Audit Report

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

FULL-TIME SUPPORT STAFFING FOR SELECTED RESERVE FORCES

Report No. 95-099 February 6, 1995

Department of Defense

Additional Copies

To obtain additional copies of this report, contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit, Audit Planning and Technical Support Directorate, at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 664-8937) or FAX (703) 604-8932.

Suggestions for Future Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Planning and Coordination Branch, Audit Planning and Technical Support Directorate, at (703) 604-8939 (DSN 664-8939) or FAX (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

Inspector General, Department of Defense
OAIG-AUD (ATTN: APTS Audit Suggestions)
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, Virginia 22202-2884

DoD Hotline

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, call the DoD Hotline at (800) 424-9098 or write to the DoD Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1900. The identity of writers and callers is fully protected.

Acronyms

AGR	Active Guard and Reserve
FTS	Full-Time Support
GAO	General Accounting Office
MT	Military Technician
TAR	Training and Administration of Reserves

INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-2884

February 6, 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (RESERVE

Office of the Inspector General, DoD

Report No. 95-099 **February 6, 1995**
(Project No. 3RA-0075)

FULL-TIME SUPPORT STAFFING FOR SELECTED RESERVE FORCES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction. Military and civilian full-time support personnel are authorized to assist with organizing, administering, recruiting and retaining, instructing, and training in preparing Reserve component units for their wartime missions. The Full-Time Support Program becomes increasingly important to maintaining the readiness of Reserve forces as the United States reduces defense spending and the size of its armed forces. Full-time support personnel are intended to provide continuity and stability vital to the success of Reserve organizations.

Objectives. The objectives of the audit were to evaluate the criteria used to staff full-time support positions in Selected Reserve units and to evaluate the Military Departments' implementation of policy and procedures prescribed in DoD Directive 1205.18, "Full-time Support to the Reserve Components." Also, we

Finding D. Other Direct Costs 36

Part III - Additional Information

Appendix A. Comparison of Proposed and Billed Labor Hours for CTI Labor Categories 44
Appendix B. Management Comments on the Report and Audit Response 52
Appendix C. Management Comments Required 63
Appendix D. Summary of Potential Benefits Resulting From Audit 64
Appendix E. Organizations Visited or Contacted 66
Appendix F. Report Distribution 67

Part IV - Management Comments

Ballistic Missile Defense Organization Comments 70

support programs. Also, we recommend a review of administrative reporting and other Reserve workload requirements to determine whether work performed is needed and whether the work could be performed in an administrative support unit. In addition, we recommend periodic reviews of Reserve component full-time support staffing to verify that personnel meet the qualified skill levels for their assigned positions and that Reserve components follow procedures for monitoring military skill code training for full-time support personnel after assignment.

Management Comments. The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs), the

fee, level-of-effort, term contracts (CPFF contracts) for support services. As of February 28, 1994, CTI had incurred costs of $44.5 million on the three CPFF contracts, received a fee of $3 million, and delivered 958,218 staff hours.

o CPFF contract SDIO84-89-C-0010 (contract 10)* was awarded to CTI on February 22, 1989, for support in planning acquisitions, preparing

* For the purposes of this report, we will refer to the three CPFF contracts by the last two digits of the contract number.

Part I - Introduction

Background

DoD Reserve Components. The DoD Reserve components consist of the Army National Guard, Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air National Guard, and Air Force Reserve. The mission of the Reserve components is to provide trained and qualified units and personnel in case of war or national emergency. During peacetime, Army and Air National Guard units are supervised by DoD, but are under the control of their respective State Governors.

Selected Reserve. The Selected Reserve is composed of units and individuals designated by their respective Military Department as so essential to initial wartime missions that they have priority for training, equipment, and personnel over all other Reserve organizations. The Selected Reserve accounts for about 57 percent of all Ready Reserve forces and will usually be the first to mobilize during a crisis or contingency. Although all segments of the Reserve are subject to mobilization during war or national emergency, the Selected Reserve consists of the most highly trained personnel in the Reserve force. Selected Reserve

- o Active Guard and Reserve (AGR),
- o Military Technicians (MTs),
- o Active Component, and
- o Federal Civil Service Personnel.

Objectives

The objectives of the audit were to evaluate the criteria used to staff FTS positions in Selected Reserve units and the Military Departments' implementation of policy and procedures prescribed in DoD Directive 1205.18. Also, we reviewed the adequacy of management's implementation of the DoD Internal Management Control Program and internal controls applicable to the objectives. Originally announced audit objectives included determining the cost-effectiveness of using active duty personnel in support of the Reserve and

issued by the Comptroller General of the United States as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD. Accordingly, we included tests of internal controls that were considered necessary. We did not audit the computer-processed data obtained from Reserve components or the individual Reserve units on full-time support authorizations and assignments. However, we believe that the data were sufficiently reliable to satisfy the audit objectives. Any inaccuracies in those data will not affect the results of the audit or the recommendations.

Internal Controls

We reviewed implementation of the DoD Internal Management Control Program at the Military Department and the Reserve component headquarters. We evaluated internal controls applicable to the ETS Program and the

Enclosure (1) includes our comments on the draft report

Part II - Finding and Recommendations

Assignment and Use of FTS Personnel

The Reserve components did not assign and use FTS personnel in accordance with DoD guidance on managing full-time support for the Reserve. Personnel were not properly assigned and used because the Reserve components used staffing criteria based on individual program-unique operating methods and organizational philosophies and because the Military Departments had inadequate procedures to monitor the Reserve components' FTS programs. As a result, Reserve units did not maintain skill levels needed in case of mobilization and deployment and the personnel and training readiness goals of the Reserve organizations were not met.

Reserve Components' FTS Program-Unique Staffing Criteria

DoD Directive 1205.18, "Full-Time Support to the Reserve Components," September 20, 1988, provides overall policy and guidance for assigning and using FTS personnel. The Reserve components did not staff positions in accordance with DoD guidance. Reserve components assigned and used FTS personnel based on individual operating methods and organizational philosophies, resulting in six FTS programs with program-unique staffing criteria. Reserve component staffing practices did not meet the intent of FTS Program goals. The position of the Reserve components is that they have consistently applied their own criteria over the years and that their criteria is more appropriate based on methods of employment of Reserve forces.

Distinguishing FTS Categories. Reserve components' staffing practices did not distinguish between the four categories of FTS. Reserve components assigned FTS personnel from a particular category to positions for which the mission, duties, and mobilization status indicated personnel from another FTS category should have been assigned. The Military Departments' guidance (discussed below) implementing DoD Directive 1205.18 provides detailed criteria for assigning FTS personnel within the four categories. However, the Reserve components used their own criteria in filling positions. Active Guard and Reserve (AGR), military technician (MT), and active component personnel performed the same or similar duties in the Reserve units. Further, rather than performing readiness-related duties, AGRs, MTs, and active component personnel were assigned administrative and clerical duties. Reserve personnel stated that the DoD criteria is out of date and that changing missions, employment of Reserve forces, the need to provide career development, and congressionally mandated staffing levels for AGR and MT personnel dictate many of the Reserve components' staffing decisions.

Army National Guard. The Army National Guard staffed about 52 percent of its FTS positions with MTs and 47 percent with AGRs. Because AGR requirements were staffed at only 47 percent, the Army National Guard assigned MTs to meet the remaining requirements. Army Regulation 140-30,

"Active Duty in Support of the United States Army Reserve and Active Guard and Reserve Management Program," November 13, 1987, defines readiness support as special readiness functions relating to Reserve operations, administration, logistical requirements, and other functions necessary to coordinate, implement, and maintain programs that support Reserve unit readiness and facilitate Army Reserve mobilization. AGRs that provide those functions include recruiters, trainers, inspectors general, and mobilization planners. Instead of performing readiness-related duties, AGRs performed a variety of routine support duties, including clerical and administrative duties.

Army Reserve. The Army Reserve staffed about 57 percent of its FTS requirements with AGRs. The Army Reserve used AGRs and MTs interchangeably in the Reserve units. Army Regulation 140-30 states that AGR positions may not be "encumbered unduly with routine administrative tasks." Nonetheless, AGRs performed primarily clerical and administrative duties more than 50 percent of the time. Army personnel stated that the low funding level for FTS personnel requirements contributes to assigning AGR personnel to routine administrative duties.

Naval Reserve. The Naval Reserve staffed about 70 percent of its FTS requirements with AGRs who were designated Training and Administration of Reserves (TARs). TARs are career military personnel whose chosen specialty is to administer and train drilling reservists. Secretary of the Navy Instruction 1200.1, "Full-Time Support Personnel in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve," May 26, 1989, states that the Navy uses TARs primarily for readiness support and training to wartime deployable units. In contrast to that guidance, TARs performed general administrative duties, such as travel and budgeting, data processing, payroll, and typing. The clerical and administrative duties could be performed by civilian FTS personnel in Naval Reserve support centers. The Naval Reserve Force requested and received a waiver from the Chief of Naval Operations to use TARs instead of civilian FTS personnel for positions in the Reserve units that were more appropriate for civilian FTS staffing. The Naval Reserve Force submitted the waiver request based on the position that it would be difficult to replace military personnel with civilian personnel given the reduced funding levels for civilian personnel authorizations.

Air National Guard. The Air National Guard staffed about 68 percent of its FTS positions with MTs and 25 percent with AGRs. The Air Guard assigned MTs and AGRs interchangeably within Reserve units and used MTs and AGRs for clerical and administrative support in the units.

Air Force Reserve. The Air Force Reserve staffed about 60 percent of its FTS positions with MTs (designated Air Reserve Technicians) and 32 percent with Federal civil service personnel. Of 97 Air Reserve Technicians, 19 performed primarily clerical and administrative support for the Reserve units.

Marine Corps Reserve. The Marine Corps Reserve staffed about 67 percent of its FTS requirements with active component personnel. The active component personnel (designated Inspector-Instructors) supported Marine Corps ground units and provided all clerical and administrative support in

addition to providing training and Marine Corps doctrine and tactical guidance to the Reserve units. DoD Directive 1205.18 restricts the use of active component personnel for routine functions and operational positions in the Reserves. Of 114 active component personnel, 27 performed primarily clerical and administrative duties. Other active component personnel performed operational support in the units. Marine Corps Order 1001.52F, "Marine Corps Reserve (MCR) Full-Time Support (FTS) to the Reserve Component," May 28, 1992, defines FTS as reservists on active duty. In August 1994, the Marine Corps changed its definition of FTS to Active Reserve to bring the definition in line with DoD Directive 1205.18. Inspector-Instructors serve a 3-year rotational assignment in the Reserve and had positions for which the duties performed were other than to provide doctrinal and tactical guidance. Inspector-Instructors are usually attached to the Reserve unit, but do not occupy mobilization positions in the unit. The Marine Corps has been integrating more of its Inspector-Instructors into the Reserve units. The Marine Corps' position is that the training, military skill codes, and performance measurements are identical for both the Reserve component and the active component. According to Marine Corps personnel, using marines with current active component experience assures the latest tactics and doctrine are provided during training and instruction of reservists. In addition, the application of identical standards gives the Marine Corps the capability of activating and deploying Reserve forces into any marine operation without the need for a prolonged training period.

Administrative Work Load in Reserve Units. The Reserve units were burdened with large amounts of administrative work. Most of the work was mandated by the Reserve component headquarters. To accomplish the work load, Reserve components assigned military FTS personnel to perform duties of authorized clerical or administrative positions or reassigned FTS personnel to perform duties of clerical or administrative positions that were either not authorized or not funded. Military FTS personnel were spending less time on their primary duties and more time on administrative work. The table below shows the numbers and types of FTS personnel performing clerical or administrative support in the Reserve units.

FTS Personnel Performing Clerical or Administrative Support in Reserve Units

Reserve Component	FTS Positions Reviewed	No. and Type of FTS Personnel Performing Clerical or Administrative Support (AC)	(AGR)	(MT)
Army National Guard	119	--	22	13
Army Reserve	121	3	26	17
Naval Reserve	153	3	47	--
Air National Guard	173	--	16	29
Air Force Reserve	104	--	--	19
Marine Corps Reserve	173	27	11	--
Totals	843	33	122	78

Using Military FTS Personnel to Perform Administrative Work Load. Civil Service personnel who were not dual status* comprised only 7 percent of the Reserve components' workforce. As a result, military FTS personnel were assigned administrative and clerical duties which they also performed on drill weekends; however, FTS personnel would not perform those duties upon mobilization.

If positions had been vacant for long periods, unit commanders gave priority to filling those vacant positions. When military FTS personnel reported to Reserve units, they had a 50-percent chance of being assigned to perform administrative duties rather than fill the positions for which they were selected.

Using Civilian FTS Personnel to Perform Administrative Work Load. We believe that the Reserve components' primary mission to provide trained and qualified units is jeopardized when military FTS personnel perform primarily administrative duties rather than the duties of military positions on the units' mobilization staffing documents. Duties of the clerical and administrative positions did not require military knowledge or skills for successful completion and are more suitable for civilian staffing. However, the Reserve components expressed concern with identifying positions in support of Reserve units for civilian FTS staffing. Those concerns were based on the fact that DoD has reduced and will continue to reduce authorizations for civilian staffing.

*The condition in which a civilian must also be a member of the Selected Reserve as a condition of employment.

FTS Personnel Qualifications

DoD Policy on Reserve Personnel Qualifying for Assigned Positions. Although DoD Directive 1205.18 requires that FTS personnel assigned to support Reserve units be qualified for the positions to which they are assigned, the Reserve components did not verify that personnel selected for FTS positions met required skill levels, prior experience, or training requirements for the assigned positions. In addition, once personnel were assigned to the unit, they generally did not perform the duties of the positions for which they were selected.

Army National Guard and Army Reserve FTS Personnel Qualifications. The Army National Guard and Army Reserve did not require FTS personnel to meet skill and experience requirements of FTS positions in Reserve units. Army Regulation 135-18, "The Active Guard/Reserve (AGR) Program," provides policy on the assignment of AGR personnel and requires that AGR personnel either meet the skill and training requirements for the position prior to selection or be trained to meet the skill and training requirements after selection. Although the AGRs we interviewed received on-the-job training, 62 neither registered for nor received the training required to qualify for their FTS positions.

Of 240 FTS personnel interviewed in the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve, 35 either performed duties that were not related to their military skill code or did not have the training needed for the position. Personnel were not skill qualified because of reassignments and high turnover rates, especially among AGR personnel. Unit commanders stated that skill qualifications were not matched to positions because of the need to provide AGR personnel with career advancement opportunities.

Navy and Air Force FTS Personnel Qualifications. The Navy and Air Force also have policies on assignment of FTS personnel that require AGR personnel to either meet the skill and training requirements for the position prior to selection or be trained to meet the skill and training requirements after selection.

Army National Guard Training Guidance. DoD Directive 1205.18 requires that FTS personnel meet skill and experience requirements of the designated position before selection. Guidance in National Guard Regulation 600-5, "The Active Guard/Reserve (AGR) Program," February 20, 1990, requires that Army National Guard AGR personnel who have not received required skill training for an FTS position acquire the skill training within 12 months after assignment. National Guard Regulation 600-5 requires that soldiers who do not qualify for assigned skills within 12 months be reassigned to positions for which they are qualified, or the soldier will be separated from the AGR program. Those soldiers will not then be reassigned to other positions for which they are not qualified. When AGRs are assigned to positions before qualifying, the unit commander, administrative officer, and FTS supervisor must prepare a plan specifying how and within what time frame the AGR will become qualified for assigned skills.

Interviews with AGR personnel, FTS supervisors, and unit commanders showed that AGRs were not trained and that supervisors and commanders were not aware of procedures to monitor AGR personnel qualifications after assignment. The Army's position is that its policy allows AGRs to fill vacant positions while they are awaiting training. The AGR turnover rate is about 25 percent in some units, and supervisors and commanders stated that it is difficult to replace AGRs with the correct military skill training. In addition, unit commanders stated that providing AGRs on-the-job training is one way of ensuring career opportunities for AGR personnel.

Untrained personnel in FTS positions result in lost productivity and inefficient use of FTS resources. Also, when FTS personnel occupy mobilization billets in the unit and have not been trained for their primary skill code, the readiness goals of the unit are adversely affected. In addition, FTS military personnel did not maintain their skill levels because they did not receive training in the duties they will have to perform if the unit is mobilized and deployed.

Navy and Air Force Training Guidance. The Navy and Air Force require reassignment of AGR personnel when they do not meet the skill training for their FTS position. The Navy requires skill training to be met within 12 months after assignment, and the Air Force requires skill training within 9 months after assignment. The Air Force has taken steps to match Air Force skill codes to FTS position vacancies.

Summary. As the DoD relies more on the contributions of the Reserve for wartime contingencies, domestic emergencies, and peacetime operations, readiness becomes increasingly important. Training is an essential element in achieving and maintaining readiness. Because FTS personnel assigned to a unit count against the unit's trained end strength, it is important for a unit to maintain the skills and trained personnel needed to provide the required level of readiness in the event of mobilization and deployment.

MT Support to the Reserve

DoD Policy on Staffing MT Positions. DoD policy requires that dual status MTs be used primarily to provide highly skilled support to wartime deployable units, be assigned to mobilizable positions in those units, and hold compatible military positions. The Reserve components did not implement those criteria in staffing MT positions. MTs provided the full range of support to the Reserve components, not just skilled or technical support. With the exception of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, which did not use MTs, and the Air Force Reserve which used only MTs, the Reserve components improperly used MTs and AGRs interchangeably. MTs were assigned to nonmobilizing and nondeploying positions in the Reserve units and did not have compatible military positions on the units' mobilization staffing documents.

Army National Guard and Army Reserve MTs. MTs provided primarily clerical and administrative rather than technical support. Of 61 Army

National Guard and Army Reserve MTs interviewed, 30 performed clerical and administrative duties on a regular and recurring basis. When MTs' primary duty assignments were other than clerical or administrative, many still performed the clerical or administrative duties more than 50 percent of the time. Several MTs did not participate in weekend drills because they had administrative duties that had to be performed on weekends. The positions were more appropriate for Federal civil service personnel who were not dual status. For example, the unit administrator position in Army Reserve units is considered one of the more important FTS positions in the unit because it involves day-to-day administration and payroll functions. Since the unit administrator position does not have a compatible military position or a mobilization mission, the MTs assigned to the position performed various other duties during drill weekends. The Army decided to assign the MT category to all unit administrator positions, although the position was initially designated for civilian staffing.

Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve MTs. The Air Force Reserve effectively used MTs (referred to as Air Reserve Technicians) to perform highly skilled duties in its Reserve units. However, the Air Force relied almost exclusively on MTs to perform routine clerical and administrative duties that would have been more appropriate for civilian FTS personnel who were not dual status. At the 36 Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve units visited, 39 of 207 MT positions reviewed were clerical and administrative. The positions included secretaries, clerk typists, management assistants, budget assistants, and administrative assistants. When MTs' primary duties were clerical and administrative, the MTs performed those duties during weekend drills, since the MTs had no mobilizing positions in the unit. MTs worked side by side with AGRs performing the same duties in Air National Guard units.

MTs Assigned to Nondeploying Positions. Of 268 MT positions reviewed, 139 MTs did not mobilize and deploy with the units they supported. The nonmobilizing MT positions were positions that did not have a compatible military position on the units' mobilization staffing documents. MTs in those positions performed functions that either would not be required at mobilization or would remain behind when the unit mobilized. In addition, MT personnel stated that they are subject to mobilization, since it is a condition of employment, and most likely would be reassigned to another unit. "The National Guard Technicians Act of 1968" provides that a small number of MT personnel who work for the National Guard may be exempted from the requirement to maintain dual status. The 139 nonmobilizing MT positions do not include MTs subject to the National Guard Technicians Act.

Congressional Restrictions on MT Positions. The number of MT positions and replacement of MTs with AGRs are affected by congressional restrictions. Those restrictions contributed to assigning MTs to positions that were more appropriate for other categories of FTS, such as AGRs, since the number of positions for MTs is protected by legislation.

Compatibility of Civilian and Military Duties. Of 268 MT positions reviewed, 23 did not have compatible military positions in the units they supported. DoD Directive 1205.18 requires that the MTs be assigned to a

Reserve unit military position that is compatible with the civilian MT position. The MT position is usually characterized by years of continuing experience with a low turnover rate and is the primary category of FTS that provides the most stability in the unit from a readiness standpoint. The dual status of the MTs assures that they will be available during regularly scheduled training assemblies in a military status that parallels their civilian technician employment. Dual status further ensures that MTs will move with their unit upon mobilization and deployment, thereby enhancing stability and maintenance of high skill levels in functions performed by MTs.

DoD Efforts to Improve FTS Guidance

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) has responsibility for exercising overall supervision of Reserve component matters within DoD. During the audit, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) was in the process of reissuing guidance and procedures to the Military Departments for managing the FTS Program. That office issued a revised draft of DoD Directive 1205.18 in November 1992, which when released in final, will replace the current Directive. A new instruction that will be issued with the Directive is intended to assist the Reserve components in assigning categories of FTS and to make FTS staffing more consistent with DoD policy and guidance.

Guidance in the Draft Directive. We compared the guidance in the current Directive with the proposed draft guidance and found little difference between the two versions. The draft Directive does not provide a change in responsibilities or procedures that would require Reserve components to manage their FTS programs and personnel consistent with DoD guidance. As of February 3, 1995, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) had not issued the draft Directive.

DoD Oversight of Reserve Components' Staffing Policy. The Military Departments and the Reserve components are resisting efforts to change their FTS program structure. The Military Departments, the U.S. Marine Corps, and the National Guard Bureau agree with the intent of the DoD policy and guidance, but also expressed a need for some flexibility in certain aspects of the guidance that could adversely affect successful management of their FTS programs. In discussing concerns with Military Department representatives, we determined that some concerns are valid and that flexibility in managing the program within the policy and intent of the DoD guidance must be considered. However, without oversight at the DoD level, the components will continue to manage and staff their FTS programs using program-unique criteria and organizational philosophies that do not give proper balance to FTS Program goals.

Recommendations, Management Comments, and Audit Response

1. We recommend that the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs):

a. Revise draft DoD Directive 1205.18, "Full-time Support to the Reserve Components," to:

(1) Task the Secretaries of the Military Departments to develop procedures for determining the categories of military and civilian full-time support personnel using essentiality of military skills, readiness, and cost-effectiveness as the only criteria.

(2) Require the Secretaries of the Military Departments to submit for approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) a full-time support program structure that justifies the mix of full-time support categories.

(3) Require the Secretaries of the Military Departments to validate the basis of waivers granted to Reserve components for any aspect of their full-time support program structure that is not consistent with the intent of the DoD Full-Time Support Program goals.

b. Expedite issuance of revised DoD Directive 1205.18, "Full-time Support to the Reserve Components."

Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) Comments. The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) concurred with the recommendations, but disagreed that improper assignment and use of FTS personnel resulted in not maintaining skill levels or meeting personnel and training readiness goals.

2. We recommend that the Chief, Army Reserve; the Director of Naval Reserve; the Chief of Air Force Reserve; the Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; and the Chief, National Guard Bureau:

a. Review Reserve units' administrative reporting and other workload requirements to determine whether work performed is needed and whether work could be performed in an administrative support unit.

b. Conduct periodic reviews of Reserve component full-time support staffing to verify that full-time support personnel are used in accordance with the approved Full-Time Support Program structure, that full-time support personnel meet the qualified skill levels for their assigned positions, and that the Reserve components' follow procedures for monitoring military skill code training for full-time support personnel after assignment to their units.

Department of the Army Comments. The Army concurred with the report, stating that the primary reason for irregularities in utilizing FTS personnel is the low staffing and funding of the FTS program.

Department of the Navy Comments. As of January 27, 1995, the Navy had not provided comments.

Department of the Air Force Comments. The Air Force concurred in principle with the recommendations, stating that Air Force procedures currently provide for various inspections to verify compliance with full-time support requirements. In response to the finding, the Chief of Air Force Reserve stated that the audit results were not reflective of the overall full-time support staff because of the small number of units audited.

Chief, National Guard Bureau Comments. The Chief, National Guard Bureau, concurred with the recommendations, stating that the National Guard Bureau already has procedures in place to validate full-time support work load. However, the Chief, National Guard Bureau, nonconcurred with the finding, stating that the National Guard Bureau has a 91-percent skill qualification match for FTS personnel and a 97-percent overall compatibility rate for MT civilian jobs and military positions.

Audit Response. The Army, Air Force, and National Guard Bureau comments are responsive to the recommendations. We considered the comments provided by the National Guard Bureau and believe our conclusions are valid. We based our conclusions on a review of individual Guard units, duties performed by FTS personnel after assignment to a unit, and interviews of FTS personnel, but we do not take exception to the Guard's overall compatibility percentages. We request that the Navy provide comments in response to the final report.

Part III - Additional Information

Appendix A. Full-Time Support Categories

Active Guard and Reserve (AGR). AGR personnel are National Guard personnel on full-time National Guard duty or Reserve personnel on active duty. This category includes Naval Reserve Training and Administration of the Reserve personnel and statutory tour* personnel. AGRs provide direct support to prepare Reserve Components for their wartime mission. AGRs account for about 43 percent of the Reserve FTS.

Military Technicians (MTs). MTs are civilian employees that must have dual status as a condition of employment. Dual status means that they must also be military members of the Selected Reserve in a mobilization position. DoD policy requires that MTs be used primarily to provide highly skilled technical support to wartime deployable units and that they drill with the Reserve unit they support. The MTs must be assigned to a military position in the unit that is compatible with the civilian technician position. MT personnel account for about 42 percent of Reserve FTS personnel.

Active Component. Active component personnel are active duty military members assigned or attached to Reserve component organizations. DoD policy requires that active component personnel be used primarily to advise the Reserve components on current active component military doctrine, training, exercises, and inspections to ensure that Reserve component units are at the highest level of readiness. Further, DoD policy requires that active component personnel, except those assigned to Reserve headquarters, be assigned to validated positions in the Reserve units and mobilize with those units. Active component personnel are not part of the Selected Reserve, although for mobilization purposes, they are counted as part of the trained end strength of the unit. Active component personnel account for about 8 percent of Reserve FTS.

Federal Civil Service Personnel. Federal civil service personnel provide administrative support to the Reserve Components and are not part of the Selected Reserve. Civil service personnel account for about 7 percent of Reserve FTS.

The table below shows the allocation of FTS personnel among the Reserve components as of September 30, 1993.

*Refers to FTS personnel who are required by statute to be located at the seat of Government or within the headquarters of major commands where organizational missions include responsibility for Reserve affairs.

Allocation of FTS Personnel Among Reserve Components

Reserve Component	FTS Assigned	Active Component	Active Guard/ Reserve	Military Technician	Civil Service
Army National Guard	52,325	99	24,430	27,297	499
Army Reserve	22,350	1,240	12,637	7,321	1,152
Naval Reserve	30,474	6,244	21,458	----	2,772
Air National Guard	36,530	719	9,089	24,958	1,764
Air Force Reserve	16,333	678	636	9,827	5,192
Marine Corps Reserve	7,254	4,833	2,266	----	155
Totals	165,266	13,813	70,516	69,403	11,534

Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews

General Accounting Office

General Accounting Office (GAO) Report No. NSIAD-92-70 (OSD Case No. 8903) "Army Reserve Components: Accurate and Complete Data Is Needed to Monitor Full-Time Support Programs," December 30, 1991, states that the Army cannot effectively monitor the FTS Program because the Army does not have an accurate, complete data base of FTS personnel and because the Army has not adequately defined the information needed for effective program oversight and analyses. The GAO recommended that the Secretary of the Army define the data needed for effective oversight of the FTS Program and require its periodic collection and monitoring. GAO also recommended that the Army provide peacetime training to FTS personnel who are responsible for assisting in the wartime transition to active Army systems for personnel and supply.

GAO Report No. NSIAD-90-43 (OSD Case No. 8147) "Army Reserve Components: Opportunities to Improve Management of the Full-Time Support Program," February 8, 1990, states that:

o no one Army organization oversees and manages full-time support as a totally integrated program;

o the Army has not applied adequate monitoring mechanisms to its program, but has taken steps to place the program under the Army's internal control system;

o FTS personnel requirements are not adequately justified; and

o the Army lacks guidance that defines the roles for FTS personnel categories and procedures to ensure that positions are filled with the most cost-effective mix of personnel.

GAO recommended that the Secretary of the Army:

o assign authority and responsibility for overseeing and directing the Army's FTS program to one Army organization;

o develop measurable program objectives and implement adequate program monitoring mechanisms;

o identify FTS management deficiencies in the FTS program as a material weakness in the Secretary's next Annual Assurance Statement;

o develop clear guidance that specifically differentiates among the roles for AGR, MT, active component, and civilian employees and stipulates when those FTS personnel should be used; and

o develop procedures, as required by DoD Directive 1205.18, that will help the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve establish the most cost-effective mix of FTS personnel.

The Secretary of the Army concurred with the recommendations, but did not agree that its management of the FTS Program should be identified as a material weakness in the Secretary's Annual Assurance Statement.

Naval Audit Service

Naval Audit Service Report No. 036-S-94 "Marine Corps Management of Reserve Forces," March 14, 1994, states that FTS requirements exceeded maximum staffing levels authorized by Marine Corps directives and that FTS Inspector-Instructors were not fully integrated into mobilization billets at the Reserve units they supported. The Marine Corps stated it would consider the issues in determining a new force structure.

Naval Audit Service Report No. 045-S-94 "Naval Reserve Force Full-Time Support Personnel Requirements," May 25, 1994, states that the Naval Reserve Force generally used FTS personnel in an efficient and effective manner. However, personnel efficiencies could be gained in the Readiness Commands, Surface Reserve Centers, Operational Command Staffs, and in the use of Naval Officer FTS Personnel. The Navy nonconcurred with the original recommendations and suggested alternative means of accomplishing personnel efficiencies. The Naval Audit Service agreed with the Navy's revised recommendations for achieving efficiencies.

Other Review

The Rand Corporation Report No. R-4034-RA, "Manning Full-Time Positions in Support of the Selected Reserve," 1991, presents principles and guidelines for staffing FTS positions in Reserve units. The Rand corporation suggests broad principles and specific management strategies and guidelines that can be implemented to solve systemic problems in Reserve component staffing and structure. The Rand Corporation reviewed FTS staffing at the request of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs).

Appendix C. Summary of Potential Benefits Resulting from Audit

Recommendation Reference	Description of Benefit	Type of Benefit
1.	Internal Controls. Provides needed oversight of the FTS program by requiring the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) to review and approve Reserve component's FTS Program structure for compliance with FTS Program readiness goals.	Nonmonetary.
2.	Internal Controls. Provides for periodic reviews of Reserve component FTS staffing to verify that personnel and training readiness goals are not adversely affected.	Nonmonetary.

Appendix D. Organizations Visited or Contacted

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs), Washington, DC

Department of the Army

Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), Washington, DC
Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff (Operations and Plans), Washington, DC
Office of the Chief of Army Reserve, Washington, DC
U.S. Army Forces Command, Fort McPherson, GA
U.S. Army Reserve Command, Atlanta, GA
- 347th Medical Hospital, Sunnyvale, CA
- 693d Quartermaster Company, Bell, CA
- 3220th U.S. Army Garrison, West Palm Beach, FL
- 348th Transportation Company, Phoenix, AZ
- 757th Maintenance Company, San Antonio, TX
- 1184th Terminal Transportation Unit, Mobile, AL
- 160th Military Police Battalion, Tallahassee, FL
- 2291st Hospital, El Paso, TX
- 307th Chemical Company, Greenville, SC
- 3273d Hospital, Greenville, SC
- 335th Signal Command, East Point, GA
- 349th Hospital Unit (Surgical), Garden Grove, CA
- 361st Supply Company, Stanton, CA
- 369th Chemical Company, El Paso, TX
- 4003d U.S. Army Garrison, Oklahoma City, OK
- 450th Chemical Battalion, Houston, TX
- 807th Medical, Seagoville, TX
- 921st Medical Hospital Field, Sacramento, CA

Department of the Navy

Office of the Director of Naval Reserve, Washington, DC
Navy Manpower Analysis Center, Chesapeake, VA
Naval Reserve Force, New Orleans, LA
- Reserve Intelligence Area Seven, Naval Air Station, New Orleans, LA
- Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Baton Rouge, LA
- Naval Reserve Recruiting Command, New Orleans, LA
- Naval Reserve Center, Pomona, CA
- Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Readiness Center, Sacramento, CA
- Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center, San Jose, CA
- Helicopter Combat Support Special Squadron, Point Mugu, CA
- Mobile Inshore Underground Warfare Unit 107, San Diego, CA
- Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center, San Bernardino, CA

Department of the Navy (cont'd)

Naval Reserve Force, New Orleans, LA (cont'd)
- Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Savannah, GA
- Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Augusta, GA
- Naval Air Station Atlanta, Marietta, GA
- Naval Reserve Intelligence Command, Dallas, TX
- Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, Naval Air Station, Dallas, TX
- Mobile Inshore Underground Warfare Unit 109, Dallas, TX
- Naval Reserve Readiness Command, Charleston, SC
- Reserve Intelligence Area Thirteen, Jacksonville, FL
- Patrol Squadron Sixty-two, Jacksonville, FL

U.S. Marine Corps

Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, DC

Marine Forces Reserve, New Orleans, LA
- Company G, 2nd Battalion, 23rd Marines, Los Alamitos, CA
- Marine Aircraft Group 46, Santa Ana, CA
- Marine Medium Helicopter Squadron 764, Santa Ana, CA
- Marine Helicopter Attack Squadron 775, Camp Pendleton, CA
- Marine Fighter Attack Squadron 134, Santa Ana, CA
- 4th Light Antiaircraft Missile Battalion, 4th Marine Aircraft Wing, Hayward, CA
- Marine Wing Support Squadron 472, Santa Ana, CA
- Detachment A, Marine Aircraft Group 46, Camp Pendleton, CA
- Ordnance Maintenance Company, 4th Maintenance Battalion, Waco, TX
- 4th Reconnaissance Battalion, 4th Marine Division, San Antonio, TX
- 4th Platoon, Company B, 4th Amphibious Assault Vehicle Battalion, Galveston, TX
- Headquarters, Company A, 1st Battalion, 23rd Marines, 4th Marine Division, Houston, TX
- Marine Aircraft Group 41, 4th Marine Aircraft Wing, Dallas, TX
- Marine Fighter Attack Squadron 142, Jacksonville, FL
- Anti-Tank Company, 8th Tank Battalion, Hialeah, FL
- Automotive Contract Maintenance Platoon, Motor Transport Maintenance Company, 4th Maintenance Battalion, Augusta, GA
- Marine Helicopter Attack Squadron 773, Marietta, GA
- Battery F, 2d Battalion, 14th Marines, Oklahoma City, OK
- Company D, 8th Tank Battalion, Columbia, SC
- Battery K, 4th Battalion, 14th Marines, Huntsville, AL

Department of the Air Force

Office of Air Force Reserve, Washington, DC

Headquarters, Air Force Reserves, Robins Air Force Base, GA
- 64th Aeromedical Evacuation Squadron, Marietta, GA
- 98th Air Refueling Group, Shreveport, LA
- 78th Air Refueling Squadron, Shreveport, LA
- 98th Maintenance Squadron, Shreveport, LA

Department of the Air Force (cont'd)

Headquarters Air Force Reserves (cont'd)
- 98th Operations Support Flight, Shreveport, LA
- 917th Maintenance Squadron, Shreveport, LA
- 917th Operations Group, Shreveport, LA
- 944th Fighter Group, Phoenix, AZ
- 452nd Maintenance Squadron, March Air Force Base, CA
- 942nd Maintenance Squadron, March Air Force Base, CA
- 940th Air Refueling Group, McClellan Air Force Base, CA
- Headquarters, 349th Airlift Wing (Associate), Travis Air Force Base, CA
- 349th Operations Group, Travis Air Force Base, CA
- 433rd Aircraft Generation Squadron, San Antonio, TX
- 919th Special Operations Wing, Eglin Air Force Base, FL
- 315th Aircraft Generation Squadron, Charleston, SC
- 315th Component Repair Squadron, Charleston, SC
- 315th Operations Group, Charleston, SC
- 80th Mobile Aerial Port Squadron, Marietta, GA

National Guard Bureau

Chief, National Guard Bureau, Washington, DC
Director, Army National Guard, Washington, DC
- Headquarters, 2nd Battalion, 142nd Infantry, Lubbock, TX
- 149th Military Police Company, San Antonio, TX
- Headquarters, Troop Command, Austin, TX
- Headquarters, 1st Battalion, 118th Infantry, Mount Pleasant, SC
- Headquarters, 4th Battalion, 118th Infantry, Union City, SC
- Headquarters, 1st Battalion, 143rd Field Artillery, Richmond, VA
- Headquarters, 1st Battalion, 145th Field Artillery, Ogden, UT
- 1457th Engineer Battalion, American Fork, UT
- Headquarters, 1st Battalion, 117th Field Artillery, Opp, AL
- Director of Readiness, Detachment 3, Alabama Army National Guard, Montgomery, AL
- 123rd Intelligence Squadron, Little Rock, AR
- 125th Medical Battalion, North Little Rock, AR
- Company C, Brigade Troop Command, Las Vegas, NV
- 249th Support Battalion, Temple, TX
- Headquarters, 3rd Battalion, 156th Infantry (Mechanized), Lake Charles, LA
- Headquarters, Battalion Troop Command, Atlanta, GA
- Headquarters, Nevada Air National Guard, Carson City, NV
- 150th Maintenance Company, Carson City, NV
- 152nd Resource Management Squadron, Reno Canyon, NV

National Guard Bureau (cont'd)

Director, Air National Guard, Washington, DC
- Air National Guard Readiness Center, Andrews Air Force Base, MD
- 138th Civil Engineering Squadron, Gulfport, MS
- Headquarters, 385th Attack Aviation Group, Phoenix, AZ
- 161st Air Refueling Group, Phoenix, AZ
- 385th Attack Aviation Group, Phoenix, AZ
- 172nd Mission Support Squadron, Jackson, MS
- 173rd Civil Engineering Squadron, Gulfport, MS
- 255th Air Control Squadron, Gulfport, MS
- Installation Support Unit, Training Site, Camp Shelby, MS
- Headquarters, 129th Air Rescue Group, Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, CA
- 148th Combat Communications Squadron, Ontario, CA
- 151st Air Refueling Group, Salt Lake City, UT
- Headquarters, 165th Airlift Group, Savannah, GA
- 224th Joint Communications Support Squadron, Brunswick, GA
- 188th Mission Support Flight, Fort Smith, AR
- 202nd Civil Engineering Squadron, Starke, FL
- Headquarters, New Mexico Air National Guard, Santa Fe, NM

Appendix E. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs)
Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)

Department of the Army

Secretary of the Army
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management)
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)
Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans
Commander, U.S. Army Forces Command
Auditor General, Department of the Army
Chief, Army Reserve
Commander, U.S. Army Reserve Command

Department of the Navy

Secretary of the Navy
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management)
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)
Chief of Naval Operations
Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps
Auditor General, Department of the Navy
Director of Naval Reserve
Commander, Naval Reserve Force
Commander, Marine Forces Reserve

Department of the Air Force

Secretary of the Air Force
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Installations)
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force
Chief of Air Force Reserve
Commander, Air Force Reserve

National Guard Bureau

Chief, National Guard Bureau
Chief, Internal Review and Audit Compliance

Defense Agencies

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency
Director, Defense Logistics Agency
Director, National Security Agency
Inspector General, Central Imagery Office
Inspector General, Defense Intelligence Agency
Inspector General, National Security Agency
Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange

Non-Defense Federal Organizations

Office of Management and Budget
Technical Information Center, National Security and International Affairs Division, General Accounting Office

Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of Each of the Following Congressional Committees and Subcommittees:

Senate Committee on Appropriations
Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
Senate Committee on Armed Services
Senate Subcommittee on Military Readiness and Defense Infrastructure, Committee on Armed Services
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
House Committee on Appropriations
House Subcommittee on National Security, Committee on Appropriations
House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
House Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
House Committee on National Security
House Subcommittee on Readiness, Committee on National Security

Part IV - Management Comments

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) Comments

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1500

RESERVE AFFAIRS

11 JAN 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, READINESS AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT DIRECTORATE, DOD INSPECTOR GENERAL

SUBJECT: Audit Report on Full-Time Support Staffing for Selected Reserve Forces (Project No. 3RA-0075)

Attached please find our comments as requested in your memorandum dated November 8, 1994, subject as above. For further information on this response, please contact Colonel Dennis P. McKnight at (703) 695-7429.

Francis M. Rush, Jr.
Deputy Assistant Secretary
(Manpower and Personnel)

Attachment:
As stated

Final Report Reference

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL
Project Number 3RA-0075

Audit Report on Full-Time Support Staffing for Selected Reserve Forces.

General - We have reviewed the Audit Report on Full-Time Staffing for Selected Reserve Forces and concur with the report with the following comments:

Page 2, Paragraph 2

Second sentence should read, "The Selected Reserve Accounts for about 57 percent of all Ready Reserve manpower....." (not Reserve forces). Revised Page 2

Page 2, Paragraph 3

Second sentence should read "retaining, **instructing**, and training in preparing Reserve units for their wartime missions." Instructing is a key function of FTS personnel. Revised Page 2

Page 8, Paragraph 1

Nonconcur. We find no evidence within the report to support the finding that the improper assignment and use of FTS personnel resulted in Reserve units not maintaining required skill levels or meeting personnel and training readiness goals. Page 6

Page 8, Paragraph 2

We believe the report fails to adequately recognize the importance of service unique requirements that have led to the development of service and component unique FTS programs. As an example Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard units are generally located on relatively large bases which allow these components to establish consolidated personnel support activities that the smaller and more widely dispersed Army Reserve component units can not effectively emulate. Many other factors such as this have contributed to the development of six different FTS programs with staffing practices that meet the intent of each unique program's goal. Page 6

Page 9, Paragraph 1

Nonconcur. Because of geographic dispersion of many units, it is not always feasible to centralize all workload and therefore both AGR and MT personnel must perform routine support duties. If a unit is not authorized a full time position to accomplish the workload in a particular functional area, the full-time person filling the authorization for a second functional area will be tasked to accomplish the workload in the unit. The FTS personnel assigned to the unit will perform the tasks required to maintain the unit's readiness. Although this may create situations in which some personnel are completing tasks that more appropriately could be assigned to another type of FTS personnel and may also cause individuals to complete tasks in areas in which they are not MOS qualified, these are lesser concerns than maintaining unit readiness. Page 7

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) Comments

Final Report Reference

Revised Page 9

Page 11, Paragraph 1

The first and second sentence are confusing. As stated, they seem to imply that every military full-time support person who performs administrative and clerical duties is not assigned to a drilling military position and does not have a mobilization mission. Although non-dual status FTS personnel are not required to have either a mobilization mission or a military drilling position in the unit, all military FTS personnel are required to have both a mobilization mission and a military drilling position in the unit.

Page 9

Page 11, Paragraph 2

Nonconcur. The nature of the work performed is not the only test that needs to be applied. A more important test is whether or not the routine clerical and administrative tasks being performed by the FTS personnel remain as requirements after mobilization. If the tasks remain as requirements after mobilization, then the person assigned to accomplish the tasks must be a military FTS person. If the tasks disappear at mobilization, then the positions may be filled by civilian personnel.

Page 14

Page 16-17

We concur with the recommendations for corrective action and plan to incorporate appropriate recommendations in the revised DoD Directive 1205.18.

Department of the Army Comments

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR OPERATIONS AND PLANS
400 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0400

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

10 JAN 1995

DAMO-FDF

MEMORANDUM THRU ~~DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR OPERATIONS AND PLANS~~ DIRECTOR OF THE ARMY STAFF JAN 12 '95
~~DIRECTOR OF THE ARMY STAFF~~ 12/1/95
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
(MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS)

24 JAN 1995
Sara E. Lister
Assistant Secretary of the Army
(Manpower and Reserve Affairs)

FOR US ARMY AUDIT AGENCY, ATTN: SAAG-PRF-E, 3101 PARK CENTER DRIVE, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22302-1596

1/25/95

SUBJECT: Audit Report on Full-Time Support Staffing for Selected Reserve Forces (Project No. 3RA-0075)

1. Reference Memorandum, SAAG-PRF-E, dated 9 November 1994, subject as above.

2. After careful review the Army concurs with the report with the following comments:

a. General.

(1) The report's results, although technically correct per Army regulations, clearly do not reflect full appreciation of the real world problems associated with the full time support (FTS) program. The primary reason for the irregularities found in the audit report is the low staffing and funding of the FTS program and the need to accomplish the same basic full time functions at all locations (e.g. supply, maintenance, administration, etc.).

(2) Both the Army National Guard and the U.S. Army Reserve have manpower requirements determination programs in effect which have been determined by independent study, Decision Science Consortium in 1992 at the request of the HQDA DCSOPS, to be sound. FORSCOM has also declared the process and the manpower requirements valid and HQDA agrees.

(3) That being the case, all units should have sufficient FTS to accomplish their mission based upon their requirements. However, both reserve components are authorized only about 60% of their required FTS manpower. This means that only 60% of the work can get done. As a result, the FTS force is often required to work outside their normal duty areas to

95020830

Final Report Reference

DAMO-FDF
SUBJECT: Audit Report on Full-Time support Staffing for Selected Reserve Forces (Project No. 3RA-0075)

accomplish the mission. Because of this the team found both AGRs and MILTECHs working outside their normal duty areas and spending a high percentage of their time on administrative tasks.

(4) The report questions the need for dual status MILTECHs and suggests that those functions can be accomplished by regular Department of the Army civilians. The current MILTECH program is directed by law, DOD Directive and Army policy and is beyond the Army's ability to alter.

b. Specific comments relative to the information contained in the body of the audit report are below:

Page 3

(1) Under "**SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY**" on page 3 it is stated "We did not determine the effectiveness of the reserve components' staffing, but whether the reserve components staffed FTS positions in accordance with DOD FTS program guidance". Due to low funding and staffing levels within the FTS program, the team should have determined the effectiveness of the program based upon current staffing. As currently staffed, most units cannot accomplish all tasks without assigning their FTS personnel to other jobs as time permits. This means that in some cases AGRs and MILTECHs are performing administrative duties. However, if this was not the case, functions would not get done, and unit readiness would suffer. This, in turn, was a factor which caused the finding of personnel performing functions for which they had not been trained.

Page 6

(2) On page 9 under the heading "**RESERVE COMPONENTS' FTS PROGRAM-UNIQUE STAFFING CRITERIA**" the team found FTS "performing a variety of routine support duties" and "assigning AGR personnel to routine administrative duties". The regulation cited by the team (AR 140-30) echoes the DOD Directive 1205.18. However, both were dated in the mid to late 80s when the military had quite a different look. An attempt has been made to update DOD Directive 1205.18 two of the last three years. Both times it has been non-concurred with by a majority of the Services. The flexibility needed by the Secretary of the Army in staffing his FTS program, to ensure the highest readiness at certain levels, will continue for the foreseeable future as the turbulence of draw downs, swaps, migrations, etc., continues. The use of FTS (AGR and MILTECH) to perform administrative functions is a result of necessity not of regulation.

Final Report Reference

DAMO-FDF
SUBJECT: Audit Report on Full-Time support Staffing for Selected Reserve Forces (Project No. 3RA-0075)

(3) Page 12 and 13 under the heading "**FTS PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS**" the team found FTS personnel not trained for the position to which they were assigned or for the duties they were actually performing. Both the ARNG and USAR have programs in place to ensure that FTS personnel meet qualifications and skill levels for assigned positions, that skill qualification training is monitored, and personnel are utilized in accordance with approved structure. As stated previously, there will be times when FTS personnel are doing things for which they were not trained, but this is necessary for the unit to maintain their readiness and free up drilling time for training rather than accomplishing administrative tasks. Pages 10 and 11

(4) Page 12 under the heading "**ARMY TRAINING GUIDANCE**" indicates AGR personnel are not trained for their position and supervisors and commanders were not aware of procedures to monitor AGR personnel qualification after assignment. With the current turbulence within the reserve forces, there will be untrained personnel in some positions. However, both the ARNG and USAR have programs in place to identify these personnel, ensure they are trained and have their progress monitored by the chain of command. Page 10

(5) Page 14 under the heading "**ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AND ARMY RESERVE MTs**" the team found approximately 50% of the MILTECHs (MTs) interviewed performed clerical and administrative duties on a regular and recurring basis. In order to accomplish all the work without personnel authorizations, this is necessary. The fact that MILTECHs hold unit administrator positions seems appropriate in most cases. Since the unit administration function will continue upon mobilization, the MILTECH would mobilize with the unit and continue to function in that capacity. If the position was filled with a Department of the Army Civilian (DAC), upon mobilization the position would be vacant at a time when it is most critical. Also, the lack of funding for DAC positions affects the decision, in some cases, to place them in administrator positions. Page 11

(6) Page 15 under the heading "**DOD EFFORTS TO IMPROVE FTS GUIDANCE**" states that during the audit the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) was in the process of reissuing guidance and procedures to the Military Departments for managing the FTS program. The report failed to mention that the proposed directive was non-concurred with by the Army and other Services during the staffing process, and again the following year when it was reissued for staffing. No attempt has been made to staff a new directive since the November 1993 time frame. Page 13

3

DAMO-FDF
SUBJECT: Audit Report on Full-Time support Staffing for Selected Reserve Forces (Project No. 3RA-0075)

3. In summary, the team looked at Full-Time Support solely on the basis of regulation and not in the context of today's reality. If the Army's reserve components were staffed in accordance with the directive, so that all functions could be performed by trained and qualified personnel, we believe most of the findings would not exist. The bottom line is that the FTS personnel are doing their best, in a resource constrained environment to ensure their units are administered, trained, fed, and equipped.

4. My point of contact for this action is Mr. George Wallace, DAMO-FDF, 695-5891.

THOMAS N. BURNETTE, JR.
Brigadier General, GS
Director, Force Programs

4

Department of the Air Force Comments

Final Report Reference

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

20 JAN 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AUDITING,
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL,
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

FROM: AF/RE
1150 Air Force Pentagon
Washington DC 20330-1150

SUBJECT: DOD IG Draft Report Entitled "Full-Time Support Staffing For Selected Reserve Forces," (Project No. 3RA-0075)

This is in reply to your request for Air Force comments on the subject report.

The Chief, National Guard Bureau, the Director of the Air National Guard, and the Chief of Air Force Reserve have reviewed the recommendations for corrective action, Draft Report, Paragraph 2a and 2b, Page 17. They concur in principle and offer the following comments: Page 14

a. Administrative requirements are and will continue to be reviewed for reduction, elimination, or streamlining as mandated force reductions continue. Where possible, administrative duties are assigned to non-technician positions, but this does not eliminate the need for small numbers of our technicians to be skilled in administrative aspects of their military occupation. Wartime tasking and mobilization requirements drive Guard and Reserve technician authorizations and certain skills and duties are required whether operating in technician (peace time) or military (mobilized) status. This essential linkage is crucial to our ability to mobilize, deploy, and meet wartime requirements.

b. Both the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve are subject to Regular component standards and inspections in addition to formal internal staff assistance visits and host IG inspections. These management assets are frequently used to verify compliance with full-time support requirements. Adequate procedures are in place to assure initial hire qualifications are met and that substandard or non-qualified members are promptly separated or reclassified in accordance with existing civilian and military standards and regulations. Both the Guard and Reserve will continue

to use these available tools, as well as periodic reminders to field commanders, to assure that full-time support members are maintained in a combat ready posture at all times.

While we agree that there is always some room for improvement, we believe that the findings included from the relative small sample audited are not reflective of the overall full-time support staff. The Air Force Reserve, for example, uses the Air Reserve Technician (ART) as the core of its full-time support and the vast majority are assigned to aircraft maintenance (66%) and operational flying units (18%). The balance (16%) is assigned to support units where administration is a primary requirement. The timing of this audit may well have contributed to some of the findings due to the turmoil associated with the loss of personnel through the Base Realignment and Closure process, high grade civilian reduction programs, and overall cuts in the military technician program. Not withstanding, having selected Technician administrative positions within units that train for mobilization is essential to the effectiveness and replacement of deployed forces and conforms with Air Force policy that Administrative Command and Control (ADCOM) continues to remain with the Reserve component until full-mobilization.

ROBERT A. McINTOSH, Maj Gen, USAF
Chief of Air Force Reserve

National Guard Bureau Comments

Final Report Reference

DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY AND THE AIR FORCE
NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20310-2500

NGB-IR-C 18 January 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR The Inspector General, Department of Defense (Auditing)
ATTN: Director, Readiness and Operational Support Directorate

SUBJECT: Draft Audit Report on Full-Time Support Staffing for Selected Reserve Forces (Project No. 3RA-0075)

1. The National Guard Bureau has reviewed the Draft Audit Report on Full-Time Support Staffing for Selected Reserve Forces (Project No. 3RA-0075). The record as written contains inaccuracies and misunderstandings and did not fully evaluate or analyze the problems. The auditors appear to lack a clear understanding of the directives and models applicable to the NGB. As a result, we nonconcur with the overall report as written. However, we concur with comment on the recommendations of the Draft report, Para 2a & 2b, Page 17. Page 14

2. The attached comments from the Army National Guard (Encl 1), Air National Guard (Encl 2) and Human Resources Office (Encl 3) addresses our specific concerns as they relate to the National Guard. In reference to the Internal Control Weaknesses addressed in Part I, we have already implemented the actions required by recommendation 2 of the subject report; therefore we are in compliance with your stated objective.

3. The point of contact for this action is Mr. Lane G. Haskew, NGB Audit Compliance and Liaison Office, (703) 756-5989.

3 Encls

EDWARD D. BACA
Lieutenant General, USA
Chief, National Guard

Final Report Reference

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

COMMENTS ON DODIG DRAFT AUDIT REPORT OF FULL-TIME SUPPORT STAFFING FOR SELECTED RESERVE FORCES

1. The draft audit report has been reviewed and the Army National Guard overall nonconcurs with the report.

2. Specific comments relative to the information contained in the body of the audit follows:

Pages 6 and 7

A. Page 9 paragraph 1 (Army National Guard) -- The functions and workload for the ARNG Full-Time Support (FTS) positions have been validated using approved DOD Methods and Standards procedures. This validation was performed for both TDA and MTOE support functions throughout the ARNG force structure. There are administrative support functions which must be accomplished at unit level that directly relate to functions of administration as defined in AR 140-30.

Page 9

B. Page 11 paragraph 1 (Using Military FTS to Perform Administrative Work Load) -- Administrative positions in the ARNG are required, authorized, and funded. They are critical to the accomplishment of operations, administration and logistical support. There are administrative positions on the majority of unit MTOEs (Mobilization Manning Documents): one at the company, three at the battalion, and five at the brigade. As much as possible, the administrative workload requirements have been delegated to support units within the state headquarters (STARCs, MILPO, HRMO and AGR Branch).

Page 10

C. Page 12 paragraph 2 (Army National Guard and Army Reserve FTS Personnel Qualifications) -- The ARNG currently has 91% AGR MOS qualified in their MTOE and duty assignment. With limited AGR positions within the ARNG, downsizing, and shifting of force structure between states, transfer are required to move AGR soldiers to available positions and this requires some amount of retraining. The majority of the AGR soldiers within the ARNG stay in units much longer due to limited positions within the ARNG.

Revised Page 10

D. Page 13 paragraph 1 (Army Training Guidance) -- NGR (AR) 600-5 "The Active Guard Reserve Program" is an ARNG publication. The proponent of NGR 600-5 is the Personnel Directorate at NGB and only applies to ARNG AGR soldiers. NGR 600-5 authorizes the ARNG to transfer soldiers and retrain them within one year. All waivers to this policy must be approved by NGB. As stated above, 91% of the ARNG AGR force is qualified in their MTOE and duty assignment.

Encl 1

Final Report Reference

COMMENTS ON DODIG DRAFT AUDIT REPORT OF FULL-TIME SUPPORT STAFFING FOR SELECTED RESERVE FORCES

E. Page 14 paragraph 2 (Army National Guard) -- Military Technicians (MTs) in the ARNG are required to be assigned to the unit they work for, or if in an area support shop, one that they support. All staffing for MT and AGRs is in compliance with the "Mix of the Force" Model which identifies which of the four employment categories is allowed to fill specific positions in the ARNG manning model. Pages 11 and 12

F. Page 15 paragraph 1 (MTs Assigned to Nondeploying Positions) -- It is not possible, utilizing the staffing model, to develop manning where an AGR or an MT does not either mobilize with their unit or a unit they support. The ARNG has maintained numbers in conjunction with the intent of the legislation and requirements of "Mix of the Force". Page 12

G. Page 15 paragraph 3 (Compatibility of Civilian and Military Duties) -- The ARNG utilizes compatibility tables for MT jobs and military positions. Compatibility waivers with justification are required from NGB if the state is not in compliance. The ARNG currently has a 97% compatibility rate nationally. Pages 12 and 13

H. Page 20 paragraph 1 (Active Guard Reserve) -- AGR personnel assigned to NGB are on active duty under Sect 672(d) 10 USC. ARNG AGR soldiers in the states are on Full-Time National Guard Duty (FTNGD), not active duty, IAW Sect 502(f) 32 USC for the purposes of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the ARNG. Revised Page 18

3. Concurrence/Nonconcurrence with Recommendations for Corrective Actions.

A. Page 17, Recommendation 2a -- Concur. Work load based requirements have been and will continually be validated by the ARNG (NGB Full Time Support Division - Management Engineering Branch). Page 14

B. Page 17, Recommendation 2b -- Concur. Periodic reviews of AGR utilization have been and will be conducted by NGB at least bi-annually by NGB-ARP-FS (Plans, Programs and Analysis Branch). State visits have and will continue to focus on full time support utilization, manning, MOSQ, and program management. Electronic monitoring and reporting has been and will continue to be used in the evaluation of regulatory and program compliance. Page 14

COMMENTS ON DODIG DRAFT AUDIT REPORT OF FULL-TIME SUPPORT STAFFING FOR SELECTED RESERVE FORCES

4. Summary.

A. It is clear that the DODIG Audit team did not have a clear understanding of the statutory and regulatory requirements for staffing within the Army National Guard. Based on their conclusions, it is also obvious that they did not fully review procedures that are currently in place at NGB to monitor FTS programs and insure regulatory compliance.

B. The staffing criteria used by the ARNG are in accordance with the approved DOD Methods and Standards procedures and validated throughout the ARNG force structure.

C. Skill levels needed within ARNG units in case of mobilization and deployment are maintained, as attested by the percentage of MOS qualification within the4 AGR force. As such, personnel and training readiness goals within the ARNG are met.

5. Point of contact is MAJ DeBlois, NGB-ARP-FS, DSN 327-9711.

Final Report
Reference

NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF -- HUMAN RESOURCES

COMMENTS ON DODIG DRAFT AUDIT REPORT OF FULL-TIME SUPPORT STAFFING FOR SELECTED RESERVE FORCES

1. The draft audit report has been reviewed by the Human Resources Directorate, NGB and we concur with comment on the report recommendations as they pertain to the National Guard Technician program.

2. The following comments pertain to the National Guard technician program in both the ARNG and ANG:

a. **Page 16 para 1 (a) (1) Recommendations for Corrective Action, -- concur with comment.** We have considerable concern that the development of procedures for determining the categories of military and civilian full-time support personnel not be so restrictive as to compromise current authorities and flexibility's enjoyed by the Adjutants General to employ and administer national Guard technicians. Our concern extends to any compromise of the intent of Congress expressed in their enactment of the National Guard Technician Act of 1968. Page 14

The National Guard Technician Act of 1968, PL 90-486, authorizes technicians to be employed in the administration and training of the National Guard and the maintenance and repair of supplies issued to the National Guard or armed forces. Senate report No. 1446, which accompanied the Act, states that the concept of the technician program is that technicians will serve concurrently in three different ways: (a) perform full-time civilian work in their units; (b) perform military training and duty in their units; and (c) be available to enter active Federal service at any time their units are called. The act further requires the Secretaries concerned to designate the Adjutants General to employee and administer technicians. In addition, the Act requires that except as prescribed by the Secretary concerned, technicians shall be members of the National Guard and hold the military grade specified for that position. This authority has been delegated to Adjutants General and has afforded them the flexibility needed to maximize readiness, respond appropriately to local labor markets and available authorizations, manage both military and civilian careers, and to comply with the intent of the Act.

b. **Page 17 para 2 (a) Recommendations for Corrective Action, -- concur with comment.** Both the ARNG and ANG already administer ongoing programs to review workload requirements. Page 14

c. **Page 17 para 2 (b) Recommendations for Corrective Action, -- concur with comment.** Although this part of the recommendation appears to focus on military skill qualification and military skill code training issues, periodic reviews of both ARNG and ANG full-time support personnel utilization are already being conducted in accordance with current policy and regulatory requirements. Page 14

Encl 3

Audit Team Members

This report was prepared by the Readiness and Operational Support Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, Department of Defense.

Thomas F. Gimble
Harlan M. Geyer
Geraldine M. Edwards
Mary E. Smith
Delesta M. Ware
Juana R. Smith
Robert E. Beets
Rigoberto Luis
Thomas E. Biller
Nancy C. Cipolla
David Barton