DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
(INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT)
1000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20350-1000

16 April 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

SUBJECT: DON Comments on the Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group Military Value Report

We have conducted a detailed review of the draft IJCSG Military Value Report, and provide the following recommendations to make the written report a more complete product.

Major Concerns

1. The report does not articulate a methodology for comparing facilities with diverse missions. The scoring plan produces one military value per activity, regardless of mission or size. Therefore, multi-function agencies, with thousands of personnel, are compared with smaller, single-function activities. Consequently, the scoring plan will produce a valuation rank comparing functionally disparate and interdependent activities. The IJCSG needs to develop/codify the methodology for comparing activities with similar functions, and address in the report the thought processes that lay behind the methodology.

2. The IJCSG appears to be focusing a significant portion of their effort on addressing Business Process Re-engineering (BPR). Business process and mission-related metrics (12 of 43 metrics) compete with capacity, condition, and location metrics. Some of the analysis related to BPR may fall outside the intent and scope of BRAC. Recommend the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG) publish clear guidance for the IJCSG that defines the scope of the analysis. The report should then be updated as necessary.

3. A comprehensive list defining the IJCSG universe of activities is needed, as there is no consistent understanding across the Defense Intelligence Community as to what activities are appropriate for analysis. By clearly defining the universe we can potentially preclude data gaps and ensure parity in coverage among members of the Defense Intelligence Community.

4. The potentially classified nature of the data precludes the transparency inherent in the other JCSGs. Under public scrutiny, final recommendations could be perceived as evolving from a different process than what is being used for the other JCSGs. Recommend all data be collected and analyzed at the lowest level possible.

5. The addition of the new function "Sustainability" appears to be of a different nature than the previously identified functions to describe the intelligence community. Recommend that this function be reexamined to ensure its best fit and usefulness.

SUBJECT: DON Comments on the Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group Military Value Report

Specific Recommendations

1. Include in the scoring plan a list of definitions for commonly used terms ("routinely", "workforce," "unique," "specialized," etc.) to ensure responses provide data that is consistent and useful in subsequent phases of the BRAC process.

2. Review and revise the amplification contained in all questions to ensure responses will be consistent with their intent, and provide auditable information. Additionally, to facilitate data collection and certification, recommend consolidating questions with like responses (e.g., Yes/No, Number of Personnel). Also, create a cross-reference field linking military value metrics with appropriate data call questions.

3. Under criterion 4, Dissemination and Sustainability functions have the same rank (2) but different weights (20 and 15 respectively) without explanation. Evaluate whether rank and weights reflect the IJCSG's assessment. If no change is required, then modify the report to explain the different weights. If military value report does not capture rationale, minutes of deliberative sessions should.

4. Although the report adequately describes how the IJCSG determined weights of each military value criteria across the five functions and their attributes, a description of how weights of individual metrics were determined should be added to have a thorough report.

5. There are several military value questions that require a binary (Yes/No) response. Many of these binary questions inquire about functions being performed but do not discriminate between activities that perform these functions regularly and those that perform them on a one-time basis. Recommend either defining the metrics based on the current capability of activities to perform these functions or by modifying the metrics to quantify activity performance level for the function (establishment of thresholds, sliding scale, etc.).

6. Many questions include a variant of, "...in this facility..." yet tables provided are intended to be variable length keyed to facility number. Also, some headers describe the variable nature of the table, whereas, many do not. Modify text to read, "...for your organization complete the table below for each facility where..." Add consistent table headers for all variable length tables.

7. Recommend modifying the first sentence in the Selection Criteria section to read "all four Military Value criteria" and then stating remaining criteria will be considered when appropriate.

My staff and I stand ready to further clarify these issues and assist in implementation of the recommendations as necessary.

for Anne Rathmell Davis
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy
Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis