

U.S. Office of Personnel Management
Division for Human Capital Leadership & Merit System Accountability
Classification Appeals Program

Atlanta Field Services Group
75 Spring Street, SW., Suite 1018
Atlanta, GA 30303-3109

Classification Appeal Decision
Under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code

Appellants: [appellant]

Agency classification: General Engineer
GS-801-13

Organization: [organization]
[organization]
Naval Facilities Engineering Command,
[geographic area]
Department of the Navy
[location]

OPM decision: (Title at the agency's discretion)
GS-801-13

OPM decision number: C-0801-13-04

/s/ Robert D. Hendler
Robert D. Hendler
Classification and Pay Claims
Program Manager

August 16, 2005
Date

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

Decision sent to:

[appellant]
[representative]
[firm name]
[firm name]
[address]
[location]

Director, [name]
Directorate
Human Resources Office
Department of the Navy
[address]
[location]

Chief, Classification Appeals
Adjudication Section
Department of Defense
Civilian Personnel Management Service
1400 Key Boulevard, Suite B-200
Arlington, VA 22209-5144

Director, Office of Civilian Human Resources
Department of the Navy
ATTN: Code 00
614 Sicard Street, SE., Suite 100
Washington Navy Yard, DC 20374-5072

Introduction

On January 6, 2005, the Atlanta Field Services Group of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted an appeal from [appellant]. He occupies a General Engineer, GS-801-13, position in the [organization], [organization], Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) [geographic area], Department of the Navy, in [location]. He requests that his position be upgraded to GS-14. We received the complete appeal administrative report from the agency on March 3, 2005. The appeal has been accepted and processed under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

Background information

The appellant filed his appeal based on a revised position description (PD), provided to him by management in November 2004, which he stated was accurate. However, through an oversight attributed by his agency to reorganization and changes in the administrative support staff, the PD was not submitted to the human resources office to be officially established. As a result, in its administrative report, the agency furnished a different PD, Number [#], as the official PD. Subsequently, on April 3, 2005, the appellant was officially assigned to the revised PD, Number [#]. The revised PD was originally given the same PD number as the old one, but it is the revised PD that management certified as accurate. Management did not feel that the changes were of sufficient significance to warrant modifying their original evaluation of the position.

General issues

The appellant's rationale in part is based on his belief that he is not being technically supervised and operates independently with a high level of discretion. He indicated that he responds to problems without the requirement to consult with his supervisor, who, the appellant indicated, generally provides feedback only after the fact. The appellant believes that his position functions as a nationally recognized expert consultant and technical authority with essentially no technical supervision and did not receive proper credit for these responsibilities. The appellant believes that his supervisor, the Branch Chief, attends certain [organization acronym] meetings because the supervisor is responsible for the project management function of U.S. and [organization acronym] funded projects which is a function added to the previous branch program management function. The appellant believes he is the expert on [organization acronym] program management issues. He points out that he has provided training and guidance to the supervisor on [organization acronym] Infrastructure Program management.

Implicit in the appellant's rationale is that he is responsible for the Branch's [organization acronym] program management function and that his position should be evaluated based on that responsibility. The position classification process does not permit the crediting of multiple positions with full responsibility for the same work. The appellant's supervisor is responsible for all functions of the Branch including [organization acronym] program management. Management has the right to organize and assign work and to establish reporting relationships within the organizational structure. These matters are outside the

purview of the classification appeals process. In the classification process, positions are evaluated on the basis of those duties currently assigned and performed. Therefore, the previous structure of the [organization acronym] program office and duties and responsibilities of the program manager position and the appellant's position under that structure, discussed by the appellant, cannot be considered in the classification appeal process.

The appellant discusses program actions he was involved in and meetings and inspections he participated in two or more years ago. However, 5 U.S.C. 5112 indicates that we can consider only current duties and responsibilities in classifying positions. OPM guidelines show that in evaluating positions such as the appellant's, current duties are those that have occurred in about the past year. Therefore, we could not consider duties performed and projects completed two or more years ago, as discussed by the appellant, in deciding this appeal.

In reaching our classification decision, we have carefully reviewed all information furnished by the appellant and the agency, including information obtained from telephone interviews with the appellant and his supervisor. We find that the PD of record contains the major duties assigned to and performed by the appellant and which we incorporate by reference into this decision.

Position information

The [organization acronym] program office (a functional designation within the branch) is responsible for the planning, programming, design, construction, and funds management for all [organization acronym] common infrastructure projects for which the U.S. is designated host nation (defined as the entire U.S. and the countries of Iceland, Bermuda, Italy, and various other sites located in Europe) or user nation. [organization acronym], through the [organization acronym] Security Investment Program (NSIP), authorizes projects for Navy, Army, and Air Force activities. NAVFAC [geographic area] is designated the host nation construction agent for [organization acronym] common infrastructure projects and exercises program management responsibilities for the Department of Defense (DoD) in continental U.S. [organization acronym] activities as well as in territories where the U.S. acts as host nation. All [organization acronym] authorized funds are handled through the Navy. NAVFAC [geographic area] maintains all management control and financial responsibility and retains all records required until completion and acceptance of the [organization acronym] audit and inspection. Common infrastructure projects include civil works and the purchasing/and or installation of equipment/electronics projects. Some projects, such as electronics and nuclear weapons, are assigned to other DoD components to serve as construction agents.

[Organization acronym] infrastructure projects include buildings, pavements, piers, and other fixed facilities or structures and also certain mobile projects (e.g., radars and mobile operational war headquarters) and equipment (e.g., communications and information technology systems) essential to [organization acronym] operations and war plans. The appellant's primary involvement is with hardened underground and above ground facilities, medical and dental facilities, air fields, hangars, navigational aids, maintenance facilities, supply depots, personnel support, administration facilities, and sewage systems. He also provides guidance and financial management for projects assigned to other military components. Complexities arise from the range of jurisdictional controls over the facilities, the diversity of organizations involved in the

[organization acronym] Infrastructure Program, the technological characteristics of the facilities, and the varied national and international interest in the projects.

The appellant's position is designated as a [organization acronym] program manager for the command and serves as a NAVFAC [geographic area] expert consultant for the [organization acronym] Infrastructure Program and NSIP. He serves as a primary point of contact for matters relating to program implementation and execution and for all service components (Navy, Army, and Air Force) designing [organization acronym] Infrastructure projects. He also serves as the [organization acronym] interface for Military Construction projects, which are pre-financed or conjunctively funded with [organization acronym] projects. The appellant works in close coordination with engineers and other staff of the U.S. Mission to [organization acronym] and also coordinates with staff at the U.S. Joint Forces Command, U.S. European Command, Allied Command Operations, Allied Command Transformation, and subordinate commands to obtain [organization acronym] support for eligible projects. The appellant applies professional engineering knowledge and judgment and the NSIP in analyzing expenditures and forecast data from engineering field divisions (EFDs), other Navy, and non-Navy commands, and in managing the [organization acronym] Infrastructure Program in the U.S. and in other locations where the U.S. acts as host nation. He participates in planning meetings to clarify issues associated with [organization acronym] criteria or programming and funding issues. The appellant reviews future military construction programs to screen for projects which may have [organization acronym] eligibility and coordinates programming issues with command staffs. He develops procedures for effective project execution by the EFDs and other commands.

The appellant is responsible for the development of budget forecasts and funds control and monitors projects during execution to assure timely completion within authorized funds. He coordinates program execution issues, including requests for additional funds, reimbursements from other nations, etc., with project management personnel and the U.S. Mission to [organization acronym] staff. The appellant coordinates preparation of supporting documentation and schedules and participates in joint formal acceptance inspections. Financial management responsibilities include receiving and expensing [organization acronym] and host nation funding to other agents (e.g., EFDs, Corps of Engineer district offices, Naval Electronics Engineering Center, Electronics Systems Center) for all design, procurement, and construction of assigned projects. He participates in representing the projects in meetings with the [organization acronym] International Staff and U.S. Mission to [organization acronym] and represents the host nation for presentation of the U.S.' financial claims to [organization acronym] and for final [organization acronym] inspections. When other military services are the design agent and user, the appellant provides financial project management. He provides guidance to them on [organization acronym] requirements and funds usage and helps coordinate their meetings for pre-audit, post-audit, and inspections.

The appellant reports to the Branch Chief (an interdisciplinary position of Supervisory General Engineer/Architect, GS-801/808-14). The supervisor provides direction in terms of broadly defined goals or objectives. Completed work is considered technically authoritative and is forwarded to other commands, organizations, funding authorities, or technical approval groups generally without change. The appellant advises the supervisor of potentially controversial

issues. Completed work is reviewed for adherence to policy and to ensure that the broad technical objectives have been met.

Series, title, and standard determination

The agency has determined that the appellant's position is an interdisciplinary position classifiable as an Architect, GS-808, or as a General Engineer, GS-801. The agency classified the appellant's position as General Engineer, GS-801, based on the appellant's primary experience and professional knowledge and skills. The appellant agrees with the series and title determinations. We concur with the series determination. Since there are no mandatory titles specified for the GS-801 series, the titling of the appellant's position is at the discretion of his agency.

There is no standard that directly covers the appellant's duties and responsibilities. The General Grade Evaluation Guide for Nonsupervisory Professional Engineering Positions, GS-0800, (Guide) is used to classify positions in engineering series for which there are no specific grade-level standards, such as the GS-801 series, provided that the function and type of work performed is not adequately covered by grade-evaluation guides or standards for other engineering series. We will use the Guide's criteria to evaluate the appellant's position since it takes into consideration work having professional engineering staff advisory type services involving technical advising and program coordination.

The agency used the Architecture Series, GS-808, position classification standard to evaluate the appellant's position. The appellant's position is concerned with architecture and related engineering fields, but it does not entail responsibility for designing structures as a total entity, review of complete project designs, or development of architectural standards or advanced methods as is described by most of the standard's criteria. The standard includes criteria for evaluating positions performing construction administration functions. We will use these criteria, as they pertain to the appellant's position, for cross reference purposes since a significant portion of the appellant's work involves review of architectural design modifications and proposals.

Grade determination

Evaluation using the Guide

The Guide's grade evaluation criteria consist of two classification factors: Nature of assignment and Level of responsibility. Separate evaluative criteria are provided at each grade level for three types of engineering work. Both Type I and Type II are described as operating-level engineering assignments involving such functions as the design, testing, or technical review of equipment or systems, the development of maintenance and repair manuals, or the monitoring of contracts for equipment production. Type III engineering work is described as staff-level work performed by technical consultants and advisers and/or program coordinators. The appellant's role is consistent with Type III engineering work, and our analysis applies the Type III grading criteria.

Nature of assignment

At the GS-13 grade level, engineers perform staff advisory, consulting, and reviewing services to organizations performing a variety of Type I and/or Type II assignments of GS-12 grade level difficulty. Some positions are in the central engineering office of an agency or bureau with responsibilities for reviewing and coordinating all field work in a narrow program area and proposing additional work in the light of the needs of the agency or bureau.

At the GS-14 grade level, the Guide's criteria under this element take the form of several assignment examples intended to be illustrative of the type of work performed by engineers at this grade.

- They are expert consultants in a specialty field to a large bureau or agency. They advise on, review and conceive of new work to be undertaken by the organization. They represent their organization on technical committees developing general plans and procedures for carrying out research and experimental projects.
- For an agency headquarters and field offices, they coordinate and review broad programs containing a large amount of Type I and/or Type II GS-11 and 12 grade level work being undertaken at numerous locations under diverse conditions. They develop standard methods and procedures to be used throughout the headquarters and field, review work to avoid duplication and to assure consistency with agency policy, furnish technical and administrative advice as requested, and provide on-site advice and review.
- They develop short and long-range research and development plans and programs for a large group of research, development, and test activities.
- They serve as overall engineering and scientific advisor and consultant to the chief of a research, development, and evaluation organization. The engineering or scientific programs, projects, or investigations undertaken by the organization constitute all, or the major phases, of the technical work in the engineering or scientific area being done in the agency. They conduct studies to determine promising areas of investigation and to explore the impact of scientific or engineering breakthroughs on the organization program.

The GS-13 grade level is met. The appellant's position is assigned to NAVFAC [geographic area] which functions as an expert consultant and host nation representative for the [organization acronym] Infrastructure Program. As such, it is a primary point of contact for all service component EFDs or engineering field activities designing, implementing, and executing [organization acronym] projects where the U.S. is host or user nation. The appellant provides guidance on [organization acronym] requirements and procedures relating to obtaining funding from [organization acronym] for various major and minor construction projects. His responsibilities are in a comparable GS-13 grade level narrow program area in that they primarily involve coordinative and management issues and do not directly include broader project management responsibilities and other program functions, such as overall infrastructure program planning. For example, he participates in Capacity Package meetings to provide

technical information rather than to exercise planning responsibility. The appellant performs a variety of advisory, reviewing, justification, and coordinating functions, e.g., advising on [organization acronym] requirements in planning meetings, financial matters during construction, and potential modifications and funding for them; coordinating and participating in the Joint Final Acceptance Inspection; requesting and justifying [organization acronym] expenditures and other NSIP funding actions; and representing projects in final audits by [organization acronym].

From a management perspective, the appellant reviews or participates in reviewing projects for eligibility for [organization acronym] common funding and provides advice to others on acquisition, site selection, funding, design features, etc., as they pertain to [organization acronym] eligibility and funding. He also reviews all design modification requests to determine nature, scope, cost, consistency with [organization acronym] design or construction requirements or authorizations, etc. He tracks project status, prepares financial reports and requests, and responds to inquiries from [organization acronym], the U.S. Mission to [organization acronym], and other organizations on funding and design issues.

The GS-14 grade level is not met. The appellant performs his work without the program management control or engineering expertise expected at this level. Unlike the GS-14 grade level, the appellant does not have a major participatory role in the long-range planning activities. Rather, he provides technical and professional input necessary for decision making to those vested with that responsibility. Although the appellant does review field project work and participates in joint formal acceptance inspections, this work is not of GS-14 grade level breadth and diversity. The appellant's work primarily requires coordination and resolution of the [organization acronym] program issues and review of project design modifications proposals and recommendations to achieve consistency with [organization acronym] requirements and agency programming goals. His work does not include coordination and review of the overall engineering aspects of the projects. Unlike the GS-14 grade level, he is not responsible for a broad engineering program since infrastructure project management responsibility for the command and engineering decisions are delegated to his supervisor and project management personnel in other engineering organizations. Similarly, the appellant's work does not include responsibility for decisions that would impact the basic program as found at the GS-14 grade level. Instead, the appellant is responsible for strategies and recommendations that enable program consistency, efficiency, and fiscal soundness.

The GS-13 grade level is credited for this factor.

Level of responsibility

At the GS-13 grade level, engineers receive little or no technical guidance within their specialty area. Supervisors and others accept authoritative determinations not in conflict with policies and basic standards, and usually recognize and accept their proposals for new or additional work as those of an authority in the specialty area. GS-13 engineers have contacts with engineers in field offices that involve negotiation and persuasion in obtaining the adoption of technical points and methods that are in conflict with the desires and opinions of other engineers. GS-13 engineers who coordinate and review program functions apply a thorough and comprehensive knowledge

of the policies, laws, regulations, procedures, and methods related to basic work performed in the organization at GS-12. They exercise originality in developing and establishing standards, procedures, and instructions necessary to guide field offices and other organizations in carrying out program functions.

The GS-13 grade level is met. The appellant keeps his supervisor informed of issues and activities, primarily by providing copies of correspondence and documents, but also through discussion of controversial issues. He typically does not receive technical guidance. As at this level, the appellant functions independently in coordinating work and providing recommendations to staff at the U.S. mission to [organization acronym] and in providing guidance, technical information, justifications, etc., to staff, particularly other military and civilian engineers, program analysts, and financial personnel, at the agency, other military components, and [organization acronym] organizations. Comparable to the GS-13 grade level, the appellant uses a comprehensive knowledge of [organization acronym] regulations and policies and standardization agreements and DoD requirements and organizational authorities in coordinating projects for which the basic engineering work is directed by project managers. In representing the host nation, he presents to and defends U.S. financial claims with [organization acronym] and coordinates and negotiates issues regarding budgeting and financing and associated planning, design, and construction. He exercises originality in devising solutions to justify [organization acronym] funding for technical design features recommended by project managers and designers. Like the GS-13 grade level, he developed interim guidance for the management of cash flow for the procurement and re-procurement of [organization acronym] funded projects and an instruction for the command identifying the command roles and responsibilities in participating in the NSIP.

At the GS-14 grade level, employees operate under administrative supervision only, with guidance from higher levels restricted to matters of broad policy, program objectives, and budget limitations. Decisions, commitments, and conclusions ordinarily have considerable influence on the development of the agency program and the establishment of standards and guides for extensive engineering activities. As representatives of their agency, GS-14 engineers reach these kinds of agreements with groups from other agencies or organizations. Recommendations and decisions are almost universally accepted as technically sound even though final approval may depend upon formal action by others.

The Guide notes that GS-14 coordi[organization acronym]r-reviewers apply a broader knowledge of agency policies, laws, regulations, procedures, and methods than those at the GS-13 grade level since they deal with larger and more varied programs. They exercise originality in anticipating major problems, recognizing future program needs, and developing policies as well as standards, procedures, and instructions to guide operating personnel. The problems necessitate extensive contacts with key officials and top engineering and scientific personnel of the same or other establishments, other Government agencies, and private industry. GS-14 coordi[organization acronym]r-reviewers frequently represent their agencies in conferences with other agencies, State and local authorities, private industry, and public groups in efforts to obtain all viewpoints regarding proposed programs and to ensure concerted action by all parties involved.

The GS-14 grade level is not met. The appellant functions with more guidance than is expected at this level and does not have a significant role in determinations impacting the program itself or in development of standards and guides covering extensive engineering activities. The appellant operates within the regulations and requirements of the NSIP system, DoD and agency program guidance, agency engineering and construction policy, [organization acronym] policy and guidance, and command design manuals, engineering technical publications, directives, and instructions. His role is primarily that of a reviewer, advisor, and coordi[organization acronym]r. However, his recommendations generally pertain to funding issues or [organization acronym] criteria for individual or groups of projects rather than the broader program concerns identified at the GS-14 grade level. The appellant has extensive personal contacts with agency, DoD, and [organization acronym] representatives, that approach the GS-14 level due to the international level of the contacts and some high level engineering contacts. However, most of contacts are with staff positions and managers rather than the key officials and top engineering and scientific personnel described at the GS-14 grade level. Unlike the GS-14 grade level, the appellant does not usually participate in conferences. His role in significant meetings, such as the Capacity Package meetings and [organization acronym] Infrastructure Committee meetings, is primarily as a staff member providing technical information rather than as a key member discussing proposed programs and member involvement.

This factor is evaluated at the GS-13 grade level.

By application of the Guide, the position is evaluated at the GS-13 grade level.

Evaluation using the GS-808 standard

The GS-808 series is written in the Factor Evaluation System (FES) format, under which factor levels and accompanying point values are assigned for each of nine factors. The total is converted to a grade level by use of the grade conversion table provided in the standard. Under the FES, each factor level description in a standard describes the minimum characteristics needed to receive credit for the described level. Therefore, if a position fails to meet the criteria in a factor level description in any significant aspect, it must be credited at a lower level.

The appellant disagrees with their agency's determination for three factors and believe that his position should be credited at Levels 1-9, 2-5, and 3-5. He agrees with his agency's crediting of Levels 4-5, 5-6, 6-4, 7-4, 8-1, and 9-2. After careful review of the appeal record, we concur with the crediting of Levels 4-5, 8-1, and 9-2. Our analysis of the factors contested by the appellant and the ones with which we disagree follows.

Factor 1, Knowledge required by the position

At Level 1-8, work entails mastery of one or more architectural functions to the extent that the architect is capable of applying new developments and experienced judgment to: (1) extend or modify architectural methods and techniques; (2) resolve problems which are singular in kind or without equal; and (3) develop new approaches for use by other design or construction specialists in solving a variety of architectural problems. Typically, the architect is a recognized expert in the function(s) involved and the exploitation of basic scientific knowledge. As a recognized

expert, the architect is sought out for advice and consultation by colleagues who are, themselves, professionally mature. The architect typically speaks and deals responsibly on technical matters outside the employing organization as well as within and might, for example, have an important committee assignment in a professional organization or, performs work requiring the exercise of equivalent knowledge and skill.

Among the illustrations of work at Level 1-8 are the exercise of knowledge and skills necessary to:

- Serve as the technical authority within an agency for a multi-state area for projects involving the full range of buildings and related structures.
- Provide staff advisory services within the centralized architectural office of an agency with responsibility for reviewing and coordinating all design and construction work and proposing additional work in light of agency needs.
- Coordinate and review broad agency programs at the agency headquarters and field offices for varied buildings and related structures under diverse working conditions at numerous locations.

Level 1-8 is met. The appellant's work involves coordination and review functions for projects that are accomplished by project managers within NAVFAC [geographic area] or by project managers in the other armed services. Comparable to Level 1-8, [organization acronym] common infrastructures that the appellant is involved with that are described previously are consistent with those identified at this level and have characteristics, e.g., rare or unique problems, highly specialized type of structure, and complicated combinations of functional, technological, and economic factors as well as public interest in design considerations. He reviews architectural designs or requests for modifications to ensure the design, scope of work, cost proposal, etc., meet [organization acronym] funding eligibility. While the appellant does not review the initial architectural packages in-depth (since responsibility for building design and construction resides with the assigned project manager), he participates in initial planning capacity meetings to advise on such issues as facility acquisition strategy, justifications, site selection, technical requirements, funding eligibility, and other issues pertaining to [organization acronym] infrastructure guidelines. He also reviews all suggested or requested design changes and cost factors to evaluate them and determine constructive action to accomplish facilities engineering programming objectives.

Comparable to Level 1-8 expertise, the appellant is a recognized expert on [organization acronym] program requirements and advisor to engineers and other staff at the U.S. Mission to [organization acronym] and other military services involved in host or user nation construction funded by [organization acronym]. He represents the command at Capacity Package meetings to provide back-up support pertinent to facility acquisition requirements and opportunities, program execution issues, etc., for U.S. Joint Forces Command project recommendations. He may represent the command at [organization acronym] infrastructure conferences and in resolving technical and financial issues with the [organization acronym] infrastructure committee. The work requires extensive knowledge of [organization acronym] procedures to include planning,

programming, financial and budgetary control, project eligibility, minimum military requirements, criteria and standards, design, construction, acceptance, and auditing of [organization acronym] common infrastructure. It also requires a broad understanding of Government and agency jurisdictions and coordination requirements. The appellant maintains awareness of project status and architectural issues, cost targets and expenditures, and problems in the design, materials, and equipment requirements.

At Level 1-9, work requires mastery of building design and construction and recognized skill in generating new hypotheses, developing new concepts, and planning and evaluating long range programs and projects; or skill sufficient to function as a nationally recognized consultant and expert in building design and construction. Illustrative of Level 1-9 is an architect serving as a nationally recognized expert consultant to an agency having responsibility for the design and construction of buildings and related structures of unusual size and complexity with responsibility for observing, advising, and reporting on architectural activities nation- or world-wide.

Level 1-9 is not met. While the appellant functions, as an engineering expert in advising on program and jurisdictional requirements and providing consultation and guidance directly to Navy and other agency personnel directly involved with the program, his role is not that of a nationally recognized expert consultant in *building design and construction* as intended at this level. His work does not require or permit him to generate new architectural hypotheses, develop new concepts, or have the responsibility for planning and evaluating long range programs or projects. Duties and responsibilities assigned to a position flow from the mission assigned to the organization in which they are located. The positions that are created to perform the assigned mission must be considered in relation to one another; i.e., each position reflects a portion of the work assigned to the organization. Therefore, the duties and responsibilities assigned to the appellant and performed by him may not be considered in a vacuum. As discussed previously, multiple positions may not be credited with full responsibility for the same project; i.e., multiple architects cannot be credited with overall design and construction responsibility for a major building or other project. Overall responsibility for building design and construction work rests with the appellant's supervisor or with project managers in other agencies designated as construction agents, e.g., electronic and nuclear projects assigned to the Air Force. While the appellant represents the host nation's interests in projects, the fundamental design and construction of the structures is neither assigned to nor performed by the appellant. Assuring that building design meets command operational needs does not require or entail the exercise of knowledge and skill described at Level 1-9.

Level 1-8 is credited is credited for 1550 points.

Factor 2, Supervisory controls

This factor covers the nature and extent of direct or indirect controls exercised by the supervisor, the employee's responsibility, and the review of completed work. Controls are exercised by the supervisor in the way assignments are made, instructions are given to the employee, priorities and deadlines are set, and objectives and boundaries are defined. The architect's responsibility depends upon the extent to which the employee is expected to develop the sequence and timing

of various aspects of the work, to modify or recommend modification of instructions, and to participate in establishing priorities and defining objectives. The review of completed work depends upon the nature and extent of the review, e. g., close and detailed review of each phase of the assignment, detailed review of the finished assignment, spot check of finished work for accuracy, review performed by a contracting officer prior to signature, or review only for adherence to policy. The agency credited Level 2-3 for this factor.

The appellant's position exceeds Level 2-3 and meets Level 2-4. At Level 2-4, the supervisor sets the overall objectives and resources available. The employee and supervisor, in consultation, develop the deadlines, projects, and work to be done. The architect, having developed expertise in the work involved, is responsible for planning and carrying out the assignment; resolving conflicts which arise; coordinating the work with others as necessary; and interpreting policy on his own initiative. He or she determines the approach and methods to be used and keeps the supervisor informed of progress, potentially controversial matters, or far-reaching implications. Completed work is reviewed only from an overall standpoint in terms of feasibility, compatibility with other work, or effectiveness in meeting requirements or expected results.

As at Level 2-4, the appellant plans and carries out his assignment independently. He determines approaches and keeps the supervisor informed. His completed work is reviewed primarily for effectiveness in meeting requirements or expected results.

At Level 2-5, the supervisor provides administrative direction with assignments in terms of broadly defined missions or functions. The architect has responsibility for planning, designing, and carrying out programs, projects, studies, or other work independently. Results of the work are considered as technically authoritative and are normally accepted without significant change. If the work should be reviewed, the review concerns such matters as fulfillment of program objectives, effect of advice and influence on the overall program, or the contribution to the advancement of technology. Recommendations for new projects and alteration of objectives usually are evaluated for such considerations as usability of funds and other resources, broad program goals, or national priorities.

Level 2-5 is not met. Implicit in Level 2-5 is a degree of program management authority that is not delegated to the appellant's position. The intent of this level is that the employee normally would be responsible both for initial conception of work to be undertaken within a broad program area and for the funds and resources expended in accomplishing the work. The appellant does not operate only within the parameters of broadly defined missions in independently planning, designing, and carrying out major program activities. While the appellant functions with a high degree of technical independence, it is still within prescribed operating parameters and he does not independently establish objectives and overall goals of the work. He does not have authority or responsibility for defining mission or function, or shaping the work of the organization. The initial conception of work to be undertaken within a broad program and for the funds and resources expended in accomplishing the work do not reside in the appellant's position. The appellant provides input based on potential eligibility and program requirements, but the responsibility for initial work recommendations rests with other DoD organizations.

Though he has authority to expense [organization acronym] and host nation funding to other agents and responds to financial audits, he is not responsible for determinations on funds and resources expended in accomplishing the work. Unlike Level 2-5, the appellant reports to the Branch Chief position, which is held technically accountable for and is involved in all branch functions. Further, the work is reviewed by the U.S. Mission to [organization acronym] staff. The results of the appellant's work cannot be said to be authoritative in that he does not make actual decisions on most program matters. However, in keeping with his staff role, he makes recommendations that are subject to review at higher levels. His decisions primarily pertain to approaches to take in achieving program objectives. Neither the absence of immediate supervision for day-to-day operations nor the fact that technical recommendations normally are accepted serve to support Level 2-5 credit.

Level 2-4 is credited for 450 points.

Factor 3, Guidelines

This factor covers the nature and judgment needed to apply guidelines. Guidelines refer to standard guides, precedents, methods, and techniques and include standard, master, or guide specifications developed and prescribed by the central architectural staff of the agency; files of previous projects; technical data appearing in publications; building codes of State and local governments and recognized architectural and engineering societies and organizations; and governing policies and procedures of the agency.

At Level 3-4, guidelines are often inadequate in dealing with the more complex or unusual problems. The architect is required to use resourcefulness, initiative, and judgment based on experience to deviate from or extend traditional architectural methods and practices in developing solutions to problems where precedents are not applicable. This level may include responsibility for the development of material to supplement and explain agency headquarters guidelines.

Level 3-4 is met. [organization acronym] criteria manuals, various standardization agreements, policy and technical papers are available, in addition to agency general engineering and construction policy and guidance, design manuals, engineering and technical publications, directives, and instructions. [organization acronym] criteria and the standardization agreements provide broad or general policy and regulations and considerable judgment and ingenuity are required to interpret and apply them properly. Though the work does not require the appellant to extend architectural methods and practices typical of Level 3-4, the appellant must use comparable initiative and judgment in developing methods for resolution of project funding issues, particularly as occurs in the application of conflicting [organization acronym], national and agency criteria for specific problems. e.g., runway widths, water softeners, suspended ceilings. Solutions may involve devising methods or strategies to obtain [organization acronym] approval for recommended architectural designs having features ineligible or unauthorized for [organization acronym] funding, e.g., suspended ceilings to increase space around mechanical equipment and improve airflow, projects exceeding cost authorizations, or needed modifications exceeding available contingency funds.

At Level 3-5, the architect works chiefly under broad and general policy statements, regulations, and laws. He or she exercises considerable judgment and ingenuity in interpreting and adapting guidelines that exist and in developing new and improved hypotheses, approaches, or concepts not previously tested or reported in the literature of the field. Frequently, the architect is recognized as a technical authority in the area of assignment or specialization, and assumes responsibility for the development of policies as well as nationwide standards, procedures, and instructions to guide operating personnel.

Level 3-5 is not met. The appellant's position operates within a framework of architectural guidelines, financial management regulations, and [organization acronym] requirements which are more specific than the minimal guidelines intended at this level. The appellant interprets current guidelines and develops procedures and guidance, but his work does not require or permit him to develop new approaches as a technical authority or program policy.

Level 3-4 is credited for 450 points.

Factor 5, Scope and effect

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work, i.e., the purpose, breadth, and depth of the assignment, and the effect of work products or services both within and outside the organization. Effect measures such things as whether the work output facilitates the work of others, provides timely services of a personal nature, or impacts on the adequacy of research conclusions. The concept of effect alone does not provide sufficient information to properly understand and evaluate the impact of the position. The scope of the work completes the picture, allowing consistent evaluations. Only the effect of properly performed is considered.

At Level 5-5, the purpose of the work is to resolve critical problems or to develop new approaches or methods for use by other architectural specialists. Often serving as consultant or project coordi[organization acronym]r, the architect provides expert advice and guidance to officials, managers, and other architects within or outside the agency, covering a broad range of architectural activities. Results of the work affect the work of other architectural experts both within and outside the agency.

Level 5-5 is met. Comparable to this level, the appellant's position serves as an expert consultant on all matters relating to the implementation and execution of the [organization acronym] Infrastructure Program and the NSIP and is a primary point of contact for [organization acronym] requirements in the design and construction of infrastructure projects and resolution of funding issues. Like Level 5-5, the results of the work affect functional requirements of project managers and other expert level staff in EFDs and activities to use for resolving similar architectural problems involving [organization acronym] funding, e.g., the inclusion of water softeners, size of runways, suspended ceilings, projects exceeding costs, etc., and affects the expenditure of agency and non-agency funds and other resources.

At Level 5-6, the purpose of the work is to plan and conduct vital architectural programs for the agency, which are often of national or international scope and impact. The architect's recommendations and decisions on highly complex technical and policy areas frequently

establish the agency's position, create agency precedents, and guide field installations on matters of major architectural significance. The architect's actions affect the agency's architectural program on a long-term and continuing basis and often influence the programs of other agencies and outside organizations.

Level 5-6 is not met. While the appellant's position is involved in an international program and coordinates actions for infrastructure projects, it does not have responsibility for planning and conducting the overall architectural program as intended at this level. Program planning responsibilities are vested at higher Navy and DoD levels. NAVFAC [geographic area] maintains management control and financial responsibility. The appellant's supervisor has overall responsibility for these NAVFAC functions. The appellant's actions affect the efficiency of the program and programming goals and the actions of other agencies, but do not have the broader agency impact or influence the programs of other agencies. Similarly, the appellant's recommendations or actions typically do not create agency precedents on highly complex technical and policy areas and matters of major architectural significance as intended at Level 5-6.

Level 5-5 is credited for 325 points.

Factor 6, Personal contacts

At Level 6-3, personal contacts include a variety of officials, managers, professionals, or executives of other agencies and outside organizations. Typical of these contacts are contractor or manufacturer representatives; representatives of private architectural and engineering firms; other professional or para-professionals engaged in or concerned with the design of the cultural and social environment; and officials and technical staff members of other Federal agencies, planning commissions, or State, county, or local governments.

Level 6-3 is met. The appellant's contacts primarily are with officials, managers, engineers, within the agency and other Federal agencies and with representatives of engineer and architectural firms and [organization acronym] organizations. These contacts include engineers from the U.S. Mission to [organization acronym] assigned as representatives to the [organization acronym] Infrastructure Committee; project engineers and project managers within the agency and from other Federal agencies and contract firms; and budget analysts, financial specialists, contract specialists, etc., including those from [organization acronym].

At Level 6-4, personal contacts are with high ranking officials from outside the agency, including key officials and top architectural, engineering, and scientific personnel of other agencies, State and local governments, private industry, and public groups. The architect may also participate, as a technical expert, in committees and seminars of national or even international importance.

Level 6-4 is not met. The appellant has international contacts, such as those with technical staff and auditors from the [organization acronym] International Staff and members of Joint Formal Acceptance Inspection Teams (consisting primarily of a [organization acronym] International Staff team chairperson, representatives of user nations, and Joint Forces Command

representatives). However, these contacts are not routinely with key officials and top architectural and engineering staff, e.g., high level officials of command headquarters, field-level divisions, departmental and higher headquarters, other departmental commands, and other agencies and departments, intended at Level 6-4. The appellant's primary contacts are typically with action officers, engineers, or project managers representing projects or organizations both in the U.S. and designated areas overseas. The appellant participates in committees and other meetings, e.g., the [organization acronym] Infrastructure Committee, as the host nation representative or technical expert on infrastructure requirements, but, unlike Level 6-4, the meetings typically pertain to funding issues, such as reimbursements for specific project expenses, accuracy of audited data, project architectural deviations or allowances, scope of work, etc., and do not have the national and international importance intended at Level 6-4.

Level 6-3 is credited for 60 points.

Factor 7, Purpose of contacts

At Level 7-3, the purpose of contacts is to influence or persuade other architects or subject matter specialists to adopt technical points and methods about which there are conflicts, to negotiate agreements with agencies and contractors where there are conflicting interests and opinions among organizations or among individuals who are also experts in the field, or to justify the feasibility and desirability of work proposals to top agency officials.

Level 7-3 is met. As at this level, the appellant has a significant role in advising, resolving difficulties, negotiating issues regarding budgeting, financing, planning, design, and construction. The appellant justifies and supports Navy and command policies, procedures, and past precedent in attaining agreements and support for actions.

At Level 7-4, the purpose of contacts is to justify, defend, negotiate, or settle highly significant or controversial architectural matters. Architects often represent their agencies in professional conferences or on committees to plan extensive and long-range architectural programs and to develop standards and guides for broad activities.

Level 7-4 is not met. The appellant is not regularly involved in comparable highly significant architectural matters. His architectural issues tend to involve project design proposals or recommended modifications, e.g., the addition of water softeners as a [organization acronym] project authorization, authorization of suspended ceilings to accommodate mechanical equipment requirements. On a recurring basis, the appellant is involved in contacts on funding issues pertaining to specific projects. However he does not routinely participate in conferences or on committees to accomplish long-range program planning or standards development.

Level 7-3 is credited for 120 points.

Summary

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. Knowledge required by the position	1-8	1550

2. Supervisory controls	2-4	450
3. Guidelines	3-4	450
4. Complexity	4-5	325
5. Scope and effect	5-5	325
6. Personal contacts	6-3	60
7. Purpose of contacts	7-3	120
8. Physical demands	8-1	5
9. Work environment	9-2	<u>20</u>
<i>Total</i>		3305

A total of 3305 points falls within the GS-13 range, 3155 to 3600 points, according to the Grade Conversion Table in the GS-808 standard.

Summary

The appellant's position has been evaluated at the GS-13 level through use of both the Guide and the GS-808 position classification standard.

Decision

This position is properly classified to the General Engineering Series, GS-801, at the GS-13 grade level. Selection of an appropriate title is at the discretion of the agency.