



DCN: 10975

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

28 April 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, OSD BRAC OFFICE

SUBJECT: Department of the Navy Comments on ISG Meeting Minutes

Per the DUSD (I&E) tasking memo of 14 April, the following comments are provided on the eight sets of minutes for ISG meetings held from 17 February 2004 through 2 April 2004:

General comments

Suggest putting page numbers on the minutes for easy reference
In the list of attendees, my title should be DASN (IS&A) vice DASN (I&A)

17 February minutes [Technical]

Page 1, paragraph 3, line 1 – The word “Congress” should be capitalized for correctness.

19 February minutes [Medical]

Page 1, paragraph 6, line 2 – Inset a comma after the word “aggregate” for clarity.

20 February minutes [Supply & Storage]

Page 1, paragraph 4, line 9 – Suggest having it read, “BRAC Commissioners” vice “commissioners” for completeness.

23 February minutes [Industrial]

Page 1, paragraph 3, lines 15-16 – Replace words “avoid overlapping evaluations” with the words “ensure complementary evaluations.” Since the determination had been made that the Industrial JCSG would look at the munitions total life cycle, and that the Supply and Storage JCSG would not include munitions in their commodities, I believe the ISG discussion focused on ensuring the analysis was similar in concept, rather than duplicative.

Page 2, paragraph 2, line 5 – Insert the word “who” before “found” for completeness.

Page 2, paragraph 3, line 2 – Insert “and scenario development” after “policy imperatives” at the end of the first sentence for completeness.

Page 2, paragraph 3 – Add at end of paragraph: “The ISG also expressed its intent that the JCSGs will develop their approach to scenario development for review by the ISG in much the same way they have described their approaches for

SUBJECT: Department of the Navy Comments on ISG Meeting Minutes

capacity and military value analysis. The ISG will approve each scenario and the application of imperatives in advance and then review the results after scenario analysis." I believe this more fully captures the exchanges between Mr. Wynne, Mr. Orr, and Mr. Johnson.

23 February minutes [Headquarters & Support]

Page 1, paragraph 3, line 3 – Capitalize the word “Congressional” for correctness.

Page 1, paragraph 3, line 13 – Delete the word “with,” and add the words “with the need for” after the word “agree” for clarity.

Page 2, paragraph 1, line 2 – After the word “imperatives,” insert the words “developed from Senior Level Review Group decisions and operational planning documents” to indicate the scope of the Joint Staff tasking.

24 February minutes [Education & Training]

Page 2, paragraph 6 – Recommend rewording the second sentence for clarity as follows, “A question arose concerning the ability of the JCSG to extract and use for analysis range information contained in various databases maintained by headquarters organizations.”

Page 2, paragraph 6, line 7 – Change the word “should” to “could” for correctness, since I think the ability to certify will rest on auditor and legal determinations.

12 March minutes [Policy Imperatives]

Page 1, paragraph 3 – For clarity, change 5th sentence to, “Transformational options, which are developed prior to running scenarios, are modeled during the scenario phase.” Alternatively, reword the sentence to read, “The scenario phase is where closure and realignment alternatives are developed and analyzed.” I believe the sentence as written mixes two separate concepts (i.e., transformational options and outputs from the optimization model – both of which will be inputs to scenario development).

Page 1, paragraph 4, line 3 – Add the word “in” after the word “factor” for completeness.

Page 2, paragraph 1 – Change first sentence to read, “... some thoughts on the need to have principles in conjunction with imperatives” for completeness.

Page 2, paragraph 1 – Change second sentence to read, “... that principles and imperatives can be viewed as a mechanism to foster change in the Department” for completeness.

SUBJECT: Department of the Navy Comments on ISG Meeting Minutes

Page 2, paragraph 1 – Delete third sentence and replace with the following, "The ISG agreed that there was a need to further define the development of principles and imperatives and that the focus of the discussion on 23 April would be to better define their relationship to the process and timelines for development." I believe this more correctly captures the ISG discussion.

2 April minutes [Military Value Reports Integration]

Page 1, paragraph 3, line 5 – Add the word "fluid" after the phrase "focused and" for completeness.

Page 1, paragraph 4, line 5 – Delete the comma after "principles" and replace it with the word "and" for clarity.

Page 1, paragraph 4, line 6 – Insert a comma after the word "judgment" for clarity.

Page 2, paragraph 1, lines 3-6 – Recommend deleting the sentence reading "The ISG agreed that their data could be corrected if the audit findings merit correcting data to fix errors." Recommend rewording the last sentence to read, "The ISG acknowledged that fixing errors of fact found during data call review is critical. However, this should be the only reason capacity and military value data is altered." I am concerned that the first sentence noted limits data call changes only to those things that are identified in audit findings. I expect many more errors and inconsistencies to be identified when the analysts are actually reviewing and working with the data. The ISG did note that data shouldn't be changed arbitrarily; hence the suggested reword of the last sentence into two separate thoughts.

Page 2, paragraph 2, line 7 – Make "JCSG" plural for correctness.

Page 2, paragraph 2, line 10 – Make "JCSG" plural for correctness.

Page 2, paragraph 2, line 11 – Change the words at the end of the sentence to read "...through the scenario and recommendation development processes" for completeness.

Page 3, 1st bullet (4th cross-cutting issue) – Reword to state, "The ISG in general was opposed to reweighting military value, but agreed that it was appropriate if errors in fact or process were identified. Any other reason would have to be justified to the ISG." I believe that more accurately states the discussion.

SUBJECT: Department of the Navy Comments on ISG Meeting Minutes

Should you have any questions on these comments, I am available to discuss at your convenience.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Anne R. Davis".

Anne Rathmell Davis
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Infrastructure Strategy & Analysis)