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SUBJECT: Report on Project Assessment of the Nassriya Prison Expansion, Nassriya, Iraq (Report Number SIGIR PA-08-123)

The Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction is assessing projects funded by the International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement fund to provide real-time relief and reconstruction information to interested parties to enable appropriate action, when warranted.

This report is being provided for your information and use. It addresses the current status of construction of the Nassriya Prison Expansion, Nassriya, Iraq and whether intended objectives will be achieved.

This report does not contain any negative findings or recommendations for corrective action. As a result, management comments are not required. We did receive comments on a draft of this report from the Gulf Region Division of the United States Army Corps of Engineers which generally agreed with the facts and conclusion in the report and provided technical clarifying information for this final report.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to our staff. If you have any questions please contact Mr. Brian Flynn at brian.flynn@iraq.centcom.mil or at DSN 318-343-9244. For congressional or public affairs queries concerning this report, please contact SIGIR Congressional and Public Affairs at publicaffairs@sigir.mil or at 703-428-1100.

Stuart W. Bowen, Jr.
Inspector General
Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction

SIGIR PA-08-123

Nassriya Prison Expansion, Nassriya, Iraq

Synopsis

Introduction. This project assessment was initiated as part of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction’s continuing assessments of selected activities funded by the International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement fund. This project assessment was conducted in accordance with the Quality Standards for Inspections issued by the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency. The assessment team included a professional engineer/inspector and an auditor/inspector.

Project Objective. The overall objective of this project was to increase the bed count of the Iraqi Corrections Service for the Ministry of Justice through the construction of additional structures. Based on the Scope of Work, the objective of the project was to design and construct Phase II of the maximum/medium security prison facility located in the central region of Iraq. Phase II’s specific objective included the construction of an additional medium security building, which would house 400 inmates, an accompanying visitation building, site work, utility connections, and all appropriate security structures complete with all furniture, fixtures, equipment, and buildings ready for sustained operation.

Project Assessment Objectives. The objective of this project assessment was to provide real-time relief and reconstruction project information to interested parties to enable appropriate action, when warranted. Specifically, SIGIR determined:

1. Were the project components adequately designed before construction or installation?
2. Did the construction or rehabilitation meet the standards of the design?
3. Are quality management programs being used adequately?
4. Was the sustainability of the project addressed?
5. Were the project results consistent with the original objectives?

Conclusions. The assessment determined that:

1. The design package appeared to be complete and sufficiently detailed to construct the Nassriya Prison Facility Phase II. SIGIR’s review found that the design concept and parameters used for the facility and utilities were satisfactory. The Phase II project, if constructed in accordance with the approved design and specifications, should produce a useable inmate building. Additionally, the design considered the architectural compatibility of the prison facilities and considered future plans for prison expansion.

2. The project to date comprises the construction of the reinforced concrete foundations, columns, beams, and walls. The foundations and the load-bearing frame appear to be constructed to contract specifications. If current levels of workmanship are continued in accordance with the design and specifications, the project should result in a fully functional prison for the Iraqi Ministry of Justice.
3. The contractor’s quality control plan was sufficiently detailed to effectively guide the contractor’s quality management program. Further, the contractor’s daily quality control reports contained the required project and work activity information to document construction progress and identify problems and required corrective action. The contractor maintained nonconformance reports to document problems noted with construction/renovation activities.

The government quality assurance program was effective in monitoring the contractor’s quality control program. The quality assurance team ensured that deficiencies cited during quality assurance inspections were corrected. The quality assurance team also maintained daily quality assurance reports that contained project-specific information to document construction progress and highlight deficiencies. The quality assurance team also supplemented the daily reports with detailed photographs that reinforced the narrative information provided in the reports.

4. The contract requirements addressed the sustainability of the project. The contract required the contractor to provide and certify the warranties for all equipment, which includes any mechanical, electrical and/or electronic devices, and all operations for 12 months after the issuance of the Taking-Over-Certificate.

5. To date, the Nassriya Prison Expansion design and construction have been consistent with the contract objectives. If the current quality of construction and effective project management continues, an inmate housing unit with a 400-bed capacity will be completed. The Nassriya Prison Expansion project should result in a functional and modern prison.

**Recommendations and Management Comments.** This report does not contain any negative findings or recommendations for corrective action. As a result, management comments are not required. SIGIR did receive comments on a draft of this report from the Gulf Region Division of the United States Army Corps of Engineers which generally agreed with the facts and conclusion in the report and provided technical clarifying information for this final report.
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Introduction

Objective of the Project Assessment

The objective of this project assessment was to provide real-time relief and reconstruction project information to interested parties to enable appropriate action, when warranted. Specifically, we determined whether:

1. Project components were adequately designed prior to construction or installation;
2. Construction or rehabilitation met the standards of the design;
3. Quality management programs are being utilized adequately;
4. Project sustainability was addressed; and
5. Project results were consistent with original objectives.

Pre-Site Assessment Background

Contract, Task Order and Costs

The Nassriya Prison Facility, Phase II, project was initiated under Contract W917BK-07-C-0033, dated 23 May 2007, a firm-fixed price construction contract in the amount of $6,244,542. The contract was between the Gulf Region Division (GRD) – Southern District (GRS) and a local contractor. After receiving the Notice to Proceed, the contractor was to complete construction within 450 calendar days.

There was one modification to the contract. Modification P00001, issued 7 March 2008, increased the cost of the contract in the amount of $18,500 to $6,263,042. The modification required the contractor to move the materials that were stored in a location where Phase II construction was scheduled to begin to an alternate location inside the prison grounds.

Project Objective

The overall objective of this project was to increase the overall bed count of the Iraqi Corrections Service for the Ministry of Justice through the construction of additional structures. Based on the Scope of Work, the objective of the project was to design and construct Phase II of the maximum/medium security prison facility located in the central region of Iraq. Phase II’s specific objective included the construction of an additional medium security building, which would house 400 inmates, an accompanying visitation building, site work, utility connections, and all appropriate security structures complete with all furniture, fixtures, equipment, and buildings ready for sustained operation.

Description of the Facility (preconstruction)

The description of the facility (preconstruction) was based on information obtained from the contract and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) - GRS project file. The prison site is a 26-acre facility located in the Thi Qar Governorate, approximately 10 kilometers southwest of the City of Nassriya and several kilometers south of the Euphrates River, in a sparsely populated area of the
governorate. Under Phase I\(^1\), there were two maximum security buildings, which will house approximately 400 inmates per building, constructed with visitor control buildings attached. Additionally, under the Phase I contract the medical, laundry/kitchen, maintenance, administration, and prayer buildings were constructed. Aerial Image 1 shows the existing prison facility structures. Utilities were provided to the prison site in Phase I, which included the design and construction of an on-site electrical power generation plant, a water treatment plant, and a package wastewater treatment facility.

Scope of Work of the Contract

The contract’s Scope of Work for the project required the contractor to design, build, and commission a new maximum security building to house 400 inmates. Phase II consisted of design and construction of the following:

- maximum security unit (1 @ 400 inmate capacity)
- visitation center
- control station and site security management building
- fences and security lighting
- potable water network
- sewage collection system

\(^1\) Phase 1 was the original contract for the Nassriya Prison Facility. Refer to SIGIR Project Assessment reports PA-06-054 and PA-08-131 for a review of the Nassriya Prison Facility history.
Phase II, located within the prison site, consisted of an area of approximately 9,794 square meters ($m^2$) (Figure 1).

**Current Project Design and Specifications**

The contract’s Scope of Work included a requirement that the government provide the contractor with a set of contract drawings and specifications. The contractor was to review all drawings furnished, compare the drawings and verify the figures before laying out the work, and notify the contracting officer of any discrepancies. The contractor was also to carry out the intent of the drawings and specifications even in the event of omissions or improperly described details of the work.

In addition, the contract required conformance to the Iraqi building codes and with the final design. The contract also required that all equipment and systems in the facilities that required certification for operation (boilers, chillers, fire protection, sewer and water treatment, etc.) be certified. The specifications required conformance to the following codes and standards for the design and construction:

- International Building Code (IBC)
- International Plumbing Code (IPC)
- International Mechanical Code (IMC)
- International Fire Code (IFC)
- International Electromechanical Commission (IEC)
- National Fire Protection Agency (NFPA)
- Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractor’s National Association (SMACNA)
- American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM)
- American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME)
American Society of Heating Refrigerating and Air conditioning Engineers, Standard 52 (ASHRAE 52).

The USACE provided SIGIR with copies of the prison project designs and specifications provided to the contractor. The designs included drawings used for prison construction; which consisted of civil and site utilities, architectural, electrical, mechanical, plumbing, and structural drawings. In addition, the USACE also provided the project’s specifications prepared in the Construction Specifications Institute format.

SIGIR’s review of the design drawings and specifications also considered the contract requirements, as well as discussions with the USACE officer-in-charge. The overall design took into consideration the sequencing of work and the local availability of materials and labor skills. Based on our review of the drawings and specifications, they appear to be complete and consistent with the contract’s requirements.

Site Assessment

On 20 February 2008, SIGIR performed an on-site assessment of the Nassriya Prison Facility project, Phase II. We were accompanied by the USACE officer-in-charge. According to the Iraq Reconstruction Management System database and the USACE engineer, the Phase II project was currently 17 percent complete. On the day of the site visit, the contractor had multiple crews working at the building sites throughout the prison facility.

Work Completed

No significant work elements were completed prior to the site visit for Phase II of the Nassriya Prison Facility project.

Work in Progress

During the site visit, SIGIR observed significant work underway in the Phase II construction area. The inmate housing unit was under construction at the time of the site assessment. The building design required a reinforced concrete frame, “X” shaped structure in-filled with reinforced concrete block walls (Figure 2). The four wings of each housing unit were designed to contain two floors of inmate cells, with 26 cells upstairs and 24 cells downstairs in each of the four wings for a total of 200 cells per building. We observed considerable construction activities on the inmate housing unit. Although the structural frame (foundations, beams, columns, and floor slabs) was not complete and forms were in place in preparation for additional pours, we did not observe any concrete being poured.
Construction work was ongoing for the installed reinforced concrete frame and foundations (Site Photo 1). According to the USACE officer-in-charge, the building was scheduled to be poured monolithically. (A monolithic pour is a combined pour all at once.) The wall design for a single pour was rejected and the use of the original Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU) will be required. Some of the columns had been poured and the quality of workmanship for the reinforcement installation, the formwork, and the concrete appeared satisfactory and were in conformance with the drawings (Site Photo 2).
The USACE officer-in-charge noted that the contractor monitored the bearing capacities of the soil and compressive strength of concrete using the recommended
testing. Also, the USACE officer-in-charge noted that the bearing capacity analysis from soil boring confirmed that soils for Phase I and Phase II areas of development were homogenous, and as such, the foundation sizes and depth could be similar for the two phases.

Site Photo 3 shows one of the wings under construction and the concrete columns curing underneath burlap. The exterior block wall design required a cavity wall consisting of an inner 200 millimeter (mm) block (single block-width wall), horizontally and vertically reinforced and anchored to an outer 100-mm block wall. Within the cavity, between the walls, the design called for 50-mm of insulation board and a finish coating of cement plaster and paint on the interior and exterior side of the wall.

The foundations observed during the site inspection were a mix of isolated footings and continuous footings supporting columns of the reinforced concrete frame. According to a soil investigation report dated April 2005, soil boring and analysis established that the bearing capacity of the soil was 75 kilonewton per meter (kN/m) (Kilonewton per meter is a measure of force length). Though the site visit was brief, the foundation appeared built to the right dimensions as a result of adequate project supervision.

Per the design documents, the foundations at the inmate facility were continuous footing typically 500-mm in depth. The footing was between 1400-mm and 3000-mm wide, running underneath a column. For sections bearing the 200-mm reinforced concrete wall, the continuous foundation has a width of 600-mm. The foundation typically is underlain by 50-mm of lean concrete of strength 7 kilonewton per square meter (kN/m²) over a well compacted sub base (Kilo-Newton per square
meter is a measure of force per unit area). Reinforcement diameters were 16 and 12-mm. The minimum distance from the ground level to the bottom of the foundation is 1000-mm. SIGIR observed that the contractor placed the polyethylene vapor barrier between the compacted fill in anticipation for the ground floor slab.

Each inmate cell is designed for two persons with a sink, an eastern style toilet, a shower, and two beds consisting of a 750-mm by 1800-mm concrete pad on the cell floor as one bed and the other, a wall mounted 750-mm x 1800-mm steel bed frame. The design also required an exercise area at the end of each wing, partially covered with a pre-engineered metal roof structure. Plumbing work had not started yet, so we did not observe any interior finishes within the cells. Additionally, on the ground floor in each of the two inmate housing units, the contractor was still preparing the site prior to pouring a 150-mm reinforced concrete floor slab. Site Photo 4 shows the ground floor soil base prior to the construction of the concrete floor slab.

Site Photo 4. Core area of inmate housing

The four wings of each inmate housing unit were connected to a central core area located on the ground level (Figure 3). The central core area contained a control room and control stations for each wing, a medical office, a pharmacy, as well as rooms for a barber shop, and a commissary for prisoners. At the time of our site visit, the work in this area involved preparing the soil base for the floor slab and interior block wall construction. Site Photos 4 and 5 show the central core area construction in the inmate housing unit.
Figure 3. Core area of foundation plan (Courtesy of the USACE)

Site Photo 5. Core area of inmate housing
The quality of workmanship exhibited in the inmate housing area was satisfactory. The structural concrete that we observed did not have any noticeable cracking, segregation, or honeycomb areas.

Visitation centers were separate structures adjacent to an inmate housing unit. They were designed as one-story, pre-engineered metal buildings, approximately 20.7-m by 32-m in size. The design required a foundation consisting of isolated reinforced concrete pad footings (2-m x 2-m) supporting reinforced concrete column pedestals (400-mm x 400-mm) and the reinforced concrete grade beams around the building perimeter. The concrete pedestals were designed to support the pre-engineered building’s structural steel columns, and the grade beams supported the building’s exterior walls.

At the time of our site visit, the foundations and concrete floor slab were not complete, and most of the structural steel frame (steel columns, roof joists, purlins [horizontal structural members in a roof], etc.) on the visitation center had not been erected.

The infrastructure included civil and site works, internal road network and perimeter security roads, potable water treatment and distribution systems, power generation system, site lighting, and wastewater collection and treatment systems. The provision of potable water included installation of a compact water treatment plant on site. The 400-m$^3$ capacity plant is sized for a population of 2200 persons and consists of a sedimentation tank, gravity filter cells, a reverse osmosis unit and a storage tank. USACE engineers verified that the plant’s production would be adequate to meet the water demand of the prison in the event Phase III development is converted to inmate housing. This is because the project was initially designed assuming a water consumption of 225-liters per person consumed daily. According to the USACE, studies conducted locally have confirmed that a daily consumption parameter of 100-liters per person was adequate. At the time of SIGIR’s assessment, the utility (water, sanitary, electrical, etc.) pipe and conduit were not installed.

**Work Pending**

Since the overall project was reported as 17 percent complete at the time of SIGIR’s assessment, there was significant interior and exterior work remaining on the majority of the prison buildings. Other required pending work included the installation of the electrical and communication systems, mechanical systems, water and sewer systems, and all finishing work.

Figure 4 shows the future site of the Nassriya Prison Facility Phase III project, where the educational wing is being replaced with another 400 male inmate building. The replacement will bring the total population of the prison facility to 1600 inmates.
Project Quality Management

Contractor’s Quality Control Program

Department of the Army Engineering Regulation (ER) 1180-1-6, dated 30 September 1995, provides general policy and guidance for establishing quality management procedures in the execution of construction contracts. According to ER 1180-1-6, “...obtaining quality construction is a combined responsibility of the construction contractor and the government.”

The contract required that the contractor provide a quality plan, which described the full extent of QC measures implemented throughout all phases. The quality plan included: commentaries on objectives, responsibilities, list of proposed inspection and test plans, QA/QC requirements, inspection of received materials and equipment, and field QC.

The contractor used the three-phase inspection technique to monitor its production and those of its sub-contractors. The three-phase inspection is a quality control protocol in which assessments are made at three different stages during the process of constructing a definable part of a project e.g. piping. The three phases are the preparatory phase, the initial phase, and the follow-up inspections phase. For the preparatory phase, the QC representative organized a meeting to review applicable specifications, drawings, submittals, and testing before the start of a definable construction activity. The initial phase established the monitoring criteria, through completion of a representative sample, to be used for the construction of the definable area. The follow-up inspections involved monitoring to ensure that the metrics established in the initial phase were achieved and adhered. Inspection results were documented in the daily quality control reports.
The contract required that the contractor maintain a comprehensive daily report, which included: on-site personnel types and quantities, major equipment types and quantities, brief description of the work performed by area and activity, major material delivered to the site, any problems or concerns, and any additional information required by the USACE.

We reviewed all the daily QC reports for the Nassriya Prison Expansion project. The daily QC reports generally documented the contractor’s daily activities as well as the activities of its sub-contractors and any critical issues. The daily reports documented the labor strength and production of the various trades for the day. In addition, the QC reports had records of tests, inspections, re-work or deficiencies identified throughout the day. There was detailed documentation of site activities to facilitate further review of progress and quality by senior management for compliance with requirements of the quality control plan. Also, there were photographs documenting various stages of construction.

In addition, the contractor provided test reports to the USACE for the soil density foundations, road sub-bases, concrete compressive strength test and rebar tested. Testing equipment was also checked to ensure correct calibration. After reviewing the QC plan, QC reports, and submittals, SIGIR determined that the contractor’s QC program was adequate.

**Government Quality Assurance**

The USACE ER 1110-1-12 and Project and Contracting Office Standard Operating Procedure CN-100 specified requirements for a government QA program. Similar to the QC program, a crucial oversight technique is presence at the construction site. The USACE GRS, which was responsible for administration of the Nassriya Prison project, had dedicated personnel on site during significant construction activities.

The USACE trained the Iraqi Construction Engineers, who were on site during construction events, and monitored field activities and completed daily QA reports, which were forwarded to the USACE engineer for review. The reports showed the overall percentage of work completed, number of workers on site, and the activity description for the day. Also, the QA reports showed the equipment on site, safety concerns, weather, and photographs of the activities taking place throughout the day. The report noted any material that was delivered to the site. The QA team tracked deficiencies on the QA reports, and noted the deficiency corrections in the QA reports. In addition, the QA reports noted any problems encountered, and any immediate corrective actions taken. For example, the QA report shows segregation in a concrete column (Site Photo 6), and another QA report shows the removal of the concrete column that did not meet specifications (Site Photo 7).
In addition, as part of the QA program a submittal log was maintained. A review of the submittal log indicated that the QA team reviewed and approved submittals for definable items in architectural, structural, electrical, mechanical, and civil works. Examples of submittal items reviewed included product information for asphalt mix design, distribution boards, and shop drawings for water distribution. The review was rigorous so as to maintain the integrity of the construction.

The USACE QA program was adequate. The government QA program was effective in monitoring the contractor’s QC program for the Nassriya Prison project.
**Project Sustainability**

**Commissioning, Training, & Operations and Maintenance**

The contract stated that the contractor will prepare a commissioning and training plan. In addition, the contract stated that the contractor will submit the plan for review and approval by the USACE contracting officer representative. Where training is required, the contractor shall provide training for up to ten personnel. The contract stated that the commissioning and training will be conducted prior to final acceptance of the project and final payment. Also, the contractor will furnish three sets of operations and maintenance manuals on each system to the contracting officer. The Taking-Over-Certificate will be issued to the contractor after the following tasks have been completed: final inspection of completed facility by designated representative and the USACE resident engineer; completion and resolution of all punch list items; and delivery and acceptance of final as-built drawings and operation and maintenance manuals.

**Warranties**

The contract stated that the contractor warrants that the work performed under this contract conforms to the contract requirements and is free of any defect in equipment, material, or design furnished, or workmanship performed by the contractor or any subcontractor or any supplier at any tier. The warranty shall continue for a period of one year from the date of final acceptance of the work. If the government takes possession of any part of the work before final acceptance, the warranty shall continue for a period of one year from the date the government takes possession. The contractor shall remedy at the contractor’s expense any failure to conform or any defect.

**Conclusions**

Based upon the results of our site visit, we reached the following conclusions for assessment objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Appendix A provides details pertaining to Scope and Methodology.

1. **Determine whether project components were adequately designed prior to construction or installation.**

   The design package appeared to be complete and sufficiently detailed to construct the Nassriya Prison Facility Phase II. SIGIR’s review found that the design concept and parameters used for the facility and utilities were satisfactory. The Phase II project, if constructed in accordance with the approved design and specifications, should produce a useable inmate building. Additionally, the design considered the architectural compatibility of the prison facilities and considered future plans for prison expansion.

2. **Determine whether construction met the standards of the design.**

   The project to date comprises the construction of the reinforced concrete foundations, columns, beams, and walls. The foundations and the load-bearing frame appear to be constructed to contract specifications. If current levels of workmanship are continued in accordance with the design and specifications, the project should result in a fully functional prison for the Iraqi Ministry of Justice.
3. **Determine whether the contractor’s quality control plan and the government quality assurance program were adequate.**

   The contractor’s quality control plan was sufficiently detailed to effectively guide the contractor’s quality management program. Further, the contractor’s daily quality control reports contained the required project and work activity information to document construction progress and identify problems and required corrective action. The contractor maintained nonconformance reports to document problems noted with construction/renovation activities.

   The government quality assurance program was effective in monitoring the contractor’s quality control program. The quality assurance team ensured that deficiencies cited during quality assurance inspections were corrected. The quality assurance team also maintained daily quality assurance reports that contained project-specific information to document construction progress and highlight deficiencies. The quality assurance team also supplemented the daily reports with detailed photographs that reinforced the narrative information provided in the reports.

4. **Determine if project sustainability was addressed.**

   The contract requirements addressed the sustainability of the project. The contract required the contractor to provide and certify the warranties for all equipment, which includes any mechanical, electrical and/or electronic devices, and all operations for 12 months after the issuance of the Taking-Over-Certificate.

5. **Determine whether project results were consistent with original objectives.**

   To date, the Nassriya Prison Expansion design and construction have been consistent with the contract objectives. If the current quality of construction and effective project management continues, an inmate housing unit with a 400-bed capacity will be completed. The Nassriya Prison Expansion project should result in a functional and modern prison.

**Recommendations and Management Comments**

This report does not contain any negative findings or recommendations for corrective action. As a result, management comments are not required. SIGIR did receive comments on a draft of this report from the Gulf Region Division of the United States Army Corps of Engineers which generally agreed with the facts and conclusion in the report and provided technical clarifying information for this final report. See Appendix D for the complete text of the Gulf Region Division’s comments.
Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

This project assessment was performed from February through April 2008 in accordance with the Quality Standards for Inspections issued by the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency. The assessment team included a professional engineer/inspector and an auditor/inspector.

In performing this Project Assessment SIGIR:

- Reviewed contract documentation to include the following: contract, contract modification, Scope of Work, and final signed support agreement;
- Reviewed the design package (drawings and specifications), quality control plan, contractor’s quality control reports, USACE quality assurance reports, and construction progress photos;
- Interviewed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Gulf Region South Officer-In-Charge/Area Engineer and the International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs personnel;
- Reviewed SIGIR PA-06-054 Nassriya Prison Facility report;
- Reviewed SIGIR PA-08-131 Follow-Up on the Nassriya Prison Facility report; and
- Conducted an on-site assessment of the Nassriya Prison Expansion on 20 February 2008 and documented the results at the Nassriya Prison Expansion in Nassriya, Iraq.
## Appendix B. Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Engineering Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRD</td>
<td>Gulf Region Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>Gulf Region South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kN/m</td>
<td>Kilonewton per meter (a measure of force length)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kN/m²</td>
<td>Kilonewton per square meter (a measure of force per unit area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m²</td>
<td>Square meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m³</td>
<td>Cubic meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm</td>
<td>Millimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGIR</td>
<td>Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C. Report Distribution

Department of State
Secretary of State
   Senior Advisor to the Secretary and Coordinator for Iraq
   Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance/Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development
   Director, Office of Iraq Reconstruction
   Assistant Secretary for Resource Management/Chief Financial Officer, Bureau of Resource Management
U.S. Ambassador to Iraq
   Director, Iraq Transition Assistance Office
   Mission Director-Iraq, U.S. Agency for International Development
Inspector General, Department of State

Department of Defense
Secretary of Defense
Deputy Secretary of Defense
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer
   Deputy Chief Financial Officer
   Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense-Middle East, Office of Policy/International Security Affairs
Inspector General, Department of Defense
Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency
Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service
Director, Defense Contract Management Agency

Department of the Army
Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology
   Principal Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology
   Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Policy and Procurement)
Commanding General, Joint Contracting Command-Iraq/Afghanistan
Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management and Comptroller
Chief of Engineers and Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
   Commanding General, Gulf Region Division
   Chief Financial Officer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Inspector General of the Army

U.S. Central Command
Commanding General, Multi-National Force-Iraq
   Commanding General, Multi-National Corps-Iraq
   Commanding General, Multi-National Security Transition Command-Iraq
   Commander, Joint Area Support Group-Central
Other Federal Government Organizations
Director, Office of Management and Budget
Comptroller General of the United States
Inspector General, Department of the Treasury
Inspector General, Department of Commerce
Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services
Inspector General, U.S. Agency for International Development
President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation
President, U.S. Institute for Peace

Congressional Committees and Subcommittees, Chairman and Ranking Minority Member

U.S. Senate

Senate Committee on Appropriations
  Subcommittee on Defense
  Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs
Senate Committee on Armed Services
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
  Subcommittee on International Development and Foreign Assistance, Economic Affairs, and International Environmental Protection
  Subcommittee on International Operations and Organizations, Democracy and Human Rights
  Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South and Central Asian Affairs
Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
  Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia
  Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

U.S. House of Representatives

House Committee on Appropriations
  Subcommittee on Defense
  Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs
House Committee on Armed Services
  Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
  Subcommittee on Government Management, Organization, and Procurement
  Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
  Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight
  Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia


1. This memorandum provides the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Gulf Region Division response to the subject draft project assessment report.

2. The Gulf Region Division reviewed the subject draft report and generally agrees with the facts and conclusions contained in the draft report. We have provided additional technical comments for clarification in the enclosure.

3. Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft report and provide our written comments for incorporation in the final report.

4. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Robert Donner at (540) 665-5022 or via email Robert.L.Donner@usace.army.mil.

Encl

GARY D. PEASE
COL, EN
Chief of Staff
COMMAND REPLY

to
SIGIR Draft Project Assessment Report – Nassriyah Prison Expansion, Nassriyah, Iraq
SIGIR Report Number PA- 08-123
(Project PA-08-123)

Overall Comment. The Gulf Region Division (GRD) reviewed the report and generally agrees with the facts and figures as presented in the report. GRD provides the following technical comments for clarification.

1. Draft Report, Page 4, Work in Progress paragraph, fourth sentence. The four wings of the housing unit were designed to contain two floors of inmate cells, with 24 cells per floor in each of the four wings for a total of 192 cells per building.

Command Comment. Change sentence to read, “The four wings of the housing unit were designed to contain two floors of inmate cells, with 24 cells per floor in each of the four wings for a total of 200 cells per building.”

2. Draft Report, Page 5, first paragraph, second sentence. According to the USACE officer-in-charge, the beams and the slabs were scheduled to be poured monolithically.

Command Comment. Change the sentence to read, “According to the USACE officer-in-charge, the building was scheduled to be poured monolithically.”

3. Draft Report, Page 5, first paragraph, fourth sentence. The contractor elected to construct the concrete wall in lieu of a block wall to expedite the construction.

Command Comment. Change the sentence to read, “The wall design for a single pour was rejected and the use of the original Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU) will be required.”

4. Draft Report, Page 12, second paragraph, first sentence. We reviewed all the daily QC reports for the Nassriya Prison Facility project.

Command Comment. Change the sentence to read, “We reviewed all the daily QC reports for the Nassriya Prison Expansion project.”

5. Draft Report, Page 12, second paragraph, last sentence. Photographs showed activities such as installation of windows, painting of walls, laying foundations reinforcements, and installing air ducts.

Command Comment. These activities are not yet part of Phase II.

Enclosure
COMMAND REPLY

to
SIGIR Draft Project Assessment Report – Follow-up on the Nassriya Prison Facility,
Nassriya, Iraq
SIGIR Report Number PA- 08-131
(Project PA-08-131)

6. Draft Report, Page 13, first paragraph, last sentence. Submittals for some items such as ceramic tiles, electrical substation, layout, and fuel tank had to be revised and re-submitted before being finally approved.

Command Comment. These items are not currently on Phase II.
Appendix E. Project Assessment Team Members

The Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Inspections, Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, prepared this report. The principal staff members who contributed to the report were:

Angelina Johnston
George Baffoe, P.E.