~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

Report No. 05-INTEL-09
May 13, 2005
Infrastructure and Environment

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR INTELLIGENCE

Defense Intelligence Agency Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes for Base Realignment and Closure 2005

~~SPECIAL WARNING~~

~~*BRAC-related reports are exempt from release under section 552(b)(5), title 5, United States Code, "Freedom of Information Act," and DoD Directive 5400.7, "DoD Freedom of Information Act Program," September 1998 (Exemption Number 5, paragraph C3.2.1.5).*~~

~~*After May 16, 2005, when the Secretary of Defense publicly releases the recommendations for closure or realignment, this report is no longer exempt from release.*~~

~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

Additional Copies

To obtain additional copies of this report, contact [redacted] at (703) 604-[redacted] (DSN 664-[redacted] or [redacted] at (703) 604-[redacted] (DSN 664[redacted]

Suggestions for Future Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits or evaluations of Defense intelligence issues, contact the Office of the Deputy Inspector General for Intelligence at (703) 604-8800 (DSN 664-8800) or fax (703) 604-0045. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

Office of the Deputy Inspector General for Intelligence
Department of Defense Inspector General
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 703)
Arlington, VA 22202-4704

Acronyms

BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
COBRA	Cost of Base Realignment Actions
DIA	Defense Intelligence Agency
DoD OIG	DoD Office of Inspector General
ICP	Internal Control Plan
JCSG	Joint Cross Service Group
JIC	Joint Intelligence Command
JRIC	Joint Reserve Intelligence Center
OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense

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

May 13, 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

SUBJECT: Report on Defense Intelligence Agency Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes for Base Realignment and Closure 2005 (Report No. 05-INTEL-09)

We are providing this report for information and use. We performed the audit in response to a request from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. No written response to this report was required, and none was received. Therefore, we are publishing this report in final form.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the staff. Questions should be directed to (b)(6) at (703) 604-(b)(6) (DSN 664-(b)(6) or (b)(6) at (703) 604-(b)(6) (DSN 664-(b)(6) . See Appendix F for the report distribution. The team members are listed inside the back cover.

Shelton R. Young
Assistant Inspector General
for Intelligence

~~Special Warning~~

~~BRAC-related reports are exempt from release under section 552 (b) (5), title 5, United States Code, "Freedom of Information Act," and DoD Directive 5400.7, "DoD Freedom of Information Act Program," September 1998 (Exemption Number 5, paragraph C3.2.1.5).~~

~~After May 16, 2005, when the Secretary of Defense publicly releases the recommendation for closure or realignment, this report is no longer exempt for release.~~

~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

~~BRAC-related reports are exempt from release under section 552 (b) (5), United States Code, "Freedom of Information Act," and DoD Directive 5400.7, "DoD Freedom of Information Act Program," September 1998 (Exemption Number 5, paragraph C3.2.1.5).~~

Department of Defense Office of Inspector General

Report No. 05-INTEL-09 **May 13, 2005**
(Project No. D2004-DINTEL-0078.000)

Defense Intelligence Agency Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes for Base Realignment and Closure 2005

Executive Summary

Who Should Read This Report and Why? Office of the Secretary of Defense personnel responsible for deciding the realignment or closure of military installations based on the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) data calls and Defense Intelligence Agency management personnel should read this report. The report discusses the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of the data provided by the Defense Intelligence Agency to assist the Secretary of Defense in BRAC 2005 recommendations.

Background. BRAC 2005 is the formal process outlined in Public Law 101-510, "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990," as amended, under which the Secretary of Defense may realign or close military installations inside the United States and its territories. As part of BRAC 2005, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics issued, "Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC 2005) Policy Memorandum One-Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures," April 16, 2003, which stated that the DoD Office of Inspector General would review the accuracy of BRAC data and the certification process.

The BRAC 2005 process was mandated for the United States and its territories and was divided into the following data calls – capacity analysis, supplemental capacity, Military value, Cost of Base Realignment Actions, Joint Process Action Team Criterion Number 7, and scenario specific. The Intelligence agencies' collection process was divided into the following data calls – capacity analysis and Military value, and scenario specific. This report summarizes the data calls as of April 2005, for the Defense Intelligence Agency BRAC 2005 process.

The Defense Intelligence Agency, located in Washington DC, is a member of the National Intelligence Community and a primary producer of foreign military intelligence. The Defense Intelligence Agency was required to perform the capacity analysis, Military value, and scenario specific data calls. The DIA was responsible for collecting data from the Joint Intelligence Commands and the Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers, which were required to perform only the capacity analysis and Military value data calls.

Results. We evaluated the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation for the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Joint Intelligence Commands, and the Joint Reserve

Intelligence Centers BRAC 2005 data and compliance with applicable internal control plans. The Defense Intelligence Agency data call responses were not fully supported. The Defense Intelligence Agency collected and submitted responses to 17 questions during the capacity analysis data call, 9 of which were partially supported and 1 was unsupported. The Defense Intelligence Agency collected and submitted responses to 11 questions during the Military value data call, 5 of which were partially supported. The scenario specific data calls provided generally reasonable responses and adequate supporting documentation.

The Defense Intelligence Agency internal control plan properly incorporated and supplemented the Office of the Secretary of Defense internal control plan; however, the Defense Intelligence Agency did not provide the internal control plan to the Joint Intelligence Commands and Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers for their use and implementation. Regarding compliance with the internal control plans, the Defense Intelligence Agency did not properly mark all documents; did not maintain all nondisclosure agreements; and did not maintain a separate question page as required, during the capacity analysis data call. During the Military value and scenario data calls, the Defense Intelligence Agency followed all internal control plan processes and corrected the noncompliances identified during the capacity analysis data call. The identified not fully supported responses and the noncompliances with the ICPs should not affect the reliability and integrity of the DIA data for use in the BRAC 2005 analysis (finding A).

The responses provided by the Joint Intelligence Commands and the Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers for the BRAC 2005 data calls were generally not fully supported. During the capacity analysis data call the Joint Intelligence Commands each collected and submitted responses to 17 questions, while the Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers submitted a combined response to 17 questions. During the Military value data call the Joint Intelligence Commands each collected and submitted responses to 11 questions, while the Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers submitted a combined response to 11 questions. The data collection processes for the Military value data call generally did not comply with applicable internal control plans. During the Military value data call the Joint Intelligence Commands and the Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers did not provide supporting documentation for all Commands or Centers. When providing supporting documentation, it was not properly marked as required in the Defense Intelligence Agency internal control plan. The identified not fully supported responses and the noncompliances with the internal control plans could affect the reliability and integrity of the data that the individual Joint Intelligence Commands and the Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers provided for use in BRAC 2005 analysis (findings B and C).

Management Comments. We provided a draft of this report on May 5, 2005 to the Director, Defense Intelligence Agency. No written response to this report was required, and none was received. Therefore, we are publishing this report in final form.

Table of Contents

Background

Base Realignment and Closure 2005. Public Law 101-510, "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990," as amended, establishes the procedures under which the Secretary of Defense may realign or close military installations inside the United States and its territories. The law authorizes the establishment of an independent Commission to review the Secretary of Defense recommendations for realigning and closing military installations. The Secretary of Defense established and chartered the Infrastructure Executive Council and the Infrastructure Steering Group as the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 deliberative bodies responsible for leadership, direction, and guidance. The Secretary of Defense must submit BRAC recommendations to the independent Commission by May 16, 2005.

Joint Cross-Service Groups. A primary objective of BRAC 2005, in addition to realigning base structure, is to examine and implement opportunities for greater joint activity. The Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) established seven Joint Cross-Service Groups (JCSG)–Education and Training, Headquarters and Support Activities, Industrial, Intelligence, Medical, Supply and Storage, and Technical–to addressed issues that are common business-oriented support functions, examine functions in the context of facilities, and develop realignment and closure recommendations based on force structure plans of the Armed Forces and on selection criteria. To analyze the issues, each JCSG developed data call questions to obtain information about the functions that they reviewed.

BRAC Data Calls. The BRAC 2005 data collection process was mandated for the United States and its territories. The collection process was divided into the following data calls – capacity analysis, supplemental capacity, Military value, Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA), Joint Process Action Team Criterion Number 7 and scenario specific. The supplemental capacity analysis, Military value, COBRA, and Joint Process Action Team Criterion Number 7 data calls are collectively known as the second data call. The Services, Defense agencies, and Defense-wide Organizations used either automated data collection tools or a manual process to collect data call responses. Each data call had a specific purpose as follows.

- The capacity analysis data call gathered data on infrastructure, current workload, surge requirements, and maximum capacity.
- The supplemental capacity data call clarified inconsistent data gathered during the initial capacity analysis data call.
- The Military value data call gathered data on mission requirements, survivability, land and facilities, mobilization, and contingency.

- The COBRA data call gathered data to develop costs, savings, and payback (formerly known as return on investment) of proposed realignment and closure action.
- The Joint Process Action Team Criterion Number 7 data call gathered data to assess the community's ability to support additional forces, missions, and personnel associated with individual scenarios.[1]
- The scenario specific data call questions gathered data related to specific scenario conditions for realignment or closure.

BRAC Intelligence Agencies' Data Calls. The Intelligence agencies' collection process was divided into the following data calls – capacity analysis, Military value, and scenario specific. The scenario specific data call included COBRA data. The Joint Process Action Team collected the data for Criterion Number 7, which the Intelligence JCSG used to develop its scenario specific data calls. The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency was the only intelligence agency required to collect its own data for Criterion Number 7. The Intelligence agencies used a manual process to collect data call responses.

DoD Office of Inspector General Responsibility. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics', "Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC 2005) Policy Memorandum One-Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures," April 16, 2003, required the DoD Office of Inspector General (DoD OIG) to provide advice and review the accuracy of BRAC data and the certification process. This report summarizes issues related to the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), Joint Intelligence Commands (JICs), and Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers (JRICs) BRAC 2005 process.

Internal Control Plans. Before the BRAC data calls were released to the Service and Defense agencies, OSD required the Services and the Defense agencies to prepare internal control plans (ICPs) that incorporated and supplemented the OSD ICP. The OSD ICP was issued in the "Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC 2005) Policy Memorandum One--Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures." The DIA prepared "Defense Intelligence Agency Base Realignment and Closure 2005 Internal Control Plan Amended February 24, 2004" on February 24, 2004, and updated it on August 16, 2004, to comply with the OSD requirement.

DIA. Headquartered in Washington DC, the DIA is a member of the National Intelligence Community and a primary producer of foreign military intelligence. DIA provides military and military-related intelligence to warfighters, defense

[1] A scenario is a description of one or more potential closure or realignment actions identified for formal analysis by either a JCSG or Military Department.

policymakers, and planners to support military operations, planning, and weapons system acquisition. The DIA was required to perform the capacity analysis, Military value, and scenario specific data calls.

JICs. There are nine JICs in the DoD, at the U.S. Central Command; U.S. European Command; U.S. Joint Forces Command; U.S. Northern Command; U.S. Pacific Command; U.S. Southern Command, U.S. Special Operations Command; U.S. Strategic Command; and U.S. Transportation Command. The overall mission is to maintain the security of the commands, including its assigned or attached forces and assets, and to protect the United States, its possessions, and bases against attack or hostile incursion. The JICs were required to perform the capacity analysis and Military value data calls. However, for the purpose of the BRAC process U.S. European Command was not required to submit data.

JRICs. There are 27 JRIC sites in various locations across the United States. The JRICs are softcopy production and communications sites with advanced intelligence production computers and capabilities. Each of the JRICs is staffed by part-time Reservists producing full-time intelligence for the intelligence community. The JRICs were required to perform the capacity analysis and Military value data calls.

Objectives

The overall objective of the audit was to evaluate the validity, integrity, and supporting documentation of data that the DIA collected and submitted for the BRAC 2005 process. In addition, we evaluated whether the DIA complied with the OSD and DIA ICPs. This report is one in a series on data integrity and internal control processes for BRAC 2005. See Appendix A for a discussion of the scope and methodology related to the audit objectives and Appendix B for prior coverage.

A. Defense Intelligence Agency Base Realignment and Closure 2005 Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes

The responses provided by DIA for the BRAC 2005 data calls were not fully supported. The DIA collected and submitted responses to 17 questions during the capacity analysis data call, 9 of which were partially supported and 1 was unsupported. The DIA collected and submitted responses to 11 questions during the Military value data call, 5 of which were partially supported. The scenario specific data calls provided generally reasonable responses and adequate supporting documentation. The DIA ICP properly incorporated the OSD ICP. However, we identified several noncompliances during the capacity analysis data call review.

- DIA did not provide the ICP to the JICs and JRICs.
- DIA did not properly mark all documents.
- The Trusted-Agent did not maintain all nondisclosure agreements.
- DIA did not maintain a separate question page as required by the DIA ICP.

During the Military value and scenario data calls, DIA followed all ICP processes and corrected the noncompliances identified during the capacity analysis data call. The identified not fully supported responses and the noncompliances with the ICPs should not affect the reliability and integrity of the DIA data for use in the BRAC 2005 analysis.

Defense Intelligence Agency BRAC 2005 Data Call Submissions

The responses provided by DIA for the capacity analysis and Military value BRAC 2005 data calls were not fully supported. The scenario specific data call responses were generally reasonable and supported. The DIA headquarters forwarded all data call questions and collected the supporting documentation for each of its sites. We evaluated the validity and integrity of the supporting

documentation at the DIA headquarters. Specifically, for the capacity analysis, Military value, and scenario specific data calls, we compared responses to supporting documentation and reviewed "Not Applicable" responses to determine whether the DIA responses were reasonable. As we identified problems with the data submissions, we worked with management to correct the data.

Capacity Analysis Data Call. The DIA capacity analysis data call provided responses that were not fully supported; specifically of the 17 questions, 7 responses were fully supported, 9 responses were partially supported, and 1 response was unsupported. We concluded that questions 1, 6, 11, 14, 15, 16, and 17 were fully supported, questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, and 13 were partially supported, and question 9 was unsupported (see Appendix C). We discussed the results of the data call submissions and with DIA management. DIA management concurred with the findings.

Military Value Data Call. The DIA Military value data call provided responses that were generally supported; specifically of 11 questions; 6 responses were supported and 5 responses were partially supported. The Military value data call consisted of 11 questions with multiple parts; if one segment of the question was not supported, the overall question would be partially supported. We concluded that questions 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 28 were supported and questions 18, 20, 21, 22, and 27 were partially supported (see Appendix C). We discussed the results of the data call submissions with DIA management. DIA management concurred with the findings.

Scenario Specific Data Call. The DIA scenario specific data calls provided generally reasonable responses and adequate supporting documentation. We reviewed two scenario specific data calls (INT-0010 and HSA-0099) at DIA. Each scenario contained 9 screens (Tables of data). We evaluated the responses and supporting documentation, and identified 5 of the 9 screens in INT-0010 lacked some supporting documentation that would allow us to reconstruct the responses to portions of the screens. Based on our review and discussions, we requested that DIA provided additional supporting documentation to correct the issues. The DIA stated that it would provide the additional supporting documentation and detailed methodology. We did not validate whether additional documentation and methodology was include in the DIA BRAC file.

Internal Control Processes

We reviewed the completeness of the DIA ICP and determined that it properly incorporated and supplemented the OSD ICP. The DIA sites generally complied with the DIA ICP. We evaluated compliance with the DIA ICP for the capacity analysis, Military value, and scenario specific data call. We evaluated whether sites completed nondisclosure agreements and properly collected, marked,

safeguarded, and maintained BRAC data. In addition, we reviewed whether the data collected were certified as accurate and complete to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief for capacity analysis, Military value, and scenario specific data calls.

Completeness of ICP. The DIA ICP provides a uniform set of management controls designed to provide accountability for each sub-element of information and analysis used in the BRAC 2005 process. The DIA ICP establishes organization responsibilities that ensure the accuracy and completeness of data collection, analyses, and control mechanisms to safeguard the BRAC information. The ICP outlined documentation requirements for resubmitting and recertifying BRAC responses. The DIA ICP included directions on completing nondisclosure agreements and on collecting, marking, safeguarding, and maintaining BRAC data.

Compliance with ICPs. The DIA data collection and certification processes for the capacity analysis data call were not fully compliant with the applicable ICPs. The DIA did not provide the ICP to the JICs and JRICs for their use and implementation. Also, DIA did not properly mark all documents, did not maintain all nondisclosure agreements, and did not maintain a separate question page as required by the DIA ICP. However, during the Military value and scenario data calls, DIA followed all ICP processes and corrected the noncompliances identified during the capacity analysis data call. We consider the ICP issue(s) to be immaterial.

Conclusion

The DIA BRAC 2005 data call responses were not fully supported. The DIA collected and submitted responses to 17 questions during the capacity analysis data call of which 9 were partially supported and 1 was unsupported. The DIA collected and submitted responses to 11 questions during the Military value data call, 5 of which were partially supported. The scenario specific data calls provided generally reasonable responses and adequate supporting documentation. The DIA data collection and certification processes for the capacity analysis data call were not fully compliant with the applicable ICPs. However, during the Military value and scenario data calls, DIA followed all ICP processes and corrected the noncompliances identified during the capacity analysis data call.

We discussed the results of the data call submissions and ICP review with DIA management. DIA management concurred with the findings. The identified not fully supported responses and the noncompliances with the ICPs should not affect the reliability and integrity of the DIA data for use in the BRAC 2005 analysis.

B. Joint Intelligence Commands Base Realignment and Closure 2005 Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes

The responses provided by the JICs for the BRAC 2005 data calls were generally not fully supported. The JICs each collected and submitted responses to 17 questions during the capacity analysis data call, and provided 11 responses for the Military value data call. Each of the eight Commands provided responses to some questions that were supported, partially supported, unsupported, or unreasonable. The data collection processes for the Military value data call generally did not comply with applicable ICPs. During the Military value data call the JICs did not provide supporting documentation for all data call responses. When providing supporting documentation the JICs did not properly mark all documents as required in the DIA ICP. The identified not fully supported responses and the noncompliances with the ICPs could affect the reliability and integrity of the data provided for use in BRAC 2005 analysis.

JICs BRAC 2005 Data Call Submissions

The BRAC 2005 data reported by the JICs were generally not fully supported. The DIA headquarters forwarded all data call questions and collected the supporting documentation for each of the JICs. The JICs each collected and submitted responses to 17 questions during the capacity analysis data call and responses to 11 questions during the Military value data call. We evaluated the validity and integrity of the supporting documentation for each JIC at the DIA headquarters. Specifically, for the capacity analysis and Military value data calls, we compared responses to supporting documentation and reviewed "Not Applicable" responses to determine whether the JIC responses were reasonable. As we identified problems with the data submissions, we worked with management to correct the data.

Capacity Analysis Data Call. The JICs capacity analysis data call responses were generally not fully supported. Each of the eight Commands provided responses to some questions that were supported, partially supported, unsupported, or unreasonable (see Appendix D). We discussed the results of the data call submissions with DIA management. DIA management concurred with the findings.

Military Value Data Call. The JICs Military value data call responses were generally not fully supported. Each of the eight Commands provided responses to some questions that were partially supported, unsupported, or unreasonable (see Appendix D). The Military value data call consisted of 11 questions with multiple parts; if one segment of the question was not supported, the overall question would be partially supported. We relied on the agency responses when they answered "no," "zero," and "unknown" to applicable segments of the question because all BRAC data was certified as accurate and complete to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief. We discussed the results of the data call submissions with DIA management. DIA management concurred with the findings.

Internal Control Processes

Since DIA did not provide the ICP to the JICs until after the capacity analysis data call, we did not evaluate the JICs compliance with the DIA and OSD ICPs during the capacity analysis data call. During the Military value data call, the JICs generally did not comply with the ICPs. We evaluated whether sites completed nondisclosure agreements and properly collected, marked, safeguarded, and maintained BRAC data. In addition, we reviewed whether the data collected were certified as accurate and complete to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief for the Military value data call.

Completeness of ICP. The DIA BRAC 2005 ICP establishes organization responsibilities to ensure the accuracy and completeness of data collection, analyses, and control mechanisms to safeguard the BRAC information. The ICP outlined data requirements to address changed answers. The DIA ICP included directions on completing nondisclosure agreements and on collecting, marking, safeguarding, and maintaining BRAC data.

Compliance with ICPs. The JIC sites generally did not comply with the DIA and OSD ICPs, during the Military value data call. During the Military value data call the JICs did not provide supporting documentation for all data call responses. When providing supporting documentation the JICs did not properly mark all documents as required. The identified noncompliances with the ICPs could impact the integrity of data provided for the BRAC 2005 analysis.

Conclusion

The JIC BRAC 2005 data call responses were generally not fully supported. The JICs collected and submitted responses to 17 questions during the capacity analysis data call, and provided responses to 11 questions during the Military

value data call. Each of the eight Commands provided responses to some questions that were supported, partially supported, unsupported, or unreasonable. Also, during the Military value data call the JICs did not fully comply with the ICPs. We discussed the results of the data call submissions and ICP review with DIA management. DIA management concurred with the findings. We also determined that the identified not fully supported responses and the noncompliances with the ICPs could affect the reliability and integrity of the data that the JICs provided for use in BRAC 2005 analysis.

C. Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers Base Realignment and Closure 2005 Data Call Submissions and Internal Control Processes

The responses provided by the JRICs for the BRAC 2005 data calls were not fully supported. The JRICs collected and submitted a combined response to 17 questions during the capacity analysis data call, and provided 11 responses for the Military value data call. For the 17 capacity analysis questions, 3 responses were unsupported and 2 were unreasonable. Similarly, for the Military value questions, 10 were partially supported. The JRICs generally did not comply with the OSD and DIA ICPs during the Military value data call. During the Military value data call the JRICs did not provide supporting documentation for all data call responses. When providing supporting documentation the JRICs did not properly mark all documents as required in the DIA ICP. The identified not fully supported responses and noncompliances with the ICPs could affect the reliability and integrity of the data provided for use in BRAC 2005 analysis.

Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers BRAC 2005 Data Call Submissions

The BRAC 2005 data reported by the JRICs were not fully supported. The DIA headquarters forwarded all data call questions and collected the supporting documentation for the JRICs. The JRICs collected and submitted a combined response to 17 questions during the capacity analysis data call, and 11 responses for the Military value data call. We evaluated the validity and integrity of the supporting documentation for the JRICs at the DIA headquarters. Specifically, for the capacity analysis and Military value data calls, we compared responses to supporting documentation and reviewed "Not Applicable" responses to determine whether the JRICs responses were reasonable. As we identified problems with the data submissions, we worked with management to correct the data.

Capacity Analysis Data Call. The JRIC capacity analysis data call responses were generally not fully supported. For the JRICs combined response to the 17 capacity analysis questions, 3 responses were unsupported, and 2 were unreasonable (see Appendix E). We discussed the results of the data call submissions with DIA management. DIA management concurred with the findings.

Military Value Data Call. The JRIC Military value data call responses were not fully supported. For the JRICs combined response to 11 Military value questions, 10 responses were partially supported. The Military value data call consisted of 11 questions with multiple parts; if one segment of the question was not supported, the overall question would be partially supported (see Appendix E). We discussed the results of the data call submissions with DIA management. DIA management concurred with the findings.

Internal Control Processes

Since DIA did not provide the ICP to the JICs until after the capacity analysis data call, we did not evaluate the JRICs compliance with the DIA and OSD ICPs during the capacity analysis data call. During the Military value data call, the JRICs generally did not fully comply with the DIA and OSD ICPs. We evaluated whether sites completed nondisclosure agreements and properly collected, marked, safeguarded, and maintained BRAC data. In addition, we reviewed whether the data collected were certified as accurate and complete to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief for the Military value data call.

Completeness of ICP. The DIA BRAC 2005 ICP establishes organization responsibilities that ensure the accuracy and completeness of data collection, analyses, and control mechanisms to safeguard the BRAC information. The ICP outlined data requirements to address changed answers. The DIA ICP included directions on completing nondisclosure agreements and on collecting, marking, safeguarding, and maintaining BRAC data.

Compliance with ICPs. The JRICs generally did not comply with the DIA and OSD ICPs during the Military value data call. The JRICs did not properly mark all documents as required by the DIA ICP and generally did not provide supporting documentation for Military value responses. The identified noncompliances with the ICPs could impact the integrity of data that the JRICs provided for the BRAC 2005 analysis.

Conclusion

The JRIC BRAC 2005 data call responses were not fully supported. The JRICs collected and submitted a combined response to 17 questions during the capacity analysis data call, and a response to 11 questions during the Military value data call. For the 17 capacity analysis questions, 3 responses were unsupported and 2 were unreasonable. Similarly, for the 11 Military value questions, 10 responses were partially supported. Also, the JRICs generally did not comply with the DIA and OSD ICPs during the military value data call.

We discussed the results of the data call submissions and ICP review with DIA management. DIA management concurred with the findings. We also determined that the identified not fully supported responses and the noncompliances with the ICPs could affect the reliability and integrity of the data that the JRICs provided for use in BRAC 2005 analysis.

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

We evaluated the validity and integrity of all data call responses and the associated supporting documentation of DIA, the JICs, and the JRICs BRAC 2005 data. Specifically, we performed the following audit steps during the capacity analysis, Military value, and scenario specific data calls.

- Interviewed the personnel responsible for preparing and certifying the responses to the data calls.
- Reviewed all data call responses and associated supporting documentation.
- Compared the adequacy of responses to the supporting documentation.
- Reviewed "Not Applicable" question responses to determine whether they were reasonable.
- Reviewed the DIA ICP to determine whether the DIA incorporated and supplemented the OSD ICP and established and implemented procedures and processes to disseminate, collect, safeguard, and maintain supporting documentation. In addition, we reviewed whether the DIA, JICs, and JRICs designated the appropriate personnel to certify that data and information collected were accurate and complete to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief.
- Relied on Military value responses when they answered "no," "zero," or "unknown" to applicable questions because all BRAC data were certified by the Director, DIA as accurate and complete.
- Worked with management to correct identified problems to data call responses.

We could not validate that DIA, the JICs or the JRICs were consistent in reporting all sites during the capacity analysis data call. Also, because of time constraints, we validated only the Defense intelligence agencies' COBRA and scenario data calls for potential candidate recommendations that were approved by the Infrastructure Steering Group. In addition, we did not revalidate the data call responses.

Capacity Analysis Data Call. The DIA headquarters received the capacity analysis data call questions 1 through 17 from the Intelligence JCSG. DIA headquarters then forwarded all questions to each of its sites and collected supporting documentation. All supporting documentation was maintained at

headquarters for validation. We reviewed all data call questions and responses at DIA headquarters for accuracy, appropriate markings, and adequacy. We issued three capacity analysis site memorandums (DIA, JICs and JRICs) to summarize the site visit results. Specifically, we reviewed the following responses and supporting documentation.

Capacity Analysis Data Call Questions Reviewed

Site	Question Number	
	Answered	Not Applicable
DIA, Headquarters	1-17	
Central Command	1-3, 7, 8, 10-15, and 17	4-6, 9, and 16
Joint Forces Command	1-3 and 7	4-6, and 8-17
Northern Command	1-3	4-17
Pacific Command	1-3, 7, 8, 12, and 13	4-6, 9-11, and 14-17
Southern Command	1-3	4-17
Special Operations Command	3	1, 2, and 4-17
Strategic Command	1-3	4-17
Transportation Command	1-3	4-17
JRICs	1-3, 6, and 7	1, 4, 5, and 7-17

Military Value Data Call. The DIA headquarters received Military value data call questions 18 through 28 from the Intelligence JCSGs. Most Military value questions had multiple parts. The DIA then forwarded all questions to each of its sites and collected supporting documentation. All supporting documentation was maintained at headquarters for validation. We reviewed the data call questions and responses at DIA headquarters for accuracy, appropriate markings, and adequacy for each site. We issued three Military value site memorandums (DIA, JICs, and JRICs) to summarize the site visit results.

Scenario Specific Data Call. DIA headquarters received scenario data call questions from the Intelligence JCSG. We reviewed the data call responses at DIA headquarters for reasonableness and supporting documentation. Specifically, we reviewed DIA Scenario Specific Data Calls INT-0010 and HSA-0099.

We performed this audit from February 2004 through April 2005 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

Reliability of Computer-Processed Data. We did not test the accuracy of the computer-processed data used to support an answer to a data call question.

Potential inaccuracies in the data could affect the results. However, all BRAC data were certified as accurate and complete to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief.

Government Accountability Office High-Risk Area. The Government Accountability Office has identified several high-risk areas in DoD. This report provides coverage of the DoD Support Infrastructure Management and Federal Real Property high-risk area.

Management Control Program Review

We did not review the DIA management control program because its provisions did not apply to the one-time data collection process; however, we evaluated the internal controls for preparing, submitting, documenting, and safeguarding information associated with the BRAC 2005 data calls, as directed by the OSD and DIA ICPs, to determine whether the DIA, JICs, and JRICs complied with the ICPs. Specifically, we reviewed procedures that DIA, JICs, and JRICs used to develop, submit, and document the data call responses. We also reviewed the controls implemented to safeguard BRAC 2005 data against disclosure. Internal controls were generally inadequate as they applied to the audit objective (see the Finding A, B, and C section for additional details).

Appendix B. Prior Audit Coverage

During the last 5 years, DoD OIG issued six site memorandums discussing the BRAC 2005 data call submissions and internal control processes for the DIA, the JICs, and the JRICs.

Site Memorandums

DoD IG Memorandum, "Audit on the Military Value Data Call Submission from the Defense Intelligence Agency Sites for the Base Realignment and Closure 2005," March 3, 2005

DoD IG Memorandum, "Audit on the Military Value Data Call Submission from the Joint Intelligence Centers to the Defense Intelligence Agency Headquarters for the Base Realignment and Closure 2005," March 3, 2005

DoD IG Memorandum, "Audit on the Military Value Data Call Submission from the Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers to the Defense Intelligence Agency Headquarters for the Base Realignment and Closure 2005," March 3, 2005

DoD IG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission from all Defense Intelligence Agency Sites to the Defense Intelligence Agency Headquarters for the Base Realignment and Closure 2005," September 21, 2004

DoD IG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission from the Joint Intelligence Centers to the Defense Intelligence Agency Headquarters for the Base Realignment and Closure 2005," September 21, 2004

DoD IG Memorandum, "Audit on the Capacity Analysis Data Call Submission from the Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers to the Defense Intelligence Agency Headquarters for the Base Realignment and Closure 2005," September 21, 2004

Appendix C. Defense Intelligence Agency BRAC 2005 Data Call Questions Not Fully Supported

Capacity Analysis Data Call. For the capacity analysis data call, DIA provided data that were not fully supported. The following questions were partially supported or unsupported.

- DIA responses to question numbers 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 were only partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the responses. DIA was unable to provide adequate supporting documentation for personnel breakout, as well as, on board contractors and detailees. Also, undocumented meetings were cited in the methodology as the source for personnel breakout.

- DIA responses to question numbers 8, 12, and 13 were only partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the responses. We were able to validate DIA headquarters responses but were unable to validate other DIA site responses because no supporting documentation was provided from those sites.

- DIA response to question number 9 was unsupported. We were unable to determine the reasonableness of the response. DIA used estimates and not supporting documentation to develop the response.

- DIA response to question number 10 was partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the response. DIA provided supporting documentation that contained both contractor and vender transactions; the question does not require both.

Military Value Data Call. DIA responses to the Military value data call were generally supported. However, 5 of 11 responses were partially supported.

- DIA responses to question numbers 18, 20, 21, 22, and 27 were partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the responses for all sites. Portions of the responses did not contain adequate support. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

Appendix D. Joint Intelligence Commands BRAC 2005 Data Call Questions Not Fully Supported

Capacity Analysis Data Call. The JICs provided data that was generally not fully supported. The following questions were partially supported, unsupported, or unreasonable.

U.S. Central Command. U.S. Central Command provided responses to 12 of 17 questions. The responses provided for question numbers 4-6, 9, and 16 were "Not Applicable." We consider those responses to be reasonable.

- U.S. Central Command responses to question numbers 1, 2, 12, and 15 were unsupported. We were unable to reconstruct the U.S. Central Command responses because U.S. Central Command provided an inadequate methodology for cross-walking the supporting documentation back to the responses. In addition, the U.S. Central Command did not provide supporting documentation for the usable square feet in question number 1.

- U.S. Central Command responses to questions numbers 3, 7, 13, and 14 were unsupported. We were unable to validate the responses. Supporting documentation was not available or not provided.

- U.S. Central Command response to question number 17 was partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the data because supporting documentation for the student registration counts was not provided.

U.S. Joint Forces Command. U.S. Joint Forces Command provided responses to 4 of 17 questions. The responses provided for question numbers 4-6, and 8-17 were "Not Applicable." We consider those responses to be reasonable.

- U.S. Joint Forces Command responses to question numbers 1 and 2 were unsupported. We were unable to validate the responses. Supporting documentation was not available or not provided.

- U.S. Joint Forces Command responses to question numbers 3 and 7 were unsupported. We were unable to validate the responses. U.S. Joint Forces Command provided incomplete and inadequate supporting documentation and did not provide a documented methodology.

U.S. Northern Command. U.S. Northern Command provided responses to 3 of 17 questions. The responses provided for question numbers 4-17 were "Not Applicable." We consider the N/A responses to question numbers 4-6 and 8-17 to be reasonable.

- U.S. Northern Command responses to question numbers 1 and 2 were unsupported. We were unable to validate the responses. Supporting documentation was not available or not provided.
- U.S. Northern Command response to question number 3 was unsupported. U.S. Northern Command did not provide an adequate methodology that would cross-walk the supporting documentation to the response.
- U.S. Northern Command "Not Applicable" response to question number 7 is unreasonable. The response did not identify the total number of man-years related to the positions assigned in question number 3.

U.S. Pacific Command. U.S. Pacific Command provided responses to 7 of 17 questions. The responses provided for question numbers 4-6, 9-11, and 14-17 were "Not Applicable." We consider those responses to be reasonable.

- U.S. Pacific Command response for question number 1 was partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the response. U.S. Pacific Command did not provide supporting documentation for the usable square footage.
- U.S. Pacific Command response for question number 2 was partially supported. We were unable to fully validate or reconstruct the response. U.S. Pacific Command did not provide an adequate methodology that would cross-walk the supporting documentation to the response.
- U.S. Pacific Command response for question number 3 was partially supported. U.S. Pacific Command was unable to provide adequate supporting documentation for on-board contractors and detailees.
- U.S. Pacific Command responses for question numbers 7, 8, 12, and 13 were unsupported. We were unable to validate the responses. Supporting documentation was not available or not provided.

U.S. Southern Command. U.S. Southern Command provided responses to 3 of 17 questions. The responses to question numbers 4-17 were "Not Applicable."

We consider the N/A responses to question numbers 4-6 and 8-17 to be reasonable.

- U.S. Southern Command responses to question numbers 1, 2, and 3 were unsupported. We were unable to fully validate or reconstruct the responses. U.S. Southern Command did not provide an adequate methodology that would cross-walk the supporting documentation to the response.

- U.S. Southern Command "Not Applicable" response to question number 7 is unreasonable. The response did not identify the total number of man-years related to the positions assigned in question number 3.

U.S. Special Operations Command. U.S. Special Operations Command provided a response to 1 of 17 questions. The responses to question numbers 1-2 and 4-17 were "Not Applicable." We consider the N/A responses to question numbers 4-6 and 8-17 to be reasonable.

- U.S. Special Operations Command response to question number 3 was unsupported. We were unable to fully validate or reconstruct the response. U.S. Special Operations Command did not provide an adequate methodology that would cross-walk the supporting documentation to the response.

- U.S. Special Operations Command "Not Applicable" responses to question numbers 1, 2, and 7 are unreasonable. The responses to question numbers 1 and 2 did not identify the facilities or personnel by attributes listed in question number 3. The response to question number 7 did not identify the total number of man-years related to the positions assigned in question number 3.

U.S. Strategic Command. U.S. Strategic Command provided a response to 3 of 17 questions. The responses to question numbers 4-17 were "Not Applicable." We consider the N/A responses to question numbers 4-6 and 8-17 to be reasonable.

- U.S. Strategic Command responses to question numbers 1, 2, and 3 were unsupported. We were unable to fully validate or reconstruct the responses. U.S. Strategic Command did not provide an adequate methodology that would cross-walk the supporting documentation to the responses.

- U.S. Strategic Command "Not Applicable" response to question number 7 is unreasonable. The response did not identify the total

number of man-years related to the positions assigned in question number 3.

U.S. Transportation Command. U.S. Transportation Command provided responses to 3 of 17 questions. The responses to question numbers 4-17 were "Not Applicable." We consider the N/A responses to question numbers 4-6 and 8-17 to be reasonable.

- U.S. Transportation Command responses to question numbers 1 and 2 were unsupported. We were unable to validate the responses. Supporting documentation was not available or not provided.
- U.S. Transportation Command response to question number 3 was unsupported. We were unable to fully validate or reconstruct the response. U.S. Transportation Command did not provide an adequate methodology that would cross-walk the supporting documentation to the response.
- U.S. Transportation Command "Not Applicable" response to question number 7 is unreasonable. The response did not identify the total number of man-years related to the positions assigned in question number 3.

Military Value Data Call. The JICs responses to the second data call were generally not fully supported. The following questions were partially supported, unsupported, or unreasonable.

U.S. Central Command. U.S. Central Command provided response to all 11 questions.

- U.S. Central Command responses to question numbers 18, 20-22, 26, and 27 were partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the responses. Portions of the responses did not contain adequate support. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

U.S. Joint Forces Command. U.S. Joint Forces Command provided responses to all 11 questions.

- U.S. Joint Forces Command responses to question numbers 18, 20-22, 24, 26, and 27 were partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the responses. Portions of the responses did not contain adequate support. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

- U.S. Joint Forces Command response to question number 19 was unsupported. We were unable to validate the response. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

U.S. Northern Command. U.S. Northern Command provided responses to all 11 questions.

- U.S. Northern Command responses to question numbers 18, 20-24, 26, and 27 were partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the responses. Portions of the responses did not contain adequate support. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

- U.S. Northern Command responses to question numbers 19 and 25 were unsupported. We were unable to validate the responses. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

U.S. Pacific Command. U.S. Pacific Command provided responses to all 11 questions.

- U.S. Pacific Command responses to question numbers 18, 20 and 26, were partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the responses. Portions of the responses did not contain adequate support. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

U.S. Southern Command. U.S. Southern Command provided responses to all 11 questions.

- U.S. Southern Command responses to question numbers 18-27 were partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the responses. Portions of the responses did not contain adequate support. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

U.S. Special Operations Command. U.S. Special Operations Command provided responses to all 11 questions.

- U.S. Special Operation Commands responses to question numbers 18, 24 and 26 were partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the responses. Portions of the responses did not contain adequate support. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

U.S. Strategic Command. U.S. Strategic Command provided responses to all 11 questions.

- U.S. Strategic Command responses to question numbers 18-27 were partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the responses. Portions of the responses did not contain adequate support. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

U.S. Transportation Command. U.S. Transportation Command provided responses to all 11 questions.

- U.S. Transportation Command responses to question numbers 18, 20-22, 24, 26, and 27 were partially supported. We were unable to fully validate the responses. Portions of the responses did not contain adequate support. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

- U.S. Transportation Command response to question number 19 was unsupported. We were unable to validate the response. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

Appendix E. Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers BRAC 2005 Data Call Questions Not Fully Supported

Capacity Analysis Data Call. The JRICs provided data that were generally not fully supported. The JRICs response to question numbers 1, 4, 5, and 7-17 were "Not Applicable". We considered the "N/A" responses to questions numbers 4, 5, and 8-17 as reasonable. The following questions were unsupported or unreasonable.

- The JRICs "Not Applicable" responses to question numbers 1 and 7 are unreasonable. The response to question number 1 did not identify the facilities, even though the facilities are listed in question numbers 2 and 3 and the response to question number 7 did not address the total number of man-years related to the positions assigned in question number 3.
- The JRICs response to question number 2 was unsupported. We were unable to validate the responses. The JRICs were unable to provide supporting documentation.
- The JRICs response to question number 3 was unsupported. We were unable to validate the data because the JRICs did not provide an adequate methodology that would crosswalk the supporting documentation to the response. Also, a methodology explaining how the Centers allocated the positions to the BRAC attributes was not provided.
- The response provided for questions number 6 was unsupported. The JRICs do not own operate or maintain the facilities reported in this question.

Military Value Data Call. The JRICs responses to the second data call were not fully supported. The JRICs provided a combined response to 11 questions. However, 10 of 11 responses were partially supported.

- The JRICs responses to question numbers 18-27 were not fully supported. We were unable to fully validate the responses for all sites. Portions of the responses did not contain adequate support. Supporting documentation was either not available or not provided.

Appendix F. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Director, Base Realignment and Closures (Installations and Environment)

Other Defense Organizations

Director, Defense Intelligence Agency

Non-Defense Federal Organization

Government Accountability Office *

* Only Government Accountability Office personnel involved in the BRAC process are to receive the report.

Team Members

The Office of the Deputy Inspector General for Intelligence prepared this report. Personnel of the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General who contributed to the report are listed below.

Shelton R. Young

(b)(6)

DIA Office of Inspector General Team Member

(b)(6)