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

DCN:5489

MN-0123
IAT/JAN
29 April 2004

MEMORANDUM

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 22 APRIL 2004

Encl: (1) 22 April 2004 IEG Meeting Agenda
(2) DASN(IS&A) Memo of 16 April 2004
(3) USD(AT&L) Memo of 20 April 2004
(4) Recording Secretary's Report of IEG Deliberations on 22 April 2004 with enclosures

1. The twenty-fourth meeting of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) was convened at 0930 on 22 April 2004 in the Infrastructure Analysis Team (IAT) conference room located at Crystal Plaza 6, 9th floor. The following members of the IEG were present: Mr. H. T. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Installations and Environment (ASN(I&E)), Chair; Ms. Anne R. Davis, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis (DASN(IS&A)), Vice Chair; VADM Charles W. Moore, Jr., USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness and Logistics (N4), Member; Mr. Thomas R. Crabtree, Director, Fleet Training (N7), U.S. Fleet Forces Command, serving as alternate for VADM Albert H. Konetzni Jr., USN, Deputy and Chief of Staff, U.S. Fleet Forces Command, Member; LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (I&L), Member; LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Aviation (AVN), Member; Mr. Michael Jaggard, Chief of Staff/Policy for Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Research Development Test & Evaluation (DASN(RDT&E)), serving as alternate for Dr. Michael F. McGrath, DASN(RDT&E), Member; Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Navy Audit Service (NAVAUDSVC), Representative; Mr. Thomas N. Ledvina, Navy Office of General Counsel (OGC) Representative; Mr. David W. LaCroix, Senior Counsel, Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN, Recorder; and Capt James A. Noel, USMC, Recorder. Dr. Russ Beland, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower Analysis and Assessment (DASN(MA&A)), Member, was absent. CAPT Mark H. Anthony, USN, Deputy Director Fleet Training (N7A), U.S. Fleet Forces Command, was in attendance.

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 22 APRIL 2004

2. Additionally, the following members of the IAT were present: CAPT Christopher T. Nichols, USN, Operations Team Lead; CAPT Gene A. Summerlin, USN, Education and Training Team Lead; Ms. Laura Knight; Mr. Steven W. Belcher, CNA; Mr. John A. Crossen, CNA; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN; LtCol Mark S. Murphy, USMC; LtCol Terri E. Erdag, USMC; LtCol Robert R. Mullins, Jr., USMCR; CDR Phillip A. Black, USN; CDR Joseph E. Arleth, USN; CDR Greg Hilscher, USN; LCDR Christopher T. Sosa, SC, USN; LCDR Kristina Nielsen, CEC, USN; LCDR Kevin D. Laye, USN; LCDR Brian D. Miller, USNR; and LCDR Timothy P. Cowan, CEC, USN. All attendees were provided enclosures (1) through (3). Ms. Davis presented the minutes from the 15 April 2004 IEG meeting for review and they were approved.

3. Ms. Davis provided updates on the following matters:

a. Intelligence JCSG Military Value Report. DASN (IS&A) has submitted DON comments on the draft Intelligence JCSG Military Value Report. See enclosure (2). OSD will forward all comments from the Services to the IJCSG for incorporation into the IJCSG final Military Value Report.

b. Final Military Value Reports. OSD has requested that ISG principals provide input on draft memos that provide guidance to the JCSGs for their final Military Value Reports. The JCSGs will be directed to incorporate guidance from the memo in their final Military Value Reports. OSD requests concurrence on the reports now subject to incorporation of suggested revisions.

c. Principles and Imperatives. USD (AT&L) has issued a tasker for submission of principles and imperatives to the OSD BRAC office by 7 May 2004. See enclosure (3). The IEG discussed the tasker and concluded that, unless a new due date is set, DON should be in a position to submit a comprehensive departmental set of principles and imperatives that has been coordinated with senior DON leadership on 7 May.

4. The IEG moved into deliberative session at 0958. See enclosure (4). The next meeting of the IEG is scheduled for Thursday, 29 April 2004. The meeting adjourned at 1219.

HT Johnson

H. T. JOHNSON
Chairman, IEG

TAB 1

Infrastructure Evaluation Group

22 Apr 2004
0930-1230
Crystal Plaza 6

Meeting called by:	Chairman	Recorder:	Capt Noel

----- Agenda Topics -----

Review and approve minutes of IEG Meeting of 15 Apr 04	Ms. Davis
Status Updates:	Ms Davis
• ISG/JCSGs o Intel Military Value Report Comments o Military Value Final Reports o Principles/Imperatives	
	All
• Deliberative Session o Navy specific Education & Training functions	
	Ms. Davis

Administrative

- Next meeting Thursday 29 Apr 04, 0930-1230
  - Location Crystal Plaza 6, 9th Floor
- Meeting locations for future meetings TBD

Other Information

Draft minutes of 15 Apr 04 IEG meeting provided.
Read ahead for deliberative discussions.

TAB 2

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

TAB 3

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,
TECHNOLOGY
AND LOGISTICS

APR 20 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR INFRASTRUCTURE STEERING GROUP MEMBERS

Subject: Principles and Imperatives

As the ISG has discussed, a BRAC process that defines military value as the exercise of military judgment built upon a quantitative analytical foundation is the most appropriate way to ensure that military value is the primary consideration in making closure and realignment recommendations. The quantitative component of Military Value involves assigning weights to the selection criteria and their implementing attributes and metrics to arrive at a relative scoring of facilities within categories. The military judgment component of Military Value involves a deliberative means to implement the selection criteria in a way that fosters transformation, embraces change and/or avoids capacity reduction results that would violate strategic, force protection, or other military value considerations reflected in the selection criteria.

At its March 12, 2004, meeting, the ISG agreed that overarching principles and imperatives are the best means of expressing military judgment in the BRAC process. The ISG also agreed that I would send out a memorandum defining these terms and requesting the ISG members use these definitions to develop principles and imperatives for review and deliberation by the ISG prior to IEC approval.

In exercising the military judgment component of Military Value, the BRAC deliberative process will develop and approve overarching principles from which specific imperatives flow. The overarching principles are the top level strategic concepts that foster transformation, embrace change, and avoid capacity reductions that reduce essential military capabilities. Limited in number and written broadly, the principles should enumerate the essential elements of military judgment applied to the BRAC process. Imperatives are specific, detailed statements that are tied to the principles. The imperatives function chiefly to prevent scenarios from generating specific recommendations that would violate the principles. Imperatives could also require certain outcomes that would enhance military capabilities.

To begin the BRAC deliberative process of developing these principles and imperatives, please submit your proposed principles and imperatives to the OSD BRAC office by May 7, 2004, so that they can be provided as a read ahead for our discussion at the May 14, 2004, ISG meeting. The construct for the principles and imperatives presented in this memorandum will be discussed at the April 23, 2004 ISG meeting.

Michael W. Wynne
Acting USD (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics)
Chairman, Infrastructure Steering Group

cc: Joint Cross-Service Group Chairs

TAB 4

RP-0124
IAT/JAN
28 April 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INFRASTRUTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 22 APRIL 2004

Encl: (1) IAT Naval Aviation Revised Military Value Evaluation Scoring Statement and Question for Air-31
(2) IAT Naval Ground Forces Military Value Attribute Selection Weights and Ranking of Attribute Components By Weight
(3) Naval Operations Functions Military Value Scoring Plan
(4) IAT Military Value Analysis of DON Specific Education & Training Functions
(5) DON E&T Recruit Training Military Value Evaluation Questions, Matrix Scoring Statements and Selection Criteria Mapping
(6) DON E&T Officer Accession Training Military Value Evaluation Questions, Matrix Scoring Statements, and Selection Criteria Mapping
(7) DON E&T DON Specific PME Military Value, Evaluation Questions Matrix Scoring Statements, and Selection Criteria Mapping.

1. The eighth deliberative session of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) convened at 0958 on 22 April 2004 in the Infrastructure Analysis Team (IAT) conference room located at Crystal Plaza 6, 9th floor. The following members of the IEG were present: Mr. H. T. Johnson, Chair; Ms. Anne R. Davis, Vice Chair; VADM Charles W. Moore, Jr., USN, Member; CAPT Mark H. Anthony, USN, alternate for VADM Albert H. Konetzni, USN, Member; LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Member; LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Member; Mr. Michael Jaggard, alternate for Dr. Michael F. McGrath, Member; Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Navy Audit Service, Representative; and, Mr. Thomas N. Ledvina, Navy Office of General Counsel, Representative. The following members of the IAT were present when the deliberative session commenced: Mr. David W. LaCroix; Ms. Laura Knight; Mr. Steven W. Belcher, CNA; Mr. John A. Crossen, CNA; CAPT Chris T. Nichols, USN; CAPT Gene A. Summerlin, USN; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN; LtCol Mark S. Murphy, USMC; LtCol Terri E. Erdag, USMC; LtCol Robert R. Mullins, Jr., USMCR; CDR Phillip A. Black,

USN; CDR Joseph E. Arleth, USN; CDR Greg Hilscher, USN; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; LCDR Christopher T. Sosa, SC, USN; LCDR Kristina Nielsen, CEC, USN; LCDR Kevin D. Laye, USN; LCDR Brian D. Miller, USNR; LCDR Timothy P. Cowan, CEC, USN; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC.

2. As directed by the IEG at the last deliberative session, the IAT Operations Team reconstructed the roll-up question for scoring statement Air-31 of the Aviation Operations Function Simulator Facilities component and presented it to the IEG for consideration. See enclosure (1). The IEG approved the scoring statement and roll-up question as written.

3. The IEG noted that there were no changes for the Naval Surface/Subsurface Operations Function Military Value approach. The IAT recommended that the Personnel Support (PS) attribute weight for the Naval Ground Operations Function be aligned with the weight for the Aviation Operations Function and that the PS attribute weight as applied to Readiness be changed from 15 to 10 for the Ground Operations Function. The Operational Infrastructure attribute weight as applied to Readiness was changed from 20 to 25; Operational Training was changed from 40 to 35; Base Characteristics was changed from 15 to 20; Environment and Encroachment remained 10. The IEG approved the recommendations of the IAT. See enclosure (2).

4. These decisions completed the military value scoring plan for the three operations functions. See enclosure (3). Members of the IAT Operations Team, including LtCol Mark S. Murphy, USMC; CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN; LtCol Terri E. Erdag, USMC; LtCol Robert R. Mullins, Jr., USMCR; LCDR Brian D. Miller, USNR; and LCDR Timothy P. Cowan, CEC, USN left the session. CAPT Nichols and CDR Fairbairn, of the IAT Operations team remained in the session.

5. The IEG reviewed the Military Value Analysis plan for DON Specific Education and Training functions beginning with a general review of the Education and Training (E&T) JCSG functions, universe of functions, and military value scoring plan. See enclosure (4).

a. The IEG agreed to use the E&T JCSG Military Value scoring plan as a starting point and to tailor it for DON specific activities.

b. The IEG approved the functional areas for Military Value Analysis as follows: DON Specific Professional Military

Education (PME), DON Recruit Training, and DON Officer Accession Training. Analysis of the DON Specific Graduate Level Flight Training function is subsumed in the Aviation Operations Function military value analysis.

c. The IEG approved the DON Specific E&T universe proposed by the IAT.

(1) Recruit training. The IEG noted that Marine Combat Training (MCT) is not exactly recruit training or a follow-on school for a military occupational skill. Rather, MCT is a unique Marine Corps school analogous to the one station unit-training program of the Department of the Army, which is not being evaluated by the E&T JCSG. The IEG noted that, while the E&T JCSG will not evaluate MCT, the E&T JCSG will evaluate unique DON follow-on schools, such as sonar training, that are identified as Specialized Skills Training in the DOD Military Manpower Training Report submitted annually to Congress.

(2) Officer Accession Training. While the IEG understood the basis for grouping activities in this functional category, it expressed concern that the U.S. Naval Academy is not comparable to other activities in this function. The IEG decided that any decision concerning the methodology to be used for evaluation of the U.S. Naval Academy should be held in abeyance pending discussion with the sister services regarding their approach for evaluating service academies.

(3) DON Specific PME. The IEG noted that the military value analysis will focus on the support received by the activity hosting the PME course. The IEG specifically added the General Officer Warfighting Program course to the list of courses at MCB Quantico.

6. The IAT proposed that DON E&T attributes be the "merged" attributes of the E&T JCSG Professional Development Education and Specialized Skill Training Initial Skills Functions: Training Output, Training Infrastructure, Location, Quality of Life, Ability to Support Other Missions. The IEG approved the IAT proposed DON E&T attributes.

7. The IAT proposed components for DON Specific E&T Attributes. The IEG approved the following components for each attribute, subject to the review of the specific scoring statements and questions:

a. Training Output: Student Load and Educational Staff.

b. Training Infrastructure: Messing, Billeting, Expansion Potential, Classrooms, and Training Facilities. The IEG approved the IAT's recommendation not to include Messing and Billeting as components for the DON Specific PME Function.

c. Location: Transportation Availability, Degree of Training Centralization, and Weather Impacts.

d. Personnel Support: Medical, Housing, Education, Employment, Fleet and Family Services, MWR, Follow-on Tour Opportunities, and Metropolitan Area Characteristics. These are the same components used for the Personnel Support (PS) attribute for the DON Operations Functions. For consistency purposes, the IEG decided to substitute Personnel Support (PS) for Quality of Life (QOL) as the attribute heading for the DON E&T Functions.

e. Ability to Support Other Missions: Other Training and Reserve Support.

8. The IEG reviewed weights used by DON for Training Centers and Schools in BRAC 1995 and the BRAC 2005 E&T JCSG Military Value Weights. See enclosure (4). The IEG noted the increased importance of the Surge Capabilities criteria relative to BRAC 1995. The IEG also recognized the different surge requirements for E&T activities supporting Naval Ground Forces and E&T activities supporting Naval Surface/Subsurface Forces, as the number of ships available limits surge for Surface/ Subsurface Forces. The IEG agreed to apply the following weights for each of the DON Specific E&T Functions:

a) Readiness (R): 40
b) Facilities (F): 30
c) Surge Capabilities (SC): 15
d) Cost and Manpower (C): 15.

9. The IEG recessed at 1050 and reconvened at 1057. All IEG and IAT members present when the IEG recessed were again present.

10. The IEG approved the scoring statements and roll-up questions for each of the DON Specific E&T Functions in the following manner:

a. Recruit Training. Except as noted below, the IEG approved the IAT proposed scoring statements and roll-up

questions, including apportionment where necessary, for the Recruit Training attributes and their respective components. See enclosure (5).

(1) Training Output. The IEG deleted the IAT proposed roll-up question 1b (E&T-1b) in the Student Load Component, as student throughput requirements for FY04-09 cannot be accurately measured. The IEG deleted the IAT proposed scoring statement 3 (E&T-3) in the Educational Staff Component, as the ratio of instructors to students is not relevant to assess quality or quantity of instruction for the Recruit Training Function. As scoring statement 3 was the only scoring statement for the Educational Staff Component, the component is also deleted.

(2) Training Infrastructure. The IEG noted that although Messing was not included for DON Operations Functions, it is considered important for the Recruit Training Function since it directly relates to the ability to process and support recruits in a timely manner.

b. Officer Accession Training. Except as noted below, the IEG approved the IAT proposed scoring statements and roll-up questions, including apportionment where necessary, for the Officer Accession Training attributes and their respective components. See enclosure (6).

(1) Training Output. The IEG deleted the IAT proposed roll-up question 1b (E&T-1b) in the Student Load Component, as student throughput requirements for FY04-09 cannot be accurately measured. The IEG deleted the IAT proposed scoring statement 3 (E&T-3) in the Educational Staff Component, as the ratio of instructors to students is not relevant to assess quality or quantity of instruction for the Officer Accession Training Function. As scoring statement 3 was the only scoring statement for the Educational Staff Component, the component is also deleted.

(2) Training Infrastructure. The IEG noted that although Messing was not included for DON Operations Functions, it is considered important for the Officer Accession Training Function since it directly relates to the ability to process and support officer candidates in a timely manner.

c. DON Specific PME. Except as noted below, the IEG approved the scoring statements and roll-up questions, including apportionment where necessary, for the DON Specific PME attributes and their respective components. See enclosure (7).

(1) Training Output. The IEG deleted the IAT proposed roll-up question 1b (E&T-1b) in the Student Load Component, as student throughput requirements for FY04-09 cannot be accurately measured. The IEG deleted the IAT proposed scoring statement 3 (E&T-3) in the Educational Staff Component, as the ratio of instructors to students is not relevant for the DON Specific PME Function to assess quality or quantity of instruction. As scoring statement 3 was the only scoring statement for the Educational Staff Component, the component is also deleted.

(2) Training Infrastructure. The IEG noted that although Messing was included for the Recruit Training and Officer Accession Training Functions, it should not be included for the DON Specific PME Function. Like the rationale used for DON Operations Functions, messing is not a useful discriminator for assessing value for this type of training since most messing is provided by contractor support.

(3) Location. Reflecting the differences between the functions, the IEG approved the IAT's proposal to substitute roll-up question E&T 10c for roll-up question E&T 10a used in the Recruit Training and Officer Accessions Training Functions for the Degree of Training Centralization Component for this attribute in the DON Specific PME Function, in order to ensure the question obtains appropriate data for this function.

11. After the IEG approved the scoring statements and roll-up questions for the attributes and their respective components for each of the DON E&T functions, it placed the scoring statements in one of three bands (Band 1, 2, or 3 in descending order of importance). As aforementioned, scoring statement 3 (E&T-3) was deleted for all DON E&T functions, and not banded. Except as noted below, the IEG approved the scoring bands recommended by the IAT. See enclosures (5), (6), and (7).

a. Recruit Training. Scoring statement 8 (E&T-8) was changed from "2" to "1", and scoring statement 10 (E&T-10a-b) was changed from "1" to "2".

b. Officer Accession Training. Scoring statement 8 (E&T-8) was changed from "2" to "1", and scoring statement 10 (E&T-10a-b) was changed from "1" to "2".

c. DON Specific PME. Scoring statement 8 (E&T-10b-c) was changed from "1" to "2".

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 22 APRIL 2004

Mr. Thomas Crabtree, alternate for VADM Albert H. Konetzni, USN, Member entered the deliberative session at 1155. CAPT Mark Anthony did not participate further in the deliberative session.

12. After the IEG approved the band placement for the scoring statements for each of the DON E&T functions, it assigned them a numerical score. The numerical score for each scoring statement depended upon its band placement (i.e., Band 1: 6-10; Band 2: 3-7; and Band 3: 1-4). See enclosures (5), (6), and (7).

13. After the IEG assigned numerical scores for each scoring statement, the IEG reviewed the IAT proposed assignment of scoring statements, by attribute, to the four military value selection criteria. Insertion of a "1" indicated the scoring statement related to a particular military value selection criteria. The IEG approved the IAT's recommendations. See enclosures (5), (6), and (7).

14. The IEG requested the IAT to develop a proposed attribute weighting plan for each DON E&T function for IEG review. At the next deliberative session the IEG will review the weighting of attributes to the selection criteria, scoring statement weighting, and component array for each of the three DON E&T functions. The IEG also plans to begin the assessment of DON Specific Headquarters and Support Activities. The deliberative session adjourned at 1219.

JAMES A. NOEL
CAPTAIN, U.S. Marine Corps
Recorder, IAT