a 0 certification means the “System is retired or replaced,” which is not an Army certification-level. The number of Army systems certified as level 0 or level 5 accounts for 509 of 1168 (44 percent) of the total Army systems and 156 of 413 (38 percent) of the mission-critical systems; and,
- The Army Action Plan defines certification-level 4 as “System not fielded yet–Y2K compliance contract language is in place.” The DoD Y2K Management Plan defines level 4 as “Not certified or system requires additional work.” Because of the definition discrepancies, systems may not be properly categorized in the DoD Y2K Database. The number of Army systems certified as level 4 accounts for 122 of 1,168 (10 percent) of the total Army systems and 22 of 413 (5 percent) of the mission-critical systems.

Department of the Air Force. The Air Force Y2K Guidance Package Compliance Checklist is similar to the December 1998 DoD Y2K Management Plan “Year 2000 Compliance Checklist,” but with some differences. The differences and number of systems related to those differences during the period of May 13 to May 19, 1999, are listed below:

- The DoD Y2K Management Plan specifies between two- and four- digit testing in levels 1a, 1b, 2a, and 2b. The Air Force Y2K Guidance Package does not specify two- and-four digit testing in levels 1a, 1b, 2a, and 2b which account for 513 of 3,339 (17 percent) of the systems including 145 of 398 (36 percent) of the mission-critical systems;
- The Air Force Y2K Compliance Checklist does not include a certification-level 5. The Air Force has 199 of 3,339 (6 percent) of its total systems and 22 of 398 (6 percent) of the mission-critical systems certified as level 5 in the DoD Y2K Database; and,
- The Air Force does not include levels 1, 2, or 3 as certification-levels on its Compliance Checklist. However, it does have 794 of 3,339 (24 percent) of its total systems and 169 of 398 (42 percent) of its mission-critical systems certified at those levels in the DoD Y2K Database.

Department of the Navy. The Navy Y2K Action Plan is similar to the December 1998 DoD Y2K Management Plan “Year 2000 Compliance Checklist,” except for one noted difference. The difference and number of systems related to that difference during the period of May 13 to May 19, 1999, are listed below:

Both the DoD Y2K Management Plan and the Department of the Navy Y2K Action Plan contain levels 1a, 1b, 2a, and 2b making testing distinguishable

between two- and four-digit testing. However, there are differences in the definitions with the DoD Y2K Management Plan "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist." The Navy certification-level 1a is defined as "Full independent testing using a two- digit year format" which is equivalent to the DoD 1b certification-level. The Navy 1b certification-level is "Full independent testing using a four-digit year format," which is equivalent to the DoD 1a certification level. The same is true for the level 2a and 2b certifications. These account for 791 of 2,123 (37 percent) of the Navy total systems and 188 of 598 (31 percent) of the Navy mission-critical systems.

Defense Information Systems Agency. The DISA Compliance Checklist is similar to the DoD Y2K Management Plan "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist." The differences and number of systems related to those differences on May 13, 1999 are listed below:

- The DISA Compliance Checklist defines certification-levels 1, 2, and 3, but it does not include certifications at those levels. Instead, the compliance checklist includes certification-levels 1a, 1b, 2a, and 2b, which are not defined. The DoD Y2K Management Plan "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist" allows and defines certification-levels 1a, 1b, 2a, and 2b. DISA systems certified at levels 1a, 1b, 2a, and 2b account for 40 of 59 (68 percent) total and mission-critical systems and,
- Although the DISA Compliance Checklist defines the level 2 certification, it does not permit it as a certifiable level. This is similar to the DoD Y2K Management Plan "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist." This accounts for 1 of 59 (2 percent) of the reported DISA systems.

Potential or Known Uses of DoD Y2K Certification-Level Information

The December 1998, DoD Y2K Management Plan established the DoD Y2K Database as the single official source for reporting the status of systems. DoD Y2K certification-level information is one of the items reported into the DoD Y2K Database. However, the DoD Y2K Management Plan does not indicate

specifically why certification-level information is required to be reported and collected. We determined that there were at least six potential or known uses of the certification-level information:

- Focus management attention on systems that were self-certified, which do not undergo the same rigor as systems certified based on independent testing or verification. Certification level 3 is self-certification of system Y2K compliance, which assumes a higher level of potential failures. Numerous audit reports have found that systems were certified without adequately meeting test and certification requirements.
- Identify the magnitude of certified systems that actually converted from a two-digit to a four-digit format, thereby providing a measure of Y2K progress and of the potential remaining post-millennium work related to two digit formats. Based on the certification-level information contained in the DoD Y2K Database and the December 1998 Appendix G, "Y2K Compliance Checklist" definition, 254 certified mission-critical systems still use the two-digit year format. Additionally, 1,174 non mission critical systems still continued to use the two-digit year format. The number of Army systems using the two-digit year format could not be determined, because its certification-level does not provide that level of detail. The weapons systems functional area Y2K POC also indicated that the number of systems certified using a two-digit year format give the appearance of a patch, compared to the appearance of a "true" fix with the four- digit year format.
- Use of the information by some of the DoD functional area end-to-end testers. Specifically, the Communications functional end-to-end testing representative stated the information was being used to determine which systems need to be tested in an Operational Evaluation or integration test. The Weapons System Functional area Y2K end-to-end testing point of contact stated that the information is used as a measure of a systems credibility to the claim that it will not have any Y2K problems. The Joint Staff uses this database for overall research and analysis.
- Use of the DoD Y2K Database as the single official source for reported system information; the database has 453 registered users.
- Provide a measure of overall confidence in the Year 2000 readiness in the Department of Defense.
- Report to OMB the number of systems as certified or not yet certified.

Not all of the potential uses listed in this report have equal importance, but we see merit in them. The certification-level information in the DoD Y2K Database cannot be used for these purposes if it is not reliable, and based on our review and the inconsistencies found, we do not deem the information to be

reliable. If management does not feel these or other uses have merit, they should not expend the resources on managing and updating the certification-level information in the DoD Y2K Database, and the information should be deleted from the DoD Y2K Database. However, if management deems the certification-level information to be useful, then the data should be corrected.

Recommendations

We recommend that the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence):

- 1. Correct the certification-level reporting inconsistencies contained in the DoD Year 2000 Management Plan; and**
- 2. Notify the DoD Component data owners to verify and correct, as needed, the information contained in the DoD Year 2000 Database using the updated reporting guidance.**

Management Comments. The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) concurred with the recommendations, stating that Year 2000 Program Office has corrected the certification-level inconsistencies cited in the report. The Year 2000 Program Office has also coordinated with the DoD Components to ensure certification-level information is correctly reported.

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 CIO, 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

Work Performed. We reviewed the reported Y2K certification-levels of the systems listed in the DoD Y2K Database from May 13 to 19, 1999. We reviewed four Components (Army, Air Force, Navy, and DISA) certification-level definitions from their respective Y2K Management Plans. We determined the definition of each certification level and documented the differences and similarities between them and the DoD Y2K Management Plan. We also evaluated the usefulness of the reported certification levels and determined some potential uses of the certification level data.

DoD-wide Corporate Level Government Performance and Results Act Goals. In response to the Government Performance 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 objectives and goals.

Objective: Prepare now for an uncertain future. **Goal:** Pursue a focused modernization effort that maintains U.S. qualitative superiority in key warfighting 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 functional area objectives and goals.

- **Information Technology Management Functional Area. Objective:** Become a mission partner. **Goal:** Serve mission information users as customers. (ITM-1.2)
- **Information Technology Management Functional Area. Objective:** Provide services that satisfy customer information needs. **Goal:** Modernize and integrate Defense information infrastructure. (ITM-2.2)
- **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 the Y2K as high. This report provides coverage of that problem of the overall Information Management and Technology high-risk area.

Methodology

Audit Type, Dates, and Standards. We performed this economy and efficiency audit from May 1999 through July 1999, 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 for this Audit.

Contacts During the Audit. We visited or contacted individuals and organizations within DoD. Further details are available on 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 at <http://www.dodig.osd.mil>.

Appendix B. Compliance Checklist Comparison

DoD Dec. 1998 Version 2.0 Appendix G Compliance Checklist		DoD Version 2.0 Appendix J			
		Air Force	Army	DISA	Navy
0		0		0	0
1			1		
1a		1a	1	1	1b
1b		1b	1	1	1a
2			2		
2a		2a	2	2	2b
2b		2b	2	2	2a
3		3	3	3	3
3a		3a	3	3a	3a
3b		3b	3	3b	3b
3c		3c	3	3c	3c
3d		3d	3	3d	3d
4		4	4*	4	4
5			0	5	5

* It appears there may be instances where the Army Compliance Checklist level 4 definition does not match the DoD Y2K Management Plan Appendix G, "Year 2000 Compliance Checklist" level 4 definition.

The DoD December 1998 Version 2.0 Appendix G, "Compliance Checklist" certification levels are listed down the left column. These certification levels are defined in the Appendix G. In the Appendix J of the same DoD Management Plan there are differences that are noted in the spreadsheet. The Air Force, Army, DISA, and Navy all have their own management plans. This chart is setup to show the translation of Component certification-level definitions to the DoD certification-level definitions.

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)
Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence)
Deputy Chief Information Officer and Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
(Chief Information Officer Policy and Implementation)
Principal Director for Year 2000

Joint Staff

Director, Joint Staff

Department of the Army

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

Department of the Navy

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

Department of the Air Force

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Chief Information Officer, Air Force
Inspector General, Department of the Air Force
Auditor 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. Southern Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Space Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Transportation Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Strategic Command

Other Defense Organizations

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency
Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service
Director, Defense Information Systems Agency
 Inspector General, Defense Information Systems Agency
 Chief Information Officer, Defense Information Systems Agency
 United Kingdom Liaison Officer, Defense Information Systems Agency
Director, Defense Logistics Agency
Director, Defense Threat Reduction 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

Chief Information Officer, General Services Administration
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
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

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



COMMAND, CONTROL,
COMMUNICATIONS, AND
INTELLIGENCE

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
5000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-6000
August 9, 1999

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

SUBJECT: Audit Report on Reported Year 2000 Systems Certification Levels
(Project No. 9AS-0090)

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence), has reviewed the Draft Audit Report on the Year 2000 Systems Certification Levels, dated July 16, 1999.

After reviewing the draft report, C3I concurs with the recommendation below, and provides an explanation for the cited inconsistencies: "...that the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) correct the certification-level reporting inconsistencies contained in the DoD Year 2000 Management Plan and require the certification-level information, for certified systems to be verified and corrected based on the updated reporting guidance."

The Y2K Program Office corrected the certification-level inconsistencies, noted in the report on July 17, 1999. Currently, the certification-level information in Appendixes G and J of the DoD Y2K Management Plan (see attachment) and the DoD Y2K web database are consistent. Additional checklist inconsistencies, not mentioned in the report, have been submitted for correction.

The Y2K Program Office has also coordinated with the DoD Components to ensure reported certification-level information is reported correctly in the DoD Y2K Database. The Comments account for the differences between the DoD certification levels and their individual component certification-levels at the time of data entry into the DoD Y2K Database.

My point of contact for any additional information is Major Lois Betin, telephone: (703) 602-0980 ext. 119, email: deloise.betin@csd.pentagon.mil.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Marvin J. Livingston".

Marvin J. Livingston
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
(Deputy CIO & Year 2000)

Attachment



Corrected APPENDIX G

YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST

G.10 CERTIFICATION LEVELS ARE DEFINED BELOW. Yes and N/A are considered positive responses. No is a negative response.

LEVEL	
0	System retired or replaced
1	Full independent testing
1a	Full independent testing completed using a two digit year format: - All questions have positive responses except possibly 7a
1b	Full independent testing completed using a four digit year format - All questions have positive responses except possibly 7b
2	Independent audit
2a	Independent audit of system and existing testing completed using a two digit year format: - All questions have positive responses except possibly 7a
2b	Independent audit of system and existing testing completed using a four digit year format All questions have positive responses except possibly 7b
3	Self-Certification CAUTION: Self-certification assumes a higher risk level of potential failures
3a	Self-certification with full use of 4 digit century date fields - All questions have positive responses except possibly 7b
3b	Self-certification indicates risk due to use of 2 digit century fields - All questions have positive responses except possibly 7a
3c	Self-certification indicates risk due to ambiguous usage of dates Question 5-a,b,c,d or e have negative responses.
3d	Self-certification indicates potential problems (System needs additional work before Year 2000 processing can be assured with any level of reliability) Question 2-a,h,c,d, or e have negative responses, or - Question 3 a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i or j have negative responses, or - Question 4-a,b,c or d have negative responses, or - Question 5-a,b,c,d, or e have negative responses, or - Question 6 a,b, or c have negative responses, or - Question 9-h has a negative response.
4	Not certified or system requires additional work.
5	Does not process date related data

Corrected APPENDIX J

YEAR 2000 DATABASE GUIDANCE

Table 1. DoD Y2K Extract Format

cert_level	Definition
0 or 00	System retired or replaced
1	Full independent testing
1a	Full independent testing completed using a two digit year format
1b	Full independent testing completed using a four digit year format
2	Independent audit
2a	Independent audit of system and existing testing completed using a two digit year format
2b	Independent audit of system and existing testing completed using a four digit year format
3	Self-Certification
3a	Self-Certification (4 digit century date)
3b	Self-Certification (2 digit century date)
3c	Self-Certification (with date ambiguity)
3d	Self-Certification (with potential problems)
4	Not certified
5	Does not process date related data

Audit Team Members

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

Thomas F. Gimble
Patricia A. Brannin
Mary Lu Ugone
Kathryn M. Truex
Scott S. Brittingham
John J. Jenkins
Ericka P. Savage
Lori A. Musson
Jeffrey M. Williams