STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES Unrevised and Unedited Not for Quotation or Duplication

HEARING ON IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION:

AN OVERVIEW

Thursday, February 15, 2007,

House of Representatives,

Committee on Oversight and

Government Reform,

Washington, D.C.

"This is a preliminary transcript of a Committee Hearing. It has not yet been subject to a review process to ensure that the statements within are appropriately attributed to the witness or member of Congress who made them, to determine whether there are any inconsistencies between the statements within and what was actually said at the proceeding, or to make any other corrections to ensure the accuracy of the record."

Committee Hearings

of the

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



- 1 | Court Reporting Services, Inc.
- 2 | HGO046000
- 3 | HEARING ON IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION:
- 4 | AN OVERVIEW
- 5 Thursday, February 15, 2007,
- 6 House of Representatives,
- 7 | Committee on Oversight and
- 8 Government Reform,
- 9 | Washington, D.C.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in
 Room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, the Honorable Henry
 A. Waxman [chairman of the committee] presiding.
 - Present: Representatives Waxman, Maloney, Kucinich,
 Davis of Illinois, Tierney, Clay, Lynch, Higgins, Yarmuth,
 Braley, Norton, Van Hollen, Hodes, Murphy, Sarbanes, Welch,
 Davis of Virginia, Souder, Duncan, Issa, and Sali.
 - Staff Present: Phil Schiliro, Chief of Staff; Phil Barnett, Staff Director and Chief Counsel; Karen Lightfoot, Communications Director and Senior Policy Advisor; David Rapallo, Chief Investigative Counsel; Theo Chuang, Deputy

Chief Investigative Counsel; Suzanne Renaud, Counsel; Molly 21 Gulland, Assistant Communications Director; Christopher 22 Davis, Professional Staff Member; Earley Green, Chief Clerk; 23 Teresa Coufal, Deputy Clerk; Caren Auchman, Press Assistant; 24 Leneal Scott; David Marin, Minority Staff Director; Larry 25 Halloran, Minority Deputy Staff Director; Jennifer Safavian, 26 Minority Chief Counsel for Oversight and Investigations; 27 Keith Ausbrook, Minority Chief Counsel; John Brosnan, 28 Minority Senior Procurement Counsel; Steve Castor, Minority 29 Counsel; Edward Kidd, Minority Professional Staff Member; 30 Nick Palarino, Minority Senior Investigator & Policy Advisor; 31 32 and Benjamin Chance, Minority Clerk

Chairman WAXMAN. The meeting of the Committee will please come to order.

Last week, our Committee focused on the \$12 billion in cash that was sent by our Government into Iraq. We learned that no one knows what really happened to that money or even whether it ended up in the hands of terrorists. All we know is that the cash is gone and billions were wasted.

Today we get more bad news. The Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency is going to testify that there are more than \$10 billion in questioned and unsupported costs relating to Iraq reconstruction and troop support contracts.

This estimate is three times higher than the \$3.5 billion in questionable charges that the Government Accountability Office warned us about last year. And, in this new report, \$2.7 billion in suspect billings are attributed to just one contractor: Halliburton. My staff has prepared a memorandum on this subject, and, if there is no objection, I will enter it into the record.

[The information follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman WAXMAN. Even worse, the actual amount of waste is likely even higher. The Defense Contract Audit Agency arrived at its \$10 billion estimate after reviewing only \$57 billion of Iraq contract spending. But American taxpayers have already spent over \$350 billion for the war in Iraq. There is \$300 billion still to audit. The total amount of waste, fraud, and abuse could be astronomical.

Let's add it up. Last week's \$12 billion in cash and today's \$10 billion in questionable charges combines for \$22 billion. And there is still the potential for tens of billions more in waste. It is no wonder that taxpayers all across our Country are fed up and demanding that we bring real oversight to the 'anything goes' world of Iraq reconstruction.

Stuart Bowen, the Special Inspector General for Iraq
Reconstruction, will tell us about a particularly egregious
example of wasteful spending. It involves the State
Department's contract with DynCorp to train and equip the
Iraqi police.

The Defense Contract Audit Agency has not yet reviewed this contract. But the Inspector General found that taxpayer dollars were wasted on an Olympic sized pool that was not authorized under the contract.

The audit was critical of not just the company; it was critical of the Government for failing to conduct any

semblance of proper oversight. In this case, the contracting officer did not even have a file--he literally didn't have a file--for this \$600 million contract, and the Government could not demonstrate that it had actually received tens of millions of dollars in critical equipment, including armored vehicles, body armor, and weapons.

Well, this is the equipment that is supposed to be going to the Iraqis so they can take up the fight and allow our U.S. service members to come home. Yet, virtually nonexistence government oversight has put the entire effort at risk.

This is an intolerable mess. It is important that we hold people accountable for it and, just as important, that we prevent these outrages from happening again.

President Bush is planning on sending 21,000 more

American soldiers into Iraq. He is also proposing that we spend almost \$200 billion more on the Iraqi war effort and an additional \$1.2 billion for economic assistance to Iraq. He wants to spend over \$800 million of that amount on a ''civilian surge'' that will increase the number of Provincial Reconstruction Teams. These are the teams that are supposed to work with local Iraqis to develop democratic institutions and procedures.

I don't have the firsthand knowledge of these Provincial Reconstruction Teams, but Kiki Munshi does. Until last week,

she was a team leader. She has concluded that the civilian surge won't work. She tells us the teams have been drastically underfunded, have an ill-defined mission, and have huge staffing shortfalls.

She believes injecting more teams into Baghdad will result in a bureaucratic nightmare. And, what's worse, she says that when members of these teams were consulted about the President's proposal in the fall, they raised exactly these objections, but were ignored.

Mrs. Munshi could not be here today, but I would like to make her full written statement part of the official hearing record. And, without objection, that will be the order.

[The information follows:]

116 ****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

117 Chairman WAXMAN. She says, ''none of the objections or 118 recommendations coming from the field about the 'civilian 119 surge' appears to have reached Washington.'' 120 Well, I want to assure Ms. Munshi that we hear her, and I want to assure the American people that we aren't going to 121 122 let a handful of corporations walk away with enormous windfalls while thousands of American soldiers are 123 124 sacrificing everything to defend this Country. I want to thank our witnesses for the superb work in 125 bringing accountability to the Iraq reconstruction efforts, 126 127 and I look forward to their testimony. 128 [Prepared statement of Chairman Waxman follows:]

******* INSERT *******

129

Chairman WAXMAN. But before we hear from them, I want to 130 call on Mr. Davis, our Ranking Republican Member. 131 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me 132 also note I would like to put a supplemental memorandum into 133 the record that our staff has drafted on the minority side. 134 Chairman WAXMAN. Without objection, that will be the 135 136 order. 137 [The information follows:] ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******* 138

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. We meet for the second time in as many weeks to look into the complex range of issues arising from extensive contracting activities in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I am of course pleased the Committee is continuing this line of oversight that we began three years ago. But between last week's hearing and today's, I am afraid we may be peering into the wrong end of the telescope, looking first at very specific complaints about security contractors and then taking this much broader survey of troubled acquisitions in Iraq. That is backward and it risks spending the Committee's time and credibility chasing transient or dated issues while systematic problems go without thorough scrutiny. I look forward to working with you in setting a more coherent agenda.

Today we will hear from the three major oversight organizations tracking Federal procurements in Iraq. They have all testified here before, and they bring important perspectives informed by a substantial body of audit and review work. The picture painted by these witnesses is never pretty, nor will their testimony necessarily tell the complete story of an evolving, dynamic, and sometimes dangerous process. But this much is clear: poor security, an arcane, ill-suited management structure, and frequent management changes have produced a succession of troubled acquisitions. We need to know what has gotten better, what is

being fixed, and, more importantly, what is still broken.

And we need to refine our understanding of the difference
between interim findings that may make this complex process
look bad and the real implications of the ''definitized''
costs ultimately paid by the Government.

Without question, many reconstruction projects have fallen far short of expectations, and we have yet to completely resolve serious problems in contract management and oversight in deployment locations. The underlying causes: the lack of sufficiently focused, high-level leadership, mismatches between requirements and resources, and an inadequate number of trained acquisition and oversight personnel. While these challenges are not unique in Iraq, a highly unstable environment and consequent security problems have greatly exacerbated the impact of resulting cost, performance, and oversight issues.

These failures have plagued acquisition efforts in the battle space from the beginning. Some of those initial challenges have been mitigated; many have not. A lack of planning and poor staff training caused many of the early reconstruction contracts to be awarded using other than full and open competition. Recent GAO reports show the vast majority of more recent contract awards have been made on a competitive basis. But GAO findings also point out that we still do not have data on the total number of contract

employees or the full range of services they provide. That is a troubling blind spot in the effort to assess overall contract management and oversight in Iraq.

And recent reports by the Special Inspector General for Iraq point to inattentive management and oversight systems that still allow large contracts to careen out of control, wasting millions of dollars and buying far less than agreed. At times, between sloppy records, sloppier performance, and AWOL contract monitoring, we can't even be sure we got anything at all for the huge amounts spent. SIGIR audit findings on construction contracts for a State Department residential camp and the Baghdad Police College describe ongoing, large-scale, and systematic vulnerabilities to waste and abuse in those critical, costly reconstruction programs.

True, the Inspector General also concludes that 80 percent of the Iraq reconstruction projects have been completed properly, on time, and within budget. But there is a great deal of money committed and still in the contract pipelines, and we need to be sure those projects are not on the same oversight audit-pilot that steered over contracts into a fiscal ditch in Iraq.

Many audits from the agencies represented here today have spent considerable time working in Iraq, and we value the experience and perspective our witnesses will provide on the important issues raised by the reconstruction contracts

HG0046.000 PAGE 12

there. Much is at stake in terms of U.S. tax dollars and in 214 terms of effectively helping the Iraqi people rebuild the basic infrastructure of their nation. We look forward to their testimony and to a frank, constructive discussion. Thank you. [Prepared statement of Mr. Davis of Virginia follows:]

******* INSERT *******

215

216

217

218

219

220

221 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Davis. 222 The Chair, without objection, will hold the record open 223 for one week to receive an opening statement by any of the 224 members of the Committee. 225 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman? Chairman WAXMAN. But I would like to call on--226 227 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman? Chairman WAXMAN. If the gentleman would permit, I would 228 229 like to finish my sentence. 230 But the Chair would like to now call on members who wish to make opening statements for two minutes, and will now look 231 232 to Mr. Tierney. 233 Do you have an opening statement you wish to make? Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I will put my remarks on the 234 record if I have any, thank you. I would like to get to the 235 236 witnesses. 237 [Prepared statement of Mr. Tierney follows:]

238

******* INSERT ******

239 Chairman WAXMAN. Okay.

Mr. Lynch?

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are a couple of points I would like the panelists to focus on.

I do want to thank the gentlemen for the great work, and we appreciate your helping the Committee with its work.

Mr. Chairman, just last week the Department of Justice announced that we had three more indictments--three former Army officers and also two U.S. civilians--for their role in a scheme to defraud the Coalition Provisional Authority in the South Central Region in Al Hilla in Iraq. Specifically, the indictments alleged that the defendants, which includes, troubling, the former comptroller and the former second-in-command at CPA South Central, who funneled over \$8.6 million in rigged reconstruction contracts to American businessman Philip Bloom in exchange for \$1 million in cash plus an SUV, some jewelry, computers, airline tickets, liquor, and other items.

These most recent indictments involving our reconstruction contracts in Iraq again beg the question whether the Defense Department is doing enough and, in fact, going back and reviewing all contracts that have been touched by these individuals and could have been compromised by these individuals who have been indicted or convicted for fraud or other violations of Federal law in relation to the contracts.

We have been asking this for a while. About six months ago I asked the Defense Department panelists the same question since June of 2005. Then we had indictments of Jeffrey Mazon, a former Halliburton procurement manager, and Ali Hijazi, the managing partner of La Nouvelle, a general trading and contracting company. They had a kickback scheme through which a Kuwaiti firm, La Nouvelle, billed the U.S. taxpayer for more than \$5.5 million for work that should have cost only about \$680,000.

Regrettably, the Committee and the Chairman have been very helpful on this, but we have received only vague assurances from Mr. Reed of DCAA and from the Department's Acting Inspector General, Mr. Kimball, that such a review is in fact taking place.

Mr. Chairman, that is what I want to focus on, whether we are going back and reviewing. When we find fraud, abuse, corruption, bribes, are we going back, after conviction, after the indictments, and reviewing the contracts that these folks have been involved in? Because I fear that it is a pattern of abuse and not just an individual instance.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for your great work on this, and the Ranking Member, and I look forward to today's hearing for a discussion of all these compromised contracts. Thank you. I yield back.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Lynch follows:]

289 ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

290 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Issa, do you wish to make an opening statement?

Mr. ISSA. Yes, I do.

Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for holding this hearing. I think it is critical. Although I believe that under the previous chairmanship we certainly had a record of asking questions, as the war on terror and particularly the war in Iraq continues, it becomes more and more evident that we have to differentiate the inefficiencies of war and the ineptness that sometimes occurs on the battlefield from true fraud and abuse.

I look forward to finding the fraud and abuse, but in the spirit of bipartisanism, I think it is also important that we, as a Committee, recognize that war is wasteful, that, in fact, we, the American people, are thoroughly disappointed in the ineffectiveness of bringing a lasting piece to Iraq much more than we are the inefficiency of war. And I hope today that this hearing and our ongoing search not be misunderstood for telling our civilian and military personnel in combat that they shouldn't take risk. Taking risk, which sometimes leads to waste, is much better than having a perfect paper trail and bad outcome.

Having said that, one of the main reasons that this Committee's work is resonating with the American people is in

fact that we are not satisfied with the results that are occurring in Iraq. The ongoing Sectarian violence is very frustrating.

So I trust that we will send the right message, which is we will not tolerate dishonesty, fraud, or true abuses, but we do, as a Committee and as a Congress, want people to continue to take the risk and the innovative investments that should lead to a lasting peace of Iraq, and that is why this Committee has oversight, while at the same time the Appropriations Committee has been generous in continuing to grant the funding necessary for you all to do your job in a dangerous part of the world.

With that, I yield back.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Issa follows:]

329 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Issa.

Mr. Braley, opening statement?

Mr. BRALEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member Davis, for hosting this hearing.

Last week's hearings on the policies and spending practices of the Coalition Provisional Authority was valuable in revealing some of the disastrous and wasteful mistakes that have been made that have contributed to the ongoing bloodshed, chaos, instability, and costs in Iraq. The point of the hearing was not to point fingers or to place blame but, rather, to learn from past errors so that we can improve our policies and make real progress in Iraq reconstruction, a critical element of stabilizing the Country and bringing our troops home.

President Bush admitted, in his January 10th address to the Nation, in which he announced his plans to escalate the war in Iraq, that numerous mistakes had been made. He said that the current situation in Iraq is unacceptable and that it is clear that we need to change our strategy there. I agree. He also said that a successful strategy goes beyond military operations. Ordinary Iraqi citizens must see that military operations are accompanied by visible improvements in their neighborhoods and communities. I also agree with that statement.

In light of the increasing violence in Iraq, and

considering that the President is requesting billions of additional dollars from U.S. taxpayers to rebuild the country, it is critical that we eliminate the waste, fraud, and abuse that have been so prevalent in Iraq in the past four years. It is our duty to ensure that the current and future policies of the U.S. Government in Iraq keeps our troops safe, spends the tax money of American citizens responsibly, and makes real progress towards stabilizing and rebuilding the country so that our troops can come home.

As he also outlined in his January 10th address to the Nation, President Bush recently appointed a reconstruction coordinator in Iraq, with the purpose of ensuring better results for economic assistance being spent there. I hope that the new coordinator, Timothy Carney, will take the information and insights provided last week and at today's hearings to heart. And I look forward to the testimony of our witnesses today and hope that this hearing will help us progress forward with more effective, responsible, and transparent reconstruction efforts.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Braley follows:]

376 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Braley.

Mr. Souder? Mr. Duncan, are you next? Okay.

Mr. DUNCAN. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for calling this very important hearing.

I have always been very proud that my party, the Republican party, has been the most fiscally conservative party throughout its history for this Country, and certainly no fiscally conservative person should feel any obligation to defend some of the lavish, wasteful, ridiculous, even scandalous, contracts that we have heard about in Iraq. This war has not been conducted in a fiscally conservative way, and we need to look into this.

Fiscal conservatives should be the ones most horrified by some of these things that we have heard about, and I know that DynCorp and some of these other corporations are so big and powerful and well-connected that probably nothing will ever be done to them, but if any of these things are true, then they should be prohibited from getting future government contracts, at least for some period of time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Duncan follows:]

398 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much for your statement.

400 Mr. Sarbanes?

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Once again I want to congratulate you for holding these hearings. The amount of waste, fraud, and lack of accountability in the Iraq reconstruction and contracting processes is truly outrageous and inexcusable.

It is my understanding that the witnesses will testify today that \$10 billion in questioned and unsupported contractor costs have now been identified in the Iraq reconstruction process, a truly shocking figure. The tragedy is that this amount of money could have gone to do so much good. Think, for example, what we could have done with this to rebuild after Hurricane Katrina.

Maybe most discouraging, this Administration seems to regard this problem as minor or inconsequential. According to the Defense Contract Audit Agency, the Defense Department has been uncharacteristically and suspiciously lax in recouping and withholding payment when contractor costs are called into question. One is left to wonder what is really going on here.

There is no legitimate excuse for this lack of accountability. This is either an example of overwhelming incompetence or a willingness to look the other way because of personal or political relationships. In any case, the

424 results are unacceptable. There is only one element of this tragedy that I can be 425 sure of: those who presided over the situation, the 426 political managers of this war, failed our soldiers in harm's 427 428 way and they failed the American people. 429 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. [Prepared statement of Mr. Sarbanes follows:] 430 431 ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

432 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Sarbanes. 433 Mr. Souder? No statement? Then we go to Mr. Welch. Mr. WELCH. I would just as soon hear the witnesses, Mr. 434 435 Chair. I am fine, thank you. 436 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Yarmouth? Mr. YARMOUTH. I have no opening statement, Mr. Chairman. 437 I welcome the panel and look forward to their testimony. 438 439 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Higgins? 440 Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just briefly. 441 Again, I thank you for your leadership and your diligence on 442 this issue. Demanding accountability and transparency is our obligation, consistent with our oversight responsibility. 443 444 You continue to bring to this panel issues and individuals 445 that hopefully will help us demand that kind of transparency and accountability, particularly in a very, very difficult 446 period in our American history relative to this war, relative 447 to the costs associated with it, and relative to the abuse 448 449 and corruption in the spending of American taxpayer dollars. So again I thank you and I look forward to hearing the 450 statements of the panel. Thank you. 451 452 [Prepared statement of Mr. Higgins follows:]

453 | ******* INSERT *******

454 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Higgins.

Mr. Kucinich?

Mr. KUCINICH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The issue of Iraq reconstruction is central to the hopes that so many of us in Congress have: to bring the war to a conclusion. There are a number of plans out there to stop the war, and they recognize that a solid reconstruction program is vital to enable the Iraqi people not only to rebuild their country, but to provide jobs for the Iraqi people. This Committee is going to be hearing from Government auditors who have been tasked with the understanding of the state of contracting in Iraq.

The gross mismanagement of prior contracting efforts in Iraq leave Congress no choice but to be skeptical of current and future contracting efforts. And this hearing is timely with the recent Administrative request for an additional \$1.2 billion in U.S. taxpayer funds for Iraq reconstruction efforts in fiscal year 2008.

This Committee, Government auditors, and media accounts have highlighted failure after failure of contractor efforts to reconstruct Iraq's basic infrastructure. Unfortunately, the Administration has given low priority to reconstruction contracts and has failed to ensure these funds actually improve the situation in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, we spent \$50 billion to reconstruct Iraq,

HG0046.000 PAGE 26

but few Iraqis have seen their quality of life improve. 479 Ιt is absolutely essential that we find a way to create a viable 480 reconstruction program as a means of taking Iraq to a 481 condition of stabilization and peace. 482 483 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. [Prepared statement of Mr. Kucinich follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

484

485

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Kucinich.

I want to now introduce our panel. We are honored to have with us our Nation's top three auditors for Iraq reconstruction. David Walker is the Comptroller General of the United States. He will tell the Committee about recent audits issued by the Government Accountability Office. GAO has uncovered many critical problems in the reconstruction efforts and with the Government's oversight of contractors.

Stuart Bowen is a Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction. Mr. Bowen's work on Iraq reconstruction efforts has allowed those of us in Washington to hear firsthand accounts of how reconstruction efforts are going on in the ground.

And, finally, William Reed, who is the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency, will provide the Committee with an update on his office's ongoing audits of spending on Iraq reconstruction and troop surge support costs. Mr. Reed's office has issued more than 1800 audits relating to work in Iraq, and we are privileged to have him with us today.

It is our policy to swear in all witnesses that appear before the Committee, so I would like to ask you to rise, if you would, and raise your right hand.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Chairman WAXMAN. The record will note that each of the

witnesses answered in the affirmative.

511

512

513

514

515

516

And what I would like to ask each of you to do, your prepared statements will be in the record in full. If you would summarize your statements or make your oral presentation to us in around five minutes.

Mr. Walker, let's begin with you.

517 STATEMENTS OF DAVID M. WALKER, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
518 UNITED STATES, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE; STUART W.
519 BOWEN, JR., SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR IRAQ
520 RECONSTRUCTION; WILLIAM H. REED, DIRECTOR, DEFENSE CONTRACT
521 AUDIT AGENCY

STATEMENT OF DAVID M. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Chairman Waxman, Ranking Member Davis, other members of the Committee. I am pleased to be back before you this week to talk about various issues relating to our Nation's efforts to stabilize and rebuild Iraq.

Prudence with taxpayer funds and our Nation's large and growing long-range fiscal challenges demand that the Defense Department maximize its return on the billions of dollars it has invested in Iraq-related reconstruction projects and support contracts. Further strengthening Iraq's fragile government institutions, which thus far have failed to adequately deter corruption, stimulate employment, and deliver essential services, is critical to establishing a peaceful, stable, and secure Iraq.

DOD has relied extensively on contractors to undertake major reconstruction projects and provide a broad range of

support services. But these efforts have not always achieved their desired outcomes, nor have they achieved such outcomes on an economical and efficient manner. The challenges encountered in Iraq are emblematic of a range of systemic and longstanding challenges faced by the Department of Defense. But these systemic problems are exacerbated and accentuated when you are dealing with contingency operations in a conflict zone. In this regard, we have identified DOD contract management to be high-risk because of its vulnerability to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. We did this 15 years ago and we have continued to report related problems.

In a report issued in July of 2006, we concluded that the awards to contractors were large and growing, that DOD will continue to be vulnerable to contracting fraud, waste, and abuse of taxpayer dollars unless it ends up dealing with a number of recurring and systemic challenges. While DOD has acknowledged its vulnerabilities and taken some actions to address them, many of the initiatives are still in their early stages and it is too soon to tell what impact they may have.

The Iraq situation is more complicated, as the United States must rely on the Iraqi government to play a larger role, which will require capacity not yet present. As we previously reported, amid signs of progress, the coalition

faces numerous political, economic, and security challenges in rebuilding Iraq. In addition, the continued violence increases the risk that the United States will not be able to complete remaining reconstruction projects as planned. The violence also threatens the Iraqi government's ability to provide essential services to the Iraqi people.

The challenges faced by the Department of Defense on its reconstruction and support contracts in many cases reflect these long-standing and systemic challenges that DOD has had in connection with contracting activities. Such shortcomings result from various factors, including poorly defined or changing requirements; the use of poor business arrangements in inadequate contracting provisions; the absence of senior leadership and guidance; and an insufficient number of trained contracting, acquisition, and other personnel to mange, assess, and oversee contractor performance. In turn, these shortcomings manifest themselves in higher costs to taxpayers, schedule delays, unmet objectives, and other undesirable outcomes.

U.S. reconstruction efforts in Iraq continue to be hampered by a security situation that deteriorated in 2006. Although the number of trained and equipped Iraqi security forces has increased from about 174,000 in July of 2005 to about 323,000 in December of 2006, and more Iraqi Army units have taken the lead for counterinsurgency operations, attacks

on coalition and Iraqi security forces and civilians have increased. Consequently, U.S. forces have continued to conduct combat operations in urban areas, especially Baghdad.

Aggregate numbers of trained and equipped forces do not provide information on the capabilities and needs of these individual Iraqi units. Rather, this information is found in the unit level transitional readiness assessments. We have been attempting--we meaning GAO--since January of 2006 in order to obtain access to this information. We have not been successful to date. It is absolutely essential, if the Congress wants to make informed decisions on authorization, appropriations, and in connection with oversight matters, that we get this information. We are talking about billions of dollars and thousands of American lives at stake.

In summary, there are a number of conditions that exist in Iraq that have led to and will continue to lead to increased risk of fraud, waste, and abuse of U.S. taxpayer funds. DOD's extensive reliance on contractors to undertake reconstruction projects and to provide a broad range of support services to deployed forces requires that they address a range of systemic and long-standing challenges in an aggressive, consistent, and effective manner. This reliance raises broader questions as to whether DOD has become too dependent on contractors to provide essential services without clearly identifying the appropriate roles

and responsibilities, having adequate contracting terms, and employing appropriate oversight and accountability mechanisms.

Continuing reconstruction progress will require overall improvement in the security situation in Iraq. To do so, Iraqi security forces and provisional governments must be in a position to take responsibility for the security of their nation. At this time, their capacity to do so is questionable. Furthermore, the U.S. and the international community will need to support the Iraqi government's efforts to enhance its capacity to govern effectively and efficiently if it is to make a positive difference in the daily lives of the Iraqi people.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Davis. I am happy to hear from my colleagues now.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Walker follows:]

630 ******** INSERT *******

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Walker. We will have questions of you after all the others have completed their testimony.

Mr. Reed?

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM H. REED

Mr. REED. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee.

The Defense Contract Audit Agency has been an integral part of the oversight and management controls instituted by DOD to ensure integrity and regulatory compliance by contractors performing services in Iraq. DCAA's services include audits and professional advice to acquisition officials on accounting and financial matters to assist them in the negotiation, award, administration, and settlement of contracts. Decision-making authority on DCAA recommendations resides with contracting officers within the procurement organizations who work closely with DCAA throughout the contracting process.

Since April of 2003, DCAA has worked with all the U.S. procurement organizations supporting Iraq reconstruction to establish the resources and planning information needed to carry out required audits of contract costs as they are

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

incurred and billed. These organizations include the Joint Contracting Command, the Army Sustainment Command, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DCMA in Iraq and Kuwait, USAID, and the State Department. This coordination has enabled DCAA to maintain an inventory of Iraq-related auditable contracts.

Based on the inventory of auditable contracts as of September 30th, 2006, DCAA is responsible for auditing contracts at 93 contractors. These contractors hold more than 175 prime contracts with contract ceiling amounts of \$51.8 billion, of which \$38.5 billion had been funded at the end of fiscal year 2006. DCAA audits of cost-reimbursable contracts represent a continuous effort from evaluation of proposed prices to final closeout and payment. audits of contractor business system internal controls and preliminary testing of contract costs are carried out to provide a basis for provisional approval of contractor interim payments and early detection of deficiencies. Comprehensive contract cost audits are performed annually throughout the life of the contract and are used by the contracting activity to adjust provisionally approved interim payments and ultimately to negotiate final payment to the contractor.

To carry out these audit requirements, DCAA did open an Iraq Branch Office in May 2003 and implemented planning and coordination procedures to effectively integrate audit work

between that office and more than 50 DCAA CONUS Audit Offices with cognizance of companies performing contracts in Iraq.

Through fiscal year 2006, DCAA has issued more than 1800 reports on Iraq-related contracts. We estimate issuing another 600 reports in fiscal year 2007. DCAA oversight of contracts in Iraq has found a number of problems. Our resulting action has ranged from recommending changes in business processes, to reduction of proposed or billed cost, to referral of our findings to the Inspector General for investigation and possible legal action.

The most frequent problems disclosed during our audits of business systems involve timekeeping procedures, cash management procedures, management of subcontracts, and documentation of costs on proposals. The majority of these problems have already been resolved or are actively being worked by contractors and contracting officers. Where appropriate, reductions to billed costs have been taken to avoid potential inaccurate payments until process deficiencies are corrected.

Through fiscal year 2006, DCAA has recommended reductions in proposed and billed contract costs of \$4.9 billion. Where appropriate, DCAA has taken action to reduce contractor billed costs for disputed amounts pending a contracting officer decision. In addition, as has been noted, DCAA has identified \$5.1 billion of estimated costs

where the contractor did not provide sufficient information to explain the basis for the estimated amounts. These unsupported costs were usually resolved through contractor submission of additional supporting information at the time of contract price negotiation.

In closing, I want to underscore that DCAA has worked closely with all acquisition organizations to ensure an integrated, well-managed contract audit process in Iraq. We have had a continuous presence in Iraq and the Middle East Theatre of Operations since May of 2003, staffing our office entirely with civilian volunteers. To date, more than 180 DCAA auditors have served tours and, fortunately, none have been injured or killed. The challenges in applying business practices and auditing in Iraq are daunting and have required our auditors to be flexible, while insisting that the Department will not tolerate the billing of costs that do not comply with contract terms or are not appropriately documented and supported. DCAA has been and will continue to be vigilant about contract audit oversight and protecting the taxpayers' interests.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to your questions.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Reed follows:]

726 ******** INSERT *******

727 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Reed.

728 Mr. Bowen?

729 STATEMENT OF STUART W. BOWEN, JR.

Mr. BOWEN. Thank you. Good morning and thank you,
Chairman Waxman, Ranking Member Davis, and members of the
Committee for this opportunity to address the Committee again
on my office's oversight efforts of the U.S. reconstruction
effort in Iraq.

I leave tomorrow on my fifteenth trip to Iraq. I have spent just over a year of the last three overseeing the efforts of my staff that is deployed there. Right now I have 50 auditors, inspectors, and investigators working out of the Green Zone. They travel across Iraq visiting sites, investigating cases, and auditing programs.

Our twelfth report was released two weeks ago, twelfth quarterly report, and it is a watershed report because it carries an important message, that is, the end of the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund is here, and the burden of sustaining the recovery and relief of Iraq, financial burden, must shift to the government of Iraq at this point, and that means the Iraqi government must execute and fund a coherent reconstruction plan, and cannot leave its money in the

treasury, as it did at the end of last year, leaving about \$10 billion that should have been spent on reconstruction.

The baton has passed. That is the message that I took to Secretary Rice and Deputy Secretary England, Secretary Gates when I met with them on the implications of our report. Also, in the last week, I met with General Petraeus and yesterday with Ambassador Ryan Crocker, who is just leaving for Iraq, and with both of them I know that we will continue the good working relationship that I have had with the embassy and with MNFI to date.

Also, yesterday I met with the Department of Justice, with Assistant Attorney General Alice Fisher, on the 20 cases that we have pending there, and I am pleased to report that the coordinated interagency effort to effectuate aggressive investigative work in Iraq is getting better. It is improving. It has improved over the last year, and I am very confident, over the coming year, that we will see more progress in that area.

And, Mr. Lynch, with respect to the question you raised, we have followed up on those issues. Philip Bloom, who was the primary driver behind the criminal scheme that occurred in Hilla three years ago, will be sentenced tomorrow, following three other persons who have already been sentenced and are going to prison. We have got nine persons that have been indicted or convicted to date, and more to come.

We did a follow-up audit on exactly the issue you asked, and our recommendation was that the Government needed to hire a contractor or needed to pursue exactly this issue: what happened in the other regions. And they hired a contractor to follow-up on those issues, and the contractor, based on our most recent review, did not receive clear direction and they did not receive proper oversight, and so that follow-up is yet to be completed, but I am going to push it moving forward. And when I get back to Iraq, I am going to take on this issue, and we will meet with you when you get over there and discuss progress on that.

With my statement, I have submitted seven of our audits and inspections as examples of our work over the last two and a half years, as well as our quarterly report, and also I want to draw attention to an important issue that Ranking Member Davis raised, and that is the lessons learned that need to be drawn from our collective work, the collective work of those providing oversight.

And we have produced two lessons learned report that are effectuating change within the government system through both legislative and regulatory amendment, one in human capital management. It came out a year ago. It has been an issue from the start; it is still a challenge today, but less so, certainly burdened CPA, as we heard last week. Contracting came out last August, and a series of recommendations has

helped move real-time lessons learned, the application of real-time lessons learned in Iraq forward through the Joint Contracting Command in Iraq. I work closely with the commander there each trip, and things are better today than they have been certainly in the history of Iraq reconstruction.

Finally, our lessons learned report on program and project management will be out in a little over a month, and it will tell the executory story of how programs were implemented and projects completed.

Briefly, I want to touch on the audits I have submitted as examples, just to exemplify what SIGIR is looking at and how we try to carry out what I call real-time auditing, which means working with management to effectuate changes when we uncover problems, and that has got to be the way it works in Iraq because of the limited time frame, and I go back there to push that same philosophy forward tomorrow.

The contract award fee process, an issue that came up during my June trip in 2005, and I discovered that the award fee process had no criteria and no documentation, it had no direction that it should have had pursuant to government regulations. But this is an example of how change happened immediately. As soon as that was uncovered, within a week, criteria were developed. The JCCI began to develop a new program, and within a month, before the audit came out, the

problem had been fixed. The problem, though, was that award fees were being given, handed out based on weak criteria, limited oversight, and really in violation of the core principle of an award fee, that is, you award superior work, good work, something that exceeds expectations. That is going on today; it wasn't when we found this problem.

The primary health care clinic issue is probably the program that has been the biggest large-scale disappointment since it was an ambitious attempt to bring health care out to the rural areas, to build 150 centers across Iraq for \$250 million. Two years later, \$186 million had been spent and six were complete. The Corps of Engineers, to its credit, brought to our attention problems with Parsons, the contractor. We began to work immediately with the Ambassador Khalilzad to develop solutions to that. The execution of those solutions is still very gradual. A hundred twenty-one of those clinics are still under construction. We visited some of them in our inspections process, and they have shown to be substandard, as our reports reveal.

Thirdly, last June we released a report on definitization. It is an abstract auditor term, but it means getting a hold of costs when you start out on a cost-plus contract that doesn't have defined requirements. And the definitization requirement is essential to ensure that in a cost-plus program, which we have in Iraq, that eventually the

government gets control of how much these projects are going to cost. And as our audit revealed, the definitization requirement was not followed in Iraq by the Department of Defense. We looked at 194 task orders valued at \$3.4 billion that should have been definitized and warrant—the definitization requirement requires 180 days after work begins you have to define what costs are. The Department of the Army recognized that that was an issue. The General Counsel issued an opinion saying the definitization should be followed, so it is moving forward, but it had not been before we began to look at it.

Fourth, the Basra Children's Hospital, a USAID project that suffered from lack of oversight. The message there is you have to have more transparency. It fell behind, it was over budget, but that information didn't get up to levels that it needed to be. When it finally did, we recommended that Ambassador Khalilzad create a core group to manage this; he has. He moved management to the Corps of Engineers. It is moving forward, but rather than being done as it should have been a year ago, the hospital won't be finished for six to twelve months.

Administrative task orders was an issue that came to my attention when I was visiting with PCO, Project Contracting Office, and its predecessor, Project Management Office, during the reprogrammings, and I was concerned about overhead

for contractors that weren't doing work. So we delved into that and discovered that the need to control overhead costs wasn't managed well in Iraq.

Finally, in our latest quarterly we have the report that the Chairman referred to in his opening remarks about the police liaison officer camp that was going to be built at Adnan Palace, which is in the Green Zone, and was canceled. However, tens of millions of dollars was expended in buying the trailers anyway because of the lack of oversight of that project, including unauthorized work that was executed and equipment that, in the course of our audit, we were not able to account for.

The inspection I have submitted is of the Baghdad Police College. It has been a problematic project; an important project, the largest police college in the world, the locus for training police in Baghdad, the most difficult place in the world, and it simply has not met expectations. I just heard today from my staff over there that the Corps of Engineers is executing new contracts to fix what has been difficult to fix to date and the Iraqis have not accepted the project, though it was due to be turned over last month.

In closing, let me put this all in perspective. First of all, fraud. Fraud has not been a significant component of the U.S. experience in Iraq. Where we found it has been egregious, we continue to pursue it. I have a coordinated

effort that I referred to, but it has not been a significant component of the U.S. experience. Waste is another issue, and I am working on with General Walker and Mr. Reed and others to identify that in clearer terms, and we are pursuing that and the Congress has directed my office to perform a forensic audit that will give you the hard data on that once it is completed. And, finally, we will complete a comprehensive lessons learned program in the course of this year, and from that effectuate what I expect will be positive change that will improve not only the continuing reconstruction of Iraq, but planning for any future efforts.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Bowen follows:]

912 ******** INSERT *******

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Bowen.

Let me start with Mr. Reed. In your testimony today you highlighted some of DCAA's major findings related to Iraq, and I would like to ask you about some of these.

First, you said in your testimony that DCAA has identified \$4.9 billion in questioned costs and \$5.1 billion in unsupported costs. When I added these figures together, I end up with a total of more than \$10 billion in questioned and supported costs. That is correct, isn't it?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Chairman WAXMAN. Okay. Now, that is an astonishing figure. Last fall, GAO reported to us that the number was \$3.5 billion in questioned and unsupported costs. Now, just a few months later, the overcharges and unsubstantiated bills are nearly three times larger. Let me ask about each category of suspect charges.

When you identify costs as questioned, your audits, with their experience and expertise, believe these costs ultimately should not be paid to the contractor. In fact, that is your recommendation to the contracting officer, isn't that right?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Chairman WAXMAN. And unsupported--

Mr. REED. If I could point out, however--

937 Chairman WAXMAN. Sure.

Mr. REED.--in regards to the \$4.9 billion, it is important to note that a large part of this questioned costs occurs during the pricing of the contracts, rather than the payments. And where we make recommendations during the pricing of the contracts, the contracting officer's job is to consider our recommendations in negotiating the price. So, hopefully, we achieve reductions in the prices before we incur these costs.

Chairman WAXMAN. And unsupported costs are those with insufficient documentation from the contractor to justify the charges, isn't that correct?

Mr. REED. That is correct. And that area also deals with, in most cases, estimated cost, rather than billed cost.

Chairman WAXMAN. The total amount of dollars that you examined, I believe, was \$57 billion, is that correct?

Mr. REED. Yes, sir.

Chairman WAXMAN. So that means that you are raising questions about 18 percent of the dollars you have reviewed. Put another way, about one out of every \$6 that your office examined was either questioned or unsupported. That is a phenomenal amount of potential waste, fraud, and abuse.

Mr. Reed, your office has been doing yeoman's work. You have issued more than 1800 audits relating to Iraq contracts, I believe, but have looked at only a fraction of the spending in Iraq. And according to the Congressional Budget Office,

we spent over \$350 billion on the Iraq war. Do you know how much of the \$350 billion has gone to private contractors?

Mr. REED. No, I don't. I can tell you that in terms of what DCA is responsible for auditing, \$51.8 billion has gone to private contractors.

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Bowen, you have looked at some contracts that Mr. Reed hasn't looked at. The DynCorp contract with the State Department is one example, and you found egregious examples of misspending, like building Olympic swimming pools, that Mr. Reed didn't seem to know about, at least hasn't reported on. Also, even when Mr. Reed may not see a problem based on his review of the billings, your inspectors who are visiting the actual sites may see enormous waste or substantial construction. This means that you are finding examples of poor performance or wasteful spending that even Mr. Reed doesn't know about, is that correct?

Mr. BOWEN. My mission, as assigned by the Congress, is to oversee the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund, and we work in conjunction with DCAA, interact with them at least quarterly through the Iraq Inspector General's Counsel, and, indeed, on the contract you are referring to, we will continue to work together in getting to the bottom of where that money went. We have identified a series of issues, as you have pointed out, and we will follow up on that. More

importantly, what that audit tells me to do is to follow the rest of DynCorp's contracting in Iraq, and that we have an audit plan to do exactly that.

Chairman WAXMAN. Now, let me ask each of you this question. Mr. Reed has identified \$10 billion in questioned and unsupported costs. Do any of you think that the total amount of potential wasteful spending in Iraq is \$10 billion or, when the final audits are done, will the amount of waste, fraud, abuse, and other types of unreasonable or unsupported spending be much higher?

Mr. Bowen?

Mr. BOWEN. I am not ready to put a number on this. Our series of audits--

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, higher or not?

Mr. BOWEN. Well, the forensic audit is going to get to the bottom of that, on the \$21 billion of the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund, but there are about \$38 billion if you broadly define relief and reconstruction at work here, and that covers the Iraq Security Forces Fund, the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund, the Commander's Emergency Response Program, the Economic Support Fund--

Chairman WAXMAN. When you look at it all, is it going to be more than \$10 billion?

Mr. BOWEN. I can't put a number on it right now, but there will be serious waste, significant waste that we will

continue to identify and eventually come to a number.

Chairman WAXMAN. I wasn't asking you for a number. Do you think it is going to be more than \$10 billion?

Mr. BOWEN. I try to confine myself to what I know and can reasonably analyze, and I am not ready to answer that affirmatively.

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Reed, do you think it is going to be more than \$10 billion?

Mr. REED. Well, certainly, we have 600 audits planned in fiscal year 2007, and many of this contracts will extend beyond fiscal year 2007, so we have many years of contract costs yet to audit. However, the types of findings that we have cannot always be characterized as fraud and waste. Many of our adjustments are the routine part of administering contracts, negotiating prices, administering contracts for allowable costs. And while certainly some do fall into that category—and I don't want to diminish the importance—that is, to the Department—to catch that and deal with it, but certainly DCAA costs questioned will continue as we continue our audits.

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Walker, is \$10 billion going to be exceeded?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to be able to answer that question without doing a statistically valid sample or having some basis to do it. There is little

question that there are billions of dollars involved. How many, we can't tell you.

I think there are two issues that are important for you to know. First, the first thing you have to do is define what waste is. On page 6 of my testimony is a joint definition that we came up with and has been agreed to by SIGIR, the DOD IG, as well as Department of State IG, so that is the first thing we have got to do. We have got the definition; there it is. We are all doing related work.

And, secondly, the reason for the difference between DCAA's estimate and ours, primarily two things: one, they had a longer period of time and, number two, we only looked at final audits, we didn't look at pending audits. So those are the two primary reasons for the difference between our three point some billion dollar number and their \$10 billion number.

Chairman WAXMAN. That is understandable, but that means you haven't looked at all that Mr. Reed has looked at, and Mr. Reed hasn't looked at all the things that Mr. Bowen has looked at. But even if we just take it at about \$12 billion or \$10 billion, it is an enormous sum of money. And my staff has researched what we might have gotten for these amounts, and they determined that an up-armored Humvee vehicle costs about \$150,000 each. So for \$22 billion we could have purchased more than 146,000 Humvees. That is about one

Humvee for every U.S. service member in Iraq.

The contractors in Iraq may be pocketing billions, we don't know how much, but the troops don't have the equipment they need, and the taxpayer is, in my view, getting gauged.

Mr. WALKER. In fairness, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt there is a tremendous amount of waste, but it is also important to note that just because there has been a determination that there is not enough evidence yet doesn't mean that that is waste. There is a tremendous problem in government in not having adequate controls, not having proper documentation, not definitizing requirements enough, etc., but that doesn't necessarily mean that it is waste.

Chairman WAXMAN. Okay, well, I appreciate that. We will look at some of the specific examples later in the hearing.

But I now want to recognize Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Let me try to clarify some issues here.

Mr. Reed, there has been some concern raised about the ratio between the costs you flagged as questioned--I have seen a number of estimates as high as \$10 billion--and the quantum of those costs that the contracting agencies have finally disallowed. Are you with me?

In general, are you comfortable with the settlements made by the agencies with the contractors on these costs?

1087 Mr. REED. The relationship between us and the

1088 contracting officer is one of advisor, and we fully respect and acknowledge their authority to consider our 1089 1090 recommendation along with other advisors that they have. respect their important job and I am satisfied they are 1091 1092 fairly considering our recommendations. 1093 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Are there any particular 1094 instances, for example, the large settlement between KBR and 1095 the Corps of Engineers under KBR's Rio contract, that 1096 troubles you? 1097 Mr. REED. No. I think the process worked, as it is 1098 defined, in terms of the responsibilities of DCAA versus that 1099 of the contracting officer and the Corps of Engineers. rightly considered other evidence other than the audit 1100 1101 reports and considered extenuating circumstances that might 1102 have affected the contractor's actions, uncontrollable 1103 circumstances, and they arrived at a--1104 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. In a war zone, that is fairly frequent, too, sometimes. 1105 1106 Mr. REED. Yes. And in that particular case it occurred during the first nine months after the cessation of 1107 1108 hostilities, and it was a very--obviously a very tense 1109 situation in that period. 1110 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. And unsubstantiated costs versus 1111 an unsupported cost. An unsupported cost--my wife keeps our 1112 books and she wants me to account for everything. So if I go

to the dry cleaners, I pick up the dry cleaning, I come back and I don't have a receipt and I pay in cash, that would be an unsupported cost, is that the equivalent?

- Mr. REED. Yes.
- Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. It doesn't mean I wasted it, it
- 1118 just means at this point I don't have the backup
- 1119 documentation.

1116

- 1120 Mr. REED. That is correct.
- Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Is that a perspective of what an
- 1122 unsupported cost is?
- 1123 Mr. REED. Yes, it is.
- 1124 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. And in a war zone, these kind of
- 1125 things--sometimes you get the higher unsupported costs than
- 1126 you might get, for example, if you are sitting down out in
- 1127 Fairfax, trying to move papers, is that fair?
- 1128 Mr. REED. Yes, it is. And I would also point out, once
- 1129 again, that many of these unsupported costs are not actually
- 1130 incurred costs, they are based on estimates to establish a
- 1131 price for the contract.
- 1132 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Correct. You made that point.
- 1133 Mr. REED. So at that point we hope to negotiate a fair
- 1134 and reasonable price based on solid evidence.
- 1135 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Okay. I hear all sorts of things
- 1136 thrown around, like overcharges, unreasonable costs, suspect
- 1137 costs, to describe this \$10 billion figure. What does that

figure represent, are they really overcharges?

Mr. REED. No. These are--DCAA's activities take place during the administration of contracts. And certainly when you are dealing with price proposals and you are questioning costs or unsupporting costs in a price proposal, what you are talking about is how to negotiate a fair and reasonable price. Ultimately, the contractor will--after he is awarded the contract at the price, submits bills. These bills are audited by DCAA, and at that point we are looking at actual incurred costs, and these are differences of interpretation, in many cases, over regulations and in terms of what is compliant with the policies of the Department.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. For example, if you didn't have some deficit there between your costs and the final costs, you really wouldn't be doing your job, would you?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. I want to make sure I am clear about the relationship between DCAA auditors and the contractor officers. The DCAA auditors act as professional advisors to the contracting officers on cost, pricing, and other related matters, correct?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. The contracting officer is then free to take the advice or not take the advice. For example, if DCAA may find that there is an overcharge of, say, \$1

million, the contracting officer can then agree with that 1163 amount or not based on his or her judgment, correct? 1164 Mr. REED. That is correct. 1165 1166 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. The contracting officer then has 1167 to initiate any action against the contractor, isn't that how 1168 it works? 1169 Mr. REED. Yes. 1170 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Okay. Has there ever been any 1171 pressure on DCAA from any source in the Administration to take it easy on anybody, but particularly KBR, Parsons, or 1172 any other Iraq contractors, that you are aware of? 1173 1174 Mr. REED. Absolutely not. 1175 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Have most of the contractors that 1176 you have audited in connection with the Iraq reconstruction and support efforts been cooperative? 1177 1178 Mr. REED. Yes. 1179 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Any particular firms present any 1180 special problems? 1181 Mr. REED. Well, certainly, KBR, being the largest by far in terms of the dollar amounts of contracts we are auditing, 1182 have been the focus of a lot of our attention, and in that 1183 regard, the numbers of audit reports and the issues would 1184 reflect that. I think companies, they have had their 1185 1186 problems, all companies that we have audited in Iraq have had

their problems in cooperation from the standpoint of having

1187

good business systems and records in field circumstances, and KBR has certainly had their share of problems.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. And you hold them to a high standard, right, at least from a going-in perspective? You don't cut them a lot of slack, do you, because they are in a war zone and they don't have the systems up?

Mr. REED. We start from the same standards, but then we do try to be flexible and recognize that there are circumstances where the records might not be in perfect condition, given on the back of envelopes and things like that. So we try to be flexible in that regard, but we are not flexible in regards to having to have the evidence to support the cost ultimately.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Contract definitization is very important. Wasn't the lack--definitization. Wasn't the lack of definitization on many of these large contracts and task orders the root cause of many of the cost problems that occurred?

Mr. REED. Well, it certainly was a factor. I wouldn't want to say it was the largest factor, but it was a factor. And I would like to point out that, in that regard, we also raised concerns about the slow definitization process, particularly on the LOGCAP contract. In fact, I testified about that in one of my earlier appearances before your Committee. And, in fact, we brought that to the attention of

the Army contracting officials, and I think we were largely responsible for working out a good schedule for them to catch up with the definitization on the LOGCAP contract, and now they are in much better shape than they were during the period-
Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. But that is a key issue, getting

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. But that is a key issue, getting that nailed down, right?

Mr. REED. Absolutely.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. How many fraud referrals has DCAA made in connection with the Iraq contracting effort?

Mr. REED. To my knowledge, five.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Do you think the fact that many of the costs that your auditors had questioned had already been actually incurred by contractors by the time the contracting officer was called upon to settle the charges was a significant factor in the low sustain rate of your audit findings?

Mr. REED. Yes, certainly, the Corps of Engineers has made that clear in some of the documentation of the results of their negotiation on the Rio contract, in particular, that there is a feeling that once the cost is incurred, it is much more difficult to challenge it. I, quite frankly, do not agree with that. I believe that the provisions of the contract are very clear that the costs must be determined allowable by the contracting officer. It doesn't matter if

they have been incurred or not incurred.

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

1246

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251

1252

1253

1254

1255

1256

1257

1258

1259

1260

1261

1262

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Let me just say to all three of you, you have great reputations, at least with our office, in terms of calling balls and strikes, being fair, and we take what you say very, very seriously up here. But I think the perspective is also important as we measure this.

General Walker, let me just ask you. You and a number of witnesses and members have noted that DOD does not know the number of subcontractors or the number of contract employees in Iraq providing services, particularly security services. It is pretty clear that, from a military operation standpoint, that it makes sense to know how many folks are there carrying guns or that need to be protected. I am less clear how valuable that information is from an acquisition management standpoint. When the services are performed under large primes, we pay the prime to provide the service specified and we hold the firm responsible for that performance. How important is it to know whether the actual performance is provided by a first-tier or a fifteenth-tier subcontractor, as long as the price is reasonable, the services are performed in accordance with the contract? Aren't we, in effect, paying the prime contractor to manage the subcontracts and responsible for the overall performance? Mr. WALKER. Several comments. First, we are using

contractors in new and unprecedented ways in Iraq, and I

think there is a need, separate from this hearing, probably, to have a discussion about the systemic and generic contracting problems, including what is appropriate to use contractors and not. But, secondly, no, there can be problems-
Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Before you go there, General Walker, I want you to finish--

Mr. WALKER. Surely. I will answer your question.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. I think that is one of the problems, and we have had trouble getting Federal employees to come over there.

Mr. WALKER. We have.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. And that is one of the reasons, isn't it, that we have had to use the contractors, and it has created a problem?

Mr. WALKER. Well, there are several reasons. Number one, we don't have adequate in-strength; number two, we are having trouble getting people to come over. I mean, we can go through that at a separate time, but let me answer your question specifically.

There can be problems when you don't know who the contractors are and what the contractor terms are, even in your scenario. For example, we found that tens of millions of dollars of costs were incurred by the taxpayers in circumstances where contractors who were receiving a per diem

allowance for subsistence were using the facilities and the food facilities that were being provided and, therefore, that is waste. I mean, that is clear waste, okay? And that was tens of millions of dollars. And so because we didn't know who the contractors were, because they didn't know what the contracting arrangements were for costs, that is one example of where you can have waste.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Mr. Waxman, I think that is fine.

I would just ask Mr. Bowen a very quick question on the definitized contracts. Is that one of the biggest problems, is definitization?

Mr. BOWEN. Absolutely. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. I mean, it really boils down, at the end of the day, in a lot of this, to getting those large contracts--

Mr. BOWEN. If you are going to use cost-plus contracts, definitization has to happen at some point. There is a time line or a percentage complete milestone upon which occurring definitization should follow, and that was wrongly interpreted in Iraq. It is now being corrected, but waste occurred as a result.

1309 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Davis.

1310 Mr. Tierney.

1311 Mr TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony and your help

1313 here this morning.

Mr. Walker, I am assuming that firms like KBR and Parsons get the contracts in the first place because they purport to have the kind of experience in these types of situations, is that right?

Mr. WALKER. That is correct.

Mr. TIERNEY. So, Mr. Reed, you had about \$10 billion in questioned or unsupported costs on the reconstruction on that, and you recommended that a certain amount of that money be withheld until those issues were resolved, is that correct?

Mr. REED. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. TIERNEY. Now, you provided to the Committee sort of a historical sustention rate that looked to me to be about 50 percent to 75 percent most of the time, is that correct also?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. TIERNEY. But in this instance it looks like the Department agreed with you only about somewhere between 25 percent and 37 percent of the time. Can you explain that difference?

Mr. REED. Well, I think the difference would go to the fact that we are dealing with a contingency contracting situation. Many of the awards are made under unusual and compelling authorities and, therefore, I think the contracting officers, in dealing with settling some of these

very significant issues, one of which has been mentioned already, the Rio contract and the price of fuel, and the other was dining facilities, which were two very big issues that the contracting officer settled. In both settlements I think the contracting officer gave considerable weight to the obstacles and difficulties the contractors were facing because of contingent circumstances.

Mr. TIERNEY. So we have firms that say they want these contracts because supposedly they know how to deal with these situations, and then they get relaxation from the Department because supposedly they ran up against exactly what they were hired as experts to deal with. I find that still a little problematic when you look at the difference between 75 percent of sustention and 37 percent. But my understanding also is that when you look at this situation or you examine and you audit, you take into account the fact that there are wartime complications, don't you?

Mr. REED. Yes, we did. In fact--

Mr. TIERNEY. In fact, Halliburton, on the oil thing, didn't you give them a grace period to account for the fact that they were in a wartime emergency, even though they purported to be an expert able to deal with that?

Mr. REED. Yes, we did give them a grace period.

Mr. TIERNEY. And, in fact, you didn't recommend withholding any charges for several months on Halliburton

while they were making an adjustment to that environment, is that correct?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. TIERNEY. At some point you finally said enough is enough and you made your recommendations, and your recommendations were a sustention rate significantly higher than 25 percent to 37 percent, correct?

Mr. REED. Correct.

Mr. TIERNEY. Now, some have suggested that we may, the Pentagon may have become too reliant on contractors in general, and, Mr. Walker, you had some good testimony the other day about that issue, and I think it should have the attention of all of us. When that happens, when we rely so heavily on contractors, doesn't that in fact give them the leverage in these situations so if they go to the contracting officer, they have real leverage; they can just refuse to perform if somebody doesn't work out and pay them higher than the recommended sustention rate, they could lave the military with no alternatives. Is that a concern, Mr. Walker?

Mr. WALKER. Well, it can change the leverage. But we also don't have enough people who have the right kind of skills and knowledge to be able to oversee the contracting arrangements, even if the leverage is not changed.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Bowen, do you find that that is a legitimate concern as well?

Mr. WALKER. Absolutely. A simple axiom is elicited by our collective oversight, and that is if you don't have the right people on the scene and both government and contractor looking at programs and projects, then you are going to end up with programs that fall off the rails like the primary health care clinic program or projects that don't meet expectations like the Baghdad Police College.

Mr. TIERNEY. Did you want to add something, Mr. Walker?
Mr. WALKER. Real quickly. I think it is important to
reinforce there are systemic problems that are long-standing
with the Department of Defense. They are exacerbated and
accentuated when you have a contingency operation, which
Katrina and Iraq were both contingency operations, and a
conflict zone, which Iraq is a conflict zone. So it is
important we are focusing on Iraq, but this is the tip of an
iceberg that we have to focus on.

Mr. TIERNEY. I heard you clearly on that, and I believe that it is something we should look at.

Mr. Bowen, let me just finish with you. You reviewed the Al Fatah pipeline situation, am I right?

Mr. BOWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TIERNEY. That was along the Tigris River and Halliburton, in that instance. was asked to restore a crucial set of pipelines by digging across and under a river.

Mr. BOWEN. That is right.

Mr. TIERNEY. What you found, I understand, is that they
were just told by their expert that that was impossible to
do.

- 1416 Mr. BOWEN. That is right.
- Mr. TIERNEY. And, yet, they went ahead and spent \$76 1418 million digging what turns out to be a ditch to nowhere.
- Mr. BOWEN. Yes. Eventually they followed what the consultant said to do after expending tens of millions of dollars fruitlessly.
- Mr. TIERNEY. And I guess that probably is one certain
 highlight, that kind of insanity, about the dangers of
 contracting too much out and having too few government people
 to monitor and oversee that.
- 1426 And all of you gentlemen, I thank you for your 1427 testimony.
- Mr. Walker, I think we should have a number of other hearings on that issue.
- 1430 Thank you, I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
- 1431 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Tierney.
- 1432 Mr. Souder?
- Mr. SOUDER. I thank the Chairman. I chuckle every time

 1434 I hear long-standing problem in the Department of Defense

 1435 that actually started with Robert Morris and the American

 1436 Revolution and the question of financing and whether--because

 1437 there is nothing more disgusting than fraudulent war

1438

1439

1440

1441

1442

1443

1444

1445

1446

1447

1448

1449

1450

1451

1452

1453

1454

1455

1456

1457

1458

1459

1460

1461

1462

profiteering when people are dying, and I think we all agree with that.

I have--first off, I want to say I appreciate the caution all of you showed under questioning about what numbers might be. I want to insert for the record--because one of the things Mr. Bowen has done is corrected his initial estimate to what actually the actual potential auditing from October 2006 to January 2007, how much they actually saved in the process. Because until you actually follow-up even in your own projections and do a detailed audit process, you don't know for sure what these dollars are. And you can grab a headline with the huge number, but until we play the whole thing through, we don't know what we are dealing with. fact, that seems to me one of the main things you are saying today, and I basically have several questions here, because is it or could more be done in the initial contract that when you are bidding for the contract you have to have more auditing and sufficient auditors and sufficient people doing the paper trail in the bid for the contract? It just seems like a basic cost of doing business. We are having to deal with this in FEMA as well, when we appropriated some of the Katrina money and added all those additional auditors. Ιt seems like that ought to be an up-front cost with the dollars. Is it something--for example, if you are late on delivering a contract, there are huge penalties. Do we have

1463

1464

1465

1466

1467

1468

1469

1470

1471

1472

1473

1474

1475

1476

1477

1478

1479

1480

1481

1482

1483

1484

1485

1486

1487

and should there be penalties for failure to have adequate auditing and failure to keep the paperwork that could be added to contracts, much like we would do for being late in a contract?

A second question is do we have the ability and do you sense that a lot of this problem isn't actually with the contractors, it is with the subcontractors? In the only case--I shouldn't say the only case, but the primary case, in one of my trips to Iraq, it was right in the middle of some of the Parsons hospital questions, you just can't be anything but appalled. But what was absolutely clear in that case was that we had a whole layer of subcontractors, and the American contractor is in many cases really just a broker. So we had an American person to broker, and then we got into their subsystem, and you have got to buy off this group, you have got to buy off this group, you have got to buy off this group. By that time there is not any money left to build a hospital, so you get a substandard hospital; and the few that we have are falling down. And the question is do we have a system to figure out how to track the subcontractors? fraud here isn't necessarily at the American level, it is how, in a war zone and in an unstable environment, do we track subcontractors.

The third question I have is do you think the biggest problem here is lack of security? Because it seems to me

that one of the problems is that money was thrown at a variety of things, possibly, I don't know, but possibly even extra housing and swimming pools and all that, because nobody wanted to go or they were getting shot at and it was hard to recruit. In the subcontracting, one of the things we heard from the Army Corps was that it was really hard; the subcontractors show up, they kill somebody from their family or they shoot somebody there, they disappear, they are pouring the foundation, they don't use the normal time they would let to have cement dry for fear of getting shot at, they start putting up a beam and decide they are not going to finish the project because somebody is getting shot at. How much of this problem is actually related to security?

Mr. WALKER. I will start.

First, it is a shared responsibility between the government and the contractors at the prime and sublevel for the problems that we have. It is clearly a shared responsibility.

Secondly, you talked about a number of different things that need to be looked at, but some of the things you talked about represented management responsibilities, some of the things you talked about represented oversight responsibilities, and some of the things you talked about represented audit roles; and I think we can talk about that separately, I think they are different.

You have got to have the right incentives, transparency and accountability mechanisms for the system to work. We don't have that right now.

And, last, yes, security is the big problem. There was a presumption that we were going to have a permissive security environment and, therefore, it was going to be easy to engage in this reconstruction. We also assumed that the Iraqis were going to have an ability to maintain it after we did it. Thirty-three percent, on average, of contracting costs for reconstruction were going for overhead; 10 percent plus for security. That is obviously not what was expected when we originally planned on this and when Congress appropriated the funds.

Mr. REED. You mentioned several areas. I guess your comment about the need for having up-front audits before contracts are awarded, in regards to that area, I think that I agree with you totally; that is the prudent business approach. In this situation, the unusual and compelling circumstances made that somewhat problematic in terms of awarding what is called letter contracts, the authority to proceed, before the actual price of the contract was negotiated, which is referred to in that case as definitization, the problem we were talking about a moment ago. And so certainly I think it wasn't a case of the auditors not being available, it was a case of the speed of

1538

1539

1540

1541

1542

1543

1544

1545

1546

1547

1548

1549

1550

1551

1552

1553

1554

1555

1556

1557

1558

1559

1560

1561

1562

which contractors had to be authorized to proceed. As that became less of an issue, DCAA was involved in most of the larger pricing actions that led to cost reimbursable contracts.

The issue of subcontractors, this has been a tough area for us in auditing particularly KBR, because we expect the prime contractor, KBR, to take responsibility for administering its subcontractors. And so we were looking to them to tell us whether they have negotiated fair and reasonable prices with their subcontractors, whether they are monitoring their performance adequately to ensure they are delivering what the subcontract requires them to. not always met our expectations in regards to demonstrating the reasonableness of some of the prices. In fact, that was in the restore Iraqi oil that we talked a moment ago, was one of the big issues, is their procurement files did not contain sufficient documentation to show us how they determined what was a fair and reasonable price in the case of one particular subcontractor. That continues to be a problem with the continuing subcontracts.

We really expect KBR to be auditing its subcontracts, if they are awarded on a cost-reimbursable basis, and we are pressing them very hard to live up to their responsibilities in that regard and to share with us the results.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Souder.

1563 We now go to Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just to follow-up, Mr. Bowen. I talked about earlier the Bloom case, where we actually got a conviction, and I recommended that we look at all of the other contracts that Mr. Bloom and the other people who were indicted and convicted had been involved in. It is my understanding, in response to that, you usaid that you had made that recommendation to the Pentagon as well, is that correct?

Mr. BOWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LYNCH. And that they had in fact hired a contractor?

Mr. BOWEN. Actually made it to the Joint Area Support Group, a DOD entity that is in charge of administrative management of the embassy.

Mr. LYNCH. Okay, so who is doing the actual investigation of those individuals who have already been convicted and the other contracts?

Mr. BOWEN. Well, the follow-up--this was a development fund for Iraq investigation that arose out of development fund for Iraq audits, and so we make recommendations on our audits, and one of them was to follow up on the other regions, just what you said. And the person responsible for following up on those DFI recommendations was the Joint Area Support Group in Iraq, and they hired a contractor to follow up on that recommendation, check the other regions, but our

review, which was completed this last quarter, following up on a recommendation concluded that they did not carry out the recommendation properly, so we are going to follow up ourselves.

Mr. LYNCH. It is just getting worse. They had a failure of a contractor, so what do we do? We hire another contractor, who doesn't do their job. You know what I mean? Actually, the Chairman and I have a bill that we are going to have to put on the floor at some point, which requires the Defense Department to take that up as well.

Mr. Walker, I believe you have something to add?

Mr. WALKER. I think it is important to note that the DFI

Fund is Iraqi money, not U.S. money. At the same point in

time, we had a fiduciary responsibility to be prudent with

regard to the use of that money. There are different pools

of money, and we have different audit authorities depending

upon which money is involved.

Mr. LYNCH. Right. I am sorry, Mr. Reed, go ahead.

Mr. REED. I think, without getting into details, it is a reasonable assumption that investigations are continuing in regards to these individuals and their association in other contracts. We are supporting investigations, and I am not at liberty to say much more about that.

Also, I would point out that in terms of the La Nouvelle situation, you mentioned specifically and Mr. Mazon, we are

demanding that KBR provide cost information on all subcontracts that he was associated with awarding. We are interested in whether those prices were fair and whether excessive profits were made on those subcontracts, and we are in the process of getting that information right now.

Mr. LYNCH. Okay. I appreciate that, but it has been a while at La Nouvelle. Those folks were convicted quite a while ago, and we are still trying to get information from Halliburton?

Mr. REED. Certainly, our first priority was to make sure we recovered the kickback amounts and the penalties associated with the actual plea that was made, and we have been auditing the estimates of that amount and supporting the settlement in that regard. As we were doing that, we began to move into the secondary issues, and we are trying to--we obviously have to be careful we do not step on the toes of any investigators who may be proceeding down the same trails unbeknownst to my auditors.

Mr. LYNCH. Well, don't be too shy. Don't worry about stepping on some toes. If we can get to this corruption and the bribery and all that, that is very important.

Mr. Bowen?

Mr. BOWEN. Mr. Lynch, if I may offer one other point.

Last Wednesday we unsealed indictments on five other individuals that were the results of follow-up investigations

with regard to the Bloom and Stein conspiracy in Hilla, and more are in the works. So there is follow-up with respect to them, but we also need to be sure we check the other CPA regions to see whether those comptroller offices operated properly.

Mr. LYNCH. I appreciate that. The point I am trying to make here is that there are some core responsibilities of government on oversight, and I just do not want to have those government responsibilities that are so central to our oversight function here to be contracted out. That is where we got in this problem in the first place. And I understand we are short on staff, but there has got to be another way to do this.

The central question I had, Mr. Bowen, last week we had the Army in, and they testified that they had no idea--even though it was an open, competitive bidding process, they had no idea that Blackwater was being paid for security work under LOGCAP, even though it was an open, competitive bidding process. They testified several months ago that there was no contract. Last week--you were at the earlier panel--they testified that, yes, in fact, that had gone on. And the problem is the tiering of all of these contracts. You have a general contractor, you have a sub-subcontractor, you have a sub-subcontractor, and a sub-subcontractor.

I noticed in your report, Mr. Bowen, on page 8, we have

an example of this problem. The State Department awarded DynCorp a contract to build a residential camp for Iraqi police. DynCorp then subcontracted the work to a company called Corporate Bank. Corporate Bank then subcontracted the work to an Italian company called Cogim SpA.

Now, I want to ask you about this because it is down in your report. On page 8 of your report you say that DynCorp was awarded a subcontract to build this for \$55 million.

Now, they subcontracted to Corporate Bank to build it for \$55 million on August 15th, 2004. That is according to your report. Two weeks later, on September 1st, 2004, that corporation, Corporate Bank, subcontracted it out to this Italian company, Cogim SpA, for \$47.1 million, to do the exact same scope of work.

Now, in that two-week time period it appears that Corporate Bank made, I don't know, about \$8 million. I just want to understand. Is that right?

Mr. BOWEN. I think you are alluding to a point Mr. Souder made as well, and that is visibility into how a prime subcontracts work and how that work is subcontracted down can result in dilution of financial effort and, as a result, lack of oversight. There is—the system that we operate under is a quality assurance program operated by the government, which expects that the contractor executes a quality control program over his subcontractors. And when the lack of

visibility by the operational overseer, the government doing the QA program results in loss of visibility and cost controls.

Mr. LYNCH. I guess the central point of my question is this: Could you determine any value added by Corporate Bank in the two weeks they had the general contract? They made \$8 million by re-subcontracting out the work to the Italian company.

Mr. BOWEN. No, we didn't, and I think the lesson learned is we need to carefully study the design-build prime contracting process that was used in Iraq, how subcontracting happened, and definitization needs to operate within the cost-plus contract environment to control costs. And we heard repeatedly today that that was not executed effectively, has not been executed effectively.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back. Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Braley?

Mr. BRALEY. Thank you, Mr . Chairman.

Mr. Walker, Mr. Reed, Mr. Bowen, thank you for your time here today.

Mr. Walker, I appreciated your comment about the fact that no matter how dire the circumstances are we are talking about here today, they really represent just the tip of the iceberg and the real problem that we are facing in Iraq and

1713 | accountability.

And, Mr. Bowen, I appreciated your comment about the watershed report that you issued in January. As you know from the last time we were together, I read that report and I was deeply disturbed by some of the forward-looking conclusions that you reached about the status of our situation in Iraq with future reconstruction efforts, so I thank you for your time.

I would like to shift the focus and talk about swimming pools. I was very proud to be president of the Blackhawk Area Swim Team, where we had four teenage boys set three age-group swimming records in an Olympic swimming pool in Cedar Falls, Iowa, that no longer exists because of aging and deteriorating conditions. And one of the disturbing things about your report was that DynCorp's contract with the State Department revealed unauthorized work being performed under the contract, specifically the building of an Olympic sized swimming pool and luxury trailers without authorization from the State Department, is that correct?

Mr. BOWEN. That is correct.

Mr. BRALEY. And I understand we have some pictures that were not included in your report. Maybe we can put those up on the screen while I ask you a question.

This first photograph that we are looking at appears to depict a pool that is in pretty poor conditions. As I

1738 understand it, DynCorp had the pool built but then it 1739 collapsed, is that correct?

- 1740 Mr. BOWEN. That is right.
- Mr. BRALEY. And this pool was built in 2004 and then was subsequently rebuilt.
- 1743 Mr. BOWEN. That is right.
- Mr. BRALEY. So let's put the picture of the pool up as 1745 it appears today. Is that it?
- 1746 Mr. BOWEN. Yes, sir.
- 1747 Mr. BRALEY. It looks like a pretty impressive facility.
- 1748 Mr. BOWEN. Yes, sir.
- Mr. BRALEY. There are many swim clubs in this Country
 who have limitations of being able to swim only in a 25-yard
 or 25-meter pool, and that looks like one that would be
- 1752 available for competition level swimming.
- 1753 Mr. BOWEN. Yes, sir.
- Mr. BRALEY. Now, do we know who paid for the pool to be rebuilt a second time?
- 1756 Mr. BOWEN. No, we don't. That is something we are 1757 following up on through our investigative work.
- Mr. BRALEY. So it could have been someone else, but as I understand from the communications with your staff, this
- 1760 could have been built again by DynCorp, is that correct?
- Mr. BOWEN. That is possible. That is a possibility, and
- we will get that answer for you in short order.

1763 Mr. BRALEY. But, theoretically, U.S. taxpayers could 1764 have paid for this pool twice. 1765 Mr. BOWEN. We will find out the answer to that question, 1766 yes, sir. 1767 Mr. BRALEY. And do you know whose idea it was to build 1768 this swimming pool? 1769 Mr. BOWEN. This was unauthorized work directed by the Iraqi Ministry of Interior. Apparently, from the course of 1770 our audit, it was approved by the senior advisor to the 1771 Ministry of Interior for the Coalition Provisional Authority. 1772 1773 Mr. BRALEY. Did DynCorp have authorization from the 1774 State Department when they performed the work? 1775 Mr. BOWEN. No, they did not. The system that we have 1776 set up depends on an effective contracting officer's representative exerting oversight of how the money is spent 1777 1778 under a contract. That did not happen in this case and, 1779 indeed, it has been a problem with respect to the State Department's INL Office oversight of DynCorp. The result, 1780 1781 one of the salutary results of our audit is that that contracting officer's representative has been replaced. 1782 Mr. BRALEY. Can you tell the Committee who the person 1783 1784 was at the CPA who gave that authorization? Mr. BOWEN. I think you should go to the INL Department 1785 for who that person is. 1786 1787 Mr. BRALEY. At our hearing last week on the \$12 billion

in cash that the CPA failed to properly account for,
Ambassador Bremer and others made the argument that we
shouldn't worry because it was just Iraqi money, and I
disagreed with that argument at the time. Nevertheless,
today we are talking about U.S. taxpayer money, and these
same CPA officials seem to be just as careless with taxpayer
money as they were with Iraqi money.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee will pursue this question with the State Department and push DynCorp to return all these millions of dollars, as the Inspector General recommended in his audit report.

One of the other questions that I am concerned about are quality of life issues. One of the things we rarely talk about is the direct impact that these decisions have on the people in Iraq who are supposed to be benefitting from these dollars, and I am deeply disturbed about our continuing failure to meet the basic needs in the reconstruction in particular with the provision of electricity. Amazingly, although we have spent nearly \$3 billion in U.S. taxpayer money to restore electricity in Iraq, the production levels in 2006 were actually below pre-war levels.

Mr. Walker, can we put that in everyday terms? In Baghdad, how many hours per day does the average family have electrical power?

Mr. WALKER. Six.

Mr. BRALEY. And the GAO report indicates that the power supply that they have remains unreliable. Do people know when the power is going on or off, or does it just happen randomly?

Mr. WALKER. There is not a pre-announced, pre-planned schedule. And part of the problem here is because of the terrorism. I mean, there is an effort to try to sabotage the distribution of electricity even after it is generated from the generating plant.

Mr. BRALEY. Does that have an impact upon the approach that we take in dealing with Iraqi people on a very fundamental daily basis in terms of their trust for the services that we are providing?

Mr. WALKER. Well, first, the responsibility to provide services, I would argue, rests with the Iraqi government. The Iraqi government is responsible for providing, electricity, clean water, and the basic essentials that every citizen cares about. We are trying to help them do that, but ultimately they are responsible and accountable. And the failure to be able to do that reliably and effectively obviously undercuts the Iraqi citizens' confidence in (a) their government and (b) the effectiveness of the Coalition to be able to generate results.

Mr. BRALEY. Well, what impact does it have on the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people when their own government has

billions of dollars that are supposed to be devoted to these reconstruction efforts and it remains unspent?

Mr. WALKER. I am not sure if they know that. I am not sure how much the Iraqi people know about what is or isn't being done with regard to their funds. I can't comment on that. Part of the reason they haven't spent the funds is they don't have the capacity with regard to the systems, the controls. They have bickering, believe it or not, between various departments and agencies. Some departments and agencies are controlled by Shi'a, some are controlled by other factions. And the bottom line is the citizens want the outcomes, they want to see the results, and they are not seeing them yet.

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Braley, your time has expired.

Mr. BRALEY. Thank you.

Chairman WAXMAN. I presume they may not know whether the government has the funds and not using it, but they know they don't have the electricity.

Mr. WALKER. Right. And, in fact, I think it is important to note that we are trying to work with our counterparts, the Board of Supreme Audit, to try to help build their capacity to be able to do their job. And as was mentioned before with regard to the DFI funds, while they are not U.S. money, we had a fiduciary responsibility, and both Stuart Bowen and I have been trying to help make sure that

the records are turned over to the Board of Supreme Audit of Iraq so that they can audit what happened with that money. I mean, \$9 billion to \$12 billion is a lot of money. There needs to be accountability over that.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Walker.

Mr. Sarbanes, you are next.

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to go back and talk again a little bit more about the sustention rate and this notion of costs that get incurred before the contract has been definitized, as I guess it is called. If I am understanding what you have testified to, the chances that you can incur a lot of costs before definitization of a contract are improved in circumstances where contracts need to be let very quickly, where people brought on in ''emergency circumstances,'' is that right?

Mr. REED. Well, I think the risk that--

Mr. SARBANES. The risk, okay.

Mr. REED.--from my viewpoint, is that there is no cost control before a contract is definitized. In other words--

Mr. SARBANES. So if I am an enterprising contractor and I know how the system works, it might be in my interest to get in on a situation where a no bid contract or the fast letting of a contract was occurring, because then I know that I can load up a lot of costs during this period where things are being incurred but nothing has yet been definitized,

right?

Mr. REED. That is certainly a risk.

Mr. SARBANES. Okay. And were the circumstances under which Halliburton and KBR and some of these other contractors came onboard were ones where things were happening quickly, contracts were being let in an expeditious—to use the sort of best connotation of it—way? There were circumstances like that, right? I mean, that is essentially what was happening here.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. Do you want to respond?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Sarbanes, I think it is important to note that when you are dealing with contingency operations—and I would respectfully suggest that Iraq is a military contingency operation; Katrina was a domestic contingency operation—the government must do a better job of planning in advance, engaging in advance contracting activities that you can draw on on a task order basis, rather than being in the situation where you have to negotiate things quickly, in a crisis circumstance. These problems are exacerbated under cost—plus contracts, which creates perverse incentives for people to define the scope broadly, to incur more costs for obvious reasons.

Mr. SARBANES. And I agree the government needs to do that, and I am looking at it from a contractor's standpoint

HG0046.000 PAGE 86

1913 in terms of if you are unscrupulous as the contractor, 1914 wanting to sort of take as much advantage of the situation as 1915 you could, you could seize upon these contingency situations 1916 and push hard for whatever rules and checks the government 1917 was trying to put in place to be relaxed a little bit because 1918 there are cost opportunities available to you. 1919 But let me switch gears real quick. The process by 1920 which the auditors make a recommendation to the contract 1921 officer regarding questioned or unsupported costs, for 1922 example, what is that exactly? Is there a meeting convened 1923 and who is at that meeting? 1924 Mr. REED. No, we issue--1925 Mr. SARBANES. How does that work? 1926 Mr. REED. We issue a written audit report. 1927 Mr. SARBANES. Okay. 1928 Mr. REED. Which explains what we audited, what we looked 1929

at, and what our conclusions were, and our recommendations.

Mr. SARBANES. Okay. Is there ever a face-to-face exchange around the recommendation? And, if so, what is that?

Mr. REED. Yes, there is continuous communication.

Mr. SARBANES. Okay.

1930

1931

1932

1933

1934

1935

1936

1937

Mr. REED. Especially in more significant issues. We give the contracting officer an early alert that we are having a major issue developing. We certainly talk to them

before we issue the audit report, and often we attend a negotiations side-by-side with them.

Mr. SARBANES. Okay. So who is in the room for that kind of a meeting, that ''negotiation''? So the contracting officer is there and their staff, members of your staff are there, having made the recommendation. Is the contractor there as well?

Mr. REED. It is usually a pre-meeting of the government people only to go over the strategy that the government side is going to take in whatever negotiation is going to take place, and then the contractor is brought in. In addition to the auditors, there may be government engineers, there may be contracting officer technical representatives who observe the physical work. It could be whatever the contracting officer feels he needs to support him in the negotiation.

Mr. SARBANES. Okay, I have run out of time, but just real quick. Then, in terms of the contracting officer making a decision on what to accept, in a typical case, what kind of time frame is involved there, I mean, from the time you bring your recommendation forward to the time the decision is made on which costs to allow or not allow?

Mr. REED. Well, there is considerable variation.

Mr. SARBANES. Okay.

Mr. REED. It could range from within hours to months.

Mr. SARBANES. Okay.

1963 Mr. REED. Depending on the complexity of the nature of 1964 the issue. 1965 Mr. SARBANES. All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1966 1967 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Sarbanes. 1968 Mr. Welch? 1969 Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1970 Mr. Bowen, in your audit of DynCorp's work for the State Department, it is pretty troubling. I am still not clear on 1971 1972 exactly what the taxpayers got out, but let me ask you a few 1973 questions about some figures. 1974 First, the total amount at issue was \$189 million, is 1975 that right? 1976 Mr. BOWEN. That is right. This is a task order under a very large contract, but this task order covered that amount. 1977 1978 Mr. WELCH. Okay. And you did not examine all of the costs, but you did examine quite a bit, and there is \$51.6 1979 million for the residential camp at Adnan Palace, right? 1980 1981 Mr. BOWEN. That is right. 1982 Mr. WELCH. And there is no such thing as a residential 1983 camp at this moment at Adnan Palace? 1984 Mr. BOWEN. That is right, and there won't be. 1985 Mr. WELCH. So all the trailers that we bought for the Iraqi police are sitting unused in storage somewhere in 1986 1987 Baghdad?

1988 Mr. BOWEN. At the Baghdad International Airport. 1989 Mr. WELCH. And do we have to pay rent to store them 1990 there? 1991 Mr. BOWEN. Yes. Yes, sir. 1992 Mr. WALKER. I might note we have a lot of trailers in Hope, Arkansas related to Katrina. Systemic problem. 1993 Mr. WELCH. Well, it sounds like FEMA was in charge of 1994 1995 this. And I noticed on page 10 of your report that the State 1996 1997 Department, when it realized it wasn't going to use these 1998 trailers, they actually considered donating them to the 1999 Hurricane Katrina victims, is that right? 2000 Mr. BOWEN. Yes, sir. 2001 Mr. WELCH. Do you know if they were planning on bringing 2002 the folks in New Orleans to Baghdad or the trailers from 2003 Baghdad to New Orleans? Mr. BOWEN. Well, I think the solution that is on the 2004 2005 table now is to use them for the new embassy compound. 2006 Mr. WELCH. I mean, is this true, they literally have \$51 2007 million, trailers that are empty with people who are 2008 homeless? That is the story? 2009 Mr. BOWEN. The story is we purchased trailers that we 2010 didn't use, and haven't used yet. 2011 Mr. WELCH. Who can we congratulate for this good work? 2012 Mr. BOWEN. Well, what it has done is motivate me to look

at the rest of the DynCorp contract.

Mr. WELCH. Well, thank you. Who is DynCorp?

Mr. BOWEN. It is a Falls Church company, a very large defense contractor. They had the LOGCAP contract previous to KBR.

Mr. WELCH. Let me ask you about another DynCorp contract. On page 2 of your audit you say that \$36.4 million was spent on weapons and equipment, including armored vehicles, body armor, communications equipment. But in your report, on page 17, because of poor record keeping, nobody can verify whether we got anything that we paid for.

Mr. BOWEN. That is right.

Mr. WELCH. Did your auditors try to locate the equipment that was purchased for this \$36 million?

Mr. BOWEN. We are following up on that, but our job was to look at how the equipment was managed, and it was managed in a way that provided no assurances of accountability.

Mr. WELCH. There were some questions earlier on suggesting that because it is a wartime situation, you can't keep records. I mean, is that really true? I don't get that. If you are dealing with corporations on these big purchases, \$36 million, it goes to equipment that is of vital importance to the security of the troops. What is the problem, what possible justification can there be to not have a system, even in Baghdad, that allows the taxpayer to know

that the equipment they paid to get to the troops was delivered?

Mr. BOWEN. Well, there is no doubt that operating, managing these contracts in a wartime environment is very challenging, but the cost of doing that is also built into the contract itself, or is anticipated to be so, and simply because we are operating in a wartime environment further does not dispense with the need for accountability.

Mr. WELCH. I really don't get that. I mean, this equipment, it is not like it is flown over in C-141s and just parachuted randomly to various locations, wherever it happens to land, it goes into the Green Zone or some secure location, right?

Mr. BOWEN. That is right.

Mr. WELCH. So the people who are dealing with the receipt of this equipment are in physically safe locations, right?

Mr. BOWEN. Reasonably.

Mr. WELCH. So what happens to the equipment after it goes out into the field is one thing, which may be difficult to understand and to account for, but its actual receipt in the country, that it arrived, that—why, in a war zone, is it any more difficult when, in fact, where the equipment arrives is a very secure location?

Mr. BOWEN. Well, your question cuts to a core lesson

learned that needs to be learned and applied in Iraq and
beyond, and that is in contingency relief and reconstruction
and operations, there must be systems developed, trained, and
ready to go that can ensure reasonable accountability of the
taxpayers' money in the contingency operation.
Mr. WELCH. Let me just ask one last question. In your
report there was an indication that a contracting officer
didn't even keep a file for a \$25 million contract. Is that
right?
Mr. BOWEN. That is right.
Mr. WELCH. Literally, I mean, is there any
justification, any justification for not keeping a copy of a
contract for that amount of money?
Mr. BOWEN. No, there isn't.
Mr. WELCH. Thank you.
Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, can I quickly touch on
something here? Thank you.
Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Walker?
Mr. WALKER. Let me tell you why we continue to have
these problems on a recurring basis; not just Iraq, but
Department of Defense and other major departments. There is
no accountability. The appropriations that are granted are
not adjusted based upon these continued problems;
organizations that are responsible for managing and
overseeing these contracts are not held accountable.

Contractors are not adequately held accountable; and the individuals involved and who were responsible are not held accountable.

- Mr. WELCH. And what could we do--
- 2092 Mr. WALKER. Why change?
- 2093 Mr. WELCH. What could we do to hold them accountable?
- 2094 Mr. WALKER. Well--

2088

2089

2090

2091

2100

2101

2102

2103

2104

2105

2106

2107

2108

2109

2110

- 2095 Mr. WELCH. What three things could we do?
- Mr. WALKER. Well, one of the things you have to do is
 you have to deal with the systemic problems that I provided
 for the record as a follow-up to last week's hearing, and I
 hope to have a chance to testify on this.

Secondly, you need to hold both contractors and government employees accountable when things don't go right. There has got to be consequences. People ought to be rewarded for doing a good job, absolutely. And I think it is fair to say most contractors do a good job, and a vast majority of Federal employees do a good job. They ought to be recognized and rewarded. But when things don't go right, there have to be consequences. And if there aren't consequences, you are not going to get changed behavior. The government is no different than the private sector in that regard.

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Welch's time is up, but, Mr. Bowen,
let me, just on this question of DynCorp, is this the first

time we have had an issue with DynCorp?

Mr. BOWEN. No, it is not. It is our first comprehensive audit by my office, and, as I said, we are initiating a series of reviews.

And as to what can we do, Mr. Welch, I would also suggest the debarment and suspension process is a meaningful method of accountability that could be utilized more effectively.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Welch, but let me just point out that in December 2005 report on INL asset verification that was conducted in July-August 2005 reviewed DynCorp's inventory control and the report concluded INL cannot determine if the Bureau received what it paid for. I think this might be related to Bosnia. Are you familiar with that, Mr. Bowen?

Mr. BOWEN. Yes, that is right. That was an INL review. INL has identified internally problems with DynCorp. Indeed, they identified problems with this contracting office's representative, as our report points out, in Bosnia. And let me point out also that this was a joint review with the Department of State Inspector General's Office, so we will continue to pursue reviews with them of these issues.

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Walker's point is what are the consequences of these things, and that is something we need to look at.

Next on the list is Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to try to get to the gut of this thing.

The essential services for any functioning society are electricity, water, health care, education. None of that seems to be improving very much in Iraq. Some, but not all of that, obviously, is the responsibility of the government and who's contracting with the contractors to do a lot of this work.

Mr. Bowen, you had indicated that this is the twelfth quarterly report, there are 50 auditors and investigators on the ground in Iraq, and that the financial burden of Iraqi reconstruction is shifting to the Iraqis. Now, from what I see, is a government in Iraq that lacks legitimacy in the very eyes of the governed because it can't provide these essential services, and if we have \$50 billion--\$30 billion of which was United States money, American money; \$20 billion of which is Iraqi money--and we are not seeing measurable progress toward restoration of essential services and also oil production, it seems hardly confidence-inspiring that the responsibility is now shifting to, based on anybody's observation, an honest assessment of the legitimacy of the Iraqi government, it is not confidence-inspiring. Your thoughts?

Mr. BOWEN. Well, one other essential element to a

working society's infrastructure is rule of law, and I think the lack of security in Baghdad and elsewhere across Iraq has prevented success of what was planned, an effective relief and reconstruction operation.

The other thing, let me point out, is that the United States investment was meant to get the Iraqis started going forward. The infrastructure was seriously deteriorated through decades of neglect, and The World Bank's estimate was \$56 billion. In fact, that was low. I would say the cost to restore that infrastructure is at least \$100 billion, given what we found.

But trying to do a relief and reconstruction operation before stabilization is achieved is difficult at best. That is certainly a lesson in Iraq.

Mr. HIGGINS. And that is the point, I mean, stability hasn't been achieved, and there is obviously a lot of waste and abuse of very significant money, and this Congress is being asked to authorize more money for an effort that everybody, I believe, concludes is an abject failure. And I think it speaks to the oversight responsibility of Congress. I mean, you indicated that there is a real-time audit method being used.

Mr. BOWEN. That is right.

Mr. HIGGINS. After the conclusion of this twelfth quarterly report, is there any signs of progress this

2188

2189

2190

2191

2192

2193

2194

2195

2196

2197

2198

2199

2200

2201

2202

2203

2204

2205

2206

2207

2208

2209

2210

2211

2212

situation is changing? I think that is a very important question relative to confidence or lack of confidence that this Congress has in the Administration's ability to effectively administer this.

Mr. BOWEN. And the answer is yes, we have made progress. The taxpayers and the Iraqis have received a lot of successful projects as a result of the \$21 billion investment, notwithstanding the problems that we have identified. Polio has been eradicated; 5,000 schools have been built or refurbished; there has been progress in the education sector, in roads and transportation, communications. But the key is developing a sustainable, coherent infrastructure strategy that brings the country together, at the same time bringing an effective and coherent rule of law strategy to bear in Baghdad and beyond, and that has been a continuing challenge. The investment targets, though, I think are the right ones to choose. The Provincial Reconstruction Team effort is the most important capacity-building endeavor in Iraq nationwide, and especially in Baghdad. The Commander's Emergency Response Program, we have looked at it a couple times; it is about maneuver units executing quick turnaround projects and, in an unstable environment, that is the right place to spend the money. Community Action Program run by USAID has made a lot of difference at the very grassroots level. But progress has

2213 been mixed.

Mr. HIGGINS. Woefully inadequate. What about internal structures to enhance the issue of accountability and transparency moving forward?

Mr. BOWEN. Well, that has been a story of gradual progress, partly driven by the presence of oversight on the ground in Iraq, both DCAA, GAO, SIGIR, auditors uncovering issues that need to get fixed. That is what I mean by real-time auditing, definitization, award fees, the hospital program, the management of property. It is about executing our job that incrementally brings improvement in the overall management and it is about working with management to get it done as we find problems, rather than to wait for reports to come out.

Mr. HIGGINS. So you think it is a good thing that we are at this watershed period where the Iraqi reconstruction is shifting from United States influence to an almost exclusive Iraqi influence?

Mr. BOWEN. Well, regardless of whether it is good or not, it is the current reality. It is going to drive decision-making moving forward, and the burden has shifted. The truth is \$38 billion invested the last four years. That is a significant taxpayer investment in Iraq at every level. That period is past, and the Iraqis cannot leave \$12 billion in their treasury again this year.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Higgins.

Mr. Yarmuth?

Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Walker, you have talked about systemic problems which have made it more difficult for you to do the job which we have asked you to do, which is to look out for the taxpayers' money, so I want to focus a little bit maybe on an area that we haven't talked about, which is the level of cooperation you have received from other government entities.

Last year, Congress was told that the Defense Department Inspector General had nobody on the ground in Iraq, which was astounding considering the amount of money that we are spending there. I understand that has been rectified and they have at least a few people there. It is also my understanding that you would like to have people on the ground in Iraq as well, and have made a request of the State Department for space, is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. We have space. I mean, we have already agreed with SIGIR that we are going to co-locate with SIGIR. What we have a request to the State Department, which they are incredibly slow in responding to, is formal approval for us to be able to have people in Iraq for longer periods of time. Right now they approve us to be in for two week periods of time and that is it, and we are asking for three to six months, for people to be there for three to six months, and

then we can project supplemental people in and out for two week periods as a supplement to, not a substitute for, a few people that would have a continuing presence.

Mr. YARMUTH. What is the rationale that they have used to try to restrict you in that type of way?

Mr. WALKER. I am not--

Mr. YARMUTH. They haven't used the not supporting our troops line?

Mr. WALKER. Well, no, the issue is that—separation of powers? That is what their—well, they need to read the Constitution. There is a lot of people that aren't very good at understanding what the Constitution is. I mean, we are there to help the Congress exercise its appropriations, oversight, and authorization responsibilities. They are just incredibly slow. I mean, the State Department is a big bureaucracy. Not everybody is for oversight; not everybody is for transparency; not everybody is for accountability. And it is time that they acted on this. And I am going to call Secretary Rice on Monday if they don't give us an answer before this. This has just been going on too long.

The other thing we need, quite frankly, is the Congress is not supporting our agency enough. It does not give us adequate funds. I am going to have to ask for a supplemental in order for us to be able to get our people over there and pay for it. We generate \$105 return for every \$1 invested on

Second place in the world is 10 to 1, and we are getting 2288 2289 starved, and we hear about tens of -- we have heard here about 2290 billions of dollars of waste. I mean, what is the priority 2291 here? 2292 Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I suggest we might want to 2293 have someone from State Department respond to these issues as 2294 well. 2295 Let me ask you about the Defense Department, turn to 2296 them for a second. It is my understanding that you have been studying the readiness and effectiveness of the Iraq security 2297 2298 forces. Is that correct as well? 2299 Mr. BOWEN. Yes, we have issued two audit reports last 2300 quarter on that issue, and I know GAO is looking at is, as is 2301 the Department of Defense Inspector General. Mr. WALKER. We are, and that is a critical point. 2302 2303 appreciate your asking it. That comes back to the 2304 transitional readiness assessment reports that we have been 2305 seeking access to. 2306 Just so the members understand what that is, we have 2307 U.S. troops embedded with Iraqi troops, and those troops are responsible for doing detailed assessments as to leadership, 2308 2309 equipment, training, and other factors to try to assess the true readiness of Iraqi troops. This is done for U.S. 2310 2311 troops, and we have had access to that information on a 2312 recurring basis for many years. It is classified

information, but we have people with all the necessary clearances. And while we have received some briefing from the Defense Department, we have not received the detailed records. It is essential we get those.

You are being asked to give several billion more dollars. You are being asked to support an increase in troop deployments. You are being asked to provide additional funds for a variety of things to support the standing up of the Iraqi security forces, which will help us get out quicker. You need this information in order to be able to assess whether or not it is making a difference, and we are the agent to get it for you.

Mr. YARMUTH. Again, has this been--the rationale for this, is this another separation of powers allegation?

Mr. WALKER. No. Believe it or not, I was really surprised to find out that, evidently, nobody in the Pentagon has actually seen this detailed information, that it has just been in the area of responsibility; it has been within Iraq and CENTCOM and the Multinational Force, MNFI. But my understanding is the Pentagon is just now getting some of this data, didn't even have it itself. People are concerned it is very ''sensitive information.'' Well, it is classified, that is true, and that makes it sensitive, but that doesn't mean that the Congress doesn't need it and we don't have a right to it. I mean, we do have a right to it,

2338 and you need it and so do we.

2339 Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Walker.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure we will want to insist that we get better cooperation from those two Departments.

Chairman WAXMAN. Yes, absolutely. I agree wholeheartedly, and we will follow up on that.

Mrs. Maloney?

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having this hearing, and I really want to thank GAO for providing us with nonpartisan accurate information. It is very vital for us to practice our oversight responsibilities and I, for one, will be supporting your request for additional funding so that you can give us the information to make good policy decisions.

One of the reports that came out, which, in my sense, is government is the best, it was a bipartisan report with Congressman Hamilton and Baker, and in their report they said the situation in Iraq is grave and deteriorating. And one of their recommendations—their recommendations really called for a reversal of the policy that we are following now. They said we should start withdrawing troops, not sending in more troops.

My brother is a former Vietnam veteran, Mr. Chairman, and he called me last night and he said that in Vietnam they kept sending more and more troops, and all they saw was more and more death, and it didn't work out, and he urged me to

vote against increasing the troops there.

But one of the key proposals in the Hamilton-Baker report was number 21, that the U.S. should tell the Iraqis that the failure to meet their own milestones will only accelerate American withdrawal or result in a reduction of American support. So they are calling on us to really put their feet to the fire and tell the Iraqis very plainly, if they don't stand up and do their own work, then we are going to be leaving.

The last constituent that I went to see, Mr. Chairman, at Walter Reed, it was a graduate of West Point, our finest and brightest; he was all shot up. I asked him how did it happen; he said, I wasn't on the front line, I was in charge of garbage removal. I mean, you could have knocked me over. I said, garbage removal? And he said, I knew I was in trouble when all my Iraqi colleagues started moving away from me, and then they came out and shot me.

And I don't understand this policy where our troops are in a civil war. As one of them said, we are shooting and we don't know who we are shooting at. We don't know if they are an enemy or a friend; we don't know. We are in the middle of a civil war, and I question why American troops are being used for garbage detail in Baghdad. So I, for one, feel that it is time for us to be standing down and letting the Iraqi people take care of their problems. The longer we stay, they

run away from their responsibilities.

Now, the reports that we have been getting--and I want to mention one from a former PRT leader, a Provincial Reconstruction Team, and this was a report where she said that the--she is talking about the civilian surge, not the troop surge, but that the civilian surge is not working. She says--and it is her words--that these teams, these reconstruction teams have not been successful to date, and she feels they are ill-defined mission and they will not be successful. And her comments are in opposition to this policy.

But I have to come back. Mr. Walker, you mentioned that you were underfunded, and my constituents, I can't walk down the street without someone asking me about the \$12 billion that was flown over of Iraqi money, and of which \$8.8 billion is unaccounted for. That is the official term. Unaccounted for means missing, gone. And I know that it has been looked at, but I can't get it out of my mind and my constituents can't get it out of their mind that if we had been better stewards of the Iraqi money and the reconstruction, then we wouldn't be spending our American money on the Iraqi reconstruction.

And I want to ask Mr. Bowen, Mr. Reed, Mr. Walker, if you have any insight on what happened to that \$8.8 billion? And you say we should be more accountable. Can you help us

in figuring out how to be more accountable on that \$8.8 billion that dissolved into ether or whatever? And I just am very frustrated. If you could give us some stronger markers for the Administration.

They say there are weapons of mass destruction. We can't find the weapons of mass destruction. They say give us a surge. We give them a surge, it doesn't work. We have given them four increases in troops and it hasn't worked. Can you think of any guidelines or oversight that might get the Department of Defense to have standards by which they will agree that, after a certain amount of misleading and failure, that they will begin to step down and ask the Iraqis to step up and take responsibility for their own country?

Mr. WALKER. I will start. First, as you know, I had a son who was a Marine Corps officer who fought in Iraq, so I have not only been working on this in my responsibility as Comptroller General and GAO's responsibility, I obviously have an interest given that I have a son that fought over there, although he is out now.

Anyway, Mr. Walker.

Secondly, we did do a lot of work in support of the Iraqi Study Group. I was one of the first witnesses before the Iraqi Study Group. We gave them all of our reports and made access to all of our people there.

Thirdly, one of the things that we have recommended a

long time ago to both the Executive Branch and the Congress is that you need to have more metrics and milestones both for what the U.S. is supposed to do and trying to accomplish and what the Iraqis are supposed to do and trying to accomplish. If you don't have appropriate metrics and milestones, and if you don't have adequate transparency over those metrics and milestones, you don't have any idea whether you are making progress or not and you can't make informed decisions.

Part of that is why you need the TRAs, but it needs to go not just with regard to Iraqi security forces, it has to deal with some of the other issues that have been talked about here, electricity, water, a variety of other factors, oil production, for example. So there need to be more metrics and milestones and you need to be able to have somebody like GAO and others in the accountability community to assess the reliability of the information that you are being provided. The old trust but verify approach.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Bowen?

Mr. BOWEN. As we addressed last week and the CPA did not follow either its mandate required under the U.N. Security Council Resolution 1483 or its own rules in managing the Development Fund for Iraq and, thus, the Iraqi Ministries distributed that money, used that money, spent that money without any accountability back to CPA as to how it was used.

The Board of Supreme Audit continues to look at that issue.

I have worked with GAO to provide the documents to the president of the Board of Supreme Audit so he can complete his audit. The audits that were completed by other entities employed by the U.N. looking at this issue found a lack of controls within the Ministries and, thus, no accountability. And, finally, the Commission on Public Integrity, the law enforcement arm in Iraq, ironically, created by the CPA, has hundreds of fraud cases ongoing with respect to what happened to that money.

So it is not a good story as our audit reported almost two years ago.

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Reed, do you want to respond?

Mr. REED. I defer to Mr. Walker and Mr. Bowen and the god work they are doing in this area. It doesn't fall, of course, as a contract audit issue, but as a private citizen, I share your concerns equally.

Mr. WALKER. If I may real quick, Mr. Waxman. As you know, and hopefully your constituents do, the \$9 billion, roughly, is Iraqi money, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't be concerned about it. We had a fiduciary responsibility with regard to that money, and that should be taken very seriously. We are, in part, going to be viewed as being responsible and accountable as to whether or not those funds were used properly and for appropriate purposes and with

positive outcomes irrespective of whose money it was.

Now we need to make sure that the legitimate institutions of the Iraqi government, namely, the Board of Supreme Audit, has access and cooperation in order to conduct their audits of what happened with that money. And I and Stuart Bowen are trying to make sure that that happens, but there are varying degrees of cooperation that are occurring there.

I found out recently, for example, that my counterpart, his home was entered into by our Army; all of the weapons were confiscated; no explanation, no apology. His predecessor was assassinated. The job is a pretty tough job. Not everybody is for transparency and accountability. Fortunately, in this Country, people debate about it rather than resort to violence.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mrs. Maloney.

Mr. Bowen, just before I call on Mr. Clay, a clarification. Last week, when you were here with Ambassador Bremer, it seemed to me that both of you agreed there was no fraud. But now you are telling us that there is a fraud investigation by the Iraqis.

Mr. BOWEN. Right.

Chairman WAXMAN. So there was--there certainly appears to have been fraud by the Iraqis in the use of that cash, is that correct?

2513 Mr. BOWEN. Right. What I said was that our audit made no findings of any fraud with respect to the disbursement of 2514 2515 that audit. What I have said today is that the CPI 2516 commissioner reports to me, when I go visit with him, that he 2517 has ongoing cases with respect to allegations of fraud, 2518 allegations of fraud--and I think I said that last week as well--on the use of that money. 2519 2520 Chairman WAXMAN, CPI? 2521 Mr. BOWEN. Commission of Public Integrity. It is the Iraqi FBI. 2522 2523 Chairman WAXMAN. Okay. Thank you. 2524 Mr. Clay. 2525 Mr. CLAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for 2526 this series of hearings on Iraq. 2527 In his speech last month announcing his new strategy for 2528 Iraq, President Bush asked Congress for an additional \$1.2 2529 billion in economic aid to Iraq. That is a lot to ask of 2530 American taxpayers who have already spent \$30 billion on Iraq 2531 reconstruction. The President also said that, as part of 2532 this plan, the Iraqis have promised to spend \$10 billion of 2533 their own money. But when we examine previous Iraqi 2534 commitments, we find a troubling pattern. 2535 Mr. Walker, according to a recent GAO report, the Iraqi government budgeted about \$6 billion for reconstruction 2536 projects for 2006, but as of August 2006 it had spent only 2537

\$877 million of that amount. That is only 14 percent of what they promised to spend, isn't it?

Mr. WALKER. You are correct that they have not spent near what their budget allows. And I think one of the things that Congress needs to think about when it is considering this appropriations request is whether or not you ought to have a matching concept, our funds will flow when their funds flow. We do that between Federal and State support circumstances and, of course, employers do that for pensions with regard to 401K. We need to think about that concept and to what extent that concept might apply here.

Mr. CLAY. So like dollar for dollar, then, is what you are talking about.

Mr. WALKER. Not necessarily dollar for dollar. If they committed to do \$10 billion, for example, and we have committed \$1 billion too. That is 12 percent. Maybe when their funds flow, our funds will flow. It is just a concept to think about.

Mr. CLAY. Let me also ask you about the GAO report that also found that the Oil Ministry had spent less than 1 percent of its capital budget in 2006, is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. It is a very low percentage. I am not sure that it is less than 1 percent, but it is very low. That sounds about right.

Mr. CLAY. Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bowen, at our hearing last week you informed us that at the end of last year there was about \$12 billion left in the Iraqi treasury unspent.

Mr. BOWEN. That is right.

Mr. CLAY. Is that accurate?

Mr. BOWEN. That is the number that I was told. Two days ago the Iraqi Minister of Finance himself acknowledged at least \$9 billion that should have been spent on reconstruction and relief activities in Iraq was unspent and left in the treasury last year.

Mr. CLAY. What reason did they give you for not spending?

Mr. BOWEN. No reason is given, but we have an audit in our latest quarterly report that addresses ministry capacity development, a very significant issue in Iraq in that there are a variety of reasons I have heard, and one is the difficulty of the contracting system in Iraq. The regulatory process is byzantine, the fear on the part of Iraqi bureaucrats to sign anything because of potential prosecution. But I think that probably the overarching issue is the lack of a consensus upon a strategic plan on the Iraqi side for a relief and reconstruction program for the country.

Mr. CLAY. Now, the fact that the Iraqis have failed to spend this money raises a question whether the Iraqi government is trying to fund the reconstruction. I am

concerned that the Iraqi government may be waiting for the U.S. to spend American taxpayer dollars so that it doesn't have to spend Iraqi money on reconstruction of its own country. Do you get that sense?

Mr. BOWEN. That is an issue of political will and it is a plausible conclusion.

Mr. CLAY. And so, in your work in Iraq, you have seen signs that the government does not want to spend its money and they are waiting on American taxpayer dollars to flow.

Mr. BOWEN. Well, as my latest report points out, the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund is coming to an end, it is the end of the earth now, and that means, by simply definition, the Iraqis are going to have to sustain, going forward, the financial burden of the recovery of their country.

Mr. CLAY. Thank you for that.

And, Mr. Walker, do you have a similar impression, that the Iraqis may be waiting for the U.S. to spend their money before they spend any of the Iraqis?

Mr. WALKER. They clearly have a number of capacity challenges which prevents them from spending the money; they don't have an overall plan. And, frankly, I mean, obviously, if somebody else is willing to spend money and you don't have to spend yours, then that has behavioral impacts.

I might note that according to my very capable staff,

2613 almost 30 percent of DOD's reconstruction projects won't be completed until late 2008. So while we have made substantial 2614 2615 progress, there is still work to be done. 2616 Mr. CLAY. And just to close, Mr. Walker, I sense a level 2617 of frustration on your part at this entire ordeal of the Iraq 2618 reconstruction, and maybe I am reading it wrong, but I 2619 certainly sense it. 2620 Mr. WALKER. My frustration is broader than that. mean, the Defense Department is number one in the world in 2621 2622 fighting and winning armed conflicts, but they have 15 of 27 2623 high-risk areas and there are billions of dollars wasted 2624 every year. Billions. 2625 Mr. CLAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2626 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Clay. 2627 Mr. Van Hollen? 2628 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2629 Let me thank all the witnesses for their testimony 2630 today. 2631 Mr. Walker, I had some questions regarding the State 2632 Department's diplomatic security operations and the contracts 2633 they let under that, and I don't know to what extent GAO has 2634 done recent work in this area. I know you have looked at it 2635 in the past, but there is the Worldwide Personal Protective

Services Program and there are a number of firms that have

contracts under that overall umbrella, including DynCorp,

2636

2637

Triple Canopy, and Blackwater.

And there were some press reports back over the last summer that suggested that some audits had found some major discrepancies in terms of the amounts of monies paid for and not being able to track the costs that those were allocated to. I don't know how familiar you may be with those, and I wondered if you could--

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to try to go back and find out what we have done and provide something for the record. I am not familiar to be able to talk about it now. I will tell you that we are using contractors in new and unprecedented ways, including with regard to security arrangements. I mean, if one goes--and I am sure you have been, I have been a couple of times--to Iraq and in the Green Zone, you see a lot of private contractors basically responsible for security, including around where we currently have our ambassador, which is not normally what you would see when you go to a U.S. embassy elsewhere in the world.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Right. That used to be a function carried out by the Marines or other U.S. official members of the armed forces.

Mr. WALKER. Well, but obviously our presence is much larger there; we have got a lot of contractors, we have got troops there. But let's just say that there has been a blurring of the roles and responsibilities, and part of that

is because we don't have enough in-strength, we don't have enough boots on the ground to do some of the things that need to get done.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Does GAO have an estimate of how many so-called private soldiers are over there, people who are not members of the armed services but have responsibilities for security?

Mr. WALKER. We don't, and, frankly, that is one of the problems, is that nobody is really responsible and accountable for maintaining some type of control over how many contractors we have, what are they doing, what are the contracting arrangements, etc.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Okay. I am going to ask you to look into there were some press reports about a contract that was let under the Worldwide Personal Protective Services contract of the State Department, one to Blackwater, where they were, under the original contract, to be paid about \$229 million over five years. And yet, as of June 30th last year, according to a highly redacted audit statement that we have, they were actually paid an additional \$100 million under that contract, and I am interested in what the additional \$100 million was spent on. And if you can comment on that now, great; otherwise, we will make sure you get this information.

Mr. WALKER. I will try to get some more details, but it is my understanding that contractors do provide security for

2688 our ambassador and certain other State Department personnel 2689 in Iraq.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. No, as you say, I have been there too and, you are right, when you get escorted from the airport and others, you often have private security.

Mr. WALKER. Right.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. And it is an overall policy question as to what extent we should rely on those individuals.

Mr. WALKER. I agree.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. And then there is the separate question, of course, when you do provide these contracts to provide for private security, whether or not the taxpayer is getting what it paid for, whether there are problems with the contract.

Mr. WALKER. Value for money, right.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. So there is a particular contract here that I would ask you to take a look at going forward.

Mr. WALKER. I will go back and find out what we have done and will touch base with you. We also want to coordinate our efforts to make sure there is not duplication of effort as to what might be being done by other members of the accountability community, but we will get back to you, Mr. Van Hollen.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Okay. I don't know if either of the other witnesses want to testify. This is within the State Department, as I said, the Worldwide Personnel Protective

- 2713 | Services.
- 2714 Mr. WALKER. Well, we would want to talk to the State
- 2715 Department IG, for example, to find out what, if anything,
- 2716 the State Department IG has done on this.
- 2717 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Okay.
- 2718 Mr. REED. We have done work at DynCorp on some of their
- 2719 protective service contracts, not the one, unfortunately,
- 2720 that Mr. Bowen addressed earlier, but some of the earlier
- 2721 ones we have been doing contract audits.
- 2722 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Okay. Thank you.
- 2723 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 2724 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Van Hollen.
- I want to thank the three of you.
- 2726 Did you have anything further, Mr. Lynch?
- 2727 Mr. LYNCH. May I, Mr. Chairman? I just have one quick
- 2728 question.
- 2729 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman is recognized for one
- 2730 quick question.
- 2731 [Laughter.]
- 2732 Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- I know I have spoken to Mr. Bowen before on this. I
- 2734 have got enough experience in the construction industry to be
- 2735 dangerous, and I know that in the private sector in this
- 2736 Country we use a tool called critical path management, where
- 2737 you actually have a construction diagram, a blueprint, if you

will, of a project and it is all laid out what function has to go next, pouring concrete, erecting steel, and it has the whole project laid out in a blueprint so that anybody walking onto that job to do oversight, to find out whether the project is on schedule or over budget can basically look at that document and find out whether or not the project is on schedule and on budget.

Do they use anything like that in any of these--and this is a question that is certainly open to Mr. Walker and Mr. Reed. Do you use any tools like that that are required of these defense contractors and folks that are actually building these projects for us? Because, for us in the private sector in this Country, it offers an objective assessment of where the projects are at, and it is a great cost-containment tool. In my trips--I have been over there five times--I haven't been able to locate any documents that would help me make that type of assessment, and I just didn't know if you had access to those types of tools; critical path management, it basically lays out an accountability tool that you can track the projects on a case-by-case basis at a specific moment in time.

Mr. REED. We have not seen that in our review of quality assurance programs. The quality assurance burden is broader and it requires the government to ensure that the contractor has a quality control program. That is where that tool would

come into use if it were there. But as we have heard today, 2763 l 2764 the levels of subcontracting sometimes step down two or three steps beyond the prime, and that leads to a weakening of 2765 2766 oversight, an attenuation of insight, and has cost some 2767 waste. 2768 Mr. LYNCH. Okay. 2769 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back. Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you. Good question, Mr. Lynch. 2770 2771 I want to thank the three of you. You have been very 2772

helpful and I appreciate your testimony and look forward to continuing hearing from you and learning from you as to what accountability we are getting for the money that is being spent. Thank you.

That concludes our business. The meeting stands adjourned.

2773

2774

2775

2776

2777

2778

[Whereupon, at 12:37 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

STATEMENTS OF DAVID M. WALKER, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE; STUART W.
BOWEN, JR., SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR IRAQ
RECONSTRUCTION; WILLIAM H. REED, DIRECTOR, DEFENSE CONTRACT
AUDIT AGENCY
PAGE

	PAGE	29
STATEMENT OF DAVID M. WALKER		
	PAGE	29
STATEMENT OF WILLIAM H. REED		
	PAGE	34
STATEMENT OF STUART W. BOWEN, JR.		
	PAGE	38

PAGE

PAGE

21

23

**************************************	*****	******	*
***********	*****	*****	*
****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******			
	PAGE	3	
****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******			
	PAGE	6	
******* INSERT *******			
	PAGE	7	
****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******			
	PAGE	8	
******* INSERT *******			
	PAGE	12	
******* INSERT *******			
	PAGE	13	
****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******			
	PAGE	16	
****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******			
	PAGE	18	
****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******			
	PAGE	20	

****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

*******	INSERT *******		
		PAGE	24
******	COMMITTEE INSERT *******		
		PAGE	26
*******	INSERT *******		
		PAGE	33
*******	INSERT *******		
		PAGE	37
******	INSERT *******		
		PAGE	45