

**OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT  
ATLANTA OVERSIGHT DIVISION  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA**

**CLASSIFICATION APPEAL DECISION**

Under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code

**Appellant:** [appellant's name]

**Position:** Production Controller (Parenthetical title at agency  
discretion)  
GS-1152-09

**Organization:** [appellant's activity in Department of the Army]

**Decision:** Production Controller (Parenthetical title at agency  
discretion)  
GS-1152-09  
(Appeal Denied)

**OPM Decision Number:** C-1152-09-01

Kathy W. Day Date: 3/12/97  
Classification Appeals Officer

rd # 1152097A.AT

## **Background**

On December 6, 1996, the Atlanta Oversight Division, Office of Personnel Management, accepted an appeal for the position of Production Controller, GS-1152-09, [appellant's activity in the Department of the Army]. The appellant is requesting that his position be changed to Production Controller, GS-1152-11.

The appeal has been accepted and processed under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code. This is the final administrative decision on the classification of the position subject to discretionary review only under the limited conditions and time outlined in part 511, subpart F, of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

## **Sources of Information**

This appeal decision is based on information from the following sources:

1. The appellant's letter of November 25, 1996, with enclosures, appealing the classification of his position.
2. The agency's letter of December 19, 1996, providing position and organizational information.
3. A telephone interview with [the appellant] on December 30, 1996.
4. A telephone interview with [the servicing personnel specialist] on December 30, 1996.
5. A telephone interview with [the appellant's immediate supervisor] on December 31, 1996.

## **Position Information**

The appellant is assigned to Position Number 15764 which was classified on July 22, 1996. The appellant, supervisor, and agency have certified to the accuracy of the position description.

The appellant is responsible for planning, programming, and scheduling operations in the maintenance, demilitarization, modification and renovation of conventional ammunition, special munitions (material and readiness), propellants, complex guided missile systems and electronic guidance control systems for guided missiles. He develops comprehensive operating procedures to include contingency stocks, shipment, preservation and packing, budgeting and program requirements, detailed hazardous analyses and environmental issues. The appellant reviews and analyzes regulations, planning documents and requirements for ammunition renovation and

demilitarization and reviews personnel requirements, procedures, equipment, and facilities in coordination with appropriate directorates. He analyzes and participates in determining if the assigned ammunition workload is properly planned, tested, acquired, and supported considering depot capabilities.

The appellant reviews production data, flow charts, procedures and statistical cost data for approval or amendment; reviews technical data packages including maintenance manuals, Depot Maintenance Work Requirements (DMWRs), publications, engineering drawings, and other special instructions for development; and implements detailed plans and procedures.

The appellant works under the direction of the Division Chief who directs work through the use of a Cell Leader. The appellant and the Cell Leader confer to set the overall objectives and adjust any conflicting priorities. The appellant works independently to analyze and carry out complex production control functions and resolves problems and deviations through application of established regulations, policies, letters of instructions and other guidelines. The Cell Leader and Supervisor are notified of any situation that would impact long-term production requirements. The supervisor is available to assist with unusual situations which do not have guidelines or clear precedents.

The appellant believes his position should be reclassified from GS-09 to the GS-11 level because of accretion and absorption of duties and responsibilities as a direct result of the loss of personnel due to manpower restraints and the mandated loss of the first line supervisor. He also disagrees with the agency's evaluation of Factors 1 and 2 and believes they should be credited at a higher level.

The classification process is designed to measure the level of work performed. While the addition of duties as a result of manpower restraints may impact the quantity of work being performed, it does not necessarily impact the level of work being performed. Performing a quantity of work above that expected of a fully competent employee is recognized through appropriate performance evaluation and incentive awards procedures and is not a factor in the classification of positions.

### **Standards Referenced**

Production Control Series, GS-1152, April 1992.

### **Series and Title Determination**

The appellant does not contest the title or series of his position but believes the parenthetical title is too broad. The agency placed the appellant's position in the Production Control Series, GS-1152, which includes all positions involved in the supervision or performance of planning, estimating, scheduling, and expediting the use

of labor, machines, and materials in specific manufacturing or remanufacturing operations that employ mechanical or automated production systems and methods in the fabrication, rebuilding, overhaul, refurbishing, or repair of any type of Government-owned, controlled, or operated equipment, systems, facilities, and supplies. We agree that the appellant's position is properly placed in the GS-1152 series.

The GS-1152 standard mandates the title Production Controller with an appropriate parenthetical designation for nonsupervisory positions at the GS-7 level and above. The agency may at its discretion use the suggested parenthetical titles listed in the GS-1152 series, or affix an appropriate parenthetical title in accordance with the guidance provided in the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards.

The position requires specialized knowledge and skill in conventional ammunition, special munitions readiness (material and propellants), complex guided missiles and electronic guidance control systems for guided missiles. The appellant is responsible for all conventional ammunition which covers a variety of artillery including but not limited to 81mm, 105mm, impulse and other small arms cartridges, ammunition fiber containers, a variety of guided missile systems including adaptor booster bombs, rocket motors, mechanical time fuses (super quick), fin assembly bombs, simulator launching tows, practice warheads, launch motors, and electronic components of missiles.

The agency designated the parenthetical title of Ordnance and Missiles for the position. Ordnance includes mechanical ordnance and accessories, azimuth and elevation mechanisms and motors, sighting and range-finding equipment, field and deck guns, machine guns, mortars, and all small arms. Missiles include guided and ballistic missiles, their major components and subsystems including fuel and propulsion systems, boosters, guidance and instrumentation systems, structural components, airframe, and launchers. Given the description of the types of systems, equipment, or products covered under the listed specializations, we find the agency's parenthetical title appropriate for this position.

The appellant's position is properly titled and coded as Production Controller (Parenthetical title at agency discretion), GS-1152.

### **Grade Determination**

The Production Control Series, GS-1152, standard is written in the Factor Evaluation System (FES) format. Under the FES, positions are placed in grades on the basis of their duties, responsibilities, and the qualifications required as evaluated in terms of nine factors common to nonsupervisory General Schedule positions.

A point value is assigned to each factor based on a comparison of the position's duties with the factor-level descriptions in the standard. The factor point values mark the lower end of the ranges for the indicated factor levels. For a position factor to warrant a given point value, it must be fully equivalent to the overall intent of the selected factor-level description. If the position fails in any significant aspect to meet a particular factor-level description in the standard, the point value for the next lower factor level must be assigned, unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect which meets a higher level. The total points assigned are converted to a grade by use of the grade conversion table in the standard.

Under FES, positions which significantly exceed the highest factor level or fail to meet the lowest factor level described in a classification standard must be evaluated by reference to the Primary Standard, contained in Appendix 3 of the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards. The Primary Standard is the "standard-for-standards" for FES.

#### Factor 1 - Knowledge Required By The Position:

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts that a worker must understand to do acceptable work, such as the steps, procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles, and concepts; and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply this knowledge. The agency credited this factor at Level 1-6. The appellant believes Level 1-7 is met.

At Level 1-6, employees use knowledge and experience in the recurring manufacture, overhaul, or repair of products or projects using multiple process production methods and procedures to develop information necessary for the control of a complex project, e.g., numerous skilled trades utilizing a variety of general purpose and specialized machines, tools, equipment, and material to manufacture, remanufacture, or overhaul and assemble products such as large self-propelled ordnance; a complex missile/launcher system; major systems and airframes of fixed and rotary wing aircraft; or a variety of complex and long-term facility repair and construction projects. The employee utilizes a practical knowledge of the industrial activity, its staff and support operations, the purpose and capacities of the machines and equipment, the type and kind of labor required, a variety of material resources and their costs, to plan for and control the production cycle. The work requires extensive knowledge, understanding, and use of product and manufacturing terminology, data, and standards and how to relate them properly to new projects. The controller utilizes considerable knowledge and experience to observe and analyze production operations to determine if schedules are being followed, if they can be improved, and to determine the causes of production delays.

Level 1-6 is met. The appellant develops detailed production control plans incorporating budget and program requirements, cost estimates for personnel, equipment, shipping, storage, packaging, and other special requirements for ammunition maintenance, demilitarization, modification, renovation and repair of all types of conventional ammunition, special ammunition, preposition readiness materials (contingency ammunition stocks), propellants, and explosive components of missiles. The work requires knowledge of depot mission, functions and capabilities to coordinate ammunition and missile production control operations or special projects for the Missile Command (MICOM) and Industrial Operations Command (IOC), as well as knowledge and understanding of ammunition production methods, processes and procedures, specialized handling, supply, shipping, storage and transportation requirements including hazard class compatibility and net explosive weight requirements. The appellant must also have knowledge of quality requirement standards, standard operating procedures, program requirements, and the DMWRs which specify information and instructions for all conventional ammunition and missiles, e.g., engineering plans; designs and specifications; directions and instructions on how to fix or repair equipment or components; parts and lot numbers. This knowledge is used to plan for effective and efficient operations; analyze production operations, resources, program and budget requirements; monitor progress; identify and resolve problems and irregularities; and propose solutions ensuring workload is properly planned, tested, acquired and supported. This compares favorably with Level 1-6.

At Level 1-7, positions require, in addition to the knowledge required at Level 1-6, a comprehensive and intensive practical knowledge of all the production methods and procedures, machines, and materials; and considerable skill and experience to plan for the future or immediate production control for the manufacture, overhaul, or repair of prototype or very complex products, e.g., spacecraft; combat or strategic fixed wing aircraft, large and very complex weapon systems like a warship or submarine; or responsibility for a number of complex "compartmented zones" of a very large ship (the complete propulsion system is one such zone). The controller must have knowledge, skill and experience to prevent or alleviate production delays, scheduling conflicts, the lack of sufficient materials, faulty processes, labor shortages, or skilled trade imbalances. This requires a good working knowledge of the basic requirements and procedures of all departments being coordinated both in and outside of the production areas. The employee must apply a variety of methods to investigate, analyze, plan, and implement corrective action, as well as establish effective cost controls for difficult and complex production problems that may occur during the preplanning or the work-in-progress phase. Some production controllers, because of their advanced knowledge and experience, may function as the principle employee responsible for the production control planning for a particular type of product.

Level 1-7 is not met. The appellant works in a production control facility for rebuilding and modification of conventional artillery, small arms and ammunition, and missiles.

The facility does not perform production control operations for the manufacture, overhaul or repair of complex or prototype ammunition or missile products, systems, or projects; and the appellant is not the principle employee responsible for the production control planning for a particular type of product that requires the level of knowledge and skill depicted at this level. For example, the agency's decision credited some of the appellant's work associated with TOW missiles at Level 1-7. It should be noted that the agency's classification appeal decision referenced two appellants, the appellant and another employee, both assigned to position number 15764. During our fact finding, however, the appellant admitted that he did not perform the following duties as credited in the agency's decision and claimed in his appeal, e.g., a team member on the advance survey team on OCONUS activities for explosive building requirements, served on the MICOM inspection and assessment team for the inspection of TOW missiles, and prototyped the modification program for the 81MM procedure and test shot procedures. He stated that these production controller operations were performed by the other employee. In a follow-up conversation, the appellant also stated that he does perform testing of electrical components and circuits in missiles, but the more complex work is performed by another department within the depot. The supervisor confirmed that the appellant is not assigned to the TOW Missile and does not handle production control chemical ammunition. The actual work performed by the appellant does not require knowledge, skill and abilities typical of Level 1-7. There is no evidence in the appeal record to support the responsibility for complex or prototype products or projects or ammunition maintenance programs required to credit Level 1-7.

Level 1-6 is credited for 950 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 for carrying out assignments, and how completed work is reviewed. The agency credited this factor at level 2-3. The appellant believes this factor should be credited at a higher level because he performs his assignments without on-site supervision and must make 95 percent of the decisions due to the mandatory loss of the first line supervisor.

At Level 2-3, the supervisor assigns responsibility for providing continuous control of production in a specific department or large shop. The supervisor defines the general objectives, priorities, and any changes to project-driven deadlines. The supervisor is available to assist the employee with unusual situations which do not have guidelines or clear precedents. The controller is expected to analyze the production requirements; plan for the various phases of production and labor requirements; coordinate the job scheduling, materials, and funding; and handle problems and deviations in accordance with instructions, policies, previous training, or accepted practices. Completed work is usually evaluated for technical soundness, efficient use

of resources, resolution of normal production scheduling problems, and efforts made to expedite product completion deadlines.

Level 2-3 is met. The immediate supervisor stated that she directs the work of the appellant through a Cell Leader and a Senior Production Controller. She provides overall technical and administrative direction and expertise on planning and control operations and discusses and resolves policy or operational problems or issues through informal meetings and discussions with the appellant. She stated the Cell Leader is responsible for macro-managing the overall administrative workload of three separate teams and develops long-range administrative operating plans and program requirements. The Cell Leader assigns members to work on projects; resolves controversial or precedent-setting matters; provides technical advice on significant deviations from established procedures, policy, or techniques; monitors assignments; and provides input on performance appraisals. The Cell Leader also reviews and approves all work requests completed by the appellant. Each team has a Senior Production Controller, GS-11, who is responsible for workload distribution and reporting and is available to provide technical direction to team members, as needed. The appellant works independently to analyze and carry out complex production control functions and resolve problems and deviations through application of established regulations, policies, letters of instructions and other guidelines. He develops and/or establishes procedures, policies, letters of instruction and other guides for new and existing munitions. He makes decisions affecting whether the work can or cannot be accomplished within available resources and facility capabilities. Within the framework of DMWRs, the appellant develops standard operating procedures. Technical matters, problems or issues which are not covered by guidelines are discussed with the Cell Leader or supervisor. The Cell Leader oversees long term production control planning and analyzes workload, personnel and resource requirements for all work requests from the various directorates at the facility. Completed work requests are approved by the Cell Leader. Day-to-day activities and decisions made by the appellant are reviewed only if they affect long-range production control activities. The supervisor reviews work accomplishments from input provided by the Cell Leader and Senior Production Controller in terms of meeting performance standard requirements and customer support feedback. This meets the intent of Level 2-3.

At Level 2-4, the supervisor and the controller confer to set the overall objectives and adjust any conflicting priorities. The controller receives minimal guidance and is expected to analyze, plan and carry out complex production control tasks independently and resolve most production, labor, machine, and material conflicts or shortages which arise. The controller plans and coordinates most of the timing and integrated production efforts of many different departments or shops that are responsible for work on various segments of the product. The supervisor is informed of any situations that could impact on long-term production requirements. The controller may consult with the supervisor to provide information needed by management, to



report potentially troublesome situations, or to recommend corrective action in areas that extend beyond the area of the controller's authority. Completed work is reviewed only in terms of effectiveness in meeting and coordinating production requirements and deadlines.

Level 2-4 is not fully met. The appellant's position description reads as though he operates at Level 2-4. However, information obtained during our fact finding indicates the appellant's supervisory controls are not accurately described. In our interview with the appellant, he stated that he is given wide latitude to make decisions affecting day-to-day activities; to determine the feasibility of work requests, the capabilities of directorates to meet requirements, and the labor skills needed to complete the work; and to develop standard operating procedures for work. Although he performs his work independently without on-site supervision and coordinates and resolves problems with other directorates or commands, his decisions are limited to conventional assignments and projects within established guidelines. The appellant's supervisor stated that the appellant is not authorized to make decisions affecting long-range plans and is given technical direction and guidance on policy issues, complex projects or assignments which do not have clear precedents, and on matters which deviate from established guidelines. In addition, the appellant's work requests are subject to review and approval by the Cell Leader indicating a closer level of supervision over the work than the level of independence envisioned at Level 2-4.

Level 2-3 is credited for 275 points.

### Factor 3 - Guidelines:

This factor covers the nature of guidelines used, and the judgment needed to apply them. The appellant does not contest the agency's findings.

At Level 3-3, guidelines are available for most assignments, but they are not always specific or are not completely applicable to some products, processes, materials, or production operations. The controller must use experience and judgment to interpret, adapt, or extend policies, guides, procedures, regulations, and precedents to new or different products and production operations. Since some guides may not be applicable, the employee analyzes the results and makes recommendations for necessary changes. At this level, some positions have responsibility for preparing and testing new product assembly methods, procedures, and guidelines.

Level 3-3 is met. Guidelines include army regulations, technical orders, DMWRs, Maintenance Work Orders (MWOs), letters of instructions, technical manuals, supply bulletins, safety regulations, environmental issues, and standard operating procedures. The appellant uses experience and judgment in applying, adapting and modifying

guidelines or in developing new standard operating procedures for situations not covered by existing guidelines. This compares favorably with Level 3-3.

At Level 3-4, there is a significant lack of definitive or directly applicable guidelines and standard data. The controller usually refers to previous methods, procedural guides, and instructions over major production functional areas which are of limited use or application. The employee exercises a high degree of initiative in searching out sources of information, much of it indirect or obscure, to develop project estimates and plans for control of complex production projects. The controller may depart from traditional criteria, methods, and procedures to develop new ones which may also require proposing new policies to obtain effective results, overcome unusual problems, and meet the individual program and customer requirements.

Level 3-4 is not met. The appellant's work is governed by established guidelines which cover most situations. He is not authorized to deviate or develop new guidelines which impact policy or long-range plans and does not deal with situations that depart from traditional procedures, methods or processes. The appellant may make recommendations to improve operations or develop new operating procedures, letters of instructions, and other guides by adapting existing guidelines. However, he is not authorized to depart from traditional criteria, methods and procedures when developing new guidelines.

Level 3-3 is credited for 275 points.

#### Factor 4 - Complexity:

This factor covers the nature, number, variety, and intricacy of tasks, steps, processes, or methods in the work performed; the difficulty in identifying what needs to be done; and the difficulty and originality involved in performing the work. The servicing personnel office evaluated this factor at Level 4-4, the agency appeal decision credited Level 4-3. The official position description still reflects Level 4-4. The appellant does not contest the agency's finding of Level 4-3.

At Level 4-3, the employee is responsible for the advance planning or the immediate production control for the manufacture, construction, overhaul, or repair of a variety of types of products of one or more complex products that have numerous components or subassemblies. The product may be a new type of equipment or system made up of different complex components that require a large portion of the facility's general purpose machines which are adaptable to a variety of operations and processes. The work is programmed on a long-term basis (many months) and production control data are available.

Level 4-3 is met. The appellant is responsible for planning, scheduling, and programming the resources and operations requirements for the production control for the renovation, demilitarization, repair, overhaul or modification of conventional ammunition and missiles. Typical assignments involve developing procedures for the removal of fuses, primer cartridge cases, propellers and other parts from artillery rounds, renovating a Fin Assembly bomb or simulator launching tow, mechanical Time Fuse (Super Quick), rocket motors, and adaptor booster bombs; repairing or replacing small arms cartridges; replacing ammunition fiber containers in missiles; developing plans for the demilitarization of shillelagh missiles; replacing launch missiles and practice warheads; removing batteries with hazardous waste chemicals, ensuring the process meets environmental standards and regulations; and testing electrical components and circuits in missiles. The appellant adapts established guidelines to fit specific situations. He develops a detailed step-by-step plan from start to finish outlining specific procedures for production control activities and operations. This includes incorporation of specific parts, equipment and materials to be used; safety and hazardous materials requirements and conditions to be followed; quality requirements; the determination of financial and personnel requirements including the type and number of skilled labor required to complete the job; and determinations of scheduling, specialized shipping, packaging, transportation, supply, and storage requirements for assigned products and projects.

At Level 4-4, the controller is assigned products or projects that are difficult and complex and require the application of a complete range of production control principles, techniques, and methodology to plan and accomplish control over their construction, manufacture, overhaul, or repair. Typical assignments at this level are prototype or developmental equipment, or equipment systems that are composed of a large number of different components and subassemblies, or products that represent long-term depot level major overhaul or repair. Examples include responsibility for a major segment, system, or compartmented zone of a spacecraft or a complex combat or strategic aircraft or ship, or comparable products, e.g., the propulsion system of a large ship or nuclear submarine, the complex fire control and launching systems for sophisticated missiles, or other products of similar difficulty and complexity. Controllers develop plans prior to the immediate production or availability phases and are faced with difficult problems due to the lack of standard data and guidelines for the equipment or project. Some controllers have to make difficult production planning decisions where there is a large amount of technical data and specifications. They exercise considerable judgment in identifying areas that are similar to previous production tasks to establish a framework for initial planning. They conduct research for pertinent information and consult directly with responsible officials to obtain missing technical data, specifications, and design information. The complexity and individual nature of each product or project and its own special requirements prevent the use of routine established production plans, methods, and procedures. Long-term overhaul work involves replanning, production schedules and preparing justifications for additional

funding for unplanned work discovered during the disassembly or tear-down of the product.

Level 4-4 is not met. The appellant is not responsible for the manufacture, overhaul or repair of complex, developmental or prototype products. His work does not require research to develop new procedures nor does he make difficult production planning decisions where little or no information or technical data is available. Products or projects assigned to the appellant are covered by detailed guidelines and technical manuals and do not provide for deviations. Development of new standard operating procedures can be adapted as necessary to fit specific requirements.

Level 4-3 is credited for 150 points.

Factor 5 - Scope and Effect:

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work, as measured by the purpose, breadth, and depth of the assignment, and the effect of work products or services both within and outside the organization. The agency evaluated this factor at Level 5-3. The appellant does not contest the agency's findings.

At Level 5-3, work involves resolving a variety of conventional production problems and situations by the selection or adaption of formal work methods and procedures, utilizing established or precedent criteria, and production plans. Results of work impacts the effectiveness of operations of the activity. The goal is to achieve and maintain desired production levels for products that meet or exceed the original specifications and terms of acceptability established by the customer, and are consistent with efficient and economic operations.

Level 5-3 is met. The appellant's work involves adapting established methods, processes, and procedures to develop production control plans for conventional ammunition maintenance programs. The work affects the efficiency and effectiveness of ammunition maintenance programs for customers.

At Level 5-4, the purpose of the work is to plan, develop and implement production control programs of considerable breadth and complexity. The work involves establishing criteria, formulating effective production control programs, assessing the effectiveness of production programs, and investigating or analyzing a variety of unusual production problems and conditions. The work affects a wide range of organizations within the industrial activity, and typically has application to other agency activities that are performing similar work at other locations. Completed assignments have a direct impact on the industrial mission of the agency and the safety and security of personnel in the organization to which the product must be shipped in full operational condition.

Level 5-4 is not met. The appellant's work does not involve developing production control programs of considerable breadth and complexity dealing with unusual, complex or unprecedented problems, issues or conditions for ammunition maintenance products. The appellant develops plans for conventional ammunition maintenance programs and uses established guides, methods and procedures. His work does not have the broad impact described at Level 5-4.

Level 5-3 is credited for 150 points.

Factor 6 - Personal Contacts and Factor 7 - Purpose of Contacts:

These factors measure face-to-face contacts and telephone dialogue with persons not in the supervisory chain and the purpose of personal contacts, ranging from factual exchanges of information to situations involving significant or controversial issues and differing viewpoints. The agency credited Level 3b for these factors. The appellant does not contest their findings.

*Personal Contacts*

At Level 3, the highest level described in the standard, contacts are with individuals from outside the employing agency, as well as with agency program heads. They normally take place on the telephone and in person in a moderately unstructured setting. They are significant to the production control effort and are normally established on a nonroutine basis. Such contacts may include contractors or personnel from other Government agencies who may provide work projects, funding, support services, equipment, machinery, labor, transportation, etc.

Level 3 is met. The appellant's regular and recurring contacts are with managers and supervisors at the depot, MACON item managers, representatives from IOC and MICOM commands, posts, camps, and stations worldwide, manufacturers, and user unit, procurement, supply, shipment, environmental and safety specialists, laborers, and other personnel in other directorates as required.

At Level 4, as described in the Primary Standard, contacts are with high ranking officials from outside the employing agency at national or international levels in highly unstructured settings, e.g., contacts are characterized by problems, such as the officials may be relatively inaccessible; arrangements may have to be made for accompanying staff members; appointments may have to be made well in advance; each party may be very unclear as to the role and authority of the other; and each contact may be conducted under different ground rules. Typical of contacts at this level are those with Members of Congress, leading representatives of foreign governments, presidents of large national or international firms, national unions, State governors, or mayors of large cities.

Level 4 is not met. The appellant does not have contacts as described at this level.

Factor 6 is credited with Level 3.

#### *Purpose of Contacts*

At Level b, contacts are for the purpose of planning, coordinating, or advising on production efforts, or to resolve production problems by influencing or motivating production or support personnel. They are normally cooperative and have mutual production interests and goals.

Level b is met. The purposes of the appellant's contacts are to discuss and advise managers and staff on updates and changes in production schedules or funding requirements, update commands on program status and future planning capabilities, coordinate work requirements, and handle and resolve conventional problems. This meets the intent of Level b.

At Level c, the purpose of contacts is to influence, motivate, and persuade production shop and department supervisory personnel and others in positions of decision making authority to follow a different course of action. Such contacts often arise due to unexpected production material delays, or changes in production methods, procedures, requirements, priorities, etc. The controller must overcome objections of skeptical or uncooperative personnel and may have to negotiate on significant and/or controversial issues to achieve compromise or an alternative solution.

Level c is not met. The appellant does not get involved in significant or controversial issues, problems or technical matters that require him to negotiate or obtain the cooperation of skeptical or uncooperative personnel who may not want to compromise.

Factor 7 is credited with Level b.

The combination of personal contacts at Level 3 and purpose of contacts at Level b converts to a total of 110 points according to the matrix on page 24 of the GS-1152 standard.

#### Factor 8 - Physical Demands:

This factor measures the requirements and physical demands placed on the employee in performing the work assignment, including the agility and dexterity required, and the extent of physical exertion. The agency evaluated this factor at Level 8-2. The appellant does not contest the agency's findings.

At Level 8-2, the controller is frequently required to stand, walk, and climb in industrial facilities where it is necessary to bend, crouch, stoop, reach, and lift moderately heavy items. The employee may also be required to perform these and other functions in obstructed areas, e.g., in confining or potentially dangerous spaces in or around a ship, aircraft, or submarine under construction, overhaul, or repair.

Level 8-2 is met. The appellant's work is performed in the production control facility on the depot and requires the appellant to inspect and monitor operations. He performs a considerable amount of bending, standing, walking, climbing, crouching, stretching, and reaching.

Level 8-3, as described in the Primary Standard, is not met. Physical demands at this level involve considerable and strenuously physical exertion, such as frequent climbing of tall ladders, lifting heavy objects over 50 pounds, crouching or crawling in restricted areas, and defending oneself or others against physical attack. There is no evidence in the appeal record that the appellant is regularly required to exert such effort.

Level 8-2 is credited for 20 points.

#### Factor 9 - Work Environment:

This factor considers the risks and discomforts in the employee's physical surroundings, and the safety precautions required. The agency evaluated this factor at Level 9-2. The appellant does not contest the agency's findings.

At Level 9-2, the employee works in an office part of the time, but production control duties necessitate regular visits to production areas which involve moderate risks and discomfort and require safety precautions, e.g., working near shielded or contained radiation sources, operating machinery, moving vehicles, and cranes; down in dry docks; on and around scaffolding; or in areas of high noise levels from engine test facilities. Visits take place in all weather conditions. The employee may be exposed to strong odors or fumes from paint, fuels, or chemicals used in the work processes. Regular use of safety equipment is an occupational requirement, e.g., hardhat, safety glasses, ear plugs, steel toe safety shoes and other kinds of protective devices.

Level 9-2 is met. The appellant works in the production facility in the depot which is a restricted area. The appellant is exposed to moving machinery, industrial pollutants, high noise levels, toxic and hazardous chemical agents, explosives, fumes, and adverse weather conditions. The appellant is required to wear protective clothing when exposed to hazardous chemicals or fumes from spills and/or leaks and follow safety precautions.

Level 9-3, as described in the Primary Standard, is not met. This level involves high risks with exposure to potentially dangerous situations or unusual environmental stress that require a range of safety and other precautions, such as working at great heights under extreme outdoor weather conditions, subject to possible physical attack or mob conditions, or similar situations where conditions cannot be controlled. There is no evidence in the appeal record that the appellant is regularly exposed to such conditions.

Level 9-2 is credited for 20 points.

SUMMARY		
FACTOR	LEVEL	POINTS
1. Knowledge Required By The Position	1-6	950
2. Supervisory Controls	2-3	275
3. Guidelines	3-3	275
4. Complexity	4-3	150
5. Scope and Effect	5-3	150
6. Personal Contacts	6-3	110
7. Purpose of Contacts	7-b	
8. Physical Demands	8-2	20
9. Work Environment	9-2	20
	TOTAL	2060

A total of 1950 points falls within the range for a GS-09, 1855 to 2100 points, according to the Grade Conversion Table in the GS-1152 standard.

### Decision

This position is properly classified as Production Controller (Parenthetical title at agency discretion), GS-1152-09. This decision constitutes a classification certificate issued under the authority of section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code. This certificate is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the Government.