

**U. S. Office of Personnel Management
Classification Appeal Decision
Under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code**

Appellant: [name]

Agency classification: Supply Management Officer
GS-2003-13

Organization: [component]
[next higher organizational level]
[command]
Department of the Army
[city], Germany

OPM decision: Supply Management Officer
GS-2003-12

OPM decision number: C-2003-12-01

/s/ Judith a. Davis for

Robert D. Hendler
Classification and Pay Claims
Program Manager
Merit Systems Audit and Compliance

12/5/2012

Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, this decision constitutes a certificate that is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the Government. The agency is responsible for reviewing its classification decisions for identical, similar, or related positions to ensure consistency with this decision. There is no right of further appeal. This decision is subject to discretionary review only under conditions and time limits specified in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards (Introduction)*, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

Since this decision lowers the grade of the appealed position, it is to be effective no later than the beginning of the sixth pay period after the date of this decision, as permitted by 5 CFR 511.702. The applicable provisions of parts 351, 432, 536, and 752 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, must be followed in implementing this decision. If the appellant is entitled to grade retention, the two-year retention period begins on the date this decision is implemented. The servicing human resources office must submit a compliance report containing the corrected position description and a Standard Form 50 showing the personnel action taken. The report must be submitted within 30 days from the effective date of the personnel action to the OPM office which accepted the appeal.

Decision sent to:

[Redacted]

Mr. Dean Michalec
Director, CPAC Kaiserslautern
Unit 23152
APO AE 09227

Department of the Army
Office of the Assistant Secretary (Manpower and
Reserve Affairs)
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Human Resources)
Attn.: SAMR-HR
The Pentagon, Room 2E468
Washington, DC 20310-0111

Department of the Army
Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1
Assistant G-1 for Civilian Personnel
Attn.: DAPE-CP
The Pentagon, Room 2C453
Washington, DC 20310-0300

Department of the Army
Office of the Assistant G-1 for Civilian Personnel
Chief, Program Development Division
Hoffman Building, Room 1108
2461 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22332-0320

Introduction

The U.S. Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) Merit System Audit and Compliance accepted this position classification appeal on March 15, 2012. The appellant is the Director of the [component], which is a component of the [organizational location], with the Headquarters, United States Army, Europe (USAREUR), in [city], Germany. The appellant requests reclassification of his position as Supply Management Officer, GS-2003-14. We accepted and decided this appeal under the provisions of section 5112 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.)

We conducted a telephone audit and several follow-up telephone and email communications with the appellant and a subsequent telephone interview with his first-line supervisor. We decided this appeal by considering the audit findings and all information of record furnished by the appellant and his agency, including his official position description and other material received in the agency administrative report on May 1, 2012, and information subsequently provided by the appellant and the agency at our request.

General issues

To support upgrading of his position, the appellant notes his deputy's position (i.e., the position of Deputy Director, [component]) was recently upgraded to grade C1-08 under the classification system covering local national (LN) employees in Germany. He asserts this is equivalent to GS-13 under the General Schedule (GS). He also states his deputy was promoted on the basis of and now occupies his previous [component] Director position description (PD), thus suggesting that if the grade of his deputy's position is equivalent to GS-13, then his position should be graded at GS-14. He also compares the individual factor level assignments in his PD to those in the PDs for the other Directors in [next higher organizational level]. One of those positions is graded at GS-14; the other three are filled by LN employees at grades the appellant asserts are equivalent to GS-14.

By law, we must classify positions solely by comparing their current duties and responsibilities to OPM position classification standards (PCS) and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). Since comparison to standards is the exclusive method for classifying positions, we cannot compare the appellant's position to others that may or may not have been properly classified as the basis for deciding his appeal. Therefore, the grades of the [component] Deputy Director and the other [next higher organizational level] Director positions have no bearing on our determination of the proper classification of the appellant's position. However, we make the following observations regarding the appellant's assertions as they relate to our analysis of his position.

Although LN positions within the Department of the Army (DA) in Germany are allocated to occupational series as defined in the Federal classification and job grading systems, their grades are not based on the application of OPM classification or job grading standards and guidelines. Rather, they are set in accordance with the "General Provisions on Classification and Grading" contained in the Collective Tariff Agreement II (CTA II) for the Employees with the Stationing Forces in the Federal Republic of Germany. These provisions define and provide criteria for various wage and salary groups. Salary Group Classification C for Salaried Employees, which covers many white-collar positions including the deputy position in question, provides broad, generally-stated "duty criteria" for ten salary groups designated as groups 1 through 10, with four

intermediate groups (designated as 4a, 5a, 6a, and 7a) for positions whose duties fall between two of the major groups. Thus, although LN positions use the same occupational series as their Civil Service counterparts, LN pay plans and grades under the CTA II are unrelated to those of the GS (or the Federal Wage System (FWS)) covering Federal civil service employees.

The grading criteria in OPM PCSs and the “duty criteria” in the CTA II differ conceptually in their approach to differentiating among grade levels/salary groups. OPM PCSs are designed to place individual *positions* in their proper grades based on the breadth, difficulty, and complexity of the work performed without regard to the qualifications or abilities of the employee occupying the position. By contrast, the classification and grading provisions of the CTA II provide for the allocation of *employees* rather than *positions* to the appropriate wage and salary groups. Although this may appear to be a minor distinction, the focus on the employee rather than the position as the basis for the grade allocation under the CTA II allows for some degree of consideration of the individual employee’s abilities, training, or experience.

A direct grade equivalency cannot be made between grades on the fifteen-grade GS and the ten-grade LN Salary Group C.¹ (The four intermediate grades in Salary Group C represent gradations rather than fully-defined difficulty levels.) Further, the grade-level definition structures of these two systems are so dissimilar that no direct correspondence can be made between them. Alternatively, any pay comparison between the two systems is complicated by the many differences in their compensation plans, such as the different waiting periods between the ten steps for grades in the GS and the eight steps for grades in LN Salary Group C; the monthly pay rates based on a 38.5-hour work week under LN Salary Group C as opposed to the GS’s annual salaries based on a 40-hour work week; and the different retirement, leave, and other benefits and bonuses to which LN employees are entitled under the CTA II, which compensate for the lower basic pay rates under LN Salary Schedule C. Therefore, the appellant’s assertion that the grades of the other TLSC-E Director positions are equivalent to GS-14 under the GS is inaccurate as these two classification systems are applied independently and the grades thus derived have no direct correlation.

Within the GS and in accordance with the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), which is the OPM guide for the classification of supervisory positions, the grade of a deputy position is normally derived from the grade of the supervisor/manager position to which it reports. A full deputy position is graded one grade level below the grade of the supervisor/manager, unless the deputy position has independent responsibility for other assigned duties on which its grade is based. By comparison, deputy positions filled by LN employees are graded by application of grading criteria contained in the German Local National Grading Guide for Positions Covered by Articles 58 and 59, CTA II (otherwise referred to as the LN GSSG). The LN GSSG is largely patterned on the GSSG and contains similar instructions that its evaluation criteria are not designed to be applied directly to deputy or “assistant chief” supervisory positions. Rather, it instructs that the grade of a full deputy position be set one grade lower than the grade of the

¹ Prior to 1993, LN positions were graded by use of a conversion table that directly paralleled GS grades to “C” grades. However, this “parallel method” was rescinded effective October 1, 1993, by Headquarters, USAREUR, which further instructed that all classification decisions for LN positions under CTA II coverage be based exclusively on grading criteria contained in the CTA II.

supervisory position to which it reports. It does not, however, provide guidance on applying these criteria to determine the grade of an LN deputy position reporting to a GS supervisor/manager, considering that direct grade equivalencies between these two classification systems are not allowed.

The [component] Deputy Director is not assigned to the appellant's previous PD. However, the "Major Duties" section in the PD to which he is assigned is almost identical to the corresponding section in the appellant's PD. It includes a factor level analysis using the LN GSSG, from which is derived the grade of C-8 on its point-to-grade conversion chart. The point ranges on this conversion chart are identical to those on the conversion chart contained in the GSSG, and the point range within which the Deputy Director position falls would derive a GS-13 grade on the GSSG conversion chart. It also inexplicably assigns a higher base level grade under Factor 5, Difficulty of Typical Work Directed, to the Deputy Director position than was assigned by the agency to the appellant's position. The PD explains use of the LN GSSG to determine the grade of this deputy position by stating: "While the position also functions as Full Deputy to the Commander/Director [component], the grade is based on the full and final supervision exercised over the mainly Local National work force." However, this statement is apparently inconsistent with the position's factor level assignment under Factor 3, Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised, where Level 3-3b was assigned as opposed to Level 3-4b, which credits the exercise of "final authority for the full range of personnel actions and organization design proposals recommended by subordinate supervisors." Further, this statement is contrary to the appellant's PD, which includes a full range of supervisory functions exercised over the subordinate staff and provides no indication that this authority is limited to a portion of the staff. Therefore, we are unable to reconcile the Deputy Director's PD and its factor level analysis with the appellant's PD. However, as noted earlier, the grade of the Deputy Director's position cannot be directly equated to a GS grade and further, since we do not decide appeals by position-to-position comparison, the grade of this position is not determinant of the grade of the appellant's position.

The appellant reported that he exercises the same degree of supervision over his LN and Federal civil service subordinates. The Deputy Director is a full deputy and thus occupies a position in the supervisory line, therefore many day-to-day operational issues are handled by him. However, the appellant reported that he interviews candidates and makes selections for vacancies, handles serious disciplinary actions, hears group grievances, and approves promotions, within-grade increases, overtime, travel, awards, and non-routine training for the entire subordinate staff. This was confirmed by the General Manager, [next higher organizational level]. Therefore, for purposes of this decision, we consider the appellant to have full supervisory authority over the entire [component] subordinate staff.

Position information

The appellant is the Director of the [component], which is responsible for providing theater level, general support and direct support supply and distribution services to U.S. Army units in the European Theater. The [component] is a component of the [next higher organizational level], which is the logistics support center for the U.S. Army's [command] supporting the United States Army, Europe. As the [component] Director, the appellant plans, directs, and coordinates activities involved in the receipt, storage, maintenance, issue, and retrograde of theater excess serviceable/unserviceable material of all supply classes except ammunition, food, and medical

supplies as well as theater project, decrement, and contingency stocks. The supply classes supported include clothing and individual equipment and tools, petroleum products, construction and barrier material, major end items (e.g., vehicles, tanks, launchers, etc.), and reparable assemblies and repair parts, including maintenance as it relates to care of equipment in storage and shipment preparation. The appellant is also responsible for all activities involving the acceptance, accountability, serviceability, and transfer of all Left Behind Equipment (LBE) of deployed units in Europe. The [component] provides supply support to the European theater through the operation of four Standard Army Retail Supply System (SARSS) sites in Kaiserslautern to receive and maintain excess materials, both serviceable and unserviceable, received directly from U.S. Army units and Supply Support Activities (SSAs) in Europe, and to inspect, package, and ship them to the appropriate repair or storage facilities in the U.S. or to local [component] warehouses to maintain their own supply retention levels, and serves as the storage center for hazardous materials for all TLSC-E elements. The [component] also provides supply support to the European theater through the operation of five retail outlets (regional SSAs) in Kaiserslautern, Mannheim, Stuttgart, Vilseck, and Wackernheim, an office supply store in Kaiserslautern, and the [command's] Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment (OCIE) Sustainment Center.² The [component] also ships items to U.S. Army customers worldwide on an ad hoc basis as part of DA's agencywide ordering network, and performs several specialized support functions for USAREUR units, such as fest tent support, textile repair, and mask testing.

The appellant's position description (number HU380032) is accurate and adequate for classification purposes.

Series, title, and standard determination

The appellant does not contest the series or title of his position, and it is properly classified as Supply Management Officer, GS-2003.

Grade determination

The Position Classification Flysheet for the GS-2003 series does not contain grade-level criteria, but instructs that positions in this series be classified using the criteria in the Grade Evaluation Guide for Supply Positions or the GSSG.

Evaluation Using the GSSG

The GSSG is a cross-series guide used to determine the grade level of supervisory positions in the General Schedule. The GSSG has six evaluation factors, each with several factor-level definitions and corresponding point values. Positions are evaluated by crediting the points designated for the highest level met under each factor, and converting the total to a grade by using the grade conversion table provided in the guide.

² Stocks in these outlets are received from U.S. Army depots or the General Services Administration through the Defense Logistics Agency.

The appellant contests the agency's evaluation of Factor 5. He does not contest the agency's evaluation of Factors 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. After careful review of the record, we concur with the agency's factor-level assignments for Factors 2 and 3, but we disagree with their factor-level assignments for Factors 1 and 4. Although we agree with their factor-level assignment for Factor 6, we disagree with their crediting of certain Special Situations under that factor. Therefore, we discuss Factors 1, 4, 5, and 6 in detail below while addressing the remaining factors briefly.

Factor 1, Program Scope and Effect

This factor assesses the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including its organizational and geographic coverage (i.e., "scope"). It also assesses the impact of the work both within and outside the immediate organization ("effect"). These two elements are interrelated to some degree, but their distinction can be explained thus: In addition to assessing complexity of the work supervised, "scope" measures the size or breadth of the organization directed in terms of either geographic coverage of line program operations (usually expressed in terms of the size of the population serviced and/or the area administered), or the organizational coverage of internal support activities (usually expressed in terms of organizational size or level). "Effect" measures the degree to which the work supervised affects the organizations or populations supported. In order for a particular factor level to be assigned under this factor, the criteria for both "scope" and "effect" must be *fully* met. The agency assigned Level 1-3 under this factor.

Scope

At Level 1-2, the program segment or work directed is administrative, technical, complex clerical, or comparable in nature. The functions, activities, or services provided have limited geographic coverage and support most of the activities comprising a typical agency field office, an area office, a small to medium military installation, or comparable activities within program segments.

At Level 1-3, the work involves directing a program segment that performs technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work. The program segment and work directed typically have coverage which encompasses a major metropolitan area, a State, or a small region of several States; or, when most of an area's taxpayers or businesses are involved, coverage comparable to a small city. Providing complex administrative, technical, or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multimission military installation also falls at this level.

The complexity of the work directed by the appellant is consistent with Level 1-2. The types of work represented at Levels 1-2 and 1-3 would appear to overlap in that both cover technical and administrative work. However, technical and administrative work extend across a range of grades, and the nature of such work described at Level 1-3 represents the higher end of the range. Specifically, the work covered at Level 1-3 is described as "complex" administrative, technical, or professional in nature. The association of "administrative or technical" work with "professional" and "investigative" work at this level requires a corresponding grade association. Since the GS-9 grade level is considered the first full performance level for two-grade interval professional and investigative work, then the administrative and technical work represented at Level 1-3 would be expected to be of the same level of complexity; i.e., two-grade interval work at grade GS-9 or higher. In contrast, the administrative and technical work represented at Level

1-2 is associated with "complex clerical" work. Clerical work is one-grade interval in nature, and "complex" clerical work (otherwise known as "technician" work) does not exceed the GS-8 grade level. This is reinforced by comparison of two corresponding illustrations provided in the guide:

Level 1-2: Directs budget, management, staffing, supply, maintenance, protective, library, payroll, or similar services which support a small Army, Navy, or Air Force base with no extensive research, development, testing, or comparable missions, a typical national park, a hospital, or a nondefense agency field office of moderate size and limited complexity. The services provided directly or significantly impact other functions and activities throughout the organizations supported and/or a small population of visitors or users.

Level 1-3: Directs administrative services (personnel, supply management, budget, facilities management, or similar) which support and directly affect the operations of a bureau or a major military command headquarters; a large or complex multimission military installation; an organization of similar magnitude, or a group of organizations which, as a whole, are comparable.

Although both of these illustrations include directing a supply function, they distinguish between directing supply "services" at Level 1-2 and supply "management" at Level 1-3. Supply "services" can be construed as the one-grade interval work associated with the receipt, storage, control, packing, and issuance of materials. Supply "management" represents the two-grade interval work involved in such functions as supply systems analysis, inventory management, distribution facilities and storage management, and supply packaging and cataloging.

The base grade level of work supervised by the appellant (as determined under Factor 5 of this decision) is no higher than GS-6, which is aligned with Level 1-2 complexity of work supervised. Of the 482 authorized positions³ comprising the appellant's subordinate staff, approximately 41 nonsupervisory/non-leader positions, or only about ten percent of the total staff, are allocated to two-grade interval series. The majority of the staff is engaged in one-grade interval work (largely in the GS-2005 Supply Clerical and Technician Series) and various blue-collar occupations involved in the physical handling, packing, and maintenance of materials. The [component] mission statement, that [component] "receives, stores, issues and retrogrades material," describes functions associated with the one-grade interval supply services represented at Level 1-2.

Although the complexity of the work directed by the appellant is consistent with Level 1-2, the organizational coverage of these internally-oriented support activities is regional (i.e., USAREUR-wide) in nature and thus comparable to the Level 1-3 illustration cited above in its

³ Although the Table of Distribution and Allowances (TDA) for [component] lists 491 authorized positions (excluding the appellant's position), for purposes of this decision we excluded the 25 positions in the Humanitarian Aid Program duty-stationed in Vicenza, Italy, which are assigned to the [component] for budgetary purposes only and are not under the appellant's supervision. However, we included the 16 authorized "overhire" positions assigned to the LBE function which are not reflected on the TDA.

description of administrative services that support the operations of a bureau, major military command headquarters, or organizations of comparable magnitude. However, this level is not *fully* met as the core mission and functions of [component] as they relate to the complexity of the work directed are more closely associated with Level 1-2.

Effect

At Level 1-2, the services or products support and significantly affect installation level, area office level, or field office operations and objectives, or comparable program segments; or provide services to a moderate, local, or limited population of clients or users comparable to a major portion of a small city or rural county.

At Level 1-3, the activities, functions, or services accomplished directly and significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, or the operations of outside interests (e.g., a segment of a regulated industry), or the general public. At the field activity level (involving large, complex, multimission organizations and/or very large serviced populations), the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions.

The effect of the work supervised by the appellant meets Level 1-2. Although installation-level work is represented at both Level 1-2 and 1-3, the population served is much larger at Level 1-3. Further, consideration of the size of the organization serviced under this element is intertwined with consideration of the degree of impact the work supervised has on that organization. SAE's core function is to serve as a conduit in processing and shipping excess items back to the U.S. Thus, although [component] receives such materials from U.S. Army units and SSAs throughout the European theater, the impact this function has on the serviced population in facilitating its mission accomplishment is not comparable to work that "directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support operations." The several regional SSAs operated by [component] do provide "essential support operations" as the only source for military items in the immediate geographic areas serviced. However, these areas are localized and thus are not comparable in breadth to a "bureau or a major military command headquarters" as described at Level 1-3.

Since the work supervised by the appellant does not fully meet Level 1-3 under both elements of this factor, Level 1-2 is the highest level that may be assigned.

Level 1-2 is credited (350 points).

Factor 2, Organizational Setting

This factor considers the organizational situation of the supervisory position in relation to higher levels of management. The agency credited Level 2-2 under this factor.

The appellant's position is accountable to a position (the General Manager, TLSC-E) that is one reporting level below the first flag officer level (the Commanding General, 21st TSC) in the direct supervisory chain.

Level 2-2 is credited (250 points).

Factor 3, Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities which are exercised on a recurring basis. The agency credited Level 3-3b under this factor.

The appellant's position, as that of a third-level supervisor with an overall subordinate staff of 482 positions, meets the criteria listed under Level 3-3b. His position does not meet Level 3-4 as he does not have delegated authority to oversee the overall planning, policy development, direction, and execution of an agency-level (i.e., DA-level) program or several program segments, nor does he have final authority for the full range of personnel actions and organization design proposals recommended by subordinate supervisors. This authority is held by the General Manager, [next higher organizational level].

Level 3-3 is credited (775 points).

Factor 4, Personal Contacts

This is a two-part factor which assesses the nature and the purpose of personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The nature of the contacts credited under Subfactor 4A, and the purpose of those contacts credited under Subfactor 4B, must be based on the same contacts. The agency credited Levels 4A-3 and 4B-3 under this factor.

Subfactor 4A - Nature of Contacts

At Level 4A-2, contacts are with high ranking managers, supervisors, and staff of program, administrative, and other work units and activities throughout the field activity, installation, command (below major command level) or major organization level of the agency; and/or members of the business community or the general public. These contacts may be informal or may occur in meetings and conferences and may require special preparation.

At Level 4A-3, contacts are with high ranking managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau and major organization levels of the agency, administrative support staff at agency headquarters, or comparable personnel in other Federal agencies; contracting officials and high level technical staff of large industrial firms; and/or local officers of regional or national trade associations, public action groups, or professional organizations. These contacts take place in meetings and conferences or may be unplanned where the employee is designated as a contact point by higher management, and often require extensive preparation of briefing materials or up-to-date technical familiarity with complex subject matter.

The appellant's routine contacts are with military and civilian managers and technical staff at the [next higher organizational level] and [command] levels and with customer organizations. Given that the [component] is an installation-level organization, this is consistent with Level 4A-2, where contacts are with managers and staff throughout the field activity or installation and/or command, with the [command] being below major command level. The appellant does not have frequent contacts with high ranking managers and staff at USAREUR or DA headquarters levels, other Federal agencies, or the other types of contacts typical of Level 4A-3. Although the

appellant described his contacts with foreign military personnel in connection with weapon system inspections, these are infrequent (twice yearly with occasional unannounced visits) and do not require the types of in-depth technical briefings expected at Level 4A-3.

Level 4A-2 is credited (50 points).

Subfactor 4B - Purpose of Contacts

At Level 4B-2, the purpose of contacts is to ensure that information provided to outside parties is accurate and consistent; to plan and coordinate the work directed with that of others outside the subordinate organization; and/or to resolve differences of opinion among managers, supervisors, employees, contractors, or others.

At Level 4B-3, the purpose of contacts is to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the program, program segment, or organizational unit directed, in obtaining or committing resources, and in gaining compliance with established policies, regulations, or contracts. Contacts at this level usually involve active participation in conferences, meetings, hearings, or presentations involving problems or issues of considerable consequence or importance to the program or program segment managed.

The primary purpose of the appellant's contacts credited under Subfactor 4A above is to plan and coordinate supply program operations internally with other [next higher organizational level] components and externally with customers and suppliers. These planning and coordination functions are consistent with Level 4B-2. The [component] mission is to support U.S. Army units in the European theater by facilitating the transfer and distribution of supplies and equipment. The organization is not responsible for regulatory compliance or enforcement, and negotiation to obtain resources is performed at higher levels in the organization. Thus, the appellant's contacts are essentially collegial in nature and do not involve the types of conflict resolution described at Level 4B-3.

Level 4B-2 is credited (75 points).

Factor 5, Difficulty of Typical Work Directed

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization directed, as well as other line, staff, or contracted work for which the supervisor has technical or oversight responsibility.

In applying this factor, separate instructions are provided for evaluating first level supervisors and second (and higher) level supervisors. In this case, the [component] has a current workforce of 482 authorized positions organized into four divisions, each of which is further subdivided by one or two levels. The appellant directly supervises the Deputy Director, a small staff assigned to his immediate office, and the four division chiefs, who in turn each supervise the remainder of the staff through one or two additional levels of supervision. Thus, the appellant is a third level supervisor.

In evaluating second (and higher) level supervisors under this factor, the GSSG instructs to first use the method described for first level supervisors. This involves determining the highest grade

of basic (mission-oriented) nonsupervisory work performed that constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload of the organization. The following types of work are specifically excluded from this workload calculation (we will refer to each staff year of work as a position for purposes of applying this factor):

- work that is graded on the basis of supervisory or leader duties;
- work for which the supervisor does not have the minimum supervisory and managerial authorities defined under Factor 3 (including such basic administrative supervisory functions as approving leave and evaluating performance); and
- lower-level support work that primarily facilitates the basic work of the unit.

The workload calculation includes the work performed by GS and FWS employees, assigned military and contractor personnel, and other non-Federal workers, which in this case would include LN employees. However, since this factor measures the difficulty of the work supervised in terms of GS grades, any work performed by non-GS employees must be converted to the appropriate GS equivalent grades for the purpose of applying these criteria.

The agency credited Level 5-3 under this factor, identifying GS-6 as the base level work of the organization. The appellant asserts his position should be credited at Level 5-6 at a minimum (with its associated GS-11 base level), "equivalent to the other Directors" in [next higher level organization], because he "supervises the GS-11-13s within the organization and as the third level supervisor of the base level workers."

The [component] has a current workforce of 482 authorized positions,⁴ 446 of which are LN positions classified by application of the "duty criteria" contained in the CTA II. The remaining 36 positions are Federal civil service positions under the GS or the FWS and classified by application of OPM standards. Of the total staff, 68 positions are excluded from the workload calculation as supervisory or work leader positions (based on information provided by the appellant). Thirteen salaried (white collar) positions are excluded as lower-level support work which facilitates the basic work of the unit (i.e., positions allocated to such series as: 303 Miscellaneous Clerk and Assistant; 344 Management and Program Clerical and Assistance; 1411 Library Technician; and 1531 Statistical Assistant). In addition, 32 wage-earning (blue collar) positions are similarly excluded (i.e., 5703 Motor Vehicle Operating). Therefore, the total staff for purposes of workload calculation after these supervisory/leader and lower-level support positions are excluded is 369 positions. Accordingly, in determining the highest grade of basic (mission-oriented) nonsupervisory work performed that constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload of the organization, at least 92 positions would have to be at the grade identified or higher. For purposes of the GSSG, this grade must be expressed as a GS grade. Therefore, the

⁴The current [component] manning table which lists actual filled positions differs significantly from the TDA due to a series of recent organizational restructurings wherein the staff has not yet been fully transitioned into the intended structure. The appellant also reported that [component] is currently six positions over its authorized level. For purposes of this decision, the TDA is considered to more accurately represent the workload of the organization as it is currently configured. Therefore, numbers of positions cited are based on the TDA plus authorized overhire positions unless otherwise noted.

grades of positions classified under the FWS or the CTA II must be converted to the appropriate GS equivalent grades in order to evaluate this factor.

The highest level work supervised by the appellant is represented by the approximately 41 two-grade interval, nonsupervisory/non-leader salaried positions.⁵ These include the positions in the following series: 028 Environmental Protection Specialist; 301 (titled Quality Management Specialist or Processes and Equipment Specialist); 1152 Production Control; 1670 Equipment Services; 2001 General Supply; 2030 Distribution Facilities and Storage Management; 2032 Packaging; 2101 Transportation Specialist; and 2210 Information Technology Management. As discussed previously in this decision, GS-9 is considered the first full performance level for two-grade interval work. Therefore, for purposes of determining a base level under this factor, we consider all 41 of the two-grade interval salaried positions supervised by the appellant to be at least at that grade level. This represents approximately 10 percent of the appellant's total creditable staff.

The appellant's wage-earning staff, excluding subordinate supervisory/leader positions and the lower-level support positions identified above, consists of about 168 positions, including 5 FWS employees and 163 LN employees allocated to either Wage Group Classification A for Wage Earners or Salary Group C. (Some FWS series, such as 5801 (titled Mechanical Equipment Repair Inspector), 6907 Materials Handler, and 6912 Materials Examiner and Identifier, are designated as salaried positions under the CTA II and thus allocated to Salary Group C.) Within Wage Group A, employees are allocated to "trade group categories" designated A1 through A5 and to "wage groups" designated 1 through 7 (which in effect represent grades). The wage group classification is based on the following scheme: wage groups 1 and 2 cover unskilled workers; wage group 3 covers semi-skilled workers; wage groups 4 and 5 cover skilled workers; and wage groups 6 and 7 cover skilled workers with qualifications. These wage groups cannot be directly equated to FWS grades, as allocation to wage groups 4-7 is determined by the length of vocational training completed rather than to knowledges and skills required by the positions as in the FWS.

The grades of FWS positions likewise do not correspond to GS grades. For example, an FWS position classified as grade WG-09 is not considered equivalent to grade GS-9 because General Schedule positions involve the application of knowledges and skills that are not required for FWS positions. Therefore, wage-earning positions, both LN and FWS, must be converted to their GS equivalent grades by comparing them to the GS classification standards for occupational series that involve the performance of similar or related activities.

We approached the conversion of the wage-earning positions, both FWS and LN, to their GS equivalent grades by separating the positions into broad categories. The first category is those positions that involve the operation of a type of equipment or the performance of some other purely manual activity. Although some of these positions may require considerable skill, they do not require any significant degree of judgment or interpretation of technical guides in carrying out the work. These include the approximately 102 positions in the following occupations: 3105 Fabric Working; 4102 Painting; 4602 Blocking and Bracing; 4604 Wood Working; 5423 Sandblasting; 6907 Materials Handling; 7001 Carton Making Machine Operation; 7002 Packing; 7006 Preservation Servicing; and 7009 Equipment Cleaning. These positions can be converted

⁵ This includes 11 GS-2001-9 positions filled as two-year term appointments.

to GS equivalent grades by comparing them to criteria contained in the standard for the GS-350 Equipment Operating Series, which covers similar work in operating certain specified types of equipment and performing normal operator maintenance. The highest grade normally allowable under this series is GS-4. Therefore, GS-4 is considered the highest potential GS equivalent grade for the positions in the above identified series.

The second category is the approximately 45 positions in the 6912 Materials Examiner and Identifier occupation, which involves identifying, examining, classifying, accepting, and disposing of materials and equipment. The work of positions in the 6912 occupation is equivalent in nature to GS clerical work, defined as structured work performed in accordance with established procedures, such as preparing, receiving, reviewing, and verifying documents. (See the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards.) These positions can be converted to GS equivalent grades by comparing them to criteria contained in the standard for the GS-2005 Supply Clerical and Technician Series. The lower grade levels of this series include similar work in receiving, examining, storing, and issuing property items. Clerical work of this nature does not exceed the GS-4 level in this series. Therefore, GS-4 is considered the highest potential GS equivalent grade for the positions in the 6912 series.

The third category is those positions involved in either repair or construction work which requires judgment and the interpretation of technical guides or blueprints in carrying out the work. These include the approximately 21 positions in the following occupations: 3801 (titled Metal Mechanic); 4602 Carpentry; 5801 (titled Mechanical Equipment Repair Inspector); 5803 Heavy Mobile Equipment Mechanic; and 5823 Automotive Mechanic. Work in these occupations is equivalent in nature to GS technical work, defined as requiring extensive practical knowledge gained through experience and/or training and involving the carrying out of tasks, methods, procedures, and computations laid out in published instructions and covered by established guidelines. (See the *Introduction*.) Technical work typically follows a one-grade interval pattern and does not require the application of knowledge and skills equivalent to those required for two-grade interval work. These positions can be converted to GS equivalent grades by comparing them to criteria contained in the Job Family Standard for Technical Work in the Engineering and Architecture Group, GS-800, which covers related installation, maintenance, operation, and testing work. Although this series allows for the classification of positions up to GS-12, one-grade interval technical work does not normally exceed the GS-7 level. At the GS-9 level and above in this series, duties begin to resemble work performed by beginning professional employees in the same general occupational field. Therefore, GS-7 is considered the highest potential GS equivalent grade for the positions in the above identified series.

In summary, of the 168 total wage-earning positions, 147 would not exceed GS-4 grade equivalency and 21 would not exceed GS-7 grade equivalency. These 21 positions represent approximately six percent of the appellant's total creditable staff.

The remainder of the appellant's staff consists of the approximately 160 one-grade interval salaried positions in the following series: 1105 Purchasing; 1802 (titled Military Customs Inspector or Material Inspector); 2005 Supply Clerical and Technician; 2102 Transportation Clerk and Assistant; and 2131 Freight Rate. As noted previously, one-grade interval support work does not normally exceed the GS-7 level and correspondingly, with the exception of the 1105 series, these series standards provide criteria to the GS-7 level only. Within SAE, the positions in these series span a range of grades from GS-6 to GS-7 and C1-03 to C1-06, but with

the vast majority (approximately 155 positions) at the lower end of that range (i.e., C1-04/4A/05). We consider these lower-graded LN positions to be performing work at a GS equivalent grade lower than GS-7, which represents the highest level work performed in these occupations. Therefore, for purposes of this decision we consider the work of these positions to be no higher than GS-6 equivalent.

In summary, approximately 10 percent of the appellant's subordinate staff (the two-grade interval salaried positions) is at the GS-9 level or above and six percent (the third category of wage-earning positions discussed above) is potentially at the GS-7 level. Therefore, there are insufficient positions at either the GS-7 or GS-9 grade levels to represent the base level since the combined positions at these grade levels constitute only 16 percent of the total creditable staff. However, the combined positions potentially at the GS-6 level or above (approximately 222 positions, constituting well over half of the creditable staff) exceeds the required 25 percent. Therefore, GS-6 is identified as the base level of work supervised.⁶

Although the GSSG notes that the method applied above for evaluating first level supervisors will also be the correct one for many second level supervisors, it provides an alternative method for evaluating second (and higher) level supervisors under this factor in those cases where a heavy supervisory or managerial workload related to work above the base level (as identified by application of the first method) is present. It involves determining the highest grade of nonsupervisory work directed which requires at least 50 percent of the duty time of the supervisory position under evaluation.

This alternative method is not applicable for most second level and many higher level supervisors and is particularly inapplicable to the appellant's position. First, out of a total staff of 482 authorized positions, the appellant supervises no more than 41 nonsupervisory/non-leader salaried positions and 21 nonsupervisory wage-earning positions above the base level identified using the first method (i.e., GS-6), and only four of these positions report directly to him. The presence of one or more intervening level supervisors between the appellant and these positions renders it unlikely that he would devote 50 percent or more of his time to overseeing the work performed by these particular positions, either the wage-earning work over which he exercises limited technical supervision, or the salaried work the majority of which is no higher than GS-9 grade equivalency and thus would not be expected to occupy much of his immediate attention. Therefore, this work is not considered a "heavy supervisory or managerial workload" within the meaning of the GSSG. Second, these higher-grade positions do not represent a separate and distinct mission within [component] but rather encompass a variety of occupational fields dispersed throughout the organization, and there is thus no practical means of determining how much time the appellant may devote to supervising these specific workloads. As such, the alternative method is considered not applicable to the appellant's position and the base grade level derived through use of the first method is appropriate.

Level 5-3 is credited (340 points).

⁶ Use of the current manning table as opposed to the TDA to derive the base level grade does not yield a different result. The numbers of employees in the various occupational fields represented differ and some additional occupational series are represented, but the relative proportions of lower-graded and higher-graded positions are basically unchanged.

Factor 6, Other Conditions

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities. The *difficulty* of work is measured primarily by the grade level of work credited under Factor 5. *Complexity* is measured by the level of coordination required.

In applying this factor, when the highest level which the position fully meets is either 6-1, 6-2, or 6-3, a single level may be added to this level if the position meets three or more of the "special situations" described. The agency credited Level 6-3b under this factor, but added one grade level for final crediting of Level 6-4, through the assignment of items (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), and (8) under "special situations."

At Level 6-2b, the position directs subordinate supervisors over work comparable to GS-6 or lower, where coordinating the work of the subordinate units requires a continuing effort to assure quality and service standards.

At the corresponding Level 6-3b, the position directs subordinate supervisors over positions in grades GS-7 or GS-8 or the equivalent which requires consolidation or coordination similar to that described at Level 6-2a within or among subordinate units or with outside units. This level of coordination ensures: consistency of product, service, interpretation, or advice; conformance with the output of other units, with formal standards or agency policy. Supervisors typically coordinate with supervisors of other units to deal with requirements and problems affecting others outside the organization.

The base level of work supervised by the appellant's subordinate supervisors as identified under Factor 5 is potentially no higher than GS-6, which aligns with Level 6-2b.

Special Situations

1. Variety of work - Credited. The appellant supervises more than one kind of work which each represents the equivalent of a classification series and requires distinctly different bodies of knowledge, in that he supervises positions in about 15 GS and 18 FWS occupations.
2. Shift operations - Not credited. The appellant reported that shift operations have been terminated for budget reasons.
3. Fluctuating work force or constantly changing deadlines - Credited. Operations must often be adjusted in response to the unpredictable workloads and deadlines associated with the continuous movement of large volumes of items into and out of limited storage facilities.
4. Physical dispersion - Not credited. Although the SAE workload is carried out at numerous physically dispersed warehouses, this work is overseen by subordinate supervisors and thus does not directly impact the difficulty of supervision exercised by the appellant.

5. Special staffing situations - Not credited. The appellant's work force does not include a substantial portion consisting of employees in special employment programs or comparable situations requiring regular and recurring counseling and motivational activities and tailoring of job assignments, working conditions, and training to fit the special circumstances.

6. Impact of specialized programs - Credited. With approximately 16 percent of his subordinate staff potentially above the GS-6 level of work credited in Factor 5, the appellant supervises a "significant technical or administrative workload in grades above the base level of work" credited under that factor.

7. Changing technology - Not credited. New technology, equipment, and software are occasionally introduced into the [component] environment, such as new bar code scanning and property accountability systems, new forklifts and cranes, and new equipment to test for radioactivity and chemical contamination, and these may require training in their use. However, [component] is not an environment where work processes and procedures vary constantly because of the impact of changing technology, requiring extensive training and guidance of the subordinate staff.

8. Special hazard and safety conditions - Credited. There are inherent hazards associated with warehouse operations, and [component] serves as the storage center for hazardous materials for all [next higher level organization] elements, including chemicals and radioactive materials.

Since four special situations are credited, a single level is added to the Level 6-2 factor level assignment.

Level 6-3 is credited (975 points).

Summary

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>Points</u>
Program Scope and Effect	1-2	350
Organizational Setting	2-2	250
Supervisory/Managerial Authority	3-3b	775
Personal Contacts		
Nature of Contacts	4A-2	50
Purpose of Contacts	4B-2	75
Difficulty of Work Directed	5-3	340
Other Conditions	6-3	<u>975</u>
Total		2815

The total of 2815 points falls within the GS-12 range (2755-3150) on the grade conversion table provided in the GSSG.

Evaluation Using the Grade Evaluation Guide for Supply Positions

Factor 1, Knowledge Required by the Position

This factor measures the nature and extent of information an employee must understand in order to do the work, and the skills needed to apply that knowledge.

At Level 1-7, work requires knowledge of a broad range of supply program relationships; knowledge of specialized methods and techniques to analyze and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of supply programs and/or operations; and ability to resolve difficult issues and problems involving, for example, supply processes, work methods, supply data management, or operational procedures. At this level, employees often use knowledge of interrelated supply processes to coordinate the objectives and plans of two or more specialized supply programs and/or two or more independent organizations receiving local supply support, or to develop and/or implement procedures and practices to cover multiple supply objectives including inventory management of the supply stock fund for expendable and nonexpendable items. They must evaluate variables such as availability of materials; status of funds for purchases; time required for assembly and delivery; and similar considerations where the employee must make decisions about priorities and allocation of resources.

The knowledge required by the appellant's position meets Level 1-7. His work requires knowledge of a broad range of supply program relationships and operations and the ability to coordinate interrelated supply processes involved in receiving, storing, maintaining, accounting for, and distributing/redistributing supplies and excess/left behind equipment within the European theater. This includes both general supply (i.e., the excess theater stocks that are received from U.S. Army units in the European theater for shipment back to the continental United States) and direct supply (i.e., local retail operations for office supplies, repair parts, and some major end items, plus distribution and turn-in receipt of military gear).

At Level 1-8, employees use comprehensive knowledge of supply policy requirements to function as technical authorities in applying new theories, concepts, and developments to problems not susceptible to treatment by accepted methods. In addition to mastery of a specialty area, employees at this level use knowledge of other supply specialties in resolving major conflicts in policy and program objectives. Employees use this level and kind of knowledge to serve at a variety of operating and staff level positions requiring expertise in a specialty area of supply or as a generalist concerned with supply policy or program responsibilities. The work is characterized by the depth of analysis involved in resolving problems or issues, and/or the impact on supply support programs that extend beyond local operations. It is typically found at a major level of the organization, such as a major military command, a major depot with national and/or worldwide support requirements, a regional headquarters with delegated supply support responsibilities, or at a national headquarters level, depending on the level of authority and program responsibility delegated to each. Examples provided in the standard of assignments that embody these characteristics include the following:

- planning for significantly new or far-reaching supply program requirements; or leading or participating as a technical expert in interagency study groups to resolve problems in existing supply systems and programs that require innovative solutions;
- planning, organizing, and directing studies to develop long-range (i.e., 5-10 years) studies and forecasts;
- recommending methods for enhancing efficiency of supply systems by adapting existing and/or applying evolving technology;
- evaluating and making recommendations concerning overall plans and proposals for major agency and interagency supply projects; and

- developing and implementing national level guidance in agency standards, guidelines, or policies for major supply programs.

Level 1-8 is not met. The nature of the appellant's work is not such that it requires him to serve as a technical authority in applying new supply concepts or developments or to resolve major policy or program conflicts. The appellant does not occupy a staff-level position responsible for developing supply program policies, standards, or guidelines. Rather, as stated in SAE's mission and function statement, the appellant "interprets directives and guidance from higher authority and issues implementing instructions." The appellant occupies an operating-level position overseeing the activities of the [component], which consist primarily of material receipt, storage, issue, preservation, and packaging. The [component] mission is not equivalent to that of a "major depot with national and/or worldwide support requirements" in that its immediate support responsibilities are regional in nature. The [component] is not responsible for the acquisition, fabrication, overhaul, or maintenance of a major class of items or equipment for the DA, nor is it responsible for forecasting and planning for new DA-level supply program requirements, such that it could be credited with "national" support responsibilities. Rather, it serves as a conduit for items being shipped from U.S. Army units and SSAs in the European theater back to the continental U.S. The processes and methodology by which this is accomplished are established and do not require in-depth analysis to resolve problems or issues associated with the design or operation of the supply system.

Level 1-7 is credited (1250 points).

Factor 2, Supervisory Controls

This factor covers the nature and extent of direct or indirect controls exercised by the supervisor, the employee's responsibility, and the review of completed work.

At Level 2-4, the supervisor sets the overall objectives and decides on the resources available. The employee consults with the supervisor in determining which projects to initiate, develops deadlines, and identifies staff and other resources required to carry out the assignments. The employee, having developed expertise in the work, is responsible for planning and carrying out the work, resolving most of the conflicts that arise, integrating and coordinating the work of others as necessary, and interpreting policy in terms of established objectives. The employee keeps the supervisor informed of progress, potential controversies, issues with far-reaching implications, and intractable problems. Work is reviewed from an overall standpoint in terms of feasibility, compatibility with other supply program requirements, or effectiveness in meeting objectives and achieving expected results.

The supervisory controls under which the appellant works correspond to Level 2-4. Within the parameters of the established mission and functions of the [component] and the resources allocated, the appellant is expected to carry out the work independently with broad latitude for making operational decisions that will achieve the expected results.

At Level 2-5, the supervisor provides broad administrative and policy direction through discussion of financial and program goals, and national, agency, and local supply policies affecting the direction of the supply program. The employee works under broad delegated authority for independently planning, scheduling, coordinating, carrying out, and monitoring the

effectiveness of supply operations. The employee makes extensive unreviewed technical judgments concerning the interpretation and implementation of existing supply policy and is regarded as a leading technical authority in a supply specialization or supply program management. The supervisor usually accepts the employee's recommendations without change. The employee's actions and recommendations are reviewed primarily for results obtained in achieving supply program goals and in providing to the organization's mission. The supervisor evaluates the employee's recommendations for new or revised supply policies, procedures, and controls in terms of impact on end user programs, broad supply program goals, and/or national supply program priorities.

Level 2-5 is not met. This level does not represent merely a greater degree of independence than Level 2-4 but also a greater degree of responsibility and authority exercised, which in turn are directly related to the nature of the work performed. Level 2-5 is predicated on the exercise of some degree of program management or policy development responsibility, where the employee works under "broad delegated authority" in directing the supply program and revising supply policies. In contrast, the appellant directs a field-level supply activity which does not permit exercise of the degree or type of authority depicted at Level 2-5.

Level 2-4 is credited (450 points).

Factor 3, Guidelines

This factor covers the nature of the guidelines used and the judgment needed to apply them.

At Level 3-4, guidelines consist of broad supply guidance such as directives issued by a national headquarters, general agency policy statements and objectives, or other departmental guides that are open to local interpretation. The employee exercises a great deal of personal judgment and discretion with broad latitude for interpreting and applying guidelines across the organization, researching and implementing new and improved supply methods and procedures within the organization, and establishing criteria to identify and analyze trends in supply programs.

The guidelines used and applied by the appellant meet Level 3-4. As at this level, the appellant works within the parameters of the broad policies, directives, and regulations issued by higher headquarters and exercises considerable personal judgment in implementing local [component] supply activities, such as determining space and storage requirements and physical layouts, inventory and distribution requirements, movement plans, equipment needs, and supply accounting systems.

At Level 3-5, the employee is a recognized technical authority on the development and interpretation of supply guidelines, policies, legislation, and regulations. The results of the work cover supply operations in one or more substantive national supply programs. Guidelines are nonspecific and stated in terms of broad national or departmental policies and goals, often in obscure legal and technical terminology which necessitates extensive interpretation to define the extent and intent of coverage. For example, at this level employees perform such work as reviewing and commenting on pending legislation; recommending new or revised legislation; and developing supply regulations and policies.

Level 3-5 is not met. The organizational level of the appellant's position does not allow for the performance of such work as developing national-level supply policies, regulations, or guidelines or reviewing and recommending new legislation affecting the conduct of DA's supply programs.

Level 3-4 is credited (450 points).

Factor 4, Complexity

This factor covers the nature, number, variety, and intricacy of the tasks or processes in the work performed, the difficulty in identifying what needs to be done, and the difficulty and originality involved in performing the work.

At Level 4-5, employees perform assignments involving various projects or evaluations requiring the application of many and different processes, differing regulatory criteria and procedures, and significant departures from established practices. They make decisions, or develop and implement new methods and techniques that satisfy broad policy and technical requirements. For example, employees at this level may recommend changes in implementing instructions covering established supply practices and methods.

The complexity of the appellant's work meets Level 4-5, in recognition of the wide variety of supply-related processes and procedures carried out at [component] and the appellant's responsibility for developing local implementing instructions in order to accomplish mission requirements.

At Level 4-6, employees perform work that defines the course of supply programs across organizational lines in Federal agencies and/or industrial organizations involved in supporting supply systems. They conduct research and develop new approaches and applications in supply theory, technological developments, or controls over Federal supply work. They analyze, plan, schedule, and coordinate the development of legislative and supply policy issuances. Assignments typically involve participation, as an expert authority, in group efforts to resolve problems in supply policy development and implementation, such as interagency committees to review, analyze, develop, and issue national policy directives and draft legislation affecting supply policies and programs throughout the Government.

Level 4-6 is not met. The appellant oversees an operating-level activity which does not allow for the performance of the type of policy development work depicted at this level.

Level 4-5 is credited (325 points).

Factor 5, Scope and Effect

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work, and the effect of the work products or services both within and outside the organization.

At Level 5-4, work involves investigating and analyzing a variety of unusual supply problems or conditions associated with supply programs or operations, formulating projects or studies to substantially alter existing supply systems, or establishing criteria in an area of specialization. Employees at this level develop alternatives and options designed to meet requirements in a

variety of physical and environmental circumstances. The work affects supply system design, installation, and maintenance in a wide range of activities.

The scope of the appellant's work (i.e., the purpose of the work) meets Level 5-4 in that it often involves what could be characterized as unusual supply problems or conditions that would be expected to occur in a major receipt and distribution center. The effect of the work (i.e., the impact of the work product or service) meets the general intent of Level 5-4 to the extent that [component] provides specialized supply services affecting all U.S. Army units in the European theater, comparable to a "wide range of activities."

At Level 5-5, the work involves planning, developing, and carrying out vital supply projects and programs which are central to the mission of the agency, typically having national or international impact. Work on policy matters often involves establishing the agency's position on broad issues or working on national level committees to develop supply programs of importance to national programs. The employee's work affects the development of major aspects of supply program definition and administration throughout the agency and sometimes in other agencies. Program and project proposals frequently cut across component or geographic lines within the agency and may also affect the budgets, programs, and interests of other Federal agencies.

This level is not met. Since [component] is a field-level organization, the appellant's work has neither the agencywide scope nor the national/international impact depicted at Level 5-5.

Level 5-4 is credited (225 points).

Factor 6 and 7, Personal Contacts and Purpose of Contacts

These factors relate to the recurring face-to-face and telephone contacts with persons not in the supervisory chain and the purposes of those contacts. The relationship between Factors 6 and 7 presumes that the same contacts will be evaluated under both factors.

Persons Contacted

At Level 2, contacts are with other agency employees engaged in different functions or missions and at various organizational levels, and/or with the general public in moderately structured settings; i.e., the exact purpose of the contact or the role and authority of the parties involved may be unclear.

At Level 3, contacts are with individuals or groups from outside the agency in moderately unstructured settings; i.e., the contacts are not established on a routine basis, the purpose and extent of each contact is different, and the role of each party is identified during the contact. Typical contacts at this level are with supply managers from other agencies, vendors, or technical level representatives from foreign governments; members of professional organizations, the news media, or public action groups; or the head of the agency or program officials several managerial levels above the employee when such contacts occur on an ad hoc basis.

The appellant's regular and recurring contacts correspond to Level 2; i.e., DA employees in different program offices and at various levels of the organization. Although the appellant has

occasional contacts with representatives of foreign governments during the course of military briefings and weapons inspections, these are infrequent (e.g., annual briefings and biannual or occasional unannounced inspections) and thus not representative of the normal level of contacts associated with the work. Further, these contacts are structured in that they are for predetermined purposes and the role and authority of the parties involved are clear.

Purpose of Contacts

At Level b, contacts are for the purpose of planning, coordinating work, and resolving operating problems by influencing or motivating individuals or groups who are working toward mutual goals and have basically cooperative attitudes.

At Level c, contacts are for the purpose of influencing or motivating persons or groups where the persons contacted may be uncooperative; e.g., such as when attempting to gain compliance with established policies and regulations by persuasion or negotiation.

The purpose of the appellant's contacts are consistent with Level b; i.e., planning, coordinating, and resolving problems encountered in operating-level supply activities where the parties involved are working toward the same objectives. This is not a compliance or regulatory function that would require the types of persuasion or negotiation depicted at Level c.

Level 2b is credited (75 points).

Factor 8, Physical Demands

This factor covers the requirements and physical demands placed on the employee by the work situation.

The position matches Level 8-1, which describes sedentary work.

Level 8-1 is credited (5 points).

Factor 9, Work Environment

This factor considers the risks and discomforts in the employee's physical surroundings or the nature of the work assigned and the safety regulations required

The position matches level 9-1, which describes a typical office environment.

Level 9-1 is credited (5 points).

Summary

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. Knowledge Required by the Position	1-7	1250
2. Supervisory Controls	2-4	450
3. Guidelines	3-4	450

4. Complexity	4-5	325
5. Scope and Effect	5-4	225
6. & 7. Personal Contacts and Purpose of Contacts	2b	75
8. Physical Demands	8-1	5
9. Work Environment	9-1	<u>5</u>
<i>Total</i>		2785

The total of 2785 points falls within the GS-12 point range (2755-3150) on the grade conversion table provided in the guide.

Decision

Since application of both the GSSG and the Grade Evaluation Guide for Supply positions results in a GS-12 grade determination, the position is properly classified as Supply Management Officer, GS-2003-12.