



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

~~25474~~
121663

NATIONAL SECURITY AND
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS DIVISION

B-211122

JUNE 14, 1983



The Honorable John F. Lehman, Jr.
The Secretary of the Navy

Attention: Comptroller of the Navy (NCB-53)

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Subject: Navy Could Reduce Costs By Better Monitoring
Its Enlisted Transfer Policy (GAO/FPCD-83-31)

We have reviewed the Navy policy that requires enlisted personnel to have enough time remaining in their enlistment (obligated service) to complete their tour at a new location before transferring. We found that the Navy is not complying with its transfer policy and, as a result, is incurring unnecessary costs. This situation is occurring because local commanders are not fulfilling their responsibilities and the procedures for insuring that members obligate additional service before transferring to a new duty location are inadequate.

We found that at least 6,900 enlisted members (as of Oct. 6, 1982) transferred to new duty locations between July 1978 and September 1982, even though they did not have enough obligated service to complete their tours at their new locations. While we recognize that some of these members may have received a waiver of the obligated service requirement or may obligate additional service before their enlistment expires, we believe that the large number of members transferring without obligating additional service is a costly practice.

While we have not been able to determine how many of these members subsequently extended their tour or obtained waivers, we did identify, during our review, at least 156 members who actually left the service at or near the end of their enlistment before completing their tours. These uncompleted tours represented about 182 staff-years of lost time, estimated at about

(967068)

025905

\$3.1 million, and resulted in unnecessary permanent change-of-station (PCS) costs of about \$376,300. Because of problems with the data, as explained below, we believe that these estimates are conservative and that the actual cost to the Navy is greater than indicated.

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Our objective was to determine whether the Navy was complying with its obligated service requirement before transferring enlisted members to new locations. Accordingly, we attempted to identify, for fiscal years 1981 and 1982, the number of members who

- needed to obligate additional service before transferring to a new duty location;
- obligated the needed additional service before transferring to a new duty location;
- did not obligate the additional service before transferring; and
- left the Navy after transferring without obligating sufficient time to complete their prescribed tours at these new duty locations.

Navy officials could not provide us with the data needed for the fiscal years requested. Instead, they provided a listing of the current status of some members who, on their last transfer, had to obligate additional service before they transferred. From this listing, we identified enlisted members who (1) on October 6, 1982, (the date of the Navy's data) did not have enough obligated service to complete the tour at their current location and (2) during calendar year 1982, separated from the Navy at or near the end of their enlistment without completing the tour at their last duty station.

The Navy's listing, however, was not complete since it did not include members whose end-of-assignment dates were adjusted after the member transferred. (The Navy often adjusts members' end-of-assignment dates when it knows members do not intend to obligate the additional service.) Also, the Navy encountered difficulty in providing separation data and did not precisely identify all members who left the service without completing the tours.

To obtain an indication of the probable career decisions of members who transferred without enough obligated service, we

performed a limited analysis of the actual decisions of members who were transferred in January 1982. We selected this month because we wanted to analyze calendar year 1982 data and to allow as much time as possible for the members to make their career decisions. Our findings are not statistically projectable to the universe of the 6,900 members who transferred without adequate time remaining to complete their prescribed tour.

Our analysis also involved random sampling of members to determine the extent to which waivers are granted. We selected the waiver sample using two computer-generated, single digit random numbers. All members whose social security numbers ended in either of these numbers were selected--an 18.5-percent sample. We interpreted the results at the 95-percent confidence level.

We estimated the value of services lost for uncompleted tours using the Navy's current average annual cost of \$17,000 to maintain an enlisted member. We computed PCS costs by applying the Navy's average fiscal year 1982 costs of operational and rotational moves.

We performed our work in Washington, D.C., at the Naval Military Personnel Command (NMPC), which is responsible for enlisted personnel transfers. We reviewed assignment data for enlisted personnel and interviewed officials from the Office of Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower, Personnel, and Training); NMPC; and the Personnel Support Detachment, Anacostia, Naval District, Washington. We did not audit the Navy's automated data system or verify the accuracy of the data produced from the system.

We conducted our review from April 1982 to March 1983 in accordance with generally accepted Government auditing standards.

ENLISTED PERSONNEL ARE BEING
TRANSFERRED WITHOUT HAVING ENOUGH
OBLIGATED SERVICE

The Navy's Enlisted Transfer Manual states, in part, that members must have enough obligated service to complete their tours at new duty locations. Unless the Navy waives the obligated service requirement or members reenlist, extend their enlistment, or, under certain conditions, promise to reenlist, transfers are not allowed. Yet, despite this policy, the Navy is transferring its enlisted personnel without regard to the time members have remaining in the service. This situation is

occurring because local commanders are not fulfilling their responsibilities and Navy procedures are inadequate.

The local commanders of the duty locations losing the members are responsible for insuring the members obligate any required additional service before they transfer. If the members refuse to obligate the required service, the local commanders are required to report this fact to NMPC and to hold the members' orders in abeyance pending further instructions from NMPC. We found that local commanders are permitting many of their members to transfer without obligating the required additional service and are not notifying NMPC.

NMPC has no procedures to insure that local commanders are discharging their transfer responsibilities. NMPC personnel are responsible for matching members who are available for assignment with those positions that must be filled. They write the members' transfer directives and determine the amount of additional service the member must obligate to serve the prescribed tour at the proposed location. NMPC personnel usually prepare the directives about 4 to 6 months before the members' projected transfer dates. Therefore, sufficient time exists for local commanders to notify NMPC of the members' intentions to obligate the necessary service. If the local commanders notify NMPC of the members' intentions not to obligate, NMPC personnel can (1) cancel the members' orders and select another assignment for the members, (2) cancel the members' orders and require that the members complete their remaining obligated service at their present duty locations, and (3) waive the members' obligated service requirement and allow the members to transfer. If NMPC personnel decide to cancel the members' orders, then they can either select other members to fill the vacant positions or leave the positions vacant.

We identified about 6,900 enlisted members (as of Oct. 6, 1982) who should have obligated additional service before their last move between July 1978 and September 1982 but who transferred without obligating the additional service. This potentially represents a costly Navy transfer practice. For example, if all 6,900 members were to leave the Navy before completing their prescribed assignment tours, the Navy would lose about 6,570 staff-years of uncompleted tours, valued at \$111.7 million, and would incur \$17.2 million in unnecessary PCS costs. We recognize that some of the 6,900 members may have received a waiver of their obligated service requirements and others may obligate additional service in the future, thus reducing the potential loss to the Navy.

Problems with Navy data prevented us from determining how many members did not comply with Navy transfer requirements. However, we did identify at least 156 enlisted members who left the service at or near the end of their enlistment before completing their prescribed assignment tours. These uncompleted tours represented about 182 staff-years, valued at about \$3.1 million, and resulted in about \$376,300 of unnecessary PCS costs.

SELECTIVE ANALYSIS OF NAVY
TRANSFER DATA

Due to the problems with the Navy data, we decided to perform a limited analysis of (1) the status of members who were transferred and did not obligate the required time to complete new tour assignments and (2) the extent to which the Navy granted waivers to these members. We analyzed data for 438 members who arrived at their duty location in January 1982 and transferred without sufficient obligated service to complete their prescribed assignment tours. The 438 members represented about 28 percent of all the enlisted members who reported to their new duty locations that month and who should have obligated additional service. The results of our analysis follow.

Analysis of members who
did not obligate additional
service at the time of transfer

We analyzed the current status of 61 of the 438 members who arrived at their duty location in January 1982. These 61 individuals were all members whose enlistments were due to end between July 1 and October 31, 1982, and, therefore, they had to decide whether to enlist, extend their enlistment, or leave the service. The results of our examination showed the following.

--Thirty-four members (56 percent) obligated enough or more than enough service to complete their prescribed assignment tours after their transfers.

--Nine members (15 percent) obligated additional service but not enough to complete their prescribed assignment tours. An additional 116 months are necessary to make up the shortfall.

--Twelve members (20 percent) left the Navy at or near the end of their enlistment. These uncompleted tours at their last duty locations amounted to 185 months.

--Six members (10 percent) transferred as a condition of reenlistment to another assignment at or near the end of their enlistment. However, uncompleted tours at their prior assignments amounted to 84 months.

Although this analysis represents the conditions of a particular period, we believe it demonstrates that our concerns are not without substance--only 56 percent of the cases actually obligated enough service to complete their current prescribed assignment tour.

Granting waivers for obligated service

Under certain conditions, NMPC personnel waive the obligated service requirement if the transfer is in the Navy's best interest (for example, no other member is available for the specific assignment or the assignment requires the skills of a designated person). To determine whether waivers are frequently granted, we again used information concerning the 438 members who had arrived at their new duty locations during January 1982.

Using random sampling techniques, we found that few waivers were granted. An examination of assignment records for 81 members showed that 71 did not receive waivers; data for the remaining 10 was not available. We are 95 percent sure that at least 80 percent of the 438 members who arrived at their new duty locations during January 1982 did not have the obligated service requirement waived.

NAVY'S TRANSFER FOLLOWUP REPORTING SYSTEM IS INADEQUATE

We found major shortcomings in the Navy's transfer followup reporting system. The system

--understates the extent to which noncompliance is occurring and

--does not correctly identify the sea/shore activities that are causing the problem.

System understates noncompliance

NMPC established a system to monitor compliance with the obligated service requirements because local commanders complained that newly transferred members did not have sufficient time to complete their assignment tour--thereby disrupting unit activities. This system depends on local commanders at the new

locations to report on members transferred to their location without enough obligated service. At best, this is too late to prevent the Navy from incurring the cost of the move.

Not all local commanders, however, report this noncompliance, which causes the system to understate the extent of the problem. For example, NMPC's report based on the system data showed that about 160 members transferred during calendar year 1982 without obligating the required additional service. Our analysis of Navy data, however, showed that about 3,700 members transferred during the first 9 months of calendar year 1982 without obligating the required additional service to complete their tour--an understatement of 3,540 cases.

System incorrectly identifies noncompliance activities

For Navy officials to be able to correct noncompliance problems, they must be aware of where the problem is occurring and the reasons for it. Data available from the current reporting system would lead one to erroneously conclude that the majority of noncompliance with the obligated service requirement occurs at sea activities. To illustrate, the system showed that, from January to April 1982, nearly 84 percent of the members reported to NMPC as not having enough obligated service were transferred from sea assignments. However, our analysis shows that about 81 percent of the members identified as not having enough obligated service to complete their assignment tour were transferred from shore assignments, the opposite of what the Navy's system showed.

CONCLUSIONS

We believe that noncompliance with the Navy's transfer policy increases costs. Transfers where members do not have sufficient time to become effective and productive at their new duty assignment should be eliminated. Unless management action is taken, we believe that the noncompliance will continue.

To reduce the noncompliance with the Navy's transfer policy, Navy officials need to insure that local commanders are fulfilling their responsibilities; that is, making certain their members either obligate the amount of service needed to complete the new prescribed assignment tour or receive a waiver of the obligated service requirement before transferring to new duty locations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the Secretary of the Navy modify the Navy's reporting system for insuring that members obligate the necessary service before being transferred. This modified system should do the following:

- Establish a routine reporting requirement that monitors whether local commanders, after receiving members' transfer orders, are requiring the members to obligate service.
- Require local commanders to notify NMPC, within a specific time period after receiving the members' transfer orders, whether the member has decided to obligate additional service. If commanders do not notify NMPC of the members' intentions, then NMPC officials should request a status report and decide whether the member should be transferred.
- Provide NMPC with information to allow identification of those commanders who are repeatedly remiss in insuring that the Navy's obligated service requirements are satisfied.
- Identify those members who obligate for part of the prescribed tour so that NMPC personnel can decide whether the transfer would be in the Navy's best interest.

AGENCY COMMENTS

The Department of Defense agreed with our findings, conclusions and recommendations and noted that the report has helped the Navy to better manage its enlisted personnel assignments. (See encl.) The Department said the Navy has initiated the following actions, which should be implemented by September 30, 1983:

- Establishment, within NMPC's enlisted assignment section, of an organization to monitor whether local commanders fulfill their responsibilities.
- Establishment of a monthly management summary/tracking report to facilitate this monitoring.
- Establishment of tracking systems to remind (1) local commanders to notify NMPC concerning members' intentions to obligate additional service and (2) NMPC personnel to verify whether local commanders have fulfilled their responsibilities.

- Improvement of NMPC's automatic data processing capability to obtain current and historical assignment data.
- Improvement of the enlisted transfer procedures to provide automatic inclusion of the obligated service requirement in all orders, where appropriate.
- Development of a new assignment history file and improvements in the coding of assignment actions to better determine waiver requirements, waivers granted, and infractions.

In addition, the Department said the revised Navy procedures will require local commanders either to notify NMPC of the members' decisions to obligate additional service or to request a waiver before the member transfers. If notification is not received on a timely basis, NMPC will cancel the transfer. Also, the revised reporting system will allow NMPC to identify those commanders who are not complying with the Navy's enlisted transfer policy.


We believe that the above initiatives, if properly implemented, will improve the Navy's enlisted transfer program.

- - - -

As you know, 31 U.S.C. 720 requires the head of a Federal agency to submit a written statement on actions taken on our recommendations to the House Committee on Government Operations and the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs not later than 60 days after the date of the report. A written statement must also be sent to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with the agency's first request for appropriations made more than 60 days after the date of the report.

We are sending copies of this report to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, and to the Chairmen, House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and on Armed Services.

Sincerely yours,


for *Francis C. Conahan*
Director



MANPOWER,
RESERVE AFFAIRS
AND LOGISTICS

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301

2 JUN 1983

Mr. Clifford I. Gould
Director, Federal Personnel
and Compensation Division
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548


Dear Mr. Gould:

This is in reply to your letter to the Secretary of Defense on your draft report, "Navy Could Reduce Costs By Better Monitoring Its Enlisted Transfer Policy," dated April 26, 1983, OSD Case #6248 (GAO Code No. 967068).

Detailed comments to your proposed findings, conclusions and recommendations are contained in the enclosure. As you will note, the Department of Defense concurs with the draft report and has found it to be beneficial to the Navy in helping to better manage enlisted assignments. The corrective actions recommended in the draft report are being implemented by the Naval Military Personnel Command and should be completed in September 1983.

Your interest in bringing these matters to our attention is appreciated.

Sincerely,


James N. Juliana
Principal Deputy Assistant
Secretary of Defense
(Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics)

Enclosure

GAO Draft Report dated April 26, 1983
(GAO Code No. 967068) -- OSD Case No. 6248

"Navy Could Reduce Costs by Better Monitoring its Enlisted Transfer Policy"

DoD Response to Report's Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

FINDINGS

FINDING A: Navy Enlisted Personnel Are Being Transferred Without Having Enough Obligated Service. GAO found that the Navy is not complying with its transfer policy and is transferring its enlisted personnel without regard to the time members have remaining in the service -- resulting in unnecessary costs. GAO further found that this is occurring because (1) local commanders are not fulfilling their responsibilities, i.e., permitting many of their members to transfer without obligating the required additional service and without notifying the Naval Military Personnel Command (NMPC), and (2) Navy procedures are inadequate to assure that local commanders discharge their transfer responsibilities. (GAO noted that (1) Naval policy requires enlisted personnel to have enough time remaining in their enlistment (obligated service) to complete their tour at a new location before transferring, (2) unless the Navy waives the obligated service requirement or members reenlist, extend their enlistment, or, under certain conditions, promise to reenlist, transfers are not allowed, (3) local commanders at the affected duty locations are responsible for insuring their members obligate any required additional service before transferring -- if members refuse to obligate the required service the local commanders are required to report such to NMPC and hold orders in abeyance and (4) the NMPC is responsible for enlisted personnel rotation and can take certain steps if members do not obligate as required.) (pp. 1, 6, 7, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. Current methods of identifying obligated service infractions are inadequate. The Navy is undertaking initiatives which are designed to prevent future discrepancies. Corrective actions are outlined in DoD comments pertaining to specific GAO recommendations.

FINDING B: Uncompleted Tours Resulted in Unnecessary Costs. Although problems with Navy data precluded a determination of the numbers of members who did not comply with the Navy transfer requirements, GAO found that they were able to identify at least 156 enlisted members who left the service at, or near the end of their enlistment before completing their prescribed assignment tours. GAO further found that, through selective analysis, these uncompleted tours represented about 182 staff-years of lost time, estimated at about \$3.1 million and resulted in unnecessary permanent change-of-station (PCS) costs of about \$376,300. (GAO noted that at least 6,900 enlisted members (as of October 6, 1982) transferred to new duty locations even though they did not have enough time at their new locations to complete their tours -- representing a potentially costly Navy transfer practice. However, GAO recognized that some of the 6,900 members may have received waivers, etc. thus reducing the potential loss to the Navy.) (pp. 1, 2, 7, 8, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. The problem identified by GAO is sufficient to require the corrective actions outlined in DoD comments pertaining to specific GAO recommendations.

FINDING C: Concerns Regarding Number of Members Who Actually Obligated Enough Service to Complete Their Current Tour of Duty Not Without Substance. GAO found that, through their selective analysis of the current status of 61 of the 438 members who arrived at their duty locations in January 1982, (1) 34 members (56 percent) obligated enough or more than enough service to complete their prescribed assignment tours after their transfers, (2) nine members (15 percent) obligated additional service but not enough to complete their prescribed assignment tours -- an additional 116 months were necessary to make up the shortfall, (3) 12 members (20 percent) left the Navy at or near the end of their enlistments -- these uncompleted tours at their last duty locations amounted to 185 months, and (4) six members (10 percent) transferred as a condition of reenlistment to another assignment at or near the expiration date of their term of service -- uncompleted tours at their prior assignments amounted to 84 months. (GAO noted that this analysis represents the conditions of a particular period, however, it demonstrates that the GAO basic concerns are not without substance.) (pp. 9 and 10, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. Management action is necessary to eliminate noncompliance with Navy assignment policy.

FINDING D: Few Waivers Granted for Obligated Service. GAO found that few, if any, waivers were granted for the obligated service requirement, i.e., assignment records for 81 members showed that 71 did not receive waivers and data for the remaining 10 was not available. (GAO noted that NMPC can waive obligated service requirements under certain conditions.) (p. 10, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs that based on the results of a small representative sample, it could appear that few waivers for obligated service are granted. The Navy is granting such waivers. However, the current management system does not provide for proper documentation and monitorship. The Navy is developing a new management control system that will enable it to track and report on the number of waivers granted. These new procedures will improve capture of historical information so compliance by local commanders in obtaining required waivers can be properly monitored.

FINDING E: Navy's Transfer Followup Reporting System Understates Noncompliance. GAO found that Navy's reporting system understates the extent to which noncompliance is occurring, for example, Navy's reports showed that about 160 members transferred without obligating the required additional service versus a GAO analysis of Navy data which showed that about 3,700 members were transferred during the first 9 months of calendar year 1982 without obligating the required additional service to complete their tour -- an understatement of 3,540 cases. (GAO noted that NMPC established a system to monitor compliance with the obligated service requirements as local commanders complained that newly transferred members did not have sufficient time to complete their tour. GAO further noted that (1) this system depends on local commands to report to NMPC when they receive members who do not have enough obligated service to complete the tours and (2) since not all commanders report this noncompliance, NMPC officials do not know the extent to which noncompliance is affecting unit operations -- NMPC's system alerts personnel officials of the transfer after it occurs which is too late to avoid the costs of the move.) (p. 11, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. Noncompliance by local commanders with any part of the current reporting system can lead to inaccurate monitoring of obligated service policy execution and possibly erroneous conclusions. The Navy initiatives outlined in DoD comments pertaining to GAO recommendations will assure improved compliance with policy and improve data collection for future assessments of compliance with assignment policy.

FINDING F: Navy's Transfer Followup Reporting System Incorrectly Identifies Noncompliance Activities. GAO found that data available from the current reporting system would lead one to erroneously conclude that the majority of noncompliance with the obligated service requirement occurs at sea activities. GAO further found that about 81 percent of the members identified as not having enough obligated service were transferred from shore assignments -- the opposite of what Navy's system showed. (p. 12, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. The Navy's reporting system is being modified to correct this deficiency.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusion 1. GAO concluded that noncompliance with the Navy's transfer policy increases PCS costs. (p. 12, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. Navy initiatives will result in better compliance with reassignment policy and reduced PCS costs.

Conclusion 2. GAO concluded transfers where members do not have sufficient time to become effective and productive at their new duty assignment should be eliminated. (p. 12, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. The revised Navy reporting system will advise NMPC of those members who will obligate for only a part of the prescribed tour. NMPC assignment managers will then decide if the transfer would be in the Navy's best interest.

Conclusion 3. GAO concluded that unless management action is taken, the noncompliance with Navy transfer policy will continue. (p. 13, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. Management action is being taken to ensure compliance with Navy transfer policy.

Conclusion 4. GAO concluded that Navy officials need to assure that local commanders are fulfilling their responsibilities -- making certain their members either obligate the amount of service needed to complete the new prescribed assignment tour or receive a waiver of the obligated service requirement before transferring to new duty locations. (p. 13, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. Revised Navy reporting procedures and establishment of a monitoring organization within NMPC will help to ensure that local commanders fulfill their responsibilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1. GAO recommended that the Secretary of the Navy modify the Navy's reporting system for insuring that members obligate the necessary service before being transferred. (p. 13, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. The Navy has taken the following initiatives which will be implemented by NMPC by September 30, 1983:

- Automatic inclusion of appropriate "Comply with" items in all orders issued to non-careerists (less than 10 years service.) This is currently a manual procedure done by detailers.

- Implementation of a monitoring organization within the enlisted assignment section, NMPC.
- Establishment of a monthly management summary/tracking report to facilitate monitoring by assignment personnel.
- Establishment of a message feedback reporting and tickler system to prevent transfer of personnel without proper obligated service.
- Improved ADP capability which will provide for the capture of current and historical assignment data.
- Development of a new History File and improved ADP coding of Navy assignment actions to better determine waiver requirements, waivers granted, and infractions.

Recommendation 2. GAO recommended that the modified reporting system should establish a routine reporting requirement that monitors whether local commanders, after receiving members' transfer orders, are requiring the members to obligate service. (p. 13, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. A monitoring organization will be established within the enlisted assignment section of NMPC and a monthly management summary/tracking report will be established to measure compliance by local commanders.

Recommendation 3. GAO recommended that the modified system should require local commanders to notify NMPC, within a specific time period after receiving the member's transfer orders, whether the member has decided to obligate additional service. If commanders do not notify NMPC of the member's intentions, then NMPC officials should request a status report and decide whether the member should be transferred. (p. 13, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. The revised Navy procedures will require local commanders to notify NMPC of the member's decision to obligate additional service or request a waiver. If notification is not received on a timely basis, the assignment will be cancelled.

Recommendation 4. GAO recommended that the modified reporting system should provide NMPC with information to allow identification of those commanders who are repeatedly remiss in insuring that the Navy's obligated service requirements are satisfied. (p. 13, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. The Navy's revised reporting system will provide for the capture of current and historical assignment data that will allow NMPC to identify those commanders who are not complying with Navy assignment policy.

Recommendation 5. GAO recommended that the modified reporting system should identify those members who obligate for part of the prescribed tour so that NMPC personnel can decide whether the transfer would be in the Navy's best interest. (p. 14, GAO Draft Report)

COMMENT: DoD concurs. The establishment of a feedback reporting system will allow NMPC personnel to decide if the transfer should proceed or be cancelled.