Evaluation Report

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

EXECUTIVE AGENT SUPPORT TO JOINT OPERATIONS

Report No. 98-066 February 9, 1998

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Additional Copies

To obtain additional copies of this evaluation report, contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit of the Analysis, Planning, and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8937(DSN 664-8937) or FAX (703) 604-8932.

Suggestions for Future Evaluations

To suggest ideas for or to request future evaluations, contact the Planning and Coordination Branch of the Analysis, Planning, and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8908 (DSN 664-8908) or FAX (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

OAIG-AUD (ATTN: APTS Audit Suggestions)
Inspector General, Department of Defense
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, Virginia 22202-2884

Defense Hotline

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, contact the Defense Hotline by calling (800) 424-9098; by sending an electronic message to Hotline @DODIG.MIL; or by writing to the Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1900. The identity of each writer and caller is fully protected.

Acronyms

ASD(C^3I)	Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence)
CINC	Commander in Chief
JTF	Joint Task Force
MILDEP	Military Department
OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense
USCENTCOM	U.S. Central Command
USCINCEUR	U.S. Commander in Chief, European Command
USCINCTRANS	U.S. Commander in Chief, Transportation Command
USEUCOM	U.S. European Command
USPACOM	U.S. Pacific Command

INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-2884

February 9, 1998

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

SUBJECT: Evaluation Report on Executive Agent Support to Joint Operations (Report No. 98-066)

We provided a draft of this report to the addressee on November 21, 1997. Because this report contains no findings or recommendations, written comments were not required, and none were received. Therefore, we are publishing this report in final form.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the evaluation staff. Questions on this report should be directed to Captain A. L. Lawson, U.S. Navy, Evaluation Program Director, at (703) 604-9555 (DSN 664-9555) or Ms. Kathryn L. Palmer, Evaluation Project Manager, at (703) 604-8840 (DSN 664-8840). See Appendix C for the report distribution. The evaluation team members are listed inside the back cover.

Robert J. Lieberman
Assistant Inspector General
for Auditing

Office of the Inspector General, DoD

Report No. 98-066 **February 9, 1998**
(Project No. 7RB-9032)

Executive Agent Support to Joint Operations

Executive Summary

Introduction. Many terms are used throughout the DoD to describe executive agent type functions. They include executive agent, single manager, and lead agent. Throughout this report, the term executive agent is used in a broad sense to refer to the subordinate official that has been delegated authority by a superior to perform some function or act on behalf of the delegating official regardless of the terminology used. We obtained lists from the Military Departments that contained 401 executive agents. Those agents performed a wide variety of functions within the DoD. Our report focused on five executive agents that performed functions having an impact on joint operational readiness in the most recent past as well as in the current operational environment. The executive agents and the responsible Military Departments selected for our evaluation are listed below:

- Joint Task Force Communications Network Management (Army),
- Land-Based Water Resources (Army),
- Military Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technology and Training (Navy),
- Aeromedical Transport/Worldwide Aeromedical Evacuation (Air Force), and
- Joint Search and Rescue Center (Air Force).

Evaluation Objective. The evaluation objective was to determine the effects of executive agency support on joint operational readiness. We also reviewed the adequacy of the management control program as it applied to the evaluation objective.

Evaluation Results. Based on the five executive agents selected for evaluation, we found no evidence of systemic problems resulting from use of executive agent type authority to perform a function in support of joint operations. Four of the five selected executive agents had documentation in the form of directives and instructions that spell out authority and responsibilities. The fifth, a newly designated executive agent, was in the process of developing documentation. All of the selected executive agents

received oversight from Office of the Secretary of Defense Primary Staff Assistants* as well as through Military Department channels. Each of the selected executive agents had an established requirements process that included participation from the users of the service provided by the executive agent. Further, the users were generally satisfied with the service provided by the selected executive agents. Management controls applicable to the five executive agents were adequate in that we identified no material weaknesses.

Management Comments. The draft report was issued on November 21, 1997. Because this report contains no findings or recommendations, written comments were not required, and none were received. Therefore, we are publishing this report in final form.

---

*DoD Directive 5025.1, "DoD Directives System," June 24, 1994, defines Primary Staff Assistants as the Under Secretaries of Defense; Comptroller of the DoD; Director of Defense Research and Engineering; Assistant Secretaries of Defense; Director of Operational Test and Evaluation; General Counsel of the DoD; Inspector General, DoD; Assistants to the Secretary of Defense; and other Office of the Secretary of Defense directors or equivalents who report directly to the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i

Part I - Evaluation Results

Evaluation Background 2
Evaluation Objective 3
Executive Agent Effectiveness 4

Part II - Additional Information

Appendix A. Evaluation Process
Scope and Methodology 8
Management Control Program 9
Summary of Prior Coverage 9
Appendix B. Executive Agent Performance 10
Appendix C. Report Distribution 18

Part I - Evaluation Results

Evaluation Background

Several terms are used throughout the DoD to describe executive agent type functions. They include executive agent, lead agent, and single manager. Hereafter and throughout this report, the term executive agent will be used in a broad sense to refer to the subordinate official that has been delegated authority by a superior to perform some function or act on behalf of the delegating official regardless of the terminology used.

Definitions. Executive agent is defined as ". . . a term used in DoD and Service regulations to indicate a delegation of authority by a superior to a subordinate to act on behalf of the superior."[1] The definition goes on to say that an agreement between equals does not create an executive agent. For example, a Service cannot become a DoD executive agent for a particular matter with simply the agreement of the other Services; such authority must be delegated by the Secretary of Defense. The definition further notes that ". . . designation as executive agent, in and of itself, confers no authority. The exact nature and scope of the authority delegated must be stated in the document designating the executive agent. An executive agent may be limited to providing only administration and support or coordinating common functions, or it may be delegated authority, direction, and control over specified resources for specified purposes." The Army is the only Military Department (MILDEP) that officially defines the term executive agent. It is defined as ". . . a DoD component which has been designated by the President, DoD, or Congress as the sole agency to perform a function or service for others."[2] The definition further notes that other terms are also used to express executive agent responsibility. Those include single manager and management agent.

Number of Executive Agents. We obtained lists from the MILDEPs that contained 401 executive agents. The Army accounted for 130, the Navy 66, and the Air Force 205.[3] The 401 executive agents represented a wide variety of functions. The responsibilities cover diverse functions to include Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works; Military Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technology and Training; National Missing In Action/Prisoner of War Recognition Day; North Atlantic Treaty Organization Air Command and Control System; Protestant Religious Education Curriculum; and Single Manager for Conventional Ammunition.

---

[1]Joint Publication 1-02, "The DoD Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms," March 23, 1994, updated by Joint Staff Memorandum, "Joint Pubs-Terminology Promulgation," July 7, 1994.

[2]Department of the Army Memorandum 10-1, "Executive Agent Responsibilities Assigned to the Secretary of the Army," January 15, 1997.

The executive agent functions that had bearing on joint operational readiness accounted for only about 13 percent of the total number. From those, we selected five executive agents. We focused our evaluation on the U.S. European Command (USEUCOM) because of the recent past and the ongoing operations in that theater. Executive agent functions selected and the responsible MILDEPs are listed below. Appendix B contains detailed information on each of the selected executive agents.

o Joint Task Force (JTF) Communications Network Management (Army),

o Land-Based Water Resources (Army),

o Military Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technology and Training (Navy),

o Aeromedical Transport/Worldwide Aeromedical Evacuation (Air Force), and

o Joint Search and Rescue Center (Air Force).

Evaluation Objective

The evaluation objective was to determine the effects of executive agency support on joint operational readiness. We also reviewed the adequacy of themanagement control program as it applied to the objective. See Appendix A for a discussion of the evaluation scope and methodology, and the review of the management control program.

[3]The numbers of executive agents used in this report should not be interpreted as a static number. The numbers will vary depending on how executive agent was defined and the time period for which the information was obtained.

Executive Agent Effectiveness

Based on the five executive agents selected for evaluation, we found no evidence of systemic problems resulting from use of executive agent type authority to perform a function in support of joint operations. Four of the five selected executive agents had documentation in the form of directives and instructions that spell out authority and responsibilities. The fifth, a newly designated executive agent, was in the process of developing documentation. All of the selected executive agents received oversight from Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Primary Staff Assistants[4] or a Unified Commander. Each of the selected executive agents had an established requirements process that included participation from the users of the service provided by the executive agent. Further, the users were generally satisfied with the service provided by the selected executive agents.

Functioning Executive Agents

For the five evaluated executive agent functions, we found no evidence of systemic problems resulting from use of executive agents. The use of an executive agent has the positive benefit of focusing resources for accomplishment of a specific function. This is accomplished through proper authority and documentation, management oversight, and a mechanism to identify and incorporate customer requirements. It also involves, as an end product, customer satisfaction.

Authority and Documentation

Each of the five executive agents was established through proper authority and documentation. Specifically, each executive agent was authorized to perform the assigned functions by a tasking memorandum from the Secretary of Defense or a Primary Staff Assistant, or by a DoD directive. Four of the five executive agents had directives or instructions delineating authority and responsibilities. The fifth, JTF Communications Network Management, was a newly designated

[4]DoD Directive 5025.1, "DoD Directives System," June 24, 1994, defines Primary Staff Assistants as the Under Secretaries of Defense; Comptroller of the DoD; Director of Defense Research and Engineering; Assistant Secretaries of Defense; Director of Operational Test and Evaluation; General Counsel of the DoD; Inspector General, DoD; Assistants to the Secretary of Defense; and other OSD directors or equivalents who report directly to the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of Defense.

executive agent. It was in the formative stages of developing a program under the authority of a tasking memorandum from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) (ASD[C^3I]). The delineation of authority and responsibilities provided the executive agents with the direction and access to resources needed for effective functional support.

Management Oversight

While there was no centralized oversight of all executive agents at the OSD level or two of the MILDEPs, oversight was provided for the five selected executive agents along functional chains of authority within the MILDEPs and by Primary Staff Assistants at the OSD level. The Army was the only MILDEP that provided centralized oversight by routinely reviewing assigned executive agent responsibilities for duplication and by accounting for the level of resources used to support them. Additionally, the various joint boards and groups established for specific functional areas provided oversight relative to ensuring accomplishment of joint management responsibilities. For example, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology provided OSD level oversight for the Land-Based Water Resources executive agent. Functional oversight of land-based water resources was provided by the Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. Additionally, the Joint Water Resources Management Action Group ensured that the Army's management of Land-Based Water Resources was accomplished with a joint perspective. Membership of the group included representatives of the MILDEPs, Unified Commands, the Joint Staff, and Defense agencies. This joint group met twice a year to coordinate and resolve land-based water support issues.

Customer Requirements

All five of the selected executive agents had mechanisms to identify and incorporate customer requirements. The mechanisms included joint boards, groups, and councils that were involved in providing customer feedback to the executive agent. (The boards, groups, and councils will be referred to as user groups when referred to collectively.) The user groups ensured that customers of the service had the opportunity to participate in the process for determining deficiencies and identifying the requirements that would meet the deficiencies. The user groups also identified requirements for training and support as well as for research and development programs. For example, the Explosive Ordnance Disposal Program Board served as the focal point for users to identify requirements for explosive ordnance disposal training and technology. This joint board was composed of representatives from each Service and met twice a year to review all explosive ordnance requirements.

Customer Satisfaction

The users were generally satisfied with the services provided by the executive agents. We contacted staff officers at various Unified Commands and other users and found overall satisfaction with the support provided by the four executive agents that had programs in place. This may be the most important factor in determining the overall effectiveness of the joint operational support.

Conclusion

Based on the five executive agents selected for evaluation, we found no evidence of systemic problems resulting from use of executive agent type authority to perform a function in support of joint operations. Therefore, this report does not include recommendations.

Part II - Additional Information

Appendix A. Evaluation Process

Scope and Methodology

Work Performed. For the five selected executive agents, we examined their authority and documentation, management oversight, customer requirements, and customer satisfaction. Documents reviewed included directives, instructions, Joint Staff publications, charters, minutes of working groups, operational directives, and planning documents dated from September 1980 through June 1997. Specifically, we evaluated authority and documentation by reviewing tasking memorandums from the Secretary of Defense and Primary Staff Assistants as well as reviewing DoD regulations and instructions that pertained to a particular function. We evaluated management oversight by reviewing DoD, Joint Staff, MILDEP, and USEUCOM regulations and instructions. We also interviewed OSD, Joint Staff, MILDEP, and USEUCOM staff officers. To evaluate customer requirements for each executive agent, we reviewed DoD and MILDEP regulations and instructions as well as reviewed the minutes from joint user groups. We evaluated customer satisfaction with the executive agent by interviewing staff officers at headquarters USEUCOM, USEUCOM Components,* headquarters U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM), and headquarters U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM).

Universe and Sample. We obtained lists containing a total of 401 executive agents from the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Because of the large number of executive agents and the diversity in the types of functions performed, we limited our evaluation of executive agent support to five executive agents. The selection was based on a review of each list for those functions that had impact on joint operational readiness in the most recent past as well as in the current operational environment. We focused on USEUCOM because of the operations in that theater that have included Operation Restore Hope (Somalia), Operation Guardian Assistance (Zaire), and Operation Joint Endeavor (Hungary and Bosnia).

Use of Computer-Processed Data. We did not use computer-processed data in the course of this evaluation.

Evaluation Type, Dates and Standards. We performed this economy and efficiency evaluation from May through September 1997 in accordance with standards issued and implemented by the Inspector General, DoD. Accordingly, we included tests of management controls considered necessary.

---

*USEUCOM Components consisted of the U.S. Army Europe, the U.S. Naval Forces Europe, and the U.S. Air Forces Europe. They will be referred to collectively as Components.

Contacts During the Evaluation. We visited or contacted individuals and organizations within DoD. Further details are available upon request.

Management Control Program

DoD Directive 5010.38, "Management Control (MC) Program," August 26, 1996, requires DoD managers to implement a comprehensive system of management controls that provides reasonable assurance that programs are operating as intended and to evaluate the adequacy of those controls.

Scope of Review of Management Control Program. We reviewed the adequacy of the management controls for each of the five executive agents included in our evaluation. Specifically, we reviewed management controls associated with the authorization to perform a function as executive agent, documentation outlining responsibilities, management oversight, requirements process, and customer feedback mechanisms.

Adequacy of Management Controls. Management controls applicable to the five executive agents were adequate in that we identified no material weaknesses.

Summary of Prior Coverage

No prior coverage has been conducted on the topic of executive agent support to joint operations during the past 5 years.

Appendix B. Executive Agent Performance

Our evaluation focused on five executive agents that performed functions having impact on joint operational readiness in the recent past as well as the current operational environment. A summary of each follows.

JTF Communications Network Management (Army)

An August 1993 ASD(C^3I) memorandum tasks the Secretary of the Army ". . . to designate and resource an executive agent as a single point of contact to develop and maintain a JTF communications network management system capable of satisfying JTF and Service Component headquarters communications network management requirements." The Army in turn designated the U.S. Army Communications and Electronics Command as the executive agent for the task.

Authority and Documentation. The ASD(C^3I) memorandum, "Responsibility for Joint Task Force Communications Network Management System," August 17, 1993, directs that the Army establish an executive agent for JTF Communications Network Management (the JTF Communications Network). The Army Director of Information Systems for Command, Control, Communications, and Computers directed that the Commander, U.S. Army Communications and Electronics Command, act as the Army executive agent. To date, the ASD(C^3I) memorandum is the authority for the program. Development and staffing of a DoD directive outlining responsibilities was to be accomplished after an executive agent charter was staffed and approved by the principals.

Management Oversight. The Director of Information Systems for Command, Control, Communications, and Computers provided Army level oversight for the JTF Communications Network executive agent function. The ASD(C^3I) provided OSD oversight for this executive agent. In addition, oversight was provided from a joint user perspective through the Joint Network Management Configuration Control Board (the Joint Control Board). Members of the Joint Control Board included representatives of the Joint Staff Director for Command, Control, Communications, and Computer Systems (J-6); MILDEPs; Unified Commands; Joint Communications Support Element; Joint Interoperability Test Center; Defense Information Systems Agency; Defense Intelligence Agency; and National Security Agency.

Customer Requirements. A key role of the Joint Control Board was the development of joint requirements. Additionally, the Joint Control Board provided a user forum for any problems with the JTF Communications Network system once it was fielded. A Mission Needs Statement was approved in 1992 through the joint requirements process prior to the designation of the Army as the executive agent. The Operational Requirements Document was approved on June 17, 1997.

Customer Satisfaction. As of November 1997, a JTF Communications Network system did not exist. Joint Staff, MILDEP, and Defense agency representatives on the Joint Control Board can ensure that the joint user will be represented in developing the system and that customer feedback will occur throughout the life of the system.

Land-Based Water Resources (Army)

The Secretary of Defense designated the Secretary of the Army as the executive agent for land-based water resources in a 1980 memorandum. The Secretary of the Army in turn delegated executive agent responsibility to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. The mission of the executive agent is to develop and coordinate policies, procedures, and doctrine for all aspects of water support for U.S. forces in joint contingency operations. Land-based water support included water detection; pumping; purification; storage and distribution; research, development and acquisition of water support equipment; water source intelligence; and water support operations doctrine. Fixed installation water supply such as that found on military bases or other installations, and water systems designed for internal use on aircraft or aboard ship, are not included under land-based water support.

Authority and Documentation. The Secretary of the Army was delegated executive agent authority for land-based water resources by a Secretary of Defense memorandum dated September 22, 1980. The following list of documents provide the policies and management responsibilities for land-based water resources:

o DoD Directive 4705.1, "Management of Land-Based Water Resources in Support of Contingency Operations," July 9, 1992; and

o Army Regulation 700-136, "Tactical Land-Based Water Resources Management in Contingency Operations," April 1, 1993.

Management Oversight. The Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology) had OSD level oversight for land-based water resources. That oversight included DoD land-based water policy as well as oversight of research, development, and acquisition efforts aimed at ensuring water support in all operational environments. The Joint Water Resources Management

Action Group (the Joint Action Group) also provided oversight. DoD Directive 4705.1 directs that ". . . a water resources management action group be established to coordinate and resolve water support issues." The Joint Action Group met twice a year and was chaired by the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics (Transportation, Energy, and Troop Support). Participants included the MILDEPs, Unified Commands, the Joint Staff, and Defense agencies.

Customer Requirements. The Joint Action Group provided a forum for representatives of the Joint Staff, the Services, Unified Commands, and Defense agencies (to include the DoD intelligence community) to discuss water requirements and identify deficiencies. Deficiencies in capabilities and documentation of required capabilities for materiel items needed to provide land-based water were documented in Mission Needs Statements and Operational Requirements Documents. In USEUCOM, operational requirements for land-based water support were considered in the initial phases of each military operation and may be included in operational plans. During contingency operations, requests for land-based water support were made by the JTF Commander through logistics channels back to the Director of Logistics for the Unified Command. The Army provided back-up water support to other Services in an area of operations when requested.

Customer Satisfaction. Customers at USEUCOM headquarters and the USEUCOM Components were generally satisfied with the land-based water support. Additionally, staff officers at USCENTCOM and USPACOM expressed satisfaction with the support being provided for land-based water.

Military Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technology and Training (Navy)

DoD Directive 5160.62, "Single Manager for Military Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technology and Training (EODT&T)," April 26, 1989, designates the Secretary of the Navy to act as single manager for explosive ordnance disposal technology and training within DoD. The Secretary of the Navy delegated the executive management authority to the Chief of Naval Operations. It is the mission of the executive agent for Military Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technology and Training to ". . . improve the effectiveness and economy of EOD [Explosive Ordnance Disposal] throughout the Department of Defense by eliminating duplication and overlap of EOD [Explosive Ordnance Disposal] technology and training efforts."

Authority and Documentation. DoD Directive 5160.62 provides the authority for the establishment of the Navy as the single manager for explosive ordinance disposal technology and training. Additional guidance is provided by:

o SECNAV [Secretary of the Navy] Instruction 5410.116B, "Single Manager for Military Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technology and Training (EODT&T)," September 14, 1989; and

o OPNAV [Chief of Naval Operations] Instruction 8027.1G, "Interservice Responsibilities for Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technology and Training (EODT&T)," February 14, 1992.*

Management Oversight. The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations, Low Intensity Conflict) provided OSD level oversight for explosive ordnance disposal within the DoD. The Secretary of the Navy appointed the Chief of Naval Operations to act as the executive manager for explosive ordnance disposal and to provide oversight of the Explosive Ordnance Disposal Board (the Disposal Board). DoD Directive 5160.62 directs that the Disposal Board be established to coordinate requirements and other issues of concern. Membership on the Disposal Board included representatives from all the Services.

Customer Requirements. The Disposal Board serves as the focal point for identifying requirements for training as well as technology needed for the explosive ordnance disposal mission. Technological requirements were documented in Mission Needs Statements and Operational Requirements Documents generated by the Services, the Commanders in Chief (CINCs) or the Disposal Board. The Disposal Board reviewed all explosive ordnance disposal requirements for duplication and coordinated explosive ordnance disposal training requests for all the Services.

Customer Satisfaction. The USEUCOM and USEUCOM Components reported that they are generally satisfied with the explosive ordnance disposal training provided. Staff officers at USCENTCOM and USPACOM also reported that the training was sufficient.

Aeromedical Transport/Worldwide Aeromedical Evacuation (Air Force)

The U.S. Commander in Chief, Transportation Command (USCINCTRANS) was the DoD single manager for implementation of policies and standardization of procedures and information support systems for inter-theater medical

*OPNAV Instruction 8027.1G was issued jointly as Army Regulation 75-14, Air Force Regulation 136-8, and Marine Corps Order 8027.1D.

regulating as well as the DoD single manager for transportation. Under the direction of USCINCTRANS, the Air Force Air Mobility Command was the executive agent for aeromedical transportation and worldwide aeromedical evacuation (hereafter referred to as aeromedical evacuation). The aeromedical evacuation mission is to air transport casualties from forward airfields in a combat zone to other treatment elements in the theater. The mission also includes the transportation of casualties from one theater to another.

Authority and Documentation. DoD Regulation 4515.13-R, "Air Transportation Eligibility," November 1994, provides the authority for assignment of the aeromedical evacuation mission to the Air Mobility Command. In addition, the following documents provide the roles and responsibilities for aeromedical evacuation:

o DoD Directive 4500.9, Change 2, "Transportation and Air Traffic Management," December 29, 1993;

o DoD Directive 5154.6, "Armed Services Medical Regulating," April 29, 1993;

o DoD Directive 5158.4, "United States Transportation Command," January 8, 1993;

o Air Force Instruction 41-301, "Worldwide Aeromedical Evacuation System," August 1, 1996; and

o Air Force Instruction 41-302, "Aeromedical Evacuation Operations and Management," July 28, 1994.

Management Oversight. Oversight of aeromedical evacuation was directly provided by the USCINCTRANS. At the OSD policy level, oversight was split between the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics) for transportation policy and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs) for the medical regulating portion of the mission. Policy development and oversight of medical affairs was provided in conjunction with the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. The headquarters, Air Mobility Command, Surgeon General established the standards for DoD-wide organization, equipage and training of the aeromedical evacuation force for the worldwide system.

Additional oversight was provided by two groups: the Aeromedical Evacuation Executive Board (the Executive Board) and the Aeromedical Evacuation Steering Group (the Steering Group). The Executive Board met two times a year to ensure doctrinal requirements were met, establish policy to accomplish the mission, and validate recommendations made by the Steering Group. The Executive Board was composed of the Surgeons General of the active and Reserve Components. The Steering Group met two times a year to ensure a joint force perspective on equipping, organizing, and training of the aeromedical evacuation forces. Membership of the Steering Group consisted of representatives of the major air command staffs and the Reserve Components.

Customer Requirements. Customers provided feedback on aeromedical evacuation performance and requirements for additional support through the Executive Board and the Steering Group. Customer requirements for the transportation of patients were handled through the Global Patient Movement Requirements Center (the Global Movement Center). The Global Movement Center, a direct reporting unit of the U.S. Transportation Command, identified aeromedical evacuation requirements to the Air Mobility Command. The mission of the Global Movement Center included coordination of aeromedical evacuation requirements with airlift operations; coordination of timely and orderly movement of patients; coordination of the arrival of the aeromedical evacuation aircraft with that of the civilian ambulance agency; and consolidation and processing requests for patient movement. Theater Patient Movement Requirements Centers (the Theater Movement Centers) were in the process of being established to perform many of the same functions as the Global Movement Center for a particular operational theater. The Theater Movement Centers would report to the CINC in each theater. Specifically, a Theater Movement Center would be responsible for aeromedical evacuation of patients within a theater, and the coordination of aeromedical evacuation of patients to other theaters. In all the Unified Commanders' areas of responsibility, contingency planning for aeromedical evacuation was part of the deliberate planning process and was included under the logistics operations portion of planning.

Customer Satisfaction. The customers we interviewed in USEUCOM headquarters and USEUCOM Components reported that they were generally satisfied with aeromedical evacuation services provided to them. The staff officers contacted at USCENTCOM and USPACOM also indicated that they were generally satisfied with aeromedical evacuation.

Joint Search and Rescue Center (Air Force)

In 1991, the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, tasked the combatant CINCs to establish a Joint Search and Rescue Center in each of their theaters to monitor combat search and rescue matters. The purpose of the Joint Search and Rescue Centers was to monitor recovery efforts; to plan, coordinate, and execute joint and combat search and rescue operations; and to integrate combat search and rescue operations with other evasion, escape, and recovery operations within the geographic area assigned to the joint force. In evaluating the implementation of this executive agent function, we reviewed the Joint Search and Rescue Center in the USEUCOM theater as well as the overarching guidance that provided for the establishment of this function within the larger mission of personnel recovery.

Authority and Documentation. The classified memorandum, CJCS MCM 136-91 [Memorandum in the Name of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff], "Delineation of Responsibilities for Evasion and Escape within the

Department of Defense," August 8, 1991, directed that the combatant CINCs establish a Joint Search and Rescue Center. U.S. Air Forces Europe was designated as the U.S. Commander in Chief, European Command (USCINCEUR), agent for this function by USEUCOM Draft Directive 55-10, "Evasion and Recovery," September 1994. This draft USEUCOM directive was being used as the basis for operations until additional guidance was provided by DoD that would clarify overall responsibilities. That guidance was published in DoD Directive 2310.2, "Personnel Recovery," June 30, 1997. Additional directives that address combat search and rescue include:

o Joint Publication 3-50.2, "Doctrine for Joint Combat Search and Rescue," January 26, 1996; and

o Joint Publication 3-50.3, "Joint Doctrine for Evasion and Recovery," September 6, 1996.

Management Oversight. Oversight of the USEUCOM Joint Search and Rescue mission was provided by the USCINCEUR. Additional oversight of combat search and rescue was provided by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs) and the Secretary of the Air Force because combat search and rescue is part of the larger personnel recovery mission. The personnel recovery mission included combat search and rescue; evasion and recovery; survival, evasion, resistance, and escape; and code of conduct training. The Secretary of the Air Force was appointed executive agent for Personnel Recovery by DoD Directive 2310.2. The Secretary of the Air Force reported to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs) on matters pertaining to personnel recovery. DoD Directive 2310.2 also requires that additional oversight be provided by the Office of the Inspector General, DoD, stating: "The Inspector General for the Department of Defense shall provide results of inspections regarding PR [Personnel Recovery] to the ASD(ISA) [Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs)] and the DoD EA [Executive Agent] for PR [Personnel Recovery]."

Customer Requirements. The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, developed doctrine, coordinated with the CINCs, and ensured requirements were reviewed by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council. The USEUCOM, as well as all Unified Commanders, had the responsibility to establish an office of primary responsibility for doctrine and execution; to ensure personnel recovery was in operational plans and training; to identify intelligence requirements for personnel recovery; and to identify shortfalls in recovery capability. USEUCOM Draft Directive 55-10 required that an Evasion and Recovery Council be established for the purpose of providing coordination and planning of evasion and recovery matters. This council also served to identify requirements for training as well as technological improvements needed to accomplish the mission. The Evasion and Recovery Council consisted of a representative from each USEUCOM Component. Staff officers contacted at USCENTCOM and USPACOM reported that they also used informal councils composed of representatives of the Components to serve as forums for the exchange of information among the staffs responsible for the conduct of

recovery operations. Additionally, under DoD Directive 2310.2, it was the responsibility of the Secretary of the Air Force to recommend policy requirements to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs) and operational requirements to the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Customer Satisfaction. The USEUCOM users expressed overall satisfaction with the executive agent support provided by the U.S. Air Forces Europe as the executive agent for USCINCEUR. The staff officers contacted at USCENTCOM and USPACOM also indicated that they were generally satisfied with the support provided by their Joint Search and Rescue Centers.

Appendix C. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology
  Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)
  Deputy Chief Financial Officer
  Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)
Director, Administration and Management

Joint Staff

Director, Joint Staff

Department of the Army

Secretary of the Army
  Office of the Administrative Assistant
Auditor General, Department of the Army
Headquarters, U.S. Army Europe

Department of the Navy

Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy
  Office of the Assistant for Administration
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Navy
Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces Europe

Department of the Air Force

Secretary of the Air Force
  Office of the Assistant for Administration
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force
Commander, Air Mobility Command
Headquarters, U.S. Air Forces Europe

Unified Commands

Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Transportation Command

Other Defense Organizations

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency
Director, Defense Logistics Agency
Director, National Security Agency
  Inspector General, National Security Agency
Inspector General, Defense Intelligence Agency

Non-Defense Federal Organizations and Individuals

Office of Management and Budget
Technical Information Center, National Security and International Affairs Division, General Accounting Office

Chairman and ranking minority member of each of the following congressional committees and subcommittees:

  Senate Committee on Appropriations
  Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
  Senate Committee on Armed Services
  Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
  House Committee on Appropriations
  House Subcommittee on National Security, Committee on Appropriations
  House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
  House Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
  House Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
  House Committee on National Security

Evaluation Team Members

The Readiness and Logistics Support Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, DoD, produced this report.

Shelton R. Young
Captain A. Lee Lawson, U.S. Navy
Kathryn L. Palmer
Joel McLeod
Elizabeth Denny
Mark McDonough