NASA OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

OFFICE OF AUDITS
SUITE 8U71, 300 E ST SW
WASHINGTON, DC 20546-0001

August 6, 2025

TO: Lori Glaze
Acting Associate Administrator for Exploration Systems Development
Mission Directorate

Denise Thaller
Acting Assistant Administrator for Strategic Infrastructure

Karla Smith Jackson
Assistant Administrator for Procurement

SUBJECT: Final Memorandum, *Audit of Government Property for the Artemis Campaign* (IG-25-010; A-24-12-00-HED)

The programs within the Artemis campaign rely on multiple contractors to support the Agency's mission to return humans to the Moon in preparation for future missions to Mars. NASA furnishes its Artemis contractors with government property to support these efforts when it determines it is in the government's best interest. Government property can range from specialized tooling equipment to high-speed cameras and unique spacecraft components. As of February 2025, NASA had allocated $26.6 billion in government property to contractors in support of 27 active contracts that span 6 major Artemis programs. Given this significant investment, it is imperative that the Agency maintain proper accountability for property in use by its contractors to avoid unnecessary costs in repurchasing these items due to loss, theft, misuse, or destruction.

During a 2024 audit examining NASA's Space Launch System Block 1B development, we were made aware of two instances of improper utilization of government property for commercial purposes.[1] First, the prime contractor continued to use specialized storage containers owned by NASA without payment after the previous authorization had expired. Second, the same contractor used a digital radiographic camera—provided by NASA for the inspection of solid rocket boosters—for services to

[1] NASA Office of Inspector General, *NASA's Management of Space Launch System Block 1B Development* (IG-24-015, August 8, 2024).

commercial customers.[2] In June 2024, we alerted NASA management to the contractor's misuse of Artemis campaign government property for non-NASA purposes.[3] While the Agency has taken actions to address the specific concerns identified, we determined that the subject warranted further review.

In this audit, we examined NASA's management of government property for the Artemis campaign, including property control activities and records. We identified the value of Artemis-related government property and selected four Artemis contracts to evaluate how government property is managed for each individual contract. For these contracts, we reviewed property management plans, property management audits, property submission data, and contract file documentation. We did not perform a detailed inventory analysis of property at contractor sites or at NASA centers. See Enclosure I for details of the audit's scope and methodology.

Background

NASA's Artemis campaign aims to return humans to the Moon and build a sustainable lunar presence as a foundation for human exploration of Mars. To achieve this ambitious and costly undertaking, the Agency relies on contractors to develop its Artemis systems. These include the Space Launch System (SLS) heavy-lift rocket, the Orion Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle (Orion), upgraded ground systems to support the launch of increasingly more powerful rockets, two Human Landing Systems to transport astronauts from lunar orbit to the Moon's surface and back, the Gateway space station, next-generation spacesuits, and a lunar terrain vehicle. Development of these systems requires material, equipment, special tooling, and real property that may be time-consuming and costly to obtain, could already be available within the Agency, or the Agency could be better suited to hold the title to the property, such as forklifts that can be used by multiple contractors. While contractors are ordinarily required to furnish all property necessary to perform government contracts, contracting officers may provide contractors with government property when it is in the government's best interest.

Management of Government Property

The Office of Procurement and Office of Strategic Infrastructure's Logistics Management Division (LMD) are jointly responsible for the oversight of NASA's government property. Prior to contract award, procurement officials collaborate with logistics specialists to determine whether contractor-held or government-held property is necessary. Procurement officials then insert appropriate government property clauses and reporting requirements into the contracts. The offices continue to work together throughout the contract's period of performance to oversee property management records, tracking,

[2] Digital radiographic cameras employ a digital detector to capture images, which are then displayed on screen. While similar to x-ray imaging, digital radiography results in clearer pictures and does not require the use of film.

[3] NASA Office of Inspector General, *Management Alert: Misuse of Government Furnished Property at Contractor Facility* (ML-24-007, June 20, 2024).

and an annual inventory.[4] Alternatively, NASA has the option to delegate some of its off-site property management duties to the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) for a fee.[5]

NASA classifies government property into two main categories—government-furnished property (contractor-held) and installation-accountable government property (government-held). While contractor-held property may be used outside of a NASA center or facility, government-held property typically refers to property that must be used within the physical confines of a NASA center or facility. For example, special equipment such as a crane bridge, grit blasting system, and cooling tower furnished to construct the SLS solid rocket boosters are contractor-held properties because they are used at the contractor's facility in Promontory, Utah. On the other hand, equipment such as trailers, lifting equipment, and tents furnished to construct the second mobile launcher (ML-2)—the ground structure NASA uses to assemble, process, transport, and launch the integrated SLS and Orion system—are government-held because the work is performed on-site at Kennedy Space Center.

Vertical Assembly Center

The Vertical Assembly Center is the world's largest spacecraft welding tool. It was specifically designed to build the Space Launch System core stage. Located at the Michoud Assembly Facility in New Orleans, Louisiana, the Vertical Assembly Center is government-held property used by the Space Launch System contractor on-site. Pictured here, a liquid oxygen tank confidence article completes final welding to verify weld procedures are working as planned.

Source: NASA.

For contractor-held property, NASA's contractors retain responsibility for its day-to-day stewardship with oversight from NASA or delegated DCMA officials. The contractor must have an approved property management plan, which includes procedures and practices for how it will manage the property, and a property management system that aligns with NASA's requirements for tracking and monitoring property.[6] Annually, contractors are required to input property records into the NASA Electronic Submission System—the system for tracking contractor-held property. NASA's center-designated industrial property officers, organized under LMD, oversee and evaluate the contractor's management of government property through an annual property management system analysis audit. This audit ensures the contractor meets contractual requirements by verifying records, evaluating management controls, and ensuring appropriate accounting of property. NASA may delegate property

[4] LMD is responsible for oversight and guidance of contractor-held property in accordance with NASA Procedural Requirements (NPR) 4500.1A, *Administration of Property in the Custody of Award Recipients* (April 10, 2024), and for oversight of government-held property in accordance with NPR 4200.1H, *NASA Equipment Management Procedural Requirements* (March 8, 2017).

[5] DCMA provides contract administration services from pre-award through sustainment for the U.S. Department of Defense, other federal agencies, and international partners to ensure they get the equipment they need, it is delivered on time at the projected cost, and all performance requirements are met.

[6] NPR 4500.1A, Chapter 5, "Property Management System Analysis (PMSA)."

oversight to DCMA, including annual audits, physical inventory inspection, and verification of the contractor's records. DCMA provides an annual written report to NASA detailing any findings.

For government-held property, the NASA center where the property is located retains accountability and title to the equipment and responsibility for property records. Property administration for government-held property is primarily performed by the center-designated supply and equipment management officer, organized under LMD.[7] The supply and equipment management officer is responsible for overseeing receipt of property and maintaining accurate records. They also conduct annual audits consisting of physical inventory inspections and identification of any damaged, lost, or disposed property. The official recordkeeping, financial control, and reporting of this property is recorded within NASA's Property, Plant, and Equipment system.

Artemis Campaign Government Property

As of February 2025, NASA had allocated $26.6 billion in government property to contractors in support of 27 active prime contracts that span 6 major Artemis programs—Orion, SLS, Exploration Ground Systems, Gateway, Human Landing System, and Extravehicular Activity and Human Surface Mobility (see Table 1). While the majority ($25.6 billion) of property used by Artemis campaign contractors is classified as contractor-held, some contracts include both contractor- and government-held property. For example, Northrop Grumman utilizes a digital radiographic camera for development of the solid rocket boosters at its Utah facility, which is classified as contractor-held property, and they also use the test stands at Kennedy Space Center, which are considered government-held property.

[7] NPR 4200.1H, Chapter 1, "Equipment Management Responsibilities."

Table 1: Total Government Property Values for Major Artemis Programs (as of February 2025)

Artemis Program	Contractor-Held Property	Government-Held Property
Orion[a]	$11,849,827,400	$293,279,257
SLS[b]	$8,474,923,828	$456,923,820
Exploration Ground Systems[c]	$4,412,597,778	$158,492,438
Gateway[d]	$899,898,419	$5,311,532
Human Landing System[e]	$284,103	$0
Extravehicular Activity and Human Surface Mobility[f]	$93,112	$0
Subtotals	**$25,637,624,640**	**$914,007,047**
Total		**$26,551,631,687**

Source: NASA Office of Inspector General summary of data from the Agency's property management systems.

[a] The Orion Program includes two contracts—the original design, development, test, and evaluation contract and the production and operations contract.

[b] The SLS Program includes eight contracts to build core stages 1 through 4, Exploration Upper Stages 1 through 3, interim cryogenic propulsion stage, universal stage adapter, solid rocket boosters, and RS-25 rocket engines.

[c] The Exploration Ground Systems Program includes seven contracts to build ML-2 and provide ground systems, engineering, and test support.

[d] The Gateway Program includes three contracts to build the power and propulsion system and habitation module, as well as the deep space logistics contract to lead the commercial supply chain in deep space.

[e] The Human Landing System Program includes two contracts for the design and build of the Starship from SpaceX and the Blue Moon from Blue Origin.

[f] The Extravehicular Activity and Human Surface Mobility Program includes contracts for extravehicular spacesuits and the lunar terrain vehicle. The spacesuits include two contracts for the design and build of next-generation extravehicular spacesuits to be used for the International Space Station and Artemis. The lunar terrain vehicle includes three contracts to advance capabilities for a vehicle that Artemis astronauts will use to travel to the lunar surface and conduct research. There was no contractor- or government-held property reported for the lunar terrain vehicle.

NASA IS GENERALLY FOLLOWING ESTABLISHED POLICIES TO MANAGE ARTEMIS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

We reviewed NASA's implementation of its government property policies for four Artemis contracts—Boosters, Stages, Orion, and ML-2—that account for more than 50 percent ($15.1 billion) of NASA's $26.6 billion in Artemis campaign government property (see Table 2). Based on our review, we found that NASA is generally following established policies to manage its Artemis campaign government property, with a few exceptions.[8]

Table 2: NASA Office of Inspector General Sample of Artemis Campaign Government Property by Contract (as of March 2025)

Program	Contract	Managing Center	Contractor-Held Property	Government-Held Property	Property Oversight
SLS	Boosters DDT&E	Marshall Space Flight Center	$1.6B	$7.4M	NASA/DCMA
SLS	Stages DDT&E	Marshall Space Flight Center	$2.4B	$407.7M	NASA/DCMA
Orion	Orion DDT&E	Johnson Space Center	$10.7B	$17.2M	NASA
Exploration Ground Systems	ML-2 Design and Construction	Kennedy Space Center	N/A	$16.6k	NASA

Source: Summary of data from NASA's Enhanced Procurement Data Warehouse and information provided by NASA.

Note: Design, Development, Test, and Evaluation (DDT&E), billions (B), millions (M), and thousands (k).

For each of the four contracts selected for review, we evaluated whether the contract included an approved property management plan, an approved property management system, annual input of property data into NASA's systems, and an annual audit conducted by NASA or DCMA. The contracts selected for review were generally compliant with these property management policies. Notably, we found that in 2024 NASA met its property loss goal for government-held property by achieving a 0.5 percent average equipment loss rate across all centers.[9]

Furthermore, NASA's annual audit process for contractor-held property resulted in contractors correcting significant property management issues identified by NASA and DCMA. For example, as a result of NASA's 2020 audit, the Orion Design, Development, Test, and Evaluation (DDT&E) contractor corrected discrepancies between serial numbers in their database and those on the equipment. In subsequent audits in 2022 through 2024, NASA did not identify any findings or recommendations for corrective actions. In addition, DCMA identified several significant deficiencies in their 2024 review of the SLS Boosters contractor's property system. These issues included not properly tagging property, not completing a property inventory, and not providing certain documentation to the DCMA auditors. However, the contractor corrected the issues resulting in DCMA approving the contractor's property management system.

[8] NASA policies for government property include Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 45, *Government Property*; NASA FAR Supplement 1845, *Government Property*; NASA FAR Supplement 1852.245-80, *Government Property Management Information*; NPR 4500.1A; and NPR 4200.1H.

[9] This loss rate represents all NASA government-held property and is therefore not limited to Artemis-related property. NPR 4200.1H includes loss rate as one of the metrics used to assess performance for managing NASA-held property.

While the contracts selected for review generally followed established policies, we found several cases where NASA inconsistently applied its policies, increasing the risk of unnecessary costs associated with contract inefficiencies and potential loss, theft, misuse, or destruction of government property.

Inconsistent Property Type Classifications for Orion DDT&E Contract. NASA oversees property administration for approximately $11 billion of government property assigned to the Orion DDT&E contract, most of which is contractor-held (as shown in Table 2). However, equipment for handling and lifting heavy equipment—such as crane hooks at Kennedy Space Center's Operations and Checkout facility and slings at Michoud Assembly Facility—were categorized as contractor-held despite being physically located on a NASA center.[10] Typically, NASA is responsible for government-held property located on center, while contractors are responsible for the stewardship of contractor-held property located off-site. While LMD's property specialists assist the contracting officers and program and project management teams to ensure appropriate classification, property type classifications are ultimately subject to the interpretation of NASA guidance by procurement and logistics officials. Further, according to NASA policy, the final decision on how the property will be categorized is made by the contracting officer.[11] Ultimately, according to NASA officials, categorizing on-center property as contractor-held could result in higher contract costs because the contractor must maintain their own property management system.

Unverified ML-2 Property Records. NASA has limited oversight over 229 property items worth $1.5 million purchased by the ML-2 contractor, Bechtel National, Inc. Bechtel is constructing the ML-2 on-site at Kennedy Space Center, and the Agency decided to use the Center's institutional support contractor to oversee administrative management of this property, to include transferring title of the property from Bechtel to NASA and recording the property in NASA's Property, Plant, and Equipment system. However, NASA property officials reported that NASA was delayed in funding a task order that would allow the support contractor to execute its property management tasks for the ML-2-associated property. As a result, since the task order was not yet finalized when NASA selected property for review in accordance with its fiscal year 2024 annual inventory audit, these 229 property records were not subject to audit selection, limiting NASA's oversight activities that are key to preventing unnecessary costs.[12]

Potentially Underutilized Oversight Resources. While NASA has overall responsibility for its property, it also has the authority to delegate certain contractor-held property administration and oversight functions to DCMA when it determines it is in the government's best interest. As shown in Table 2, NASA has oversight over each of the four contracts we reviewed and delegates specific property administration tasks to DCMA for the SLS Boosters and Stages DDT&E contracts. According to NASA procurement and logistics officials, delegating these tasks to DCMA has created efficiencies, improved property management practices, and lessened the administrative burden for NASA contracting officers. For example, working closely with DCMA representatives co-located at the contractor's facility, NASA

[10] According to Orion Program officials, the justification for classifying these items as contractor-held is because the prime contractor for the Orion DDT&E contract operates Kennedy Space Center's Operations and Checkout facility and the Michoud Assembly Facility as their own factories on a NASA center.

[11] NASA FAR Supplement 1845.103-70 states that "Contracting officers are responsible for overall management of their contracts, including the management of Government property provided to contractors under NASA Contracts." In the case of the slings at Michoud Assembly Facility, the contracting officer made the final determination to classify the property as contractor-held despite their physical location, which is allowed by policy.

[12] Because the $1.5 million in ML-2 property was not recorded in a NASA property system, the property value was excluded from Tables 1 and 2.

and Northrop Grumman identified over 30,000 pieces of property that were no longer needed. In addition, DCMA assisted Boosters procurement officials by ensuring Northrop Grumman was properly using the contractor-held property in accordance with NASA requirements.

While NASA's policy is to designate LMD personnel to perform key government property oversight roles, we found Artemis-related program and project managers are not consistently utilizing LMD's logistics personnel. According to NASA officials, even though coordination between procurement and logistics officials is performed, many Artemis programs have not incorporated specialized logistics personnel into their teams. Further, we did not find LMD logisticians working with the Artemis program and project teams that were part of our sample review. Without fully leveraging the oversight role by logistics personnel from a contract's onset through closeout, the Agency may be missing opportunities to gain efficiencies and reduce costs.

CONCLUSION

Given the $26.6 billion in Artemis campaign government property in use by NASA's contractors, it is imperative that the Agency maintain proper accountability for the property to avoid unnecessary costs in repurchasing these items due to loss, theft, misuse, or destruction. Overall, we found that NASA has established policies and procedures in place to manage its government property, whether held by the government or contractor, but NASA can strengthen its oversight by ensuring consistent application of those policies.

We did not perform a detailed inventory analysis of property at contractor sites or at NASA centers, instead relying on the Agency's own inventory audits to assess how NASA and its contractors are adhering to the Agency's established policies. Based upon our audit work performed to date, we determined that further review at this time by our office would not be the best use of our or NASA's resources. While we are closing this review, we may initiate a similar assessment in the future if conditions warrant.

RECOMMENDATIONS, MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE, AND OUR EVALUATION

To improve NASA's management of government-held property, we recommended the Associate Administrator for Exploration Systems Development Mission Directorate:

1. Incorporate Office of Strategic Infrastructure LMD representatives with property expertise into the programs and projects at the contract's onset to ensure procurement officials receive sufficient support.

To improve NASA's management of contractor-held property, we recommended the Assistant Administrator for Procurement and Assistant Administrator for Strategic Infrastructure:

2. Review Artemis-related contracts that are not delegated to DCMA for contractor-held property management to determine whether NASA can leverage the delegations already in place to consolidate government property administration tasks.

We provided a draft of this report to NASA management who concurred with our recommendations and described planned actions to address them. We consider management's comments responsive; therefore, the recommendations are resolved and will be closed upon completion and verification of the proposed corrective actions.

Management's comments are reproduced in Enclosure II. Technical comments provided by management have been incorporated as appropriate.

If you have questions or wish to comment on the quality or usefulness of this memorandum, contact Laurence Hawkins, Financial Oversight and Audit Quality Director, at 202-358-1543 or laurence.b.hawkins@nasa.gov.


Digitally signed by
Robert Steinau
Date: 2025.08.05
16:26:05 -04'00'

Robert H. Steinau
NASA OIG Senior Official

Enclosures–2

Enclosure I: Scope and Methodology

We performed this audit from July 2024 through June 2025 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

Our overall objective was to assess NASA's management of government property for the Artemis campaign. To perform this audit, we examined NASA's requirements and processes for managing government property. We interviewed personnel from the Office of Strategic Infrastructure's LMD, the Office of Procurement, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, the Defense Contract Management Agency, and a combination of officials for representation from NASA Headquarters, Johnson Space Center, Kennedy Space Center, and Marshall Space Flight Center.

We reviewed applicable federal laws and regulations as well as NASA policy and guidance related to management of government property, including Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 45, NASA FAR Supplement 1845 and 1852, NASA Policy Directive 4200.1D, NASA Procedural Requirements 4200.1H and 4500.1A, and the Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6: Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment.

To assess the total amount and distribution of government property for the Artemis campaign, we reviewed property data from the NASA Electronic Submission System and NASA's Financial Accounting System Property, Plant, and Equipment module.

We selected a sample of four contracts to review—Boosters DDT&E, Stages DDT&E, Orion DDT&E, and ML-2 Design and Construction—which comprise 57 percent of the Artemis campaign-related government property. Specifically, we reviewed the property submission data and examined the contract documentation to include the listing of government property awarded to the contractor, property management system analysis, DCMA audit analysis, and risk matrix for each applicable contract within our sample. Additionally, we interviewed the contracting officer and industrial property officer or supply and equipment management officer for each contract.

Assessment of Data Reliability

We relied on the fact that data derived from the Financial Accounting System Property, Plant, and Equipment module had been previously validated through the Agency's fiscal year 2020 Digital Accountability and Transparency Act Submission. Additional assurance was obtained by reviewing the detail for transactions falling within audit scope as well as looking for obvious erroneous data. We determined that the data was sufficiently reliable for the purposes of our reporting objectives with the limitations described in the memorandum.

Additionally, we assessed the reliability of NASA's submission form (NF1018) for contractors to report property and the NASA Electronic Submission System by performing a manual review of contracts for accuracy and completeness. We interviewed contracting officers and industrial property officers to gain insight into the process of managing government property and records. We reviewed provided documentation to include contract files, property management system analyses, and risk matrix evaluations. When we found discrepancies, we worked with LMD to identify the extent of the

discrepancies or to realign our understandings. We determined that the data was sufficiently reliable for the purpose of understanding NASA's management of government property.

Review of Internal Controls

We reviewed and evaluated internal controls and compliance with regulations necessary to satisfy the audit objective. We also reviewed appropriate policies and procedures and conducted interviews with responsible personnel. However, because our review was limited to these internal control components and underlying principles, it may not have disclosed all internal control deficiencies that may have existed at the time of this audit. Any internal control deficiencies significant to the audit objective are discussed in this memorandum.

Prior Coverage

During the last 5 years, the NASA Office of Inspector General has issued one report and one management alert of significant relevance to the subject of this memorandum. Reports can be accessed at https://oig.nasa.gov/audits/.

NASA Office of Inspector General

NASA's Management of Space Launch System Block 1B Development (IG-24-015, August 8, 2024)

Management Alert: Misuse of Government Furnished Property at Contractor Facility (ML-24-007, June 20, 2024)

Enclosure II: Management's Comments

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Mary W. Jackson NASA Headquarters
Washington, DC 20546-0001

Reply to Attn of: Exploration Systems Development Mission Directorate

TO: Assistant Inspector General for Audits (Acting)

FROM: Associate Administrator for Exploration Systems Development Mission Directorate (Acting)
Assistant Administrator for Procurement
Assistant Administrator for Strategic Infrastructure (Acting)

SUBJECT: Agency Response to OIG Draft Memorandum, "Audit of Government Property for the Artemis Campaign" (A-24-12-00-HED)

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Office of Inspector General (OIG) draft memorandum entitled, "Audit of Government Property for the Artemis Campaign" (A-24-12-00-HED), dated June 24, 2025.

In this draft memorandum, the OIG found that NASA is generally following established policies to manage its Artemis Campaign Government property, with a few exceptions. These OIG-identified exceptions included (1) inconsistent property type classifications for the Orion Design, Development, Test, and Evaluation contract; (2) unverified Mobile Launcher 2 property records; and (3) potentially underutilized oversight resources.

The Artemis Campaign, under the Exploration Systems Development Mission Directorate (ESDMD), is responsible for advancing human exploration beyond low Earth orbit. This includes the first crewed Artemis mission, scheduled for no later than April 2026, which will validate spacecraft systems in lunar orbit. ESDMD acknowledges that effective management and allocation of Government property are essential to maintaining operational readiness and supporting mission success. Projects like Artemis involve multiple systems, facilities, and contractors, which increases the complexity of property tracking and integration. While property management varies across contracts due to differences in risk, complexity, Agency expectations, and the structure of the contractual agreement itself, ESDMD agrees that property management is important.

As noted in Enclosure I of the draft memorandum, the OIG audited this subject matter one other time over the last five years, resulting in a management alert being issued. During this specific audit, ESDMD provided 19 products, attended five requested meetings, and participated in 34 hours of interviews. Altogether, this activity incurred an estimated 65 hours of work by our ESDMD team. This commitment to transparency underscores our

dedication to upholding the highest standards of integrity and ethics in all aspects of our work.

The OIG makes two recommendations, one addressed to the Associate Administrator for ESDMD, and one addressed to the Agency's Office of Procurement (OP) and Office of Strategic Infrastructure (OSI) to improve NASA's management of contractor-held property.

Specifically, the OIG recommends the Associate Administrator for ESDMD:

Recommendation 1: Incorporate OSI Logistics Management Division representatives with property expertise into the programs and projects at the contract's onset to ensure procurement officials receive sufficient support.

> **Management's Response:** NASA concurs with this recommendation. ESDMD recognizes the importance of involving subject matter experts at the outset of contract development. ESDMD currently collaborates with program offices and OP to support effective contract management.
>
> To enhance consistency, improve efficiency, and strengthen property management and compliance throughout the contract lifecycle, ESDMD will work closely with NASA procurement officials to support integration of property management experts in accordance with NASA Procedural Requirements (NPR) 4500.1A, Administration of Property in the Custody of Award Recipients, and for oversight of Government-held property in accordance with NPR 4200.1H, NASA Equipment Management Procedural Requirements—particularly for procurements requiring Agency approval at an Acquisition Strategy Meeting.
>
> **Estimated Completion Date:** December 31, 2026.

In addition, the OIG recommends that NASA's OP and OSI:

Recommendation 2: Review Artemis-related contracts that are not delegated to the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) for contractor-held property management to determine whether NASA can leverage the delegations already in place to consolidate government property administration tasks.

> **Management's Response:** NASA concurs with this recommendation. OP will review Artemis contracts with contractor-held Government property and will identify opportunities to delegate property administration to DCMA by the end of third quarter of fiscal year 2026.
>
> **Estimated Completion Date:** September 30, 2026.

We have reviewed the draft report for information that should not be publicly released. As a result of this review, we have not identified any information that should not be publicly released.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the subject draft report. If you have any questions or require additional information regarding this response, please contact Christine Solga at (202) 358-1238.

Lori Glaze
Digitally signed by Lori Glaze
Date: 2025.08.01 15:07:32 -04'00'

Lori S. Glaze
Associate Administrator for Exploration Systems Development Mission Directorate (Acting)

Karla Smith Jackson
Digitally signed by Karla Smith Jackson
Date: 2025.08.01 10:34:26 -04'00'

Karla Smith Jackson
Assistant Administrator for Procurement

Denise Thaller
Digitally signed by Denise Thaller
Date: 2025.08.01 09:36:12 -04'00'

Denise Thaller
Assistant Administrator for Strategic Infrastructure (Acting)