

December 15, 2004



Human Capital

Management of Navy Senior Enlisted
Personnel Assignments in Support of
Operation Iraqi Freedom
(D-2005-024)

Department of Defense
Office of the Inspector General

Quality

Integrity

Accountability

Additional Copies

To obtain additional copies of this report, visit the Web site of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense at <http://www.dodig.osd.mil/audit/reports> or contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit, Audit Followup and Technical Support 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 Audit Followup and Technical Support at (703) 604-8940 (DSN 664-8940) or fax (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

ODIG-AUD (ATTN: AFTS Audit Suggestions)
Inspector General of the Department of Defense
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, VA 22202-4704

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

hotline

To report fraud, waste, mismanagement, and abuse of authority.

Send written complaints to: Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1900
Phone: 800.424.9098 e-mail: hotline@dodig.osd.mil www.dodig.osd.mil/hotline

Acronyms

BA	Billets Authorized
EPMAC	Enlisted Placement Management Center
MCA	Manning Control Authority
NMP	Navy Manning Plan
OIF	Operation Iraqi Freedom
ROC/POE	Required Operational Capability/Projected Operational Environment
SORTS	Status of Resources and Training System
USCENTCOM	U.S. Central Command



INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-4704

December 15, 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR NAVAL INSPECTOR GENERAL

SUBJECT: Report on Management of Navy Senior Enlisted Personnel Assignments in Support of Operation Iraqi Freedom (Report No. D-2005-024)

We are providing this report for review and comment. Comments from the Navy were received too late to be considered in preparing the final report. DoD Directive 7650.3 requires that all recommendations be resolved promptly. Therefore, if the Navy does not submit additional comments by January 14, 2005, we will consider the comments received as the response to the final report.

If possible, please send management comments in electronic format (Adobe Acrobat file only) to Audls@dodig.osd.mil. Copies of the management comments must contain the actual signature of the authorizing official. We cannot accept the / Signed / symbol in place of the actual signature. If you arrange to send classified comments electronically, they must be sent over the SECRET Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNET).

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the staff. Questions should be directed to Mr. Donald A. Bloomer at (703) 604-8863 (DSN 664-8863) or Mr. Richard B. Vasquez at (703) 604-9174 (DSN 664-9174). See Appendix D for the report distribution. The team members are listed inside the back cover.

By direction of the Deputy Inspector General for Auditing:

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Shelton Young".

Shelton R. Young
Assistant Inspector General
for Readiness and Logistics Support

Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense

Report No. D-2005-024

December 15, 2004

(Project No. D2003LA-0151.001)

Management of Navy Senior Enlisted Personnel Assignments in Support of Operation Iraqi Freedom

Executive Summary

Who Should Read This Report and Why? DoD civilian and military personnel who are responsible for the management of military personnel should read this report. The report discusses senior enlisted manning deficiencies and how Navy policies and procedures can be modified to help identify and correct those deficiencies.

Background. During March 2003, the Commander, U.S. Atlantic Fleet and the Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet deployed operating forces to the Commander, U.S. Central Command in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. This report discusses manning levels of Navy senior enlisted personnel for 14 units among those forces. Those 14 units were assigned personnel through the manning and distribution processes established within the Navy Manpower, Personnel, and Training process.

Results. We visited 14 Navy units at 5 locations and evaluated their senior enlisted manning levels for March 2003 when they deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. According to Navy officials, all 14 units met the Navy-required readiness levels to accomplish their missions. However, senior enlisted manning levels are not measured when assessing a unit's readiness level. Four of the units we visited had deployed with less than 80 percent of their senior enlisted warfighting positions filled. Specifically, one carrier airborne early warning squadron and three strike fighter squadrons reported senior enlisted manning levels of 71 percent, 76 percent, 63 percent, and 72 percent. As a result, personnel in those units were exposed to a higher level of risk for mishap or injury during their deployment. Senior enlisted manning levels should be considered in determining a unit's readiness level. Reviewing and updating Navy manpower and personnel guidance to clearly define acceptable manning levels, together with establishing procedures to alleviate senior enlisted manning deficiencies, will help to optimize personnel manning levels during future deployments and will correct the management control weaknesses we identified. See the Finding section for the detailed recommendations.

Management Comments. Comments from the Navy were received too late to be considered in preparing the final report. If the Navy does not submit additional comments by January 14, 2005, we will consider the comments received as the response to the final report.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Background	1
Objectives	2
Finding	
Manning of Senior Enlisted Warfighting Positions	3
Appendixes	
A. Scope and Methodology	10
Management Control Program Review	11
Prior Coverage	11
B. Units Visited	13
C. Strike Fighter Squadron 147	14
D. Report Distribution	16

Background

Navy Manpower, Personnel, and Training Process. The Navy Manpower, Personnel, and Training process helps to ensure Navy readiness by identifying and funding manpower requirements, then managing the distribution of personnel to meet those requirements. The Office of the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower and Personnel) is responsible for the administration of the process.

Manpower. Manpower requirements reflect the minimum quantity and quality of manpower required for peacetime and wartime to effectively and efficiently accomplish a unit's mission. The Navy Manpower Analysis Center determines manpower requirements for fleet-based units using the required operational capability/projected operational environment (ROC/POE). Shore-based units determine their own manpower requirements based on their mission, function, and task statements.

The Navy uses the manpower process to determine which requirements will be funded. The number of personnel positions that the Navy will fund in a given fiscal year is referred to as billets authorized (BA).

Personnel. Navy personnel who are available for active duty assignment to fill BA are referred to as the Navy's distributable inventory. Distributable inventory does not include a category of manpower called "individuals account," which includes military personnel who are not available for assignment. The individuals account consists of:

- transients who are in a permanent change of station status;
- patients, prisoners, and holdees who are dropped from the assigned strength of an operational or training unit for reasons of medical, disciplinary, or separation nonavailability; and
- students, trainees, and midshipmen who are active Service officer students, active enlisted students, active enlisted trainees, Service academy midshipmen, and active officer accession students not assigned to a specific unit.

The Navy Personnel Command allocates distributable inventory to the four manning control authorities (MCAs), which are under the Commander, U.S. Atlantic Fleet; the Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet; the Bureau of Naval Personnel, commanded by the Chief of Naval Personnel; and the Commander, Naval Reserve Force. In the enlisted distribution system, MCAs are tasked with determining the quality, quantity, and priority for the assignment of personnel that will maintain unit readiness. The MCAs are also tasked with initiating actions to correct manning deficiencies.

Because personnel assets rarely equal manpower requirements, the Navy uses Navy Manning Plans (NMPs) to determine an equitable distribution of personnel throughout the Navy. The Enlisted Placement Management Center

(EPMAC), within the Navy Personnel Command, develops and maintains an NMP for each rating¹ within each unit. The MCAs use the NMPs to help ensure a prioritized balance (fair share) when assigning personnel from the distributable inventory.

U.S. Central Command. For Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), the Navy received its mission from the U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM). USCENTCOM is one of nine combatant commands² and is composed of components from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the U.S. Special Operations Command. The USCENTCOM area of responsibility includes 25 nations and extends from the Horn of Africa to Central Asia. The Navy component of USCENTCOM is the U.S. Naval Forces Central Command, headquartered in Manama, Bahrain.

U.S. Naval Forces Central Command. The Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Central Command has operational command and control over all naval operations throughout the USCENTCOM area of responsibility. To support a combatant commander, the Navy provides operating forces, which can include a Carrier Strike Group and an Amphibious Ready Group, as well as other ships and aircraft. The groups are formed and deployed on an as-needed basis. The majority of naval forces for the USCENTCOM area of responsibility are rotationally deployed from either the U.S. Atlantic Fleet or the U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Objectives

Our overall audit objective was to evaluate the Services' management of the assignment process for military personnel. Specifically, the audit was to evaluate whether the assignment process for officers and enlisted personnel was managed to minimize the amount of time that essential warfighting positions were vacant, to ensure that qualified personnel were assigned to those positions, and to ensure that training requirements to fully perform the duties of those positions were being met.

This report addresses the enlisted personnel management process for Navy units that deployed in support of OIF and how vacant senior enlisted warfighting positions impacted the readiness of deployed forces. We also reviewed the management control program as it related to the objectives. Because enlisted warfighting positions remained vacant during deployment, the audit objectives to determine whether qualified and trained personnel were assigned to those positions became moot. This report does not address officer assignments because our initial review did not identify areas of concern that warranted additional audit work. See Appendix A for a discussion of the scope and methodology, our review of the management control program, and prior coverage related to our objectives.

¹Rating is a broad enlisted career field identifying an occupational specialty.

²The nine combatant commands are U.S. Northern Command, U.S. Southern Command, U.S. Joint Forces Command, U.S. Pacific Command, U.S. European Command, U.S. Central Command, U.S. Transportation Command, U.S. Special Operations Command, and U.S. Strategic Command.

Manning of Senior Enlisted Warfighting Positions

According to Navy officials, the 14 Navy units at the 5 locations visited³ had met the Navy-required readiness levels to accomplish their missions when they deployed in support of OIF. However, senior enlisted⁴ manning levels are not measured when assessing a unit's readiness level. Four of the units had deployed with less than 80 percent of their senior enlisted warfighting positions filled. Those manning levels occurred because Navy policy and procedures lack requirements that would help ensure vacant senior enlisted positions are filled to an acceptable level. Specifically, Navy policy does not:

- clearly define acceptable senior enlisted manning levels,
- require senior enlisted manning deficiencies to be resolved prior to deployment, and
- require senior enlisted manning levels to be tracked and reported.

As a result, Navy units deployed in support of OIF with vacant senior enlisted warfighting positions, exposing Navy personnel to a higher level of risk for mishap and injury.

Navy Policy and Procedures

Chief of Naval Operations Instruction 1000.16J, "Manual of Navy Total Force Manpower Policies and Procedures," June 17, 2002, provides policy guidance and procedures to develop, review, approve, and implement total force manpower requirements and authorizations for Navy organizations.

Enlisted Distribution Management System. According to Naval Military Personnel Manual 1306-100, "Enlisted Distribution Management System," February 28, 2003, the MCAs should measure unit personnel levels to ensure that the unit is properly manned in accordance with the NMP and, if personnel become available, ensure that the unit is fully manned according to its BA.

Operational Readiness. Navy Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures 1-03.3, "Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) Joint Report-Navy," Revision A, March 2001, establishes readiness levels to indicate the degree to which a unit is capable of undertaking its primary wartime missions. Among those levels, C-1 and C-2 denote that a unit is trained and possesses the required

³See Appendix B for a list of the units visited and their locations.

⁴Navy senior enlisted personnel are chief petty officers, senior chief petty officers, and master chief petty officers (E-7s, E-8s, and E-9s, respectively).

resources and personnel to undertake the “full” or “most of the” wartime mission(s), respectively. According to Navy policy, a unit is adequately manned and deployable if it meets the minimum personnel readiness level of C-2. Further, Chief of Naval Operations guidance for 2003 was to “achieve C-2 manning status for all deploying units at least six months prior to deployment.”

Enlisted Placement Policy. The Commanders of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet and the U.S. Pacific Fleet issued a joint letter on “Manning Placement Policy for Atlantic/Pacific Fleet Manning Control Authority” (the Fleet Placement Policy), December 23, 1997, that requires EPMAC to “balance the needs of the units with the current and projected available personnel assets.” The joint letter also requires that manning deficiencies that degrade a unit’s mission capability be resolved and allows EPMAC to request extraordinary manning actions⁵ to ensure that enlisted positions are filled with qualified personnel. The joint letter also directs that deploying units “will be manned to C1 or C2 SORTS readiness (minimum of C2) . . . as early in the training/work up cycle as possible (but not later than the month of deployment) and maintained throughout deployment.”

Predeployment Personnel Manning Assistance. The Commanders of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet and the U.S. Pacific Fleet issued Instruction 1306.14A, “Predeployment Personnel Manning Assistance Report,” April 18, 2001, to improve enlisted personnel readiness by providing the means for exchanging information between personnel managers and units scheduled for extended deployments. The exchange of information also keeps the chain of command advised of manning deficiencies and actions being taken to resolve them.

Senior Enlisted Warfighting Positions

According to Navy officials, the 14 Navy units at the 5 locations visited had met the Navy-required readiness levels (C-1 or C-2) to accomplish their missions when they deployed in support of OIF. However, because the personnel component is measured in the aggregate, a unit may be rated at the C-1 or C-2 readiness level but have senior enlisted manning levels of less than 80 percent.⁶ According to the Navy SORTS guidance:

Although aggregation of PRMAR [primary mission area status set] essential personnel may mask degraded mission or resource status, the lack in any area (officer, enlisted, mission essential personnel, aircrew, MSC [Military Sealift Command] personnel) could result in a more serious degradation. Additionally, in isolated instances within a specific PRMAR, over-manning in one area could mask significant deficiencies in another area.

⁵Extraordinary manning actions are personnel actions to correct a unit’s readiness-degrading manning deficiency once all other avenues have been exhausted and include alteration of an enlisted member’s approved work assignment on either a permanent or temporary basis.

⁶We used 80 percent of BA as an acceptable senior enlisted manning level for purposes of our audit.

Four air squadrons of the 14 Navy units visited deployed with less than 80 percent of their senior enlisted warfighting positions filled. We determined manning levels by reviewing manning reports provided by EPMAC for March 2003. The units were deployed in support of OIF during March 2003. The following table shows the manning levels of senior enlisted personnel for the 14 units visited.

Senior Enlisted Manning Levels (as of March 2003)					
Unit	Assigned Personnel	BA	Percent of BA	NMP	Percent of NMP
U.S.S. <i>Princeton</i> (CG 59)	29	30	97	28	104
U.S.S. <i>Nimitz</i> (CVN 68)	183	213	86	193	95
U.S.S. <i>Harry S. Truman</i> (CVN 75)	194	195	99	177	110
U.S.S. <i>Fitzgerald</i> (DDG 62)	26	24	108	24	108
U.S.S. <i>Bonhomme Richard</i> (LHD 6)	76	76	100	74	103
U.S.S. <i>Iwo Jima</i> (LHD 7)	80	78	103	73	110
U.S.S. <i>Nashville</i> (LPD 13)	24	25	96	24	100
HS-6	15	16	94	14	107
VAW-117	10	14	71	12	83
VFA-14	13	17	76	16	81
VFA-41	18	19	95	16	113
VFA-94	12	19	63	17	71
VFA-97	13	18	72	15	87
VS-29	13	16	81	15	87

Carrier Airborne Early Warning Squadron Manning Level. Carrier Airborne Early Warning Squadron 117 (VAW-117), based at Naval Air Station Point Mugu, California, has the mission of providing all-weather airborne early warning, airborne battle management, and command and control functions for the Carrier Strike Group and the Joint Force Commander. An integral component of the Carrier Strike Group Air Wing is the E-2C *Hawkeye*, which uses computerized equipment to provide early warning and threat analysis against potentially hostile air and surface targets.

For March 2003, the EPMAC manning report of VAW-117 showed a senior enlisted manning level of less than 80 percent of BA. The EPMAC manning report showed that the number of senior enlisted BA for VAW-117 was 14 and that VAW-117 had 10 senior enlisted personnel (71 percent of BA) as of March 2003.

Strike Fighter Squadron Manning Levels. Strike Fighter Squadrons 14, 94, and 97, based at Naval Air Station Lemoore, California, fly the F/A-18 *Hornet*, an all-weather aircraft used as an attack aircraft as well as a fighter. In its fighter mode, the F/A-18 is used primarily as a fighter escort and for fleet air defense; in its attack mode, it is used for force projection, interdiction, and close-air and deep-air support. The newest model, the *Super Hornet*, is highly capable across the full mission spectrum: air superiority, fighter escort, reconnaissance, aerial refueling, close-air support, air defense suppression, and day/night precision strike capability.

The March 2003 EPMAC manning reports for the three strike fighter squadrons showed their senior enlisted manning levels were less than 80 percent of BA. The reports showed that VFA-14, VFA-94, and VFA-97 had senior enlisted manning levels of 76 percent, 63 percent, and 72 percent of BA, respectively.

According to Navy policy, a unit is adequately manned and deployable if it meets the minimum personnel readiness level of C-2. The Navy had not established a minimum manning level, based on NMP or BA, for senior enlisted personnel.

Senior Enlisted Personnel. Senior enlisted personnel (E-7s, E-8s, and E-9s) occupy key leadership positions and are responsible for the supervision, mentoring, professional development, and training of junior enlisted personnel. Senior enlisted personnel lead and manage the enlisted personnel resources of the Navy. As such, senior enlisted personnel are responsible for, have the authority to accomplish, and are held accountable for leading junior enlisted personnel and applying their skills to tasks that enable mission accomplishment.

Manning Policy and Procedures

Senior enlisted warfighting positions were less than 80 percent filled because Navy policy and procedures lack requirements that would help ensure those positions are filled to an acceptable level. Specifically, Navy policy does not clearly define acceptable senior enlisted manning levels, which would help ensure deficiencies are identified; does not require senior enlisted manning deficiencies to be resolved prior to deployment; and does not require senior enlisted manning levels to be tracked and reported.

Resolution of Manning Deficiencies. The Fleet Placement Policy requires that manning deficiencies be resolved only if they degrade a unit's mission capability. The Navy's assessment criteria for determining a unit's personnel readiness to perform its mission (its overall SORTS readiness level) does not specifically include the manning levels of senior enlisted positions. In addition, the Fleet Placement Policy does not specifically require an MCA to correct a unit's senior

enlisted manning deficiencies. The Fleet Placement Policy only requires that a unit have a minimum SORTS readiness level of C-2.

EPMAC can request extraordinary manning actions to resolve manning deficiencies. However, those actions are not always successful because the actions are geographically restricted. Those extraordinary actions include “diverts” and “crossdecks,”⁷ which are restricted to personnel already assigned to a geographical area. Often, diverts and crossdecks have a very limited impact for geographically isolated units.

One official at Strike Fighter Wing, U.S. Pacific Fleet stated that “the Navy’s current policy and distribution system does not work for isolated stations, such as Lemoore.” Another squadron at Naval Air Station Lemoore experienced similar problems, as well as increased aviation ground mishaps⁸ and increased incidences of nonjudicial punishment,⁹ but was not included in our judgmental sample because it had not deployed in support of OIF (see Appendix C).

Manning Deficiency Tracking and Reporting Mechanism. Although Navy policies and procedures do not require a unit to track its senior enlisted manning level or to report deficiencies, commanders may use the Predeployment Personnel Manning Assistance Report to notify EPMAC and the appropriate MCA of manning deficiencies. In addition, units may use an Enlisted Manning Inquiry Report that includes a commanding officer’s opinion that a manning deficiency has a significant effect on unit readiness. The reporting mechanism is in place, but Navy manpower and personnel guidance does not require units meeting the minimum SORTS readiness level of C-2 to track or report manning deficiencies. Further, if senior enlisted personnel vacancies do not affect a unit’s SORTS readiness level, MCAs do not consider filling them a priority.

Conclusion

Navy units deployed in support of OIF with vacant senior enlisted warfighting positions, exposing junior enlisted personnel to less senior supervision and direction in applying their skills to mission accomplishment.

⁷A divert is the reassignment of a prospective gain of one unit to another unit, usually in the same geographic area and with the same type of duty (sea duty to another sea duty). A crossdeck is when an enlisted member already assigned to a unit is transferred to a unit belonging to a command having a significant degradation in mission capability caused by a manning deficiency and a divert is not available.

⁸An aviation ground mishap is an event in which the intent for flight did not exist but a reportable injury occurred, a DoD aircraft or unmanned aerial vehicle was lost, or more than \$20,000 damage was sustained.

⁹A nonjudicial punishment under the Uniform Code of Military Justice is discipline rendered through formal administrative proceedings established within an offender’s chain of command rather than through the penal system.

Command personnel and personnel specialists at the units visited stated that senior enlisted manning deficiencies can go unrecognized in the SORTS assessment and can have a dramatic effect on command readiness even if the unit's overall SORTS readiness level is C-1 or C-2.

Commanders of the squadrons we visited in geographically isolated areas all indicated that shortages of senior enlisted personnel negatively affected the squadron's ability to supervise junior enlisted personnel and monitor maintenance programs. Those shortages also resulted in the squadron's senior enlisted personnel having increased workloads. Officials at one squadron described their senior enlisted personnel as "task saturated." The increased workloads in turn reduced the time senior enlisted personnel had to mentor junior enlisted personnel. In addition, junior enlisted personnel (E-5s and E-6s) were prematurely forced into senior enlisted roles, drawing them away from their own responsibilities.

Management Initiatives

Perform to Serve. In February 2003, the Chief of Naval Operations stated that some ratings are overmanned while others "are in critical need of Sailors" when he announced the impending March 2003 start of the "Perform to Serve Policy" aimed at correcting those inventory imbalances. The policy is a new long-term "Navy Force Shaping" initiative that seeks to "match enlisted staffing with mission requirements, thereby reducing those imbalances which significantly affect career progression and advancement opportunities of enlisted personnel and that have a negative impact on mission readiness and Fleet capabilities."

Aviation Forces Individual Readiness Moves Program. In March 2004, the Commander, Naval Air Forces instituted the Aviation Forces Individual Readiness Moves Program (the Moves Program) to resolve critical manning deficiencies that are not corrected through normal distribution processes. The Moves Program defines a minimum personnel manning level, which refines the SORTS readiness level, and establishes policy to allow moves from one geographical location to another geographical location (a forced move). Notably, a unit's manning level of senior enlisted personnel is one of the criteria for allowing a forced move.

Recommendations

1. We recommend that the Vice Chief of Naval Operations direct the appropriate Deputy Chiefs of Naval Operations to revise the criteria for assessing unit readiness to include the manning level of senior enlisted personnel (E-7s, E-8s, and E-9s) as a separate category. The change should be coordinated with the Commanding Officer, Navy Center for Tactical Systems Interoperability, who is the primary review authority for Navy Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures 1-03.3, "Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) Joint Report-Navy," Revision A, March 2001.

2. We recommend that the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower and Personnel)/Chief of Naval Personnel review and update Navy manpower and personnel guidance to:

a. Clearly define acceptable senior enlisted manning levels by establishing a minimum senior enlisted manning level, based on Navy Manning Plans or billets authorized, as the baseline for identifying senior enlisted manning deficiencies that would require immediate action.

b. Require senior enlisted manning deficiencies to be resolved prior to deployment.

c. Require units to track and report senior enlisted manning levels.

d. Establish a monitoring program and plans of action to alleviate senior enlisted manning deficiencies.

3. We recommend that the Commander, Manning Control Authority Atlantic and the Commander, Manning Control Authority Pacific identify and correct senior enlisted manning deficiencies within the U.S. Atlantic Fleet and the U.S. Pacific Fleet, respectively, in accordance with standards set as a result of Recommendations 1. or 2.

Management Comments

Comments from the Navy were received too late to be incorporated into the final report. If the Navy does not submit additional comments, we will consider the comments received as the response to the final report.

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

We reviewed the processes and procedures the Navy uses in the assignment of personnel. In addition to personnel in the 14 units visited (see Appendix B), we visited or contacted officials from the following Navy organizations:

- the Deputy Chief of Naval Personnel/Navy Personnel Command,
- EPMAC,
- the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), and
- U.S. Atlantic Fleet and U.S. Pacific Fleet headquarters and subordinate units.

We reviewed applicable regulations, directives, instructions, policies, and articles, dated from August 1954 through September 2003, related to the assignment process and mobilization of Navy forces. We visited or contacted officials at Navy headquarters level, the Navy Personnel Command, and EPMAC to determine the Navy assignment process, including their organizations' roles and responsibilities. We interviewed officials at U.S. Atlantic Fleet and U.S. Pacific Fleet headquarters and at subordinate units to determine the process used to identify personnel operating strengths, manning deficiencies, and the method used to request personnel to correct identified deficiencies of deploying units.

Our audit focused on the review of 14 units, at 5 locations, that deployed in support of OIF. See Appendix B for a list of the units visited and their locations. Specifically, we determined whether those units had deployed with vacant senior enlisted warfighting positions. We analyzed EPMAC-provided deployment status reports for enlisted personnel dated from March 2003 through December 2003 to determine senior enlisted manning levels.

We performed this audit from July 2003 through September 2004 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Because of resource constraints, we limited our scope to the Navy for this report. A previous report addresses the Marine Corps (see page 13).

Use of Computer-Processed Data. We relied on computer-processed data contained in Navy databases established to track military personnel assignments without performing tests of those databases' general and application controls to confirm the reliability of the data. Specifically, our conclusions on senior enlisted manning levels of Navy surface and aviation units deploying in support of OIF were based on each unit's BA, NMP, and the number of assigned personnel. The computer-processed data was obtained from EPMAC officials. In Naval Audit Service Report No. N2003-0026, "Verification of the Reliability and Validity of the Department of the Navy's Readiness Information System (RIS) Data," February 13, 2003, the Navy reported concerns with the Readiness Information System data. As stated in the Navy report, however, that system is the principal

source for data on unfilled authorized requirements, which placement officers use for assigning enlisted personnel to available positions. Therefore, problems in the data would not affect our conclusions.

Government Accountability Office High-Risk Area. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has identified several high-risk areas in DoD. This report provides coverage of the Strategic Human Capital Management high-risk area.

Management Control Program Review

DoD Directive 5010.38, “Management Control (MC) Program,” August 26, 1996, and DoD Instruction 5010.40, “Management Control (MC) Program Procedures,” August 28, 1996, require DoD organizations to implement a comprehensive system of management controls that provides reasonable assurance that programs are operating as intended and to evaluate the adequacy of the controls.

Scope of the Review of the Management Control Program. We reviewed the EMPAC policies and procedures for enlisted personnel assignments. Specifically, we determined whether management policies and procedures had been established to manage personnel assignments for deploying units. We also reviewed management’s self-evaluation of controls related to personnel assignments.

Adequacy of Management Controls. We identified material management control weaknesses for the Navy, as defined by DoD Instruction 5010.40. Navy management controls for resolving manning deficiencies were not adequate to ensure that deploying units’ senior enlisted positions were filled to an acceptable level. The recommendations, if implemented, will correct the identified weaknesses and could result in the Navy more effectively and efficiently accomplishing its missions. A copy of the report will be provided to the senior official responsible for management controls in the Navy.

Adequacy of Management’s Self-Evaluation. Navy officials had not developed a formal plan to identify or solve senior enlisted manning deficiencies and, therefore, did not identify or report the material management control weaknesses identified by the audit.

Prior Coverage

During the last 5 years, the GAO, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense (IG DoD), and the Naval Audit Service have issued reports discussing various aspects of the management of Navy personnel distribution. Unrestricted GAO reports can be accessed over the Internet at <http://www.gao.gov>. Unrestricted IG DoD reports can be accessed at <http://www.dodig.osd.mil/audit/reports>. Unrestricted Naval Audit Service reports can be accessed over the Internet at <http://www.hq.navy.mil/NavalAudit>.

GAO

GAO Report No. GAO-03-921, "DoD Actions Needed to Improve the Efficiency of Mobilizations for Reserve Forces," August 2003

IG DoD

IG DoD Report No. D-2004-086, "Management of Marine Corps Enlisted Personnel Assignments in Support of Operation Iraqi Freedom," June 16, 2004

Navy

Naval Audit Service Report No. N2003-0047, "Use of Navy Recruiters to Perform Administrative and Support Jobs," May 6, 2003

Naval Audit Service Report No. N2003-0026, "Verification of the Reliability and Validity of the Department of the Navy's Readiness Information System (RIS) Data," February 13, 2003

Naval Audit Service Report No. N2003-0012, "Verification of the Reliability and Validity of the Department of the Navy's Total Force Manpower Management System (TFMMS) Data," November 8, 2002

Naval Audit Service Report No. N2000-0004, "Funding and Requirements Determination for Temporary Duty Under Instruction as Related to Permanent Change of Station Moves," October 19, 1999

Appendix B. Units Visited

Location	Unit
Naval Air Station Lemoore	Strike Fighter Squadron Fourteen (VFA-14) Strike Fighter Squadron Forty-one (VFA-41) Strike Fighter Squadron Ninety-four (VFA-94) Strike Fighter Squadron Ninety-seven (VFA-97)
Naval Air Station North Island	U.S.S. <i>Nimitz</i> (CVN 68) Helicopter Anti-Submarine Squadron Six (HS-6) Sea Control Squadron Twenty-nine (VS-29)
Naval Air Station Point Mugu	Carrier Airborne Early Warning Squadron One Hundred Seventeen (VAW-117)
Naval Base San Diego	U.S.S. <i>Princeton</i> (CG 59) U.S.S. <i>Fitzgerald</i> (DDG 62) U.S.S. <i>Bonhomme Richard</i> (LHD 6)
Naval Station Norfolk	U.S.S. <i>Harry S. Truman</i> (CVN 75) U.S.S. <i>Iwo Jima</i> (LHD 7) U.S.S. <i>Nashville</i> (LPD 13)

Appendix C. Strike Fighter Squadron 147

During our visit to Strike Fighter Wing, U.S. Pacific Fleet in December 2003, we learned of another squadron based at Naval Air Station Lemoore that had shortages of senior enlisted personnel similar to the squadrons we visited. EPMAC manning reports for that squadron, VFA-147, showed its senior enlisted manning was at 58 percent of BA in December 2003. VFA-147 was not part of our judgmentally selected sample because it had not deployed in support of OIF. VFA-147 had deployed as one of eight air squadrons aboard U.S.S. *Carl Vinson* (CVN 70). *Vinson* was deployed from January 17 to September 19, 2003, to the Western Pacific in support of the Global War on Terrorism, specifically to provide a stabilizing presence in the Pacific Rim region and the South China Sea. March 2003 EPMAC manning reports for VFA-147 showed the squadron's senior enlisted manning was at 68 percent of BA.

VFA-147 Senior Enlisted Manning Levels. According to squadron officials, sustained senior enlisted manning deficiencies for VFA-147 evolved over 14 months from being a managerial concern to being a safety issue that resulted in the issuance of an Aviation Hazard Report* in December 2003. The Aviation Hazard Report stated that the squadron's senior enlisted manning was at 65 percent of NMP, and its Maintenance Department's senior enlisted manning level was 58 percent of its NMP. Command personnel and personnel specialists for the squadron stated that the shortage of senior enlisted personnel had reached the point where they would be willing to accept any senior enlisted member, regardless of background or specialty.

Manning Actions. VFA-147 officials reported that they reviewed senior enlisted manning to identify deficiencies. Requests to correct those deficiencies were submitted through appropriate channels to the MCA and EPMAC. When the normal distribution processes did not correct the senior enlisted manning deficiencies, VFA-147 officials submitted appropriate correspondence through their chain of command to EPMAC and their MCA to alert them of the critical manning situation and to gain additional support from the assignment system.

Effects of Manning Deficiencies. The Commander, VFA-147 stated that the senior enlisted manning deficiencies that his squadron sustained for more than a year resulted in an increase in the squadron's ground mishap rate and in the number of incidences resulting in nonjudicial punishment. For example, the Aviation Hazard Report stated that "during a nine-month decline in CPO [senior enlisted] manning, VFA-147's ground mishap rate increased from an average of one event per month to four events per month." The report also cited the increase in nonjudicial punishments, stating: "Over the past six-months, VFA-147 has processed 15 NJP [nonjudicial punishment] cases. (During the previous six-month period the command processed only 8 NJP cases.)"

*Aviation Hazard Reports are an element of the Naval Aviation Safety Program as described in Chief of Naval Operations Instruction 3750.6R, "The Naval Aviation Safety Program," March 1, 2001, as amended on November 29, 2001.

According to VFA-147 officials, the squadron successfully completed its missions during the deployment. However, the commander stated that the squadron's shortage of senior enlisted personnel diminished squadron readiness as well as the ability of senior enlisted personnel to adequately supervise the personnel under their command. The shortage of senior enlisted personnel also increased the time required to train new sailors to become proficient in their rating. Further, the shortages of senior enlisted personnel necessitated the transfer of maintenance duties to junior enlisted personnel, which the commander stated increased the risk of accidents.

Barrier to Extraordinary Actions. As provided for within the personnel distribution system, Naval Air Forces officials executed extraordinary actions to alleviate the senior enlisted manning deficiencies of its deploying units. However, those actions did not correct the manning deficiencies identified at VFA-147. Diverts and crossdecks are restricted to personnel already assigned to a geographical area and are not effective when several units at a geographically isolated area have manning deficiencies.

Appendix D. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer
Deputy Chief Financial Officer
Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)
Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation

Joint Staff

Director, Joint Staff

Department of the Navy

Vice Chief of Naval Operations
Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower and Personnel)/Chief of Naval Personnel
Deputy Chief of Naval Personnel/Commander, Navy Personnel Command
Commanding Officer, Enlisted Placement Management Center
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)
Commander, U.S. Fleet Forces Command
Commander, Naval Air Forces
Commander, Naval Submarine Forces
Commander, Naval Surface Forces
Commander, U.S. Atlantic Fleet
Commander, Naval Air Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet
Commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet
Commander, Naval Surface Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet
Commander, Manning Control Authority Atlantic
Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet
Commander, Naval Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet
Commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet
Commander, Naval Surface Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet
Commander, Manning Control Authority Pacific
Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Central Command
Commander, Naval Construction Forces Command
Commanding Officer, Navy Center for Tactical Systems Interoperability
Naval Inspector General
Auditor General, Department of the Navy

Department of the Air Force

Auditor General, Department of the Air Force

Combatant Commands

Combatant Commander, U.S. Central Command
Inspector General, U.S. Joint Forces Command

Non-Defense Federal Organizations

Office of Management and Budget
Government Accountability Office

Congressional Committees and Subcommittees, Chairman and Ranking Minority Member

Senate Committee on Appropriations
Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
Senate Committee on Armed Services
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
House Committee on Appropriations
House Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
House Committee on Armed Services
House Committee on Government Reform
House Subcommittee on Government Efficiency and Financial Management, Committee on Government Reform
House Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats, and International Relations, Committee on Government Reform
House Subcommittee on Technology, Information Policy, Intergovernmental Relations, and the Census, Committee on Government Reform

Team Members

The Office of the Deputy Inspector General for Auditing of the Department of Defense, Readiness and Logistics Support prepared this report. Personnel of the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense who contributed to the report are listed below.

Shelton R. Young
Donald A. Bloomer
Richard B. Vasquez
David A. Palmer
Kenneth W. Sokol
Lindsay B. Warner
Elizabeth L.N. Shifflett