

## INTRODUCTION

1. On 31 July 1991, The Judge Advocate General, Major General David C. Morehouse, appointed a Commission to study the Legal Information Services Directorate (JAS) of the Air Force Legal Services Agency. The Commission was given the charter of studying "de novo the missions of and resources allocated to this important directorate." The Commission was charged with taking a comprehensive look at all the components of the JAS mission and the value of each to the Department (Atch 1).

2. The Commission members were selected with a view toward bringing together people with diverse backgrounds and a wide variety of assignments within the Air Force and The Judge Advocate General's Department. The Commission members are:

**Col William A. Moorman, Chairman**

SJA 12 AF; now SJA HQ USSTRATCOM

**Col James E. Heupel**

Chief Trial Judge, USAF, Trial Judiciary (AFLSA/JAJT)

**Col Stephen P. Donohue**

Deputy/Director, Legal Information Services (AFLSA/JAS)

**Col James W. Russell III**

SJA 836 AD; now Ch, Manpower and Analysis (HQ USAF/JAX)

**Lt Col John Murdock**

Senior Judge, Court of Military Review (AFLSA/JAA);  
now Ch, Information Programs Office (AFLSA/CCI)

**Lt Col Alan M. Rotach**

Contract Litigation Division (AFLSA/JACN)

**Capt David M. Fillman**

Professional Development (HQ USAF/JAX);  
now SJA, Templehof AP, GE

**SMSgt Tom J. Jones**

Paralegal Manager, 9 AF/USCENTAF

**Mr Sentiff C. Busby**

AFLSA/JAS

3. The Commission members initially exchanged their written preliminary ideas as to the issues to be addressed in order to fulfill the Commission's charter. Thereafter, the Commission met as a group on seven occasions. In addition, individual Commission members undertook factfinding missions. Members examined thousands of pages of documents, interviewed members of the Department from locations all over

the world, consulted experts from the Air Force computer and communications communities at a variety of locations, and reviewed the experience of other DoD agencies. Two surveys were designed and fielded. The results from more than 1600 respondents were tabulated, reviewed, and analyzed.

4. This report contains the results of the Commission's work and the Commission's best judgment concerning the appropriate future role for the Legal Information Services Directorate in addressing The Judge Advocate General's Department information technology needs.