National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Office of Inspector General
Headquarters
Washington, D.C. 20546-0001

Reply to Attn of: W

June 24, 2002

TO: Distribution

FROM: W/Assistant Inspector General for Inspections and Assessments

SUBJECT: Review of Performance-Based Service Contract Quality Assurance Surveillance Plans, G-02-011, Final Report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Office of Inspector General (OIG) conducted an assessment of NASA's contract quality assurance surveillance activities under performance-based service contracts. Specifically, the assessment focused on the use of Quality Assurance Surveillance Plans (QASPs) as part of the contract surveillance function. Fieldwork for this inspection was conducted at Ames Research Center (Ames), Goddard Space Flight Center (Goddard), and Langley Research Center (Langley).

To facilitate effective contract surveillance, Federal procurement regulations require agencies to develop QASPs for all service contracts. A QASP, which directly corresponds to a contract's specified performance standards, is used to measure contractor performance and to ensure that the Government receives the quality of services called for under the contract and pays only for the acceptable level of services received. We found several weaknesses related to NASA's use of QASPs as part of the contract surveillance function.[1] Our findings demonstrate the need for improved development, content, and utilization of QASPs, more systematic and better documented contract surveillance, and an increased emphasis on refresher training for designated Contracting Officer's Technical Representatives (COTRs). NASA management concurred with our five recommendations intended to improve the Agency's administration of its service contracts, and has taken or plans appropriate corrective actions.

[1] Contract surveillance is a function of contract administration that involves utilizing a variety of insight and oversight methods to gauge contractor performance. The extent of contract surveillance is based on risk management.

BACKGROUND

The Government has a fiduciary responsibility to ensure that appropriated funds are spent prudently. Therefore, Federal procurement policy requires that agencies use performance-based contracting (PBC)[2] methods to the maximum extent practicable when acquiring services.[3] PBC methods are intended to ensure that required performance quality levels are achieved and that the Government's total payment is commensurate with the quality of services received. Performance-based service contracts (1) describe the requirements in terms of results required rather than methods of performing the work, (2) use measurable performance standards (e.g., terms of quality, timeliness, quantity), (3) specify procedures for reductions in fee and/or price for deficient services, and (4) include performance incentives where appropriate.

Effective Government contract surveillance, based on risk management, is an essential aspect of PBC and is necessary to ensure that funds are spent prudently. One of the basic tenets of PBC is that contractors assume increased accountability and responsibility for their processes and their performance. Accordingly, PBC methods emphasize Government contract surveillance through *insight* (versus *oversight*). In other words, Government contract surveillance for PBC contracts is primarily conducted through *insight* by monitoring selected performance metrics and/or milestones as opposed to traditional intense *oversight* methods requiring the Government's review and concurrence of contractor processes and decisions.

To facilitate effective contract surveillance, Federal procurement regulations require agencies to develop QASPs[4] for all service contracts.[5] A QASP, which directly corresponds to a contract's specified performance standards, is used to measure contractor performance and to ensure that the Government receives the quality of services called for under the contract and pays only for the acceptable level of services received. Because of PBC's emphasis on insight versus oversight, the effective utilization of QASPs is integral to the successful administration of performance-based service contracts.[6]

---

[2] Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 2.101 defines PBC as follows: "Performance-based contracting means structuring all aspects of an acquisition around the purpose of the work to be performed with the contract requirements set forth in clear, specific, and objective terms with measurable outcomes as opposed to either the manner by which the work is to be performed or broad and imprecise statements of work."

[3] The PBC preference for service contracts is set forth in FAR 37.102(a).

[4] The NASA technical office initiating a procurement action for required services is primarily responsible for developing all initial requirements documents, including the QASP. However, it is usually desirable to use an interdisciplinary team approach (including, as a minimum, technical and procurement representatives) in developing these documents. Regardless of which office initially develops the QASP, technical and procurement personnel share in the responsibility for maintaining the plan and ensuring that it is effectively utilized for contract administration.

[5] The requirement for QASPs for service contracts is set forth in FAR Subpart 37.6 and FAR 46.103.

[6] QASPs are also a major element of the cost comparison process as described in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Handbook for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-76, *Performance of Commercial*

We found several weaknesses related to NASA's use of QASPs as part of the contract surveillance function. These weaknesses could have a detrimental impact on the effectiveness of the Agency's administration of its service contracts. Our findings demonstrate the need for improved development, content, and utilization of QASPs, more systematic and better documented contract surveillance, and an increased emphasis on refresher training for designated Contracting Officer's Technical Representatives (COTRs).

I. NEED FOR IMPROVED DEVELOPMENT, CONTENT, AND UTILIZATION OF QASPS

We found that the development, content, and utilization of QASPs for NASA contracts could be significantly improved. Specifically, we found several weaknesses such as required plans not being developed, plans in place that are deficient in terms of content, and plans that are not being effectively utilized. In addition, for many of the contracts reviewed, we found a lack of documentation that would demonstrate that contract surveillance is being conducted systematically and consistently with the respective QASPs.

A. QASPs Need to be Developed for All Service Contracts

FAR 37.602-2, *Quality Assurance*, states that "Agencies shall develop quality assurance surveillance plans when acquiring services." However, we found that plans were not developed for a significant percentage of sampled performance-based service contracts. Specifically, plans were not developed for 15 (approximately 36%) of the 42 contracts reviewed.[7]

Our interviews with the responsible NASA Contracting Officers (COs) and COTRs indicated that there is considerable confusion pertaining to the requirements for developing and utilizing QASPs for service contracts. When these individuals were asked why a plan was not developed for those particular contracts lacking plans, the various responses indicated misconceptions that plans are not required or necessary in the following circumstances:

- Award fee contracts
- Research & Development (R&D) contracts
- Contracts where the services are performed off-site
- Small dollar value contracts
- Contracts with small business contractors

Activities. This Circular establishes Federal policy for the performance of recurring commercial activities and provides guidance and procedures for determining whether recurring commercial activities should be operated under contract with commercial sources, in-house using Government facilities and personnel, or through interservice support agreements. This inspection focuses on the use of QASPs as a contract administration tool, apart from any commercial activities cost comparison considerations addressed in the Circular.

[7] All 15 sampled contracts for which the required QASPs were not developed were from Goddard and Langley (all contracts sampled at Ames had QASPs in place).

- Contracts where the contractor has an established internal quality control plan

However, contrary to these misconceptions, plans must be developed and utilized for all service contracts.[8]

Due to the apparent lack of awareness or misinterpretation of the regulations regarding this requirement, QASPs are not being implemented for all service contracts. Without the required plans, which are intended to serve as essential contract administration tools, the Government has limited assurance that it is receiving the quality of services called for under these contracts and is paying only for the acceptable level of services received. Accountability and insight also suffer since the Government does not have a clear and documented approach for how contract surveillance is conducted.

B. Need for Improved QASP Content

The FAR specifically addresses the utilization and content of QASPs. FAR 37.602-2, *Quality Assurance*, states:

> These plans shall recognize the responsibility of the contractor (see 46.105) to carry out its quality control obligations and shall contain measurable inspection and acceptance criteria corresponding to the performance standards contained in the statement of work. The quality assurance surveillance plans shall focus on the level of performance required by the statement of work, rather than the methodology used by the contractor to achieve that level of performance.

Furthermore, FAR 46.401(a) states that QASPs should specify all work requiring surveillance and the method of surveillance.

In addition to regulatory guidance, the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) published its *Best Practices Guide for Performance-Based Service Contracting* (Best Practices Guide) in October 1998. Chapter 5 of this guide provides additional information related to the effective development and utilization of QASPs in the administration of performance-based service contracts.

In general, we found that many of the plans reviewed appeared to be "boilerplate" documents that were vague and ambiguous. These plans contained little, if any, meaningful information regarding the specific performance requirements, corresponding criteria, or surveillance methods for the respective contracts. We also found that the majority of plans were deficient in that they did not address all of the required elements specified in the FAR and the recommended guidelines provided in the OFPP Best Practices Guide. For example, 20 of the

[8] Naturally, the scope, level of detail, and contract surveillance methods in a given QASP will vary depending on several factors (e.g., type of contract, complexity and criticality of services, location of services, performance requirements and standards).

27 plans reviewed (approximately 74%) did not recognize the contractor's responsibility to carry out its quality control obligations and 17 of the 27 plans reviewed (approximately 63%) did not clearly specify the work requiring surveillance and the particular methods utilized to conduct surveillance as required by the FAR.

A QASP that is overly general, or is otherwise deficient, is of minimal value as a contract administration tool. To facilitate effective administration of service contracts, it is essential that QASPs be well thought out, address all elements required by the FAR, and are tailored to reflect the specific services and surveillance considerations under the respective contracts.

C. Need for Improved Utilization of QASPs

To maximize its benefit and effectiveness as a contract administration tool, a QASP is intended to be used as a living document.[9] A QASP should be prepared in conjunction with the contract work statement. After contract award, the QASP must be revised to address the specific approach used by the selected contractor and the risks associated with that unique approach. Finally, the plan should be periodically reviewed by the CO and COTR throughout contract performance, and updated as substantive changes to the contract requirements, performance, or contract surveillance approaches occur.

We found that QASPs were not developed in conjunction with the respective work statements for the vast majority of the contracts reviewed. While some QASPs were established shortly after contract award, the majority of plans were not put into place until well after contract award (in several cases, plans were not developed until a year or more after award). In addition, none of the QASPs for the 9 contracts reviewed that had substantive changes (e.g., significant work scope revisions, changes in contract type) were updated to reflect the impact of those changes. Only 1 COTR indicated that she makes a point of periodically reviewing and updating the QASP to ensure that it continues to accurately reflect the current scope of contracted services and the associated surveillance considerations.

A QASP that is not maintained and utilized as a living document is of limited value as a contract administration tool. Plans that are not periodically reviewed and updated may become obsolete and no longer reflect the current scope of services and associated surveillance considerations for the respective contracts. As a result, the Government has less assurance that surveillance activities conducted are sufficient to ensure that the Government receives the quality of services called for and pays only for the acceptable level of services received.

D. Need for More Systematic and Better Documented Contract Surveillance

While the QASP provides the general framework for how contract surveillance will be conducted for a particular contract, the actual surveillance activities performed in accordance

[9] Regulatory guidance pertaining to establishing and updating QASPs is set forth in FAR 46.401 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1846.401.

with the plan provide the Government with necessary information to determine if services received conform to contract requirements. Therefore, in order for contract surveillance to be effective, it must be conducted systematically as described in the QASP and should be well documented. The OFPP Best Practices Guide emphasizes this point by stating "Surveillance must be performed as stated in the QA[S]P" and "Surveillance should be comprehensive, systematic, and well documented." The guide also provides suggested approaches for effectively conducting and documenting surveillance, such as through use of a surveillance checklist (a sample surveillance checklist is included in the guide).

We found a few excellent examples of systematic and well-documented contract surveillance being conducted at all three Centers. For example, some COTRs had implemented automated contract surveillance systems, as described in the respective QASPs, using secure Internet sites to collect, track, and share surveillance and performance data. These systems give COs, COTRs, task monitors, and quality assurance evaluators complete access to all surveillance data for the particular contract. We also found that several COTRs routinely keep detailed notes, records, and other documentation related to the surveillance activities performed under their respective contracts.

However, systematic and well-documented contract surveillance appeared to be the exception rather than the rule. Although we found that there was some level of surveillance conducted for all contracts reviewed,[10] in most cases the contract surveillance activities were not conducted systematically and were not well documented. Rather, contract surveillance activities were generally done informally on an ad-hoc basis. Also, for those contracts that had QASPs in place, the surveillance activities were not necessarily conducted as described in the respective plans.

The lack of systematic and well-documented contract surveillance is a particular area of concern under PBC contracts, for which the contractor assumes more responsibility and greater risk in exchange for more flexibility and less Government involvement in contract activities. Although the Government has a more limited role under PBC contracts, it still has a responsibility to monitor the contractor's performance and ensure that the contractor is performing in accordance with the contract. Without systematic contract surveillance being conducted and documented, the Government is unlikely to have sufficient information to assess how the contractor is performing. As a result, the Government has limited assurance that contract requirements are being met and that it is paying only for the acceptable level of services received.

Recommendation 1: The NASA Headquarters Office of Procurement should collaborate with the necessary NASA Headquarters technical offices to issue formal guidance regarding the critical quality assurance surveillance function. This guidance, in the form of a Procurement Information Circular (PIC) or other appropriate vehicle, should remind all Agency technical and procurement personnel of the regulatory requirements and Agency policies regarding the implementation and utilization of QASPs for service contracts.

[10] We also noted that all contracts reviewed did include the required applicable inspection clauses, which ensure the Government's right to inspect the services provided under the contract.

Recommendation 2: The NASA Headquarters Office of Procurement should review the existing NFS language regarding the implementation and utilization of QASPs for service contracts and revise it as necessary to further clarify the Agency's policies and provide additional guidance in this area.

II. NEED FOR MORE CURRENT COTR TRAINING FOR DESIGNATED COTRS

The critical issue of acquisition workforce training has recently been given significant attention across Government.[11] Adequate training of Government representatives responsible for awarding and administering contracts is essential to ensure that the Government meets its fiduciary responsibilities to U.S. taxpayers.

COTRs must have current training, including the contract surveillance function and the development and utilization of QASPs, in order to effectively perform their contract surveillance responsibilities as part of the administration of PBC service contracts. However, of the 23 contracts reviewed at Langley and Ames, we found that 8 designated COTRs (approximately 35%) have not completed any COTR training within the last 5 years.[12] This constitutes a contract administration vulnerability, especially considering the dynamic nature of the federal procurement environment during the last several years.

The NASA Assistant Administrator for Procurement recently expressed his concern over the need for COTR refresher training in a memorandum to all Agency Procurement Officers dated September 13, 2001 (See Appendix A). In this memorandum, he indicated that he would like each Center procurement office to pursue refresher training for COTRs. Specifically, the memorandum states:

> This effort should be tailored to the needs of your Center, but at a minimum, refresher training should be given to those COTRs for whom it has been more than five (5) years since they received comprehensive training.

This guidance was issued informally via a memorandum, rather than through a PIC or other formal policy, in order to leave the implementation of COTR training to the discretion of each NASA Center.

An Agency-wide contract for COTR training was recently awarded by the Glenn Research Center to meet the Agency's COTR training needs. This contract offers both basic and refresher COTR training courses and is intended to ensure consistency in the content of

[11] The U.S. General Accounting Office is currently examining agency funding and budgeting processes as part of a review of acquisition workforce training and it expects to report back to Congress later this year on the results of its review.

[12] Goddard's procurement training coordinator does not currently maintain centralized records indicating the dates that specific individuals completed COTR training. However, our interviews with the designated COTRs at Goddard indicated that the majority had not had any type of COTR training within the last five years.

COTR training across the Agency. However, NASA training officials indicated that unlike typical procurement training, which is funded through NASA's Agency-wide procurement-training budget, COTR training must be funded out of the respective Center budgets. The limited availability of training funds at the respective Centers makes it difficult for Center training officials to ensure that all COTRs receive the necessary refresher training. Without a consistent Agency-wide emphasis on critical COTR training, the overall training and effectiveness of designated NASA COTRs may fluctuate from Center to Center.

Recommendation 3: The Ames, Goddard and Langley Center Directors, in conjunction with the respective Center training officials, should ensure that sufficient funding is made available to support critical COTR training, including necessary refresher training.

Recommendation 4: The Ames, Goddard and Langley Center Directors, in conjunction with respective center training officials, should track COTR training completion dates for all current and prospective COTRs and continue to ensure that all designated COTRs lacking recent (i.e., within the last 5 years) COTR training complete refresher training as soon as possible.

Recommendation 5: All Ames, Goddard and Langley training officials responsible for coordinating COTR training should review the training materials from their respective training providers to ensure that there is sufficient emphasis regarding the contract surveillance function. Specifically, the training should address COTR surveillance responsibilities and the effective implementation and utilization of QASPs as essential contract administration tools.

SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF NASA MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

NASA management concurred with the five recommendations and has taken or plans appropriate corrective actions. Management completed corrective action for recommendation 2, and we consider this recommendation closed. We consider the remaining four recommendations resolved pending verification of corrective actions.

In its response, NASA management made the following general comment:

> Furthermore, it is heartening that this review did not find a single instance of substandard or improper contract management by Contracting Officers or by Contracting Officer's Technical Representatives. Moreover, we are pleased that no areas of ineffective contract surveillance were observed in the report.

As detailed in the report, we did identify several weaknesses related to contract administration such as required plans not being developed for a significant percentage of sampled contracts and the need for more effective utilization of existing plans. Also, in reference to

management's statement that we did not observe any areas of ineffective contract surveillance, it should be noted that our review was limited in scope to NASA's use of QASPs as part of the overall contract surveillance function. Accordingly, we did not examine the adequacy of the specific surveillance methodologies used, or the overall effectiveness of the surveillance activities being conducted.

CONCLUSION

Contract surveillance, including the use of QASPs, is a critical element in the effective administration of performance-based service contracts. We found several weaknesses related to NASA's use of QASPs as part of the contract surveillance function. These weaknesses could have a detrimental impact on the Agency's ability to ensure that it receives the quality of services called for under its contracts and pays only for the acceptable level of services received.

Our findings demonstrate the need for improved development, content, and utilization of QASPs, more systematic and better documented contract surveillance, and an increased emphasis on refresher training for designated COTRs. We believe the recommendations in this report will improve NASA's contract surveillance and overall administration of performance-based service contracts. We will conduct follow up activities relating to this issue as necessary.

[original signed by]

David M. Cushing

4 Enclosures:
Appendix A: Memorandum From NASA's Assistant Administrator for Procurement to Center Procurement Officers Regarding COTR Refresher Training
Appendix B: NASA Management Response
Appendix C: Report Distribution
NASA Office of Inspector General Reader Survey

Distribution:
H/Mr. Luedtke
ARC/220-1/Dr. McDonald
GSFC/100.0/Mr. Diaz
LaRC/106/Mr. Freeman

MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS REPORT

Theresa Becker, Procurement Analyst (team leader)
Joseph Kroener, Procurement Analyst

Appendix A

Memorandum From NASA's Assistant Administrator for Procurement to Center Procurement Officers Regarding COTR Refresher Training

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
Headquarters
Washington, DC 20546-0001

SEP 13 2001

Reply to Attn of: HK

TO: Procurement Officers

FROM: H/Associate Administrator for Procurement

SUBJECT: Refresher Training for Contracting Officers' Technical Representatives (COTR)

Since 1994, NASA has had a training program for COTRs. It has been a major success in standardizing and improving contract management processes. But a long time has passed since many COTRs received their required instruction. Since inception of the COTR training program, innovative acquisition and contract management methods and techniques have been introduced or refined.

Examples of new material include the following: Risk Based Acquisition Management (RBAM) introduced performance surveillance requirements that are coupled to NPG 7120.5 management processes. RBAM was introduced by PN 97-46 in June 2000, and NPG 8735.2 "Management of Government Safety and Mission Assurance Surveillance Functions for NASA Contracts", was issued on August 15, 2000. In October 2000, "Performance Based Task and Delivery Order Contracts", PIC 00-24, was issued. Also, reviews have discovered a need to reemphasize basic principles such as avoidance of personal services contracting (PIC 01-03, February 21, 2001). Now, undefinitized contract actions (UCA) are a focus of management attention and new guidance will soon be issued. All of these are pertinent to COTR training and should be presented to all COTRs.

Several Centers have already initiated COTR refresher training. I would like each Center procurement office to pursue refresher training for COTRs. This effort should be tailored to the needs of your Center, but as a minimum, refresher training should be give to those COTRs for whom it has been more than five (5) years since they received comprehensive training.

In Code H, Patrick Flynn (202) 358-0460, is the point of contact and he is available to discuss a range of available options on the Internet.

Thomas S. Luedtke

Appendix B

NASA Management Response

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
Headquarters
Washington, DC 20546-0001

June 12, 2002

Reply to Attn of: HK

TO: W/Assistant Inspector General for Inspections & Assessments

FROM: HK/Director, Contract Management Division

SUBJECT: Agency Response to OIG Draft Report of Performance-Based Service Contract Quality Assurance Surveillance Plans, G-02-011

Enclosed is our response to the subject draft report dated May 22, 2002.

Please call Jeff Cullen at 202-358-1784 or Louis Becker at 202-358-4593 if you have any questions or need further coordination on this matter.

Scott Thompson

Enclosure

General Comment: We are pleased to comment on the administrative findings contained in this report, and welcome the opportunity to have an external evaluation of our policies and procedures. Furthermore, it is heartening that this review did not find a single instance of substandard or improper contract management by Contracting Officers or by Contracting Officer's Technical Representatives. Moreover, we are pleased that no areas of ineffective contract surveillance were observed in the report.

Recommendation 1: The NASA Headquarters Office of Procurement should collaborate with the necessary NASA Headquarters technical offices to issue formal guidance regarding the critical quality assurance surveillance function. This guidance, in the form of a Procurement Information Circular (PIC) or other appropriate vehicle, should remind all Agency technical and procurement personnel of the regulatory requirements and procurement personnel of the regulatory requirements and Agency policies regarding the implementation and utilization of QASPs for service contracts.

Response:

Concur.

- Over the last 18 months, an activity to analyze surveillance plan guidance was held, with participants from GSFC, JSC, KSC, MSFC, MSFC and Codes AE, H, M, Q, and Y. After a comprehensive review of surveillance plan guidance, a draft NPG 7120.xx document, "NASA Surveillance Procedures and Guidelines," sponsored by the Office of the Chief Engineer was developed. This provides guidance for the planning, coordination, conduct, and communication of NASA surveillance. It is anticipated this draft will be published shortly on NODIS for comment.
- In addition, the NASA Headquarters Office of Procurement will issue a PIC by October 31, 2002 to reiterate surveillance requirements, among them the technical office responsibility to prescribe and provide to the Contracting Office contract quality requirements, including Government Quality Assurance Surveillance Plans.

Recommendation 2: The NASA Headquarters Office of Procurement should review the existing NFS language regarding the implementation and utilization of QASPs for service contracts and revise it if necessary to further clarify the Agency's policies and provide additional guidance in this area.

Response:

Concur.

- The existing FAR and NFS language was reviewed and is adequate, as it clearly spells out the technical office requirements to develop and implement quality assurance surveillance plans and provide the results to contracting offices; and for

contracting officers to utilize the surveillance results in contract administration. The Office of Procurement considers this recommendation closed.

Recommendation 3: The Ames, Goddard and Langley Center Directors, in conjunction with respective center training officials, should ensure that sufficient funding is made available to support critical COTR training, including necessary refresher training.

Response: Concur. The Ames, Goddard and Langley Procurement Offices are working with their respective training officers to ensure that funding for the training is available.

Recommendation 4: The Ames, Goddard and Langley Center Directors, in conjunction with respective center training officials, should track COTR training completion dates for all current and prospective COTRs and continue to ensure that all designated COTRs lacking recent (i.e., within the last 5 years) COTR training complete refresher training as soon as possible.

Response: Concur.

- ARC has a system for tracking COTR training that allows them to determine when refresher training is required, and will notify all COTRs requiring refresher training when the training is scheduled.
- GSFC is in the process of updating the GSFC and HQ database to record the completion dates for all COTR training taken. They anticipate completing the database by August 1, 2002, and estimate that a majority of COTRs will need refresher training. They plan to advertise the requirement for refresher training in July and offer numerous COTR refresher classes throughout fiscal year 2003.
- LaRC has created a database of current COTRs and their training dates, and has identified those that need refresher training.

Recommendation 5: All Ames, Goddard and Langley training officials responsible for coordinating COTR training should review the training materials from their respective training providers to ensure that there is sufficient emphasis regarding the contract surveillance function. Specifically, the training should address COTR surveillance responsibilities and the effective implementation and utilization of QASPs as essential contract management tools.

Response: Concur.

Ames, Goddard and Langley all plan to use the agency-wide contract awarded by GRC for COTR training and refresher training.

Ames states that the GRC contract statement of work identifies surveillance plans as a required area for training and that they will work with the instructor, in accordance with the terms of the contract, to ensure this area receives adequate coverage. Goddard has requested the class material from GRC to review. Langley states that the GRC contract

includes appropriate and sufficient emphasis on contract surveillance functions and utilization of QASPs as administration tools.

Appendix C

Report Distribution

Distribution

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Officials-In-Charge:

A/Administrator
AI/Associate Deputy Administrator
B/Chief Financial Officer
F/Assistant Administrator for Human Resources & Education
G/General Counsel
H/Assistant Administrator for Procurement
J/Assistant Administrator for Management Systems
JM/Director, Management Assessment Division
L/Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs
M/Associate Administrator for Space Flight
P/Assistant Administrator for Public Affairs
Q/Associate Administrator for Safety & Mission Assurance
R/Associate Administrator for Aerospace Technology
S/Associate Administrator for Space Science
SJ/Director, NASA Management Office
Y/Associate Administrator for Earth Science
Director/Dryden Flight Research Center
Director/Glenn Research Center at Lewis Field
Director/Jet Propulsion Laboratory
Director/Johnson Space Center
Director/Kennedy Space Center
Director/Marshall Space Flight Center
Director/Stennis Space Center

NASA Advisory Officials:

Chairman, NASA Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel
Chairman, NASA Advisory Committee

Non-NASA Federal Organizations and Individuals:

Assistant to the President for Science and Technology Policy
Deputy Associate Director, Energy and Science Division, Office of Management and Budget
Budget Examiner, Energy Science Division, Office of Management and Budget
Associate Director, National Security and International Affairs Division, General Accounting Office
Professional Assistant, Senate Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space

Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of each of the following Congressional Committees and Subcommittees:

Senate Committee on Appropriations
Senate Subcommittee on VA-HUD-Independent Agencies
Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation
Senate Subcommittee on Science, Technology and Space
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
House Committee on Appropriations
House Subcommittee on VA-HUD-Independent Agencies
House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
House Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice
House Committee on Science
House Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics

Congressional Member:

Honorable Pete Sessions, U.S. House of Representatives

Public Distribution:

NASA Office of Inspector General Internet Site:
http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/oig/hq/inspections/closed.html