

BRAC 2005
Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG)
VTC Meeting Minutes of 8 June 2004

Dr. Ron Sega, Director, Defense Research and Engineering chaired the meeting. The list of attendees is attached. Mr. Shaffer opened the meeting by providing a brief overview of ongoing and upcoming TJCSG activities. The key points, decisions and action items from the meeting are as follows:

Key Points:

- Dr. Rohde indicated the implementation of the Capacity Report dated 11 December 2003 for calculating capacity is not appropriate at this time. He, on behalf of the CIT, recommended the use of two new capacity measures:

- ACAT \$
- ACAT #'s

(All eight capacity measures (including the two new ones mentioned above) are listed below.)

1. Formulas for Work Years
 2. Formula for Equipment Use
 3. Formula for Facility Use
 4. Formula for Test Resource Workload
 5. Formula for Funding
 6. Formula for Building Use
 7. Formula for ACAT \$
 8. Formula for ACAT #'s
- Dr. Rohde, again on behalf of the CIT, recommended the use of all eight equations: five now (1, 4, 5, 7, and 8): and then use the remaining three (2, 3, 6) during Scenario Deliberations. OSD BRAC representative stated TJCSG should use all metrics because BRAC is concerned with infrastructure.
 - COL Buckstad indicated the TJCSG will not be able to meet the 23 June 2004 deadline for the final Capacity Analysis Report. He proposed 23 June 2004 as an interim deliverable with updates in July and August 2004. This is needed to allow the TJCSG to resolve capacity data base clarification issues in coordination with the Services. OSD BRAC representative indicated this is an issue for all of the JCSGs and that further guidance would be forthcoming. No new suspense date was provided.
 - There was a brief discussion on the Request for Clarification (RFC) Process. The subgroups were tasked to finalize their RFC questions and to provide to Mr Shaffer. Dr. Stewart requested clarification of Wynne's memo, dated May 28, 2004, specifying JCSG Service Principals' role in providing RFCs to Service BRAC Office. Action was given to Mr. Goldstayn to write memo to Principals to explain RFC process and how it plays with Wynne's recent memo.
 - Mr. Goldstayn indicated the Subgroups are working on the target lists for soliciting military value data call. Three lists are being developed and should be completed by

noon tomorrow, 9 June 2004. They are: 1. Installations, 2. Organizations, and 3. Technical Facilities/hybrid.

- Dr. Schuette presented the status of Data Call #2 Military Value Questions.
 - Dr. Schuette presented a summary of the ISG rulings presented in Mr. Wynne's memo dated 4 June 2004, subject: Technical Joint Cross Service Group Report on Military Value Analysis.
 - Dr. Stewart raised the issue on FFRDCs personnel. He indicated they should not be counted as contractors since they have been granted special status by law. The OSG BRAC office representative, Mr. Porth, stated that the FFRDCs are contractors. The TJCSG asked OSD BRAC office to clarify the issue and provide guidance to JCSGs for implementation. Dr. Schuette indicated the current version of the Military Value questions does not count FFRDC personnel in the people attribute. A decision should be made prior to the release of the Military Value questions in order to match whatever the decision to eliminate potential for future questions requirements.
 - Dr. Schuette indicated the DST concluded the "Buildable Acres" data could not be provided by bin as required to fit the TJCSG analytical framework and therefore should be eliminated.
 - Dr. Schuette indicated the CIT made a decision to change the 5% floor in ACAT question to a fixed \$\$/FTE level.
 - For ACAT I/II questions - \$10M/30 FTE aggregated over FY01/03
 - For ACAT III/IV questions - 15 FTE aggregated over FY01/03
 - Dr. Schuette indicated the final draft questions would be provided to the Question Owners by 1400 hrs today, 8 June 2004, for a final check and then provided to the TJCSG Principals tomorrow, 9 June 2004. Dr. Rohde indicated the Analysis Team should also take a look to ensure these questions will work into the TJCSG analytical framework.
 - Subgroups need to revise metric weights.
 - Appendix A is being updated to reflect Data Call #2.
- Dr. Higgins indicated the Capacity Data Clarification Process is in works.
- Next TJCSG VTC Scheduled for 16 June 2004, 0900-100 hrs EST.

Decisions:

- TJCSG accepted the CIT recommendations as presented by Dr. Rohde above. They requested the Analysis Team to provide at the next TJCSG Meeting any issues they may have with this recommendation.

Action Items:

1. Analysis Team to provide any issues they may have with adding the additional capacity formulas for ACAT \$ and ACAT #'s to the capacity analysis methodology and for deferring calculations of Formula for Equipment Use, Formula for Facility Use and Formula for Building Use until Scenario

- Deliberations. (POC: COL DeSalva, due by TJCSG Meeting scheduled for 16 June 2004)
2. Mr. Goldstayn to write a memo to the TJCSG Principals explaining the RFC process and the TJCSG Principals' role with respect to the Mr. Wynne memo dated June 2004.
 3. Determine whether the intent of the "No-Contractor" decision in Mr. Wynne's memo, dated 28 May 2004, was to include or exclude FFRDCs in the TJCSG Military Value Analysis and to provide rationale associated with whichever the intent. (POC: Mr. Potochney, due 9 June 2004), Corrollary: COL Buckstad asked Mr. Goldstayn to draft an email for Mr. Shaffer to send to the OSD BRAC Office staff.)
 4. Analysis Team to review Data Call #2 questions and ensure they will work in the TJCSG analytical construct. (POC: COL DeSalva, due by 9 June 2004)
 5. ~~S~~. Subgroup Leads tasked to finalize RFC questions and provide to Mr. Shaffer by COB 11 June 2004.

Signed: _____



Mr. Alan R. Shaffer
Chairman, Capabilities Integration Team

Approved: _____



Dr. Ronald Sega
Chairman, Technical Joint Cross Service Group

Attachments

1. Meeting Agenda
2. Capacity Data Call Evaluation Recommendations
3. Capacity Analysis Report Schedule
4. Draft Target Facilities
5. Status of Military Value Questions
6. TJCSG RFC Process
7. TJCSG Open Action Item List
8. TJCSG Planned Next Steps

Technical JCSG Meeting

June 8, 2004

Attendees

Members:

Dr. Ron Sega (Chair)
Dr. Dan Stewart, Air Force
Dr. John Foulkes, Army
Mr. George Ryan, Navy (Alternate for RADM Cohen, Navy)
Dr. Barry Dillon, Marines

Other:

Mr. Al Shaffer, OSD
Mr. Andy Porth, OSD BRAC Office
Mr. Al Goldstyan, AF CIT Rep
Mr. Roger Florence, DOD IG
COL Buckstad, OSD
Mr. Don DeYoung, Navy CIT Alternate
Mr. Gerald Schiefer, OSD BRAC
Dr. Bob Rohde, Army CIT Rep
Mr. Gary Strack, OSD
Col Eileen Walling, AF CIT Alternate
Dr. Karren Higgins, Weapons/Armaments Subgroup Lead
Dr. Larry Schuette, Innovative Systems Subgroup Lead
Mr. Brian Simmons, Army CIT Alternate

TJCSG, 8 June – Tuesday

Date-Time: 1200-1300 (VTC), Location: Pentagon, 4D979, Attendees: TJCSG members, and presenters. CIT may modify attendee list¹ on Monday.

Introduction – COL Buckstad/Mr Shaffer

Decisions

- Capacity Evaluation – Does TJCSG use 5 or 8 equations? (10 Minutes total)
 - Presenters – Dr Rohde, advocate for 8 equations (3.5 minutes) and Mr Goldstayn, advocate for 5 equations (3.5 minutes). Expected result – TJCSG select 5 or 8 equations.
 - Facilitate decision (3 Minutes), Dr Short.
- MIL Value level of collected data - Installation level , Facility (or activity) level, or some hybrid approach (12 Minutes total)
 - Presenters – COL Hamm (installation) and Mr Mleziva (facility or activity), Mr Goldstayn (hybrid). 3 minutes each. Expected result – TJCSG provide guidance.
 - Facilitate Decision (3 minutes), Dr Short
- Approve Capacity Clarification Questions – Dr Short (10 Minutes)
- Approve MIL Value Questions – Dr Short (Dr Schutte assist) (20 Minutes)

Status and Schedule to complete Mil Value Report – Dr Short (3 Minutes)

Schedule (7 Minutes)

- Macro Schedule – COL Buckstad
- Micro Schedule – Mr Strack

Action Item review – Mr Shaffer (Provide handouts, action: Mr Strack)

Open Discussion – as time available

Closing Remarks – Dr Sega/Mr Shaffer

Other as time available

- Review proposed Target List (5 minutes) – Dr Short. Expected result – TJCSG provide guidance. Dr Short provide handout
- Proposal (5 Minutes) – Approach to improving Field responses to MIL Value Questions. Concept – provide information briefing to field, show them how TJCSG plan to use the data (question answers).
- Master Plan Status (i.e. approved), Lessons Learned, and Change 1 plans (2 Minutes) – COL Buckstad. COL Buckstad provide hand out
- Status of Transformation Options, Principle, and Imperative Definition effort – Mr Erb, BG Castle
- Analysis Plan Status and road ahead to Analysis Plan approval – Col DeSalva
 - Issue – documented analysis methodology
- Portal Usage (see Master Plan, paragraph 25.9)

¹ The “facilitators” for the Monday all day work session are invited.

Proposed process for TJCSG to get the current capacity data to the point for conducting the capacity analysis as currently defined (R2: update #6 per TJCSG 20 May guidance)

1. Each subgroup reviews their data with access to other subgroup data as required
 - a) Identify data issues to support capacity analysis
 - General across the board issues (e.g., peak year definition)
 - Obvious installation/organization specific data anomalies (e.g., S&T funding, however, no FTEs)
 - Potential installation/organization technical data issues (e.g., SME knows that Installation X does testing, however, no test data was reported)
 - b) Subgroups and analytic team collectively review data issues
 - Develop a master RFC list
 - General across the board
 - Installation-by-installation
 - Develop list of new questions required immediately to support capacity analysis, such as,
 - FY01, FY02, FY03, and Peak ACAT funding
 - Peak year for ACAT numbers
 - Identify need for a new question or clarification required to support Scenario Analysis
2. Develop standard TJCSG RFC format
 - a) Implement BRAC 95 RFC process
 - b) TJCSG adopt one of the Services RFC formats and each Service will use it to respond to the TJCSG requests
3. Supplemental Data Call
4. Subgroups sort out key players vice secondary and tailor RFCs to collect required capacity data from the key players and use less intrusive RFCs to determine the appropriateness of the involvement of the secondary players
5. Determine methodology to reconcile double counting of funding
 - a) BRAC “facility” budget less budget forwarded to another BRAC “facility”
6. Request the MILDEPs provide data by “like facility” as we have defined that term
7. Commission a smaller subset of subgroup members to examine MILDEP data inputs to assess the potential for data translation errors as the data proceeds through the various databases (MILDEP tools through CNA db, into TJCSG Access files)

Capacity Analysis Report Schedule

7 Jun

Draft Deliberative Document -- for discussion only -- do not release under
FOIA

Draft

Capacity Analysis Report

BRAC FOUO

- 28 May: Initial Assessment, draft to OSD BRAC Office
- 7 Jun: Freeze Capacity Data Base
- 11 Jun: Analysis Cut-off
- 16 Jun: Draft Capacity Report, ready for coordination
- 21 Jun: Final for TJCSG Chair approval and signature
- 23 Jun: Deliver Report to OSD BRAC Office*

- 22 Jul: Update report
- 24 Aug: Final Report

* ISSUE -- 23 Jun is OSD Suspend item for Final Report, Need for updates not acknowledged by OSD staff.

Draft Deliberative Document -- for discussion only -- do not release under
FOIA

Thank you

Draft Deliberative Document -- for discussion only -- do not release under
FOIA

Source	OrgName
DCMA	DCMA Arlington
DCMA	DCMA ATK Thiokol
DCMA	DCMA Atlanta
DCMA	DCMA Birmingham
DCMA	DCMA Boeing St. Louis
DCMA	DCMA Chicago
DCMA	DCMA Dallas
DCMA	DCMA Denver
DCMA	DCMA EAST
DCMA	DCMA Ft. Worth
DCMA	DCMA GE Lynn
DCMA	DCMA HQs
DCMA	DCMA Huntsville
DCMA	DCMA Indianapolis
DCMA	DCMA Kelly
DCMA	DCMA L3
DCMA	DCMA Lockheed Martin Dallas
DCMA	DCMA Lockheed Martin Delaware Valley
DCMA	DCMA Lockheed Martin Ft. Worth
DCMA	DCMA Lockheed Martin Marietta
DCMA	DCMA Lockheed Martin Missiles and Space
DCMA	DCMA Long Island
DCMA	DCMA Milwaukee
DCMA	DCMA NASA Programs
DCMA	DCMA New York
DCMA	DCMA Northrop Grumman El Segundo
DCMA	DCMA Northrop Grumman Rolling Meadows
DCMA	DCMA Raytheon
DCMA	DCMA Raytheon Tuscon
DCMA	DCMA Richardson
DCMA	DCMA Rockford
DCMA	DCMA Rockwell Cedar Rapids
DCMA	DCMA Salt Lake City
DCMA	DCMA San Antonio
DCMA	DCMA San Diego
DCMA	DCMA San Francisco
DCMA	DCMA Seattle
DCMA	DCMA Silicon Valley
DCMA	DCMA South Bend
DCMA	DCMA Springfield
DCMA	DCMA St. Louis
DCMA	DCMA Syracuse
DCMA	DCMA Twin Cities
DCMA	DCMA WEST
DCMA	DCMA Wichita
DISA	Camp Swampy -- IG DOD Test Site
DISA	JITC Fort Huachuca
DISA	JITC Indianhead
DLA	DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION CENTER
DLA	DESC HQ
DLA	DLA HQ - USA FORT BELVOIR

USA	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND
USA	ADELPHI LABORATORY CENTER
USA	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT
USA	CORPUS CHRISTI ARMY DEPOT
USA	DETROIT ARSENAL
USA	DUGWAY PROVING GROUND
USA	FORT A P HILL
USA	FORT BELVOIR
USA	FORT BENNING
USA	FORT BLISS
USA	FORT BRAGG
USA	FORT DETRICK
USA	FORT EUSTIS
USA	FORT GORDON
USA	FORT HOOD
USA	FORT HUACHUCA
USA	FORT JACKSON
USA	FORT KNOX
USA	FORT LEE
USA	FORT LEONARD WOOD
USA	FORT MONMOUTH
USA	FORT RUCKER
USA	FORT SAM HOUSTON
USA	FORT SILL
USA	FORT WAINWRIGHT
USA	HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT
USA	KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT
USA	LAKE CITY AAP
USA	LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT
USA	LIMA ARMY TANK PLT
USA	MCALESTER AAP
USA	PICATINNY ARSENAL
USA	PINE BLUFF ARSENAL
USA	REDSTONE ARSENAL
USA	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL
USA	SCRANTON AAP
USA	SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER
USA	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT
USA	TRIPLER ARMY MEDICAL CENTER
USA	WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER
USA	WATERVLIET ARSENAL
USA	WEST POINT MIL RESERVATION
USA	WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE
USA	YUMA PROVING GROUND
USAF	Arnold AFS
USAF	Brooks City-Base
USAF	Des Moines IAP AGS
USAF	Eglin AFB
USAF	Holloman AFB
USAF	Hurlburt Field
USAF	Indian Springs AFS
USAF	Niagara Falls IAP ARS

USAF	Onizuka AFS
USAF	Rome Laboratory
USAF	Vandenberg AFB
USAF	Tucson IAP AGS
DECA/USAF	BARKSDALE AFB
DECA/USAF	BEALE AFB
DECA/USAF	DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB
DECA/USAF	DYESS AFB
DECA/USAF	EDWARDS AFB
DECA/USAF	Hanscom AFB
DECA/USAF	HILL AFB
DECA/USAF	KEESLER AFB
DECA/USAF	KIRTLAND AFB
DECA/USAF	LACKLAND AFB
DECA/USAF	Langley AFB
DECA/USAF	LOS ANGELES AFB
DECA/USAF	McGuire AFB
DECA/USAF	NELLIS AFB
DECA/USAF	PATRICK AFB
DECA/USAF	RANDOLPH AFB
DECA/USAF	Robins AFB
DECA/USAF	TINKER AFB
DECA/USAF	TYNDALL AFB
DECA/USAF	WHITEMAN AFB
DECA/USAF	WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB
USN	AEGIS_TECHREP_MOORESTOWN_NJ
USN	CBTDIRSYSACT_DAM_NECK_VA
USN	CDR_USJFCOM_NORFOLK_VA
USN	CG_MAGTF_TRNGCOM
USN	CG_MCB_CAMPEN
USN	CG_MCB_QUANTICO_VA
USN	CG_MCCDC_QUANTICO_VA
USN	CNR_ARLINGTON_VA
USN	CO_MCLB_ALBANY_GA
USN	COMNAVAIRSYSYSCOM_PATUXENT_RIVER
USN	COMNAVAIRWARCENACDIV_PATUXENT
USN	COMNAVAIRWARCENWPNDIV_CHINA_LA
USN	COMNAVFACENGCOM_WASHINGTON_DC
USN	COMNAVPERSCOM_MILLINGTON_TN
USN	COMNAVSEASYSYSCOM_WNY_DC
USN	COMNAVSPECWARGRU_FOUR
USN	COMNAVSPECWARGRU_ONE
USN	COMNAVSURFWARCEN_WASHINGTON_D
USN	COMNAVUNSEAWARCEN_NEWPORT_RI
USN	COMOPTEVFOR_NORFOLK_VA
USN	METROSTAR_SYSTEMS
USN	NATEC_SAN_DIEGO_CA
USN	NAVAEROMEDRSCH_PENSACOLA_FL
USN	NAVAIRDEPOT_CHERRY_PT_NC
USN	NAVAIRDEPOT_JACKSONVILLE_FL
USN	NAVAIRENGSTA_LAKEHURST_NJ
USN	NAVAIRWARCENACDIV_LAKEHURST_NJ

USN NAVAIRWARCENTRASYS DIV_ORLANDO_F
USN NAVAIRWARCENWPNDIV_PT_MUGU_CA
USN NAVCLOTEXTRSCHFAC_NATICK_MA
USN NAVDENBIOMEDRSCH_GREAT_LAKES_IL
USN NAVEODTECHDIV_INDIAN_HEAD_MD
USN NAVHLTHRSCHCEN_SAN_DIEGO_CA
USN NAVMEDRSCHCEN_SILVER_SPRING_MD
USN NAVOBSY_WASHINGTON_DC
USN NAVORDSAFSECACT_INDIAN_HEAD_MD
USN NAVPGSCOL_MONTEREY_CA
USN NAVPMOSSP_PITTSFIELD_MA
USN NAVPMOSSP_SUNNYVALE_CA
USN NAVSHIPYD_PORTS MOUTH_NH
USN NAVSUBMEDRSCHLAB_NEW_LONDON_C
USN NAVSUPPACT_ORLANDO_FL
USN NAVSURFWARCEN_CARDEROCKDIV_BET
USN NAVSURFWARCEN_COASTSYSSTA_PANA
USN NAVSURFWARCENDIV_CORONA_CA
USN NAVSURFWARCENDIV_CRANE_IN
USN NAVSURFWARCENDIV_DAHLGREN_VA
USN NAVSURFWARCENDIV_INDIAN_HEAD_MD
USN NAVSURFWARCENDIV_PORT_HUENEME_
USN NAVSURFWARCENSHIPSYSSENGSTA_PHIL
USN NAVUNSEAWARCENDIV_KEYPORT_WA
USN NAVUNSEAWARCENDIV_NEWPORT_RI
USN NAVXDIVINGU_PANAMA_CITY_FL
USN NCTSI_SAN_DIEGO_CA
USN NFESC_PORT_HUENEME_CA
USN NRL_WASHINGTON_DC
USN PACMISRANFAC_HAWAREA_BARKING_SA
USN SPAWARINFOTECHCEN_NEW_ORLEANS_
USN SPAWARSYSCEN_CHARLESTON_SC
USN SPAWARSYSCEN_NORFOLK_VA
USN SPAWARSYSCEN_SAN_DIEGO_CA
USN SPAWARSYSCOM_SAN_DIEGO_CA
USN SSFA_CHANTILLY_VA
USN SUBASE_BANGOR_WA
USN SUBMEPP_PORTS MOUTH_NH
USN SURFCOMBATSYSCEN_WALLOPS_ISLAN
USN USUHS_BETHESDA_MD
USN WPNSTA_YORKTOWN_VA

CAPACITY ANALYSIS REPORT

Initial Assessment of Current Capacity

- Report (June 23) is to Identify:
 - Facilities performing technical functions (100-200)
 - Workload capacity of the facilities
 - Surge workload capacity of the facilities
 - Excess capacity, if any
- Interim report (May 28) is to
 - Calculate at one location:

Current capacity	Maximum potential capacity
Current usage	Excess capacity

- Identify problems jeopardizing completion

$$\text{Maximum Capacity} - \text{Current Capacity} - \text{Surge Capacity} = \text{Excess Capacity}$$

CAPACITY ANALYSIS REPORT

Initial Assessment of Current Capacity

Maximum Capacity - Current Capacity - Surge Capacity = Excess Capacity
 Peak Capacity - 3-year average capacity -10% for surge = Excess Capacity)

R	FTE:	430	-	300	-	30	= 100 FTE
D&A	FTE:	1500	-	1100	-	110	= 390 FTE
T&E	FTE:	480	-	40	-	4	= 436 FTE

R	\$:	\$ 20M	-	\$10M	-	\$ 1M	= \$ 9M
D&A	\$:	\$230M	-	\$200M	-	\$20M	= \$ 10M
T&E	\$:	\$640M	-	\$480M	-	\$48M	= \$112M

T&E test hours: 300,000 - 280,000 = 28,000 = 0 (-8000 hours)

ACAT I/II/III/IV: not asked - 16/7/10/3 = 1.6/0.7/1.0/0.3 = indeterminate

CAPACITY ANALYSIS REPORT

Initial Assessment of Current Capacity

- **Issues—unexpected results impeding analysis**
 - Confusing answers at a location
 - More sensible when aggregated
- **Enabling subgroups to continue capacity analysis**
 - Clarifying questions
 - Time phase capacity analysis
 - Use data meaningful today
 - Use data which becomes meaningful in 10, 20, 30, 60 days

Military Value Report

Status of Military Value Questions Release

- **Data Standardization Team feedback on questions**
 - **Contractor questions (#2,4,6,8), Audit issue**
 - **Binning people (#1,3,5,7), Audit issue**
 - **Binning special features (#9,10,12), Audit issue**

Military Value Report

Status of Military Value Questions Release


- **Transition to D&A (#18):** Audit issue
- **Urgent Needs Statement (#20):**
- **Threshold to excuse smaller respondents from answering military value questions (#9-31)**
- **Meet with DST again next Wednesday**

Sub Group Actions for Data Correction

1. **Each subgroup reviews their data with access to other subgroup data as required**
 - a. Identify data issues to support capacity analysis
 - General across the board issues (e.g., peak year definition)
 - Obvious installation/organization specific data anomalies (e.g., S&T funding, however, no FTEs)
 - Potential installation/organization technical data issues (e.g., SME knows that Installation X does testing, however, no test data was reported)
 - b. Subgroups and analytic team collectively review data issues
 - Develop a master RFC list
 - General across the board
 - Installation-by-installation
 - Develop list of new questions required immediately to support capacity analysis, such as:
 - FY01, FY02, FY03, and Peak ACAT funding
 - Peak year for ACAT numbers
 - c. Identify need for a new question or clarification required to support Scenario Analysis

Sub Group Actions for Data Correction (continued)

2. **Develop standard TJCSG RFC format**
3. **Supplemental Data Call**
4. **Subgroups sort out key players vice secondary and tailor RFCs** to collect required capacity data from the key players and use less intrusive RFCs to determine the appropriateness of the involvement of the secondary players
5. **Determine methodology to reconcile double counting of funding**
 - BRAC “facility” budget less budget forwarded to another BRAC “facility”
6. **Decide the level of “Like Facility” definition.** AF/Army aggregation at the installation level blurs discrete apparently “like facilities” at an installation, which in truth may not be like at all. We can either decide to spend considerable time developing a solution to this, or we can push this to Scenario Analysis.
7. **Commission a smaller subset of subgroup members to examine MILDEP data inputs to assess the potential for data translation errors** as the data proceeds through the various databases (MILDEP tools through CNA db, into TJCSG Access files)



TJCSG Process Data Flow & QA Checkpoints

