From: Naval Inspector General  
To: Distribution  

Subj: COMMAND INSPECTION OF U.S. NAVAL FORCES CENTRAL COMMAND  

Ref: (a) SECNAVINST 5040.3A  
     (b) SECNAVINST 5430.57G  

1. The Naval Inspector General (NAVINSGEN) conducts command inspections of echelon 2 commands to provide the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations with a firsthand assessment of Departmental risks and major issues relevant to policy, management, and direction as directed by reference (a). Reference (b) tasks NAVINSGEN with conducting inspections and surveys, making appropriate evaluations and recommendations concerning operating forces afloat and ashore, Department of the Navy components and functions, and Navy programs that impact readiness or quality of life for military and civilian naval personnel.

2. NAVINSGEN conducted a Command Inspection of U.S. Naval Forces Central Command (NAVCENT) from 11 to 18 September 2016. This report documents our findings.

3. This report contains an Executive Summary, our observations and findings, and documented deficiencies noted during the inspection. A summary of survey and focus group data is also included.

4. During our visit, we assessed NAVCENT’s overall mission readiness in the execution of its echelon 2 responsibilities; functions and tasks as assigned in or defined by OPNAVINST 5450.341, Mission, Functions, and Tasks of U.S. Naval Forces Central Command; and other laws, policy, and regulations. We assessed administrative programs, facilities, safety and environmental compliance, security programs, and Sailor programs. Additionally, we conducted surveys and focus group discussions to assess the quality of work life and home life for Navy military and civilian personnel.

5. Our overall assessment is that NAVCENT is executing its mission, and is well positioned to implement the Chief of Naval Operations’ Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority. Prior to the inspection, we solicited input from U.S. Central Command, and their feedback was positive. A confluence of factors, most notably the high percentage of NAVCENT personnel serving on 12 month unaccompanied orders, combine to create a higher than normal rate of turnover at the command, which negatively impacts nearly every command function. After our inspection, we informed the Chief of Naval Personnel to help NAVCENT resolve these challenges. On a separate note, NAVCENT was the first command we’ve inspected in the last year to have zero safety deficiencies.
6. Corrective actions


   c. Correction of each deficiency or adoption of recommendations, and a description of action(s) taken or rationale of why recommendations were not adopted, should be reported via Implementation Status Report (ISR), OPNAV 5040/2, no later than 15 March 2017. Deficiencies not corrected by this date or requiring longer-term solutions should be updated quarterly until completed.

7. My point of contact is (b)(7)(C) Director of Inspections. (b)(7)(C)

   [Signature]
   HERMAN A. SHELANISKI
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NAVCENT
Background

The Naval Inspector General (NAVINSGEN) conducted a command inspection of U.S. Naval Forces Central Command (NAVCENT) from 11-18 September 2016. Our last inspection of NAVCENT was conducted in 2011. The inspection team was augmented with subject matter experts, including personnel from the Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy for Policy (DUSN(P)); Fleet Cyber Command/Tenth Fleet (FLTCYBERCOM); Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC); Naval Safety Center (NAVSAFECEN); Naval Supply Systems Command (NAVSUP); Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS); Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR); and the United States Fleet Forces (USFF) Command.

Prior to the inspection, we solicited feedback from the Deputy Commander, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) regarding NAVCENT’s mission accomplishment, and the feedback was positive. In addition to the command inspection, we also conducted a separate Husbanding Service Provider (HSP) assessment; our HSP assessment will be reported separately.

We assessed NAVCENT’s overall execution of its echelon 2 missions, functions, and tasks as specified in OPNAVINST 5450.314, Mission, Functions, and Tasks of the Commander, United States Naval Forces Central Command. We assessed security programs, facilities, safety and environmental compliance, command programs, and Sailor programs. Additionally, we conducted surveys and focus group discussions to assess the quality of work life (QOWL) and home life (QOHL) for Navy military, civilian personnel, and their families. Detailed listing of all areas assessed is captured below.

Areas/Programs Assessed

Mission, Functions, and Tasks
- Command & Control
- Combined Maritime Forces
- Criminal Jurisdiction
- Defense Readiness Report
- Diplomacy
- Intelligence
- Maritime Operations Center
- Medical
- Operational & Strategic Planning
- Reserve Support

Headquarters Functions
- Command Managed Equal Opportunity
- Continuity of Operations Plan
- Equal Employment Opportunity
- Hazing
- Human Resources
• IT Acquisition
• Military/Civilian Manning
• Military/Civilian Training
• Records Management
• Strategic Messaging & Communication

Security
• Information Security
• Personnel Security
• Industrial Security
• Antiterrorism/Force Protection (ATFP) and Physical Security
• Operations Security (OPSEC)
• Counterintelligence (CI) Training and Support
• Personally Identifiable Information (PII)
• Foreign Disclosure
• Insider Threat

Facilities, Safety, Environmental, and Energy
• Facilities Management
• Energy
• Environmental
• Safety & Occupational Health

Resource Management
• Contract Management
• Financial Management/Comptroller
• Government Commercial Purchase Card
• Government Travel Credit Card
• Personal Property Management

Prevention and Response
• Casualty Assistance Calls Program
• Overseas Screening
• Victim Witness Assistance Program
• Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention
• Sexual Assault Prevention and Response
• Suicide Prevention

Command Oversight
• Deployment Health/Command Individual Augmentee Coordinator
• IG Functions
• Individual Medical Readiness
• Legal/Ethics/FOIA
• Manager’s Internal Control
• Physical Readiness Program
• Voting Assistance

Sailor Programs
Observations and Findings

MISSIONS, FUNCTIONS, AND TASKS
NAVCENT is accomplishing its assigned missions, functions, and tasks, though with a heavy strain on personnel. Feedback from CENTCOM indicated NAVCENT is leading efforts to shape the theater and is proactively “flying ahead of need in respect to Iraq and Syria.” The Combined Maritime Force is having a measurable impact with respect to counter-piracy effort. NAVCENT is particularly well aligned with CNO’s Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority, with one exception – high velocity learning. The command has recently taken several steps to address knowledge management and other recurring challenges due to its rapid turnover of personnel.

A confluence of factors affects NAVCENT manning, which in turn impacts mission accomplishment. Ninety percent of NAVCENT personnel are on 12 month orders which creates a higher than normal turnover rate. The high percentage of 12 month orders is a result of the Joint Travel Regulations (JTR) mandated tour lengths of 12 months unaccompanied and 24 months accompanied, and the cap on dependents in Bahrain. The high turnover rate impacts nearly every command function, as personnel spend a larger than normal portion of their tour "storming and norming" with far less "performing". The turnover rate negatively impacts mission accomplishment, knowledge management, and readiness. This is both literal and figurative, as short tours can create a short-term mindset.

12 month tours at NAVCENT don’t always equate to 12 months on station, especially when factoring late arrival and early departure combinations, which are reportedly fairly common. The housing search and approval process in Bahrain is more lengthy and manpower intensive than normal duty stations, due to heightened security concerns. Factoring in late arrival, a few days to acclimate, weeklong command indoctrination, housing search, and early transfer from the command, the time actually performing the job is often ten months. OTEIP policies should create opportunities to lessen turnover rate, however the application timelines are incongruent with 12 month orders. Sailors face application deadlines very shortly after arrival, and commands have little time to evaluate Sailor performance before deciding if they’re a good fit.

NAVCENT has gaps in military manning. USFF conducted a Shore Manpower Requirements Determination (SMRSD) in 2015 that recommended 52 new manpower rqmts, 38 of which remain unfunded. Further, the MOC currently has 64 billets while USFF has identified 81 billets
are necessary to meet MOC standard core position requirements. This billet gap was not considered during the SMRD.

The overseas screening process creates gaps when personnel (or dependents) fail to screen. Detailers’ efforts to solicit volunteers for overseas assignments can lead to time-late detailing; this sometimes forces the command to choose between accepting a gap to get properly trained personnel or taking personnel without training simply to get them sooner. Further, the lengthy security clearance approval process impedes productivity, as members often arrive without final clearance adjudication. Additionally, NAVCENT has limited ability to designate “key billets” for 24 month orders due to DoD policy limitations.

In many Navy commands, government civilians provide continuity to balance the military turnover; however, this is not the case at NAVCENT. Civilian manning is 64% for a relatively small number of civilian billets (32 of 50 billets currently filled), and regulations cap overseas tours at 5 years for civilians. Even if DON civilian employees desired to stay longer, which many do, DoD policy provides barriers. Bahrain Human Resources Office (HRO) has billet gaps and leadership challenges of its own which exacerbate an already challenging job of filling overseas positions. The average time to hire a civilian in Bahrain is 155 days, far exceeding the Navy's goal of 80 days. Collectively, these factors impact mission accomplishment, and the mitigation methods require personnel to regularly work extended hours and weekends, as well as rely heavily on reservists to perform routine mission tasks.

Combined Maritime Forces
The CMF is having a measurable impact with respect to counter-piracy; the last successful piracy act committed in the CMF Area of Operations occurred in 2012. Further, well planned and focused counter-piracy operations have resulted in a significant reduction in false alarms and suspicious activities in the Gulf of Aden and Somali Basin. We also commend recent command efforts seeking to enforce established policy vice simply following precedence with respect to special requests from specific international partners.

Diplomacy
The NAVCENT Commander has established robust Key Leadership Engagement (KLE) processes to build trust, credibility, and enhance relationships with regional leaders. The KLE process involves an initial Council of Captains meeting to propose desired objectives and create a draft agenda; this is followed by various Internal Progress Reviews (IPRs) with the Commander.
Intelligence
A standardized process is in place to review and update priority intelligence requirements. Further, the recent standup of an Assessments Division will establish a framework for formally assessing maritime intelligence planning and operations performance.

Maritime Operations Center
USFF recently conducted a MOC Command Assist Visit (CAV) in preparation for a planned MOC certification scheduled for early November. The NAVCENT MOC team self-assessed they were performing 170 of 177 MOC supporting tasks while the USFF CAV team assessed onsite that NAVCENT was actually performing 175 of 177 enduring operations tasks and 177 of 177 contingency operations tasks.

NAVCENT recently established a new structure to better integrate MOC and Headquarters personnel through functional and cross-functional teams. This new construct was designed to improve communication, cohesiveness, and unity of effort. We were impressed by the new structure, as well as its implementation, but recommend that it be codified in writing. The longstanding NAVCENT practice for the Chief of Staff to later serve as MOC Director for the second half of their tour ensures the incumbent has a high level of awareness upon assuming this important role.

Medical
The force surgeon's office monitors over 1,000 patient admissions and 1,000 MEDEVACs a year, often providing valuable assistance to overcome regional customs, legal, and host nation diplomatic challenges. We consider NAVCENT’s distribution of medical ‘smart packs’ to in-chopping ships medical staffs to be a best practice. These smart packs provide an overview of AOR medical facilities to include the number of beds, staff size, medical capabilities, medical and ancillary services provided, facility diagrams, maps, as well as embassy and facility POC information. Additionally, the Force Surgeon educates ship medical personnel on Zika, Ebola, and other emergent health threats and associated reporting requirements.
We identified two challenges that may disrupt the high level of medical care currently provided to personnel in the AOR. A recent change to DON policy concerning the assignment of personnel with blood borne pathogens introduces a potential risk and may complicate the MEDEVAC process. Second, CENTCOM recently mandated the use of the Medical Situational Awareness Tool (MSAT) to improve data collection, MEDEVAC tracking, force health protection monitoring and other functions. This poses a challenge for ships with limited bandwidth.

**Operational and Strategic Planning**

The high volume of CENTCOM tasked plans, which require cross-functional Operational Planning Team (OPT) participation, places a significant strain on the small Plans team. Security clearance challenges, particularly for compartmentalized programs, and the acceptance of personnel who have not attended either the U.S. Army’s School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS) or the Navy’s Maritime Operational Planners Course (MOPC) and Maritime Advance Warfighting School (MAWS) courses further strain existing manning. Security clearance challenges are rooted in the personnel distribution system, as explained earlier in this report. Despite these personnel challenges, NAVCENT planners perform at a high level, synchronizing and aligning NAVCENT and other component command (AFCENT, ARCENT, MARCENT) execution with CENTCOM. Partner and allied nation planning functions are well integrated through CMF and multinational personnel incorporated into the NAVCENT headquarters’ staff.

**Reserve Support**

NAVCENT enjoys robust support from the Navy Reserve on a level that exceeds most other Echelon 2 commands. Ten reserve units, comprised of 333 billets encompassing a variety of ratings & specialties, provided over 14,000 days of mission support in FY16. The NAVCENT Operational Support Officer (OSO) is fully integrated in the staff and utilizes a rigorous process to resource Sailors to requirements, as prioritized by the Chief of Staff. Although FY17 funding levels project to be lower than FY16, NAVCENT may seek additional funds from the Navy Reserve Forces Command during the mid-year review process.

**HEADQUARTERS FUNCTIONS**

The fully integrated echelon 2/3 reduced manning construct employed by NAVCENT/C5F is effective, efficient, and devoid of functional redundancy. Consequently, compulsory compliance with future manpower reductions may be particularly disruptive to NAVCENT. Overseas civilian employment time limitations, time-late detailing, and 12-month unaccompanied tour lengths collectively yield a high personnel turnover rate, impacting command readiness and resilience. Several OPM, DoD, and DON policies, such as the Overseas
Tour Extension Incentives Program (OTEIP), lengthy TS/SCI clearance adjudication process, and personnel gaps due to overseas screening issues are incongruent with a majority of personnel on one-year orders. Further, the command has unfunded manpower requirements in the Maritime Operations Center (MOC), lacks depth in many essential billets, and requires personnel to regularly work extended hours and weekends.

**Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO)**
The NAVCENT Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) program is not compliant with governing directives. NAVCENT has not publicized nor communicated EEO program information. Moreover, NAVCENT civilian employees are not completing required EEO training requirements. By nature of a servicing agreement with USFF, the Navy Region Commander provides EEO services for NAVCENT remotely from Naples, Italy.

**Human Resources**
NAVCENT civilian employees reported a high level of dissatisfaction with the local Human Resources Office (HRO) during focus groups and interviews. Third Country National (TCN) health care benefits were raised as a significant concern during focus groups and individual interviews. As of 2016, the Bahraini General Organization for Social Insurance (GOSI) does not cover TCN personnel. The Joint Civilian Personnel Committee (JCPC) is currently addressing the issue via Central Command Regulation 690-3 (CCR 690-3). We reviewed a random sample of five NAVCENT’s civilian employee performance (IPMS) plans for FY15-16; all five reflected untimely execution of IPMS requirements as established by the Interim Performance Management System DON Handbook.

**Military/Civilian Manning**
NAVCENT leadership reported that manning is one of their top concerns. NAVCENT’s funded billets are 74 percent (498 of the 673) filled. Military manning is 94% (421 of 448 billets authorized), civilian manning is 64% (32 of 50 billets authorized). An on-site SMRD was completed by a USFF Command Manpower Analysis Team (CMAT) in 2015. The SMRD recommended 52 new manpower requirements, of which 38 remain unfunded. Additionally, the review did not address MOC manpower deficits associated with the MOC standard manning construct. The NAVCENT MOC maintains 64 billets while the USFF MOC standard stipulates 94 billets.

**Training**
Civilian training requirements are not completed as directed by governing instructions. Civilian training is not well managed; we observed limited documentation of NAVCENT headquarters’ staff 2015 and 2016 civilian training completion.

**SECURITY**
NAVCENT understands the dynamic regional security environment and the high reliance that places on individual employee situational awareness. Subordinate command oversight as required by governing directives was lacking in most security disciplines. However, the
Antiterrorism/Force Protection (ATFP) and Operational Security (OPSEC) programs have strong oversight processes that can be modeled in other security functional areas.

Personnel Security, Physical Security/ATFP, Operations Security, Counterintelligence training and support, and Foreign Disclosure programs are compliant with governing directives, with minor administrative deficiencies noted.

**Information Security**

NAVCENT’s Information Security Program is not fully compliant with governing instructions. Better coordination is required between the NAVCENT Command Security Manager, Legal and N6 departments. Additionally, a Memorandum of Understanding or Security Servicing Agreement is required between NAVCENT and co-located CTFs for shared services such as badging and information technology (IT).

**Industrial Security**

NAVCENT’s Industrial Security Program is not compliant with governing directives. NAVCENT does not have a codified Industrial Security program in place. There is no office of primary responsibility assigned to track required information for classified contracts, and NAVCENT does not provide industrial security oversight to subordinate commands. This is considered low risk, however, as other processes are in place to ensure proper contract completion.

**Antiterrorism/Force protection (ATFP) and Physical Security**

NAVCENT’s physical security and security-in-depth

**Personally Identifiable Information (PII)**

NAVCENT’s PII program is not fully compliant with governing directives. The NAVCENT privacy instruction does not contain all required elements. NAVCENT does not provide oversight to subordinate commands, and does not maintain records of semi-annual spot checks. Additionally, NAVCENT employs several Bahraini nationals and third country nationals in departments that have regular access to PII (Admin); however, the command is not tracking their initial or refresher employee training.

**Insider Threat**

Personnel at NAVCENT are generally aware of their surroundings and are knowledgeable of general security requirements. NAVCENT self-identified this issue, and recently implemented an Insider Threat Working Group (ITWG) to evaluate its processes more thoroughly and facilitate collaboration.
FACILITIES, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENERGY CONSERVATION, AND SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Facilities
Facilities and real property space limitations create challenges for Navy missions in the Central Command area of operations. Schedule delays and design and construction defects associated with MILCON projects executed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers exacerbate space limitations.

Environmental
NAVCENT’s environmental program is mission capable but not fully compliant. The Fleet Navy On-Scene Coordinator (NOSC) has not conducted annual Spill Management Team exercises, and certain environmental-related documents require updating to be in compliance with current Navy policy. The NAVCENT Environmental Health Officer (EHO) and staff provide Navy medicine support for the Overseas Drinking Water (ODW) Program. Support services include, but are not limited to, medical surveillance of the drinking water system and public health consultation. The EHO and staff are well-trained, experienced, and diligent and assertive in applying Navy policy and good public health practices to drinking water systems to ensure protection of public health.

Safety & Occupational Health
NAVCENT’s safety & occupational health program is compliant and makes good use of limited resources. This is noteworthy, as it is the first inspection in over a year without a safety deficiency.

COMMAND PROGRAMS

Resource Management
NAVCENT’s Resource Management Programs are effective and executed in accordance with governing instructions.

Prevention and Response
NAVCENT’s Prevention and Response Programs are effective and executed in accordance with governing instructions, with the exception of three programs assessed as not fully compliant. NAVCENT’s Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program (NADAP) does not have an Alcohol Drug Control Officer (ADCO) assigned to provide oversight of UPC and DAPA programs for subordinate commands. NAVCENT’s Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program is not fully compliant because SAPR training for individuals and watchstanders has not been completed and watchstander training is needed to ensure proper victim response protocols are followed. However, we believe NAVCENT is committed to maintaining an environment free of sexual assault (SA) and that any future victims would receive excellent care and support services. NAVCENT’s Suicide Prevention Program is not fully compliant with governing directives because required training of civilian staff was not completed. Although Command
Duty Officer Training has been conducted, there is room for improvement in watchstander training to better assist Sailors in crisis.

**Command Oversight**

NAVCENT’S Command Oversight Programs are effective and executed in accordance with governing instructions, with the exception of three programs: Inspector General (IG) Program, Managers’ Internal Control (MIC) Program, and Physical Readiness Program (PRP). The NAVCENT IG Hotline/Investigations program fails to meet the timelines set forth in SECNAVINST 5370.5B, Navy Hotline Program. Additionally, NAVCENT does not have a structured inspection program. The NAVCENT Managers’ Internal Control (MIC) program is not compliant with governing instructions. Although the alternate MIC coordinator has been identified and NAVCENT has started to draft plans for 2017, the MIC Program requires revitalization and will require involvement and oversight from the assessable unit manager. The NAVCENT Physical Readiness program does not contain the minimum required number of Assistant Command Fitness Leaders (ACFLs) and NAVCENT lacks a command policy that integrates physical fitness into the workweek.

**SAILOR PROGRAMS**

Command Sponsorship, Career Development Board, Sailor Recognition, and CPO 365 Programs are compliant with governing directives. The recently revamped Command Indoctrination Program will become compliant once recent program changes are implemented and mature over time.

**SURVEY AND FOCUS GROUP FINDINGS**

Survey and focus group discussions indicated that both Quality of Work Life (QOWL) and Quality of Home Life (QOHL) at NAVCENT are lower than the historical echelon 2 command averages. However, NAVCENT’s ratings are similar to other overseas commands we’ve surveyed. On a 10-point scale, the NAVCENT QOWL and QOHL are 6.16 and 6.93, respectively; corresponding echelon 2 command historical averages are 6.69 and 8.10. Overall, we found NAVCENT personnel to be hard-working and dedicated to the mission. Further, based on pre-event survey submissions and focus group discussions, our perception is that the command is in a better place today than it was a year ago. A comprehensive analysis of pre-event survey and focus group responses will also be provided directly to the inspected command for usage as appropriate.

**Deficiencies and Recommendations**

A comprehensive list of deficiencies and recommendations will be forwarded to the inspected command under separate correspondence.
From: Naval Inspector General  
To: Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Central Command

Subj: COMMAND INSPECTION OF U.S. NAVAL FORCES CENTRAL COMMAND

Ref: (a) NAVINSGEN ltr 5040 Ser N3/1163 of 14 Dec 16

Encl: (1) List of Deficiencies from NAVCENT Command Inspection  
(2) List of Recommendations from NAVCENT Command Inspection  
(3) Implementation Status Report (ISR), OPNAV Form 5040/2  
(4) Summary of Key Results and Data from NAVCENT pre-inspection Survey  
(5) Summary of Focus Group Perceptions from NAVCENT workforce

1. NAVINSGEN conducted a Command Inspection of U.S. Naval Forces Central Command (NAVCENT) from 11 to 18 September 2016. Reference (a) is our inspection report, previously distributed under separate correspondence.

2. Enclosure (1) includes a list of deficiencies identified during the command inspection, compiled from governing directives. They are forwarded for your awareness and corrective action. Enclosure (2) includes a list of our recommendations, based on best practices as observed from previous inspections; they are forwarded for your consideration. Correction of each deficiency, and a brief description of action(s) taken, should be reported using an implementation status report (ISR) form, enclosure (3), on a quarterly basis with the first submission due on March 14, 2017. ISRs should be submitted to naviginspections.FCT@navy.mil. Deficiencies not corrected by this date should be updated quarterly until completed.

3. Enclosure (4) is a summary of information collected from our anonymous pre-event online survey, and enclosure (5) is a summary of information collected from the on-site focus groups. This information is provided for your usage as appropriate.

4. My point of contact is [BLANK] Deputy Director of Inspections. [BLANK]
Deficiencies

MISSION PERFORMANCE

None Identified

HEADQUARTERS FUNCTIONS

Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO)

Deficiency 1. NAVCENT does not prominently display EEO program written materials in personnel offices or on the command’s internal and external websites. References: 29 CFR Part 1614, MD-110, MD-715, and DON CHRM 1614.

Deficiency 2. Mandatory annual EEO training requirements are not completed. Reference: SECNAVINST 12410.25, Civilian Employee Training and Career Development, Enclosure 3; DON Office of Civilian Human Resources portal.

Interim Performance Management System


Information Technology (IT) Acquisition

Deficiency 4. NAVCENT has not entered required items in the DOD Information Technology Portfolio Repository (DITPR)/DON Application and Database Management System (DADMS). Reference: GENADMIN MSG DTG R021936Z JAN 09, Subj: Implementation of Master Record Functionality in DADMS/DITPR-DON.

Military/Civilian Training

Deficiency 5. NAVCENT has not completed required annual training for its civilian workforce. Reference: SECNAVINST 12410.25, Civilian Employee Training and Career Development, paragraph 5f and 5h(s); DON Office of Civilian Human Resources portal.

Deficiency 6. Mandatory supervisor training requirements have not been completed. Reference: SECNAVINST 12410.25, Civilian Employee Training and Career Development and DON Office of Civilian Human Resources portal.

Records Management

Deficiency 7. NAVCENT has not conducted an annual inventory or triannual self-assessment of its RM Program. Reference: SECNAVINST 5210.8E, Enclosure (6), paragraphs 5 and 6.

Deficiency 8. NAVCENT does not have a records check-in/checkout process for senior personnel. Reference: SECNAVINST 5210.8E, paragraph 5u.
SECURITY PROGRAMS

Information Security

Deficiency 9. CUSNC/C5FINST 5510.1H does not cite and append Security Service Agreements (SSAs). Reference: SECNAV M5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2d.

Deficiency 10. CUSNC/C5FINST 5510.1H does not describe procedures for subordinate security reviews and inspections. Reference: SECNAV M5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2e.

Deficiency 11. CUSNC/C5FINST 5510.1H does not clearly state whether the Commander or any other command officials have been delegated original classification authority. Reference: SECNAV M5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2i.

Deficiency 12. CUSNC/C5FINST 5510.1H does not clearly establish procedures for the review of classified information prepared in the command, to include sources of security classification guidance commonly used. Reference: SECNAV M5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2j.

Deficiency 13. NAVCENT does not have a written Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or Security Servicing Agreement (SSA) with tenant commands that perform or receive security functions in support of their command. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36 Section 2-10; and SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 2-11, paragraph c.

Deficiency 14. (b) (7)(E)

Deficiency 15. (b) (7)(E)

Personnel Security

Deficiency 16. Information Technology position level designations for all users at NAVCENT are not annotated within the Joint Personnel Adjudication System (JPAS). Reference: SECNAV M5510.30, Section 5-2, paragraph 6.

Deficiency 17. Position sensitivity levels are not accurately reflected in numerous Position Descriptions. Reference: SECNAV-5510.30, Section 5-3, Paragraphs 1a and 1b.

Deficiency 18. (b) (7)(E)

Industrial Security

Deficiency 19. (b) (7)(E)
Deficiency 20. (b) (7)(E)

Deficiency 21. (b) (7)(E)

Deficiency 22. (b) (7)(E)

Deficiency 23. NAVCENT has not designated a Contracting Officer Representative (COR) in writing for all classified contracts. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2-6.

Deficiency 24. NAVCENT CORs who handle/process classified contracts do not meet the standards for certification as a COR. Reference: DoDI 5000.72, DoD Standard for Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR) Certification, paragraph 3c.

Deficiency 25. NAVCENT does not have a Security Servicing Agreement (SSA) or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in place with the sponsoring commands on all classified contracts, to provide Information and Personnel security support for contractors located on site. References: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2-10; and SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 2-11.

Deficiency 26. (b) (7)(E)

Deficiency 27. (b) (7)(E)

Deficiency 28. (b) (7)(E)

Deficiency 29. (b) (7)(E)

Deficiency 30. (b) (7)(E)

Antiterrorism/Force Protection (ATFP) and Physical Security

Deficiency 31. COMNAVCENT has not appropriately posted signage for its Restricted Areas. References: OPNAVINST 5530.14E (CH-2), Enclosure (1), Article 0210, paragraph g(6); and NTTP 3-07.2.3, Appendix W, Section W.1.
Deficiency 32. (b) (7)(E)

[Text]

Operations Security

Deficiency 33. NAVCENT OPSEC Officer does not formally review contracts for OPSEC requirements. References: DoDM 5205.02-M, Enclosure 6, paragraph 1a; and OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5.m.

Deficiency 34. NAVCENT does not ensure classified and unclassified contract requirements properly reflect Operations Security (OPSEC) responsibilities in contracts, where applicable. References: DoDM 5205.02-M, Operations Security (OPSEC) Program Manual, Enclosure 6, paragraph 2; and OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Operations Security, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5d.

Deficiency 35. NAVCENT contracts do not consistently include OPSEC provisions where appropriate. Reference: DoDM 5205.02-M, Enclosure 6, paragraph 2c.

Deficiency 36. (b) (7)(E)

[Text]

Personally Identifiable Information (PII)

Deficiency 37. NAVCENT Privacy Instruction does not contain all required elements of a PII instruction. SECNAVINST 5211.5E, Department of the Navy (DON) Privacy Program, paragraph 7.h.(7) and paragraph 30.c.

Deficiency 38. NAVCENT does not maintain an auditable record of PII semi-annual spot checks. Reference: ALNAV 070/07, Department of the Navy (DON) Personally Identifiable Information (PII) Annual Training Policy, Paragraph 1b.

Deficiency 39. NAVCENT does not provide comprehensive oversight of the PII programs of subordinate commands. Reference: SECNAVINST 5211.5E, Department of the Navy (DON) Privacy Program, paragraph 7.h.(11).

Deficiency 40. (b) (7)(E)

[Text]
FACILITIES, ENERGY, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Environmental

**Deficiency 41.** The NAVCENT Fleet NOSC has not conducted annual Spill Management Team (SMT) exercises to ensure planning documents are adequate for response and personnel assigned have the necessary skills to respond. Reference: OPNAV M-5090.1D, paragraph 39-3.4.c.(2).

COMMAND PROGRAMS

Prevention and Response

**Deficiency 42.** NAVCENT does not have a designated Alcohol Drug Control Officer (ADCO). Reference: OPNAVINST 5350.4D, paragraph 8m(1).

**Deficiency 43.** NAVCENT does not have a full time Drug and Alcohol Prevention Advisor (DAPA). Reference: OPNAVINST 5350.4D paragraph 8p(6)(d).

**Deficiency 44.** Triad Leadership did not receive the required SARC Brief and MRE 514 privilege brief from the SARC and SJA within 30 days of assuming their responsibilities. References: DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Enclosure (5), paragraph 3b; SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (5), paragraph 3b; OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraph 15b and Appendix 2B (page 2B-1).

**Deficiency 45.** NAVCENT has not completed the required command review of all NAVPERS 1070/887 or FC 91 documents in OMPF for permanently assigned personnel and notation of sex-related offenses. Reference: OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraph 15ab, and Appendix 2B (page 2B-1), NAVADMIN 025/15 JAN15.

**Deficiency 46.** NAVCENT watchstanders are not following proper response protocols when responding to suicidal behavior. References: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraph 5c, and Enclosure (3), paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 10, OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraph 5b(1), and Enclosure (3), paragraphs 4 and 6.

**Deficiency 47.** NAVCENT civilian personnel and full time contractors are not attending suicide prevention training. References: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraph 5a(1), 6h(3), Enclosure (3) paragraph 1.

Inspector General Functions

**Deficiency 48.** NAVCENT IG is not meeting the 30 day completion timeline for course of action to address complaints (Assist, Refer, Dismiss). Reference: SECNAVINST 5370.5B, paragraph 9a; NAVINSGEN Investigations Manual.

**Deficiency 49.** NAVCENT IG is not meeting the 30 day completion timeline for all preliminary inquiries. Reference: SECNAVINST 5370.5B, paragraph 9a; NAVINSGEN Investigations Manual.
Deficiency 50. NAVCENT IG is not meeting the 90 day completion timeline for all full investigations. Reference: SECNAVINST 5370.5B, paragraph 9a; NAVINSGEN Investigations Manual.

Deficiency 51. NAVCENT IG has not developed and implemented an Inspection Program for appropriate oversight of lower echelon commands. Reference: SECNAVINST 5040.3A, paragraph 9f(1).

Deficiency 52. NAVCENT does not provide external oversight and audit liaison, and has not established internal controls for ensuring timely responses to draft reports and open recommendations. Reference: CUSNC/C5FINST 7500.1, Section 3.b.

Managers’ Internal Control (MIC) Program

Deficiency 53. NAVCENT’s Alternate MIC Coordinator has not been appointed in writing nor been trained. References: SECNAVINST 5200.35F, Enclosure (1), paragraph 9e , and OPNAVINST 5200.25E, paragraph 5a2c.

Deficiency 54. NAVCENT does not have a MIC Plan to include the organization of NAVCENT MIC Program (MICP), overview of MICP related to standards for internal controls, risk assessment methodology, tracking of corrective action plans, MIC training, and the date the plan was updated. References: SECNAVINST 5200.35F 35F, Encl (1), paragraph 9.e.4 and SECNAV M-5200.35 DON MIC Manual, MIC program Documentation Requirements section- The MIC Plan pages 16-17.

Deficiency 55. NAVCENT did not utilize the Statement of Assurance tool to submit Certification Statements as required. Reference: SECNAVINST 5200.35F Encl (1), paragraph 9f and SECNAV M-5200.35 DON MIC Manual, Statement of Assurance Tool.

Deficiency 56. NAVCENT did not have the required documentation for FY15 & FY16 Certification Statements to include separate listing, corrected and uncorrected material weaknesses, reportable conditions, and items to be revisited. Reference: SECNAVINST 5200.35F 21 Jul 2014 Enclosure (1), paragraph 9e1b and SECNAV M-5200.35 DON MIC Manual, Preparing a MIC Certification Statement page 25.

Deficiency 57. NAVCENT has not provided oversight to subordinate commands to include MIC training or followed up on the corrections and milestone progress for reported deficiencies. Reference: SECNAVINST 5200.35F 21 July 2014 Encl (1), page 7, paragraph 9.e.2.c

Physical Readiness

Deficiency 58. NAVCENT lacks a Command policy that integrates physical fitness into the workweek. Reference: OPNAVINST 6110.1J, paragraph 5a.

Deficiency 59. NAVCENT lacks the requisite number of Assistant Command Fitness Leaders (ACFLs). Reference: OPNAVINST 6110.1J, paragraph 6j(3).
Recommendations

MISSION PERFORMANCE

Diplomacy

Recommendation 1. That NAVCENT codify the existing KLE process in writing to ensure it endures beyond the current NAVCENT Commander’s tenure.

HEADQUARTERS FUNCTIONS

Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO)

Recommendation 2. That Navy Region EURAFSWA EEO staff schedule regular visits to Bahrain to help mature nascent or nonexistent EEO processes.

Human Resources

Recommendation 3. That NAVCENT conduct a systematic review and update of all PDs to reflect actual duties assigned and work being performed.

Military/Civilian Training

Recommendation 4. That NAVCENT retain a FLTMPS training snapshot at the end of each Fiscal Year for archival purposes in order to comply with training record retention policy.

Records Management

Recommendation 5. That NAVCENT consider assigning its RM Program responsibility to the Knowledge Manager to improve continuity.

SECURITY PROGRAMS

Antiterrorism/Force Protection (ATFP) and Physical Security

Recommendation 6. (b) (7)(E)

Recommendation 7. (b) (7)(E)

Recommendation 8. That NAVCENT classify addendums of the ATFP plan individually based upon their content in order to more freely distribute unclassified information.
FACILITIES, ENERGY, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Energy

Recommendation 9. That the NAVCENT BEM coordinate with the NSA Bahrain installation energy manager to receive electricity and water consumption data for review and energy awareness materials for distribution amongst the NAVCENT staff.

Safety and Occupational Health

Recommendation 10. That NAVCENT perform an inventory of its headquarters and subordinate commands to determine if class 3B or class 4 lasers exist, thereby requiring a laser safety organization.

COMMAND PROGRAMS

Prevention and Response

Recommendation 11. That NAVCENT hold more frequent Sexual Assault Prevention and Response watchstander drills to reinforce correct procedures.

SAILOR PROGRAMS

Command Indoctrination

Recommendation 12. That NAVCENT complete a self-assessment of the Command Indoctrination program within six months of implementation to ensure it is meeting desired objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS AS OF (DATE)</th>
<th>REPORTED BY (ACTION OP/BUREAU/COMMAND)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION OFFICER (NAME AND EXTENSION)</th>
<th>COORDINATING ACTION (OP/BUREAU/COMMAND)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDENTIFICATION OF REPORT (NAVINS/GEN/COMMAND INSPECTION/AUDIT/AREA COORDINATION) INCLUDE SERIAL AND DATE

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTION ITEM (RECOMMENDATION NUMBER/PARAGRAPH NUMBER)

RECOMMENDATION:

CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS (IF ACTION CONSIDERED COMPLETE, SO STATE.)

NEXT STEP IN IMPLEMENTING ACTION (INCLUDE ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETED ACTION)
Summary of Key Survey Results

PRE-EVENT SURVEY

In support of the NAVCENT Command Inspection held 11 to 18 September 2016, the Naval Inspector General (NAVINSGEN) conducted an anonymous online survey of active duty military and Department of the Navy (DON) civilian personnel from 24 February to 18 March 2016 and again from 11 July to 22 August. The survey produced 266 respondents (247 military, 19 civilian). According to reported demographics, the sample represented the NAVCENT workforce with a 5 percent margin of error at the 95 percent confidence level. A frequency report is provided in Appendix C.

Quality of Life

Quality of life was assessed using a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is worst and 10 is best. The overall NAVCENT average quality of work life (QOWL), 6.16, was lower than the historical echelon 2 average of 6.69 (Figure 1). Likewise, the overall NAVCENT average quality of home life (QOHL), 6.93, was significantly lower than historical echelon 2 average of 8.10 (Figure 2).

Figure 1. Distribution of QOWL from the pre-event survey. The x-axis lists the rating scale and the y-axis represents the number of survey respondents. Response percentages for ratings are shown at the base of each bar. Counts for each rating are shown above each bar. The most frequent rating is shown in blue.
Figure 2. Distribution of QOHL ratings from the pre-event survey. The x-axis lists the rating scale and the y-axis represents the number of survey respondents. Response percentages for ratings are shown at the base of each bar. Counts for each rating are shown above each bar. The most frequent rating is shown in blue.

Figure 3 compares females and males on their rating of QOWL. There are no significant differences in how females and males rated QOWL. Figure 4 compares military and civilian participants on their rating of QOWL. No differences can be observed due to the small number of civilian participants.

Male and Female QOWL

Figure 3. Distribution of QOWL from the pre-event survey. The x-axis represents the percentage of survey participants and the y-axis lists the rating scale. Scanning from left to right allows the reader to compare the percentage of female and male participant ratings on QOWL.
Military and Civilian QOWL

Figure 4. Distribution of QOWL from the pre-event survey. The x-axis represents the percentage of survey participants and the y-axis lists the rating scale. Scanning from left to right allows the reader to compare the percentage of military and civilian participant ratings on QOWL.

In order to get a clearer understanding of the drivers of survey participant QOWL rating, participants were asked to indicate whether the following factors have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on their QOWL rating. These factors included:

- Job satisfaction
- Leadership support
- Leadership opportunities
- Workload
- Work Hours/Schedule
- Advancement opportunities
- Awards and recognition
- Training opportunities
- Command morale
- Command climate
- Quality of workplace facilities

Factors of potential concern were identified by distributional analyses, where 20 percent negative responses served as a baseline. The baseline is derived from a simple assumption that Navy leadership may want to be alerted to a factor in which potentially more than one out of five respondents would indicate that the topic had a negative impact on their rating. The aggregate of all survey participants indicated work hours/schedule (37 percent), workload (33 percent) training opportunities (29 percent), and command morale (28 percent) had a significant negative impact on QOWL. Comparisons between demographic groups yielded more specific results. Military participants rated work hours/schedule (39 percent) and workload (35 percent) as significantly impacting their QOWL rating. Civilian participants indicated that award
and recognition programs (68 percent) significantly impacted their QOWL rating. Female participants reported command morale (35 percent) significantly impacted their QOWL rating.

Participants were asked to rate their perceptions regarding leadership guidance; specifically, “I have adequate leadership guidance to perform my job successfully.” Eighteen percent of the participants responded negatively to this question. There was a follow-on question which asked those respondents who reported a negative on leadership guidance to elaborate on their response. The dominant theme expressed was conflicting guidance or poor communication from senior leadership. Examples of participant’s comments include: “Constantly changing and conflicting guidance.” “We tend to play rock [drill] here.” “Everything is a crisis.” “Mid-level leadership utterly fails to provide clear communication in assignment of tasks.” “Attempts by AOs [Action Officers] to solicit clarification are commonly met with rancor and hostility.” “Written guidance is outdated.” “Communication flow from the top down is poor.” “My N-code berates me and the other people within my office.” “Sometimes leadership acts like you are stupid when you ask questions.” “There seems to be a lack of communication up and down the chain of command. This often leads to a misplaced expenditure of time and energy and then a repetition of work.” “Chain of Command is in too many meetings to adequately guide and lead their departments. You’ll get tasked in the morning, and then the chain of command is in meetings all day. The next opportunity to get rudder orders isn’t until the end of the work day causing people to stay late.” “The main problem is most N head codes are too scared to approach the flag deck and receive guidance from the boss.” “We have no top cover. Leadership here is non-existent. Everyone is just enduring the suck while the year passes and they can move on better career opportunities. Thank God we have name-tags, otherwise they would never know who we are. Deck-plate leadership! HA.” “If you don’t know how to find something you're an idiot and are ridiculed for it.” “Provided there is a high turnover rate here at NAVCENT and in order to effectively and efficiently complete daily tasks and workload, an individual would require either sound, clear, and concise leadership and/or an in-depth turnover binder, of which I have yet to encounter. Overall quality of life would increase if we weren’t ‘re-inventing the wheel’ every time.”

The “Awards and Recognition” factor also included a follow-up question for those who reported a negative impact. The main themes centered on the lack of recognition of superior performance and the equity of awards. Some examples of the comments include: “I completed a certification. I worked hard to study the course material for many months...I passed the proctored examination. I received no formal acknowledgement from the command. It was a big giant let down that no one seemed to care at all.” “A member who performs well above their paygrade and responsibility level gets no considerations for an upgraded award, and is told the awards don’t matter.” “NO and second floor departments get awards quicker than other offices for just doing their job.” “Awards are now expected as a reward for making it through a tour of duty, since everyone achieves them; therefore, they have lost their merit.” “Within this command, public praise is rare compared to negative attention.” “Awards are strongly weighted on rank as opposed to performance.” “There should be clear guidance if an award is rank/job description based or merit based. Right now, it is not clear.” “When it comes to end of tour awards, there seems to be all these ‘unwritten rules’ about what paygrades are
eligible for certain awards, and who gets awards is unfair.” “Civilian Awards are nearly non-existent.” “The command does not go out of its way to recognize the civilian workforce, nor does it put any real effort into evaluating performance and distinguishing merit from merely acceptable performance. The general feeling is that the civilian workforce (both US federal employees and the BG workforce) are an afterthought.”

Morale & Command Climate

The survey asks participants to expand on their perceptions of morale and command climate. Considering the above analysis suggests that 28 percent of the participants rated command morale as contributing to their negative rating on QOWL, a deeper dive into command morale and climate is presented. Participants were asked to rate their perceptions to questions concerning job importance to command, command safety, communication up and down chain of command, treatment of respect by superiors, fairness of performance evaluation, military-civilian relations, command equal opportunity program, resolution of climate issues, fraternization, discrimination, sexual harassment, and hazing. Figure 5 illustrates the results of these ratings. Only three factors are significantly above the 20% baseline indicating a negative impact on command morale and climate; communication down the chain of command, favoritism, and communication up the chain of command.

The survey had a follow-up question for those (only 7%) who reported a negative impact on the question “My command Equal Opportunity Program is effective.” There was not a dominant theme. Some example comments include: “The command climate survey and follow-on focus groups do not appear to have an impact on command’s direction to mid-level leadership’s treatment of subordinates.” “Directorate-level staff does not attempt to resolve command climate issues.” “The results of the last Command climate [survey] have not been debriefed to the staff.” “Everyone hates life and is afraid to come to work. Not knowing what random thing you will get yelled at for that day because the bullying starts at the top and flows down.” “Leadership of JO’s is atrocious.” “When there have been complaints of toxic leadership within the command, there does not seem to be any resolution or correction for the problem. This gives the impression that toxic leadership is promoted and rewarded at this command.” “I have witnessed where SWOs and Aviators are treated differently.” “I do not know who the CMEO is. That person just takes collateral [duty] and hides in the shadows. The signs posted are outdated with people who have left the command.”

The last question on the survey asks participants to submit comments about other impacts on their QOL. There was not a dominate theme in the comments. Here are a few comments of note: “Sometimes deadlines for tough taskers are not realistic especially due to the volume of documents to be reviewed.” “One of the big issues that we have is the response time that PSD Bahrain provides to us as customers...It takes PSD a longer time to act on the subject matter than other PSDs I have encountered.” “We have a tremendous lack of people here.” “I dread
coming to work. I am made to feel small and unimportant.” “Some of the leadership has been here far too long.” “If you are seen going to the gym during work hours you can expect to be chastised and ridiculed.” “Many people report here with pending TS/SCI investigation and cannot perform the job we were billeted to do because it takes too long for EQIP investigation to be adjudicated.” “PSD/Housing needs [to be] inspected on method for processing TLA forms. I had to re-submit my TLA forms 4 times. It kept getting lost in current process.” “Pay issues seem to be a recurrent problem for Sailors stationed in Bahrain.” “The HRO department does not support the command; very difficult to handle requested GS/GG issues.” “The manning shortage here leads to extensively long work hours, and being told that an additional 25% of the staff will be cut is not going to help a major command climate issue.” “If you don’t have enough people to perform the job at a minimum, how are you supposed to cross train and maintain a 24/7 watch at the same time?” “I feel like I am currently tasked with a job that I am extremely unprepared for and that no one has any interest in helping me get better at it without making me feel bad for asking questions.” “Toxic leadership appears to be rewarded and promoted.” “After the previous command climate survey, where multiple issues were addressed like morale, stress levels, and differences between one year and two year orders, the command leadership brought groups of personnel together (O1-O4, E7-E9, etc) and essentially told us to deal with it and changed nothing. I have little faith this survey will accomplish anything.” “The time to hire a civilian is excessive. Greater than six months in most cases and potentially a year. Primarily based on excessively slow HR support from outside the command.” “Many of the uniformed personnel (including some O-5 and O-6) appear to hold DoD civilians in contempt, treating them with disdain and disrespect.” “There was never any money in the budget for civilian training requirements.” “I have had senior military supervisors ask me why civilians should be authorized compensatory time when their military personnel get no compensation for extra hours required of them.” “As a Navy Reservist, the length of time to receive per diem after submitting documents to base PSD is taking well over the 30 days for payment to help pay for lodging and electrical bills locally. It has taken over 45 days on a couple occasions.” “PSD is undermanned and unable to function in a timely/effective manner. It took over 50 days to receive my PCS travel claim after filling out the required paperwork. With travel claim, TLA, BAH, first month’s rent on apartment here, and a few smaller allowances outstanding, I was owed over $15,000 by the Navy at one point. This was an extreme financial burden. No service member should be required to carry this burden.”

Figures 6 and 7 compare females and males, and military and civilian survey participants on their ratings of QOHL. Figure 6 compares females and males; females and males rated QOHL comparably. Figure 7 contrasts military and civilian participants on their rating of QOHL. No differences can be observed due to the small number of civilian participants. In order to get a clearer understanding of the drivers of survey participant QOHL rating, participants were asked to indicate whether the following factors have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on their QOHL rating. These factors included:
Factors of potential concern were identified by distributional analyses, where 20% negative responses served as a baseline. The aggregate of all survey participants indicated cost of living (49 percent), recreational opportunities (26 percent), and access to spouse employment (21 percent) factors had a negative impact on QOHL. Comparisons between demographic groups yielded more specific results. Civilian participants indicated that access to medical/dental care (53 percent) and shopping and dining opportunities (26 percent) impacted their QOHL rating.
Figure 6. Distribution of QOHL from the pre-event survey. The x-axis represents the percentage of survey participants and the y-axis lists the rating scale. Scanning from left to right allows the reader to compare the percentage of female and male participant ratings on QOHL.

Figure 7. Distribution of QOHL from the pre-event survey. The x-axis represents the percentage of survey participants and the y-axis lists the rating scale. Scanning from left to right allows the reader to compare the percentage of military and civilian participant ratings on QOHL.

Mission Tools & Resources

Participants were asked to identify tools and resources that they believe are inadequate to accomplish the command’s mission. The items addressed include: people, training, workspace, computer, software, internet, intranet, equipment, materials & supplies. Again, 20 percent negative responses served as a baseline. There were two areas identified as inadequacies; people (44 percent) and training (30 percent).
SURVEY RESPONSE FREQUENCY REPORT

Numerical values in the following tables summarize survey responses to forced-choice questions as counts and/or percentages (%). Response codes are listed below in the order that they appear.

- **SD**  Strongly Disagree
- **D**  Disagree
- **N**  Neither Agree or Disagree
- **A**  Agree
- **SA**  Strongly Agree

- **-**  Negative
- **N**  Neutral
- **+**  Positive

- **N**  Never
- **R**  Rarely
- **S**  Sometimes
- **F**  Frequently
- **A**  Always
On a scale from 1 (worst) to 10 (best), please rate your Quality of Work Life (QOWL). QOWL is the degree to which you enjoy where you work and the availability of opportunities for professional growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>8.65%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>18.05%</td>
<td>16.54%</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the factors below, please indicate whether they have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on your QOWL rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership opportunities</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Hours/Schedule</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement opportunities</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and recognition</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command morale</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command climate</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of workplace facilities</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a scale from 1 (worst) to 10 (best), please rate your Quality of Home Life (QOHL). QOHL is the degree to which you enjoy where you live and the opportunities available for housing, recreation, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
<td>9.77%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>14.66%</td>
<td>22.56%</td>
<td>12.78%</td>
<td>16.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the factors below, please indicate whether they have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on your QOHL rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of home</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the school for dependent children</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the childcare available</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping &amp; dining opportunities</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to spouse employment</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to medical/dental care</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My command gives me sufficient time during working hours to participate in a physical readiness exercise program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My current workweek affords enough time to complete mission tasks in a timely manner while maintaining an acceptable work-home life balance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My position description is current and accurately describes my functions, tasks, and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I work more hours than I report in a pay period because I cannot complete all assigned tasks during scheduled work hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Human Resource Service Center provides timely, accurate responses to my queries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My (local) Human Resources Office provides timely, accurate responses to my queries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DON civilian recruitment process is responsive to my command’s civilian personnel requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the last performance evaluation cycle, my supervisor provided me with feedback that enabled me to improve my performance before my formal performance appraisal/EVAL/FITREP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am satisfied with the overall quality of my workplace facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My command is concerned about my safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My command has a program in place to address potential safety issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My job is important and makes a contribution to my command.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_________ is occurring at my command.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternization</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Sex Discrimination</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Discrimination</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazing</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following tools and resources are adequate to accomplish the command’s mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workspace</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intranet</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have adequate leadership guidance to perform my job successfully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication down the chain of command is effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication up the chain of command is effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My performance evaluations have been fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The awards and recognition program is fair and equitable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Military and civilian personnel work well together at my command.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My command’s Equal Opportunity Program (EO - to include Equal Employment Opportunity & Command Managed Equal Opportunity) is effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My command adequately protects my personal information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My superiors treat me with respect and consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My command attempts to resolve command climate issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have adequate time at work to complete required training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you supervise Department of the Navy (DON) civilians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When did you receive civilian supervisory training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;12mos</th>
<th>1-3 yrs</th>
<th>&gt;3 yrs</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Focus Group Perceptions

On 11 September 2016, NAVINSGEN convened focus groups and interviews with various active duty military (47) and civilian personnel (23). Each focus group was scheduled for 60 minutes (30 minutes for interviews) and included one facilitator and two note takers. The facilitator followed a protocol script: (a) NAVINSGEN personnel introductions, (b) brief introduction to the NAVINSGEN mission, (c) privacy, non-attribution, and basic ground rules statements, (d) participant-derived list of topics having the most impact on the mission, job performance, or quality of life (QOL), and (e) subsequent discussion of participant-derived topics with an emphasis on refinement and understanding of perceived impact. Focus group participants were asked to characterize as major, moderate, or minor the impact on the mission, job performance, and/or quality of life for each topic using a standardized Impact Matrix (See Matrix 1 below). Note takers transcribed focus group proceedings, which were subsequently coded by the NAVINSGEN staff to protect the confidentiality of participants.

Matrix 1: Command Inspection Impact Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>• Severe negative impact on command climate or quality of life</td>
<td>• Negatively impacts the mission, job performance, or quality of life, but does not meet any of the Major impact requirements</td>
<td>• General distractor that does not meet the Moderate impact standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unable to accomplish a mission or task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accepted substantial risk to accomplish an assigned mission or task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deferred key mission readiness tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clearly violates law or regulation (e.g., Title 10, U.S.C., 32 CFR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Navy policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>• Outstanding aspect of command climate or quality of life</td>
<td>• Positively impacts mission, job performance, or quality of life, but does not meet any of the Major impact requirements</td>
<td>• General positive effect that does not meet the Moderate impact standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 lists the top five focus group topics that were expressed as a major impact on the mission, job performance, or QOL. The overall tone of the focus groups and interviews was earnest and professional with participants bringing up heartfelt concerns regarding quality of life, job performance, and mission accomplishment. Participants seemed to be forthcoming with their participation and discussions were lively.
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Table 1. Participant-Derived Focus Group Topics Expressed as a Major Impact on the mission, job performance, or quality of life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manning/Rotation</td>
<td>↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and Compensation</td>
<td>↓↓↓↓↓</td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Knowledge &amp; Development</td>
<td>↓↓↓↓↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>↓↓↓↓</td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Process</td>
<td>↓↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Descending order of the number of focus group/interview topics that were expressed as a major impact on the mission, job performance, and/or quality of life in at least two military or civilian groups; colored arrows indicate active duty military (↑) or civilian (↓). An arrow pointing up indicates a positive impact. An arrow pointing down is a negative impact.

Manning/Manpower

The most frequently mentioned topic in the focus groups centered on manning and manpower. All military focus groups (6) indicated manning and manpower has a major negative impact. One focus group of senior civilians also discussed manning and manpower as a major negative impact. Intertwined with manning and manpower discussions were military twelve month PCS orders. Participants indicated that much of the commands’ issues stems from the twelve month PCS orders for military personnel. The 12 month orders placed strain in areas such as administration (for example; PSD, housing, and pay), turnover process, documentation, workload, command climate and watch schedules. Below are samples of the comments from participants.

Civilian comments: “SORM [Standard Organization and Regulations Manual] has six people in my shop. I am a one man show.” “We are lacking resources, turnover is too much, too frequent, gapping billets due to HR inefficiencies.” “The lack of Management Internal Control policy enforcement is due to turnover.” “The turnover creates a deficiency of continuity.” “We need to address all of our NAVCENT requirements with the pending manpower cuts. We have to alert higher authority what the effects of these cuts will be in order to improve mission readiness.” “Tour lengths for military tie the civilians’ hands.” “Military turnover means knowledge is not retained.”

Military Officer comments: “There is poor turnover or no turnover.” “There is a lack of standardization. People don't know what to do except what they are told, but that isn’t always accurate.” “NAVCENT is great at what we do; we just don't know what we are supposed to do.” “Leadership doesn't tell you what you need to do. Should be in a binder.” “Manning positions are gapped.” “Leaders have to choose whether to accept a gap or waive training requirements.
for incoming personnel.” “I was told we are fully manned at 86% but that means 20 watches a month, 77 hours a week. If I was asked whether I would bring my family here, I would tell them absolutely not.” “We are undermanned. I spend so much time daily doing administrative items such as fonts/colors on a brief distracting me from watch standing/operational tasking because we lack office support.” “Turnover is 7-10 days but you’re also doing indoctrination and trying to find a house.” “We need more qualified, technically savvy people to conduct operational watches.” “We have one person doing a job where we used to have three people, resulting in a huge backlog and creating a single point of failure.” “Everybody with SCI gets put on Internal Look watch.” “Billets are gapped.” “I leave in October; my relief will not arrive until March.” “Turnover prevents you from doing a 1 for 1 comparison with other commands. High turnover yields inefficiencies.” “Those that get detailed do it for money not necessarily your best performers.” “People are working 7 days a week.” “High turnover negatively impacts everything we do here.” “Twelve month tours, but often only 10 months - people arrive at the end of the month and try and leave early.” “This is a detailing problem, constantly reorganizing reactively based upon who’s coming here.” “Very hard to train new action officers - 6 months investment for 3 months work. It’s a deficit that you can't train your way out of it. Do I take the time to train a new action officer or just do the work myself? Rotation causes higher workload for PSD, housing, etc. Why do we have one year orders?”

Military Enlisted comments: “Shifting our focus as a command - new requirements and extra work results in long hours - 0300-1800. A lot of positions are down. I have been pulled to fill in for others absence. Lack of manning is critical. I believe we have manning, but are poorly assigned.” “I have worked 25 to 30 days straight without a day off. Caused by emergencies, leave etc.” “We have one person doing a three person job.” “Turnover is so fast (12 months). Why not make it 24 months?” “I am in a 2 person shop barely keeping my head above water, overwhelming.” “Admin is undermanned. PSD puts more burdens on us. They are open 3 hours.” “We have a PS1 coming in and he won't see his replacement. Setting them up for failure.” “We do not have enough people with proper security clearance. They arrive and sit in another shop until they get their clearance.” “Sailors perform 2 or 3 times duty as manning shows we are manned.” “I work so much there is no time to lead.” “How do I evaluate a sailor that is farmed out to another section?” “Recent manning review board reduced enlisted. Plan was to have officers remain for 24 months. Reduced civilian and enlisted personnel.” “DONCAF backup results in 18 months to get a clearance. You can’t start process until you get orders. Makes a one year tour a significant problem.”

Pay and Compensation

All three Civilian focus groups and one enlisted focus group indicated pay and compensation issues impact job performance, mission accomplishment and QOL. Some of the themes discussed in the focus groups included the disparity in housing allowances and IRS rules between military, contractors and civilians, application of comprehensive hours. Foreign National Direct Hires (BG) discussed some unique issues. Examples of their discussion topics included unemployment taxes, healthcare, the 12 month military orders, and Bahrain Ministry of Labor pay scale. Enlisted discussed issues related to COLA and PSC expenses. Below are samples of comments from participants.
Civilian comments: “Using personal vehicle and time to travel once a month for command business and not being compensated.” “Using personal phones and internet for work.” “1% unemployment being deducted from pay, but under BAH rule security shouldn’t pay. Even if they pay it, not able to receive the six months unemployment by Minister of Labor.” “Need better communication between Navy HR and Bahrain government.” “Because of the one year turnover, [there is] no proper continuity of issues [in order] to get fixed. Recommend having BGs represented during turnover.” “Bahrain Minister of Labor increased pay scale. BGs told they would fall under same scale. Due to pay restrictions, BG pay was not increased. Pay difference is now 15 percent.” “Military got a raise in COLA, civilians don’t get COLA. Costs increased but pay did not. Pay is not going up with cost of living.” “Civilian pay is not tax free. Contractors don’t get taxed on the first $100,000.” “Comp Time is hard to use. I have over 170 hours of comp time. I was asked to sign a document rolling my comp time hours over to the next year because there was no money to pay them out.” “Military COLA increase is not fair to civilians because we did not get an increase.” “Locality pay in the area is not appropriate. Cost of living has increased and civilian pay has not been increased to match the increases.” “Civilians do not get tax free pay while military and contractors do.” “If hired as a US citizen from Bahrain, you are not paid a housing allowance”. “Before furlough, we were compensated for comp time. I have maxed out comp-time (participant was asked if he was forced, he said that he was not being forced to work additional hours, but felt that he had to in order to get all the work done.).” “We are tracking hours on time sheet to prove more people needed. But, we are unable to account for weekend hours.”

Military comments: “I am not getting Family Separation Allowance.” “COLA is lower than Hawaii, but this place is more expensive. Out in town prices are high. Gasoline has doubled since I got here.” “I had to pay out of pocket for first 10 days (referring to TLA process).” “If you are single, you have to bring $3,000. There is no advanced pay.” “You can be out of pocket for first 30 days until PSD repays you. I got here with $27K. After paying first month's rent and associated expenses I had $12K left over.”

Professional Knowledge and Development

Participants indicated professional knowledge and development was a topic having a significant impact on mission, job performance, and/or QOL. There was difference in perceptions between civilian participants and military. Civilians expressed concerns regarding their initial command orientation program and training opportunities are not available to them to keep up their certifications. Military participants expressed concerns about not receiving the proper training before arriving on station and lack of a proper turnover.

Civilian comments: “There is no training or command orientation training for new civilian government employees. I was told to Google it.” “I felt like there was no support. HR did not go over my benefits such as healthcare.” “Base has indoctrination training, but not for civilians.” “Military personnel are able to get TAD Training. Civilians are unable to get required training that requires funding and also training in route.” “Some people are paying out of their own pockets to maintain certificates.”
Military comments: “Didn’t get upfront training, didn't have TS on arrival, and so I waited around. Then when you get to the watch floor, it was like you are so stupid, how do you not know this already?” “Nobody is willing to help you on the watch floor; it is not a positive atmosphere.” “I went to 3 months joint planning course and was assigned somewhere other than plans.” “Constant churn of new people who haven't been trained and it is easy to just accept it.”

I spend time resending info, making sure font sizes correct, building PowerPoint slides, “We don’t have time to train because we are getting the job done.” “We don’t have a NATOPS, this isn’t pilot land (watch floor), lack of SOPs/written procedures.” “Several watch standers did not receive enroute training because of manning shortfalls.” “There is a huge knowledge gap because of high turnover and lack of job specific training.” “If something pops up in another country in our area of responsibility, we would call a crisis action team but they aren't trained.” “I became a Crisis Action Team member because I had the clearance not because I’m trained.” “Maritime Staff Officers' Course great for operational planning not necessarily for watch standing.”

Human Resources

The topic of human resources was indicated to be a major or moderate negative impact on mission, job performance, and/or QOL for all civilian focus groups and interviews. Some of the concerns expressed included the lack of customer service, and pay concerns resulting in some participants indicating they go to the States to receive the services they need. Foreign National Direct Hires discussed their concern over medical insurance which is unique to them. Samples of the type of comments from participants are included below.

Civilian comments (BG): “Medical insurance from the Navy only covers during working hours.” “We (BGs) offered to pay premiums for better insurance.” “There is different insurance for Embassy and Navy employees.” “We get sick leave is paid.”

Civilian comments: “TQSA (Temporary Quarters Subsistence Allowance) is supposed to be processed monthly, sometimes it takes up to ten months.” “HR doesn’t know their jobs.” “A one hour process took four hours.” “People don’t know the instructions.” “Paperwork held up, I got my orders 1 day prior to flight.” “Turnover is an issue.” “In processing was horrible.” “It took 2 and half years before I was paid TLA.” “It takes 10 to 12 months to fill positions.” “I am not going through our HR, I am reaching out to the US HR for my needs.” “HR is not willing to learn.” “It took me 6 and half weeks to get my first paycheck. A hard copy was sent to my home of record, it was missing most of my pay.” “People will leave because of HR support.” “Is this a hard to fill area? If so, make it a 10 year limit not 5.” “Why have a placement of PPP [Priority Placement Program] when there are no possibilities for hire. People are writing PDs to specific contractors impacting the PPPs.” “I have to go back to Norfolk for HR.” “Waiver process for civilians to stay in Bahrain is way too long.” “Civilian tour length limitations hurt command knowledge and continuity.” “We are cutting vacant billets that were gapped instead of looking into why they were gapped.” “Major Headquarters Activity [MHA] reductions when 24/7 coverage is required with only 2 people because of a gapped billet is impossible.”
**Hiring Process**

The topic of hiring process was indicated to have a negative impact on mission, job performance, and/or QOL. Participants indicated concerns regarding equity in hiring practices and the timeliness of hiring processes. A sample of their comments on this topic is included below.

**Civilian comments:** “People are being hired because they know someone, not because they are qualified.” “HR does not tell you why you were passed over.” “Not equal opportunity.” “Not getting job affects civilian morale.” “Job hire based on who you know, not on qualifications.” “Qualification for job does not match criteria.” “Hiring people from other commands not necessarily the best, helping buddies, jobs not being competed for. This process is making me want to leave. Promotions are not fair. Qualified people not getting jobs.”

**Military comments:** “Takes forever here to hire someone and takes even longer at OCHR Stennis.” “A 10 day requirement takes at least 30 days.” “Six to 9 months to get new civilian.” “Hard to get people to come, than add a problematic HRO makes it that much harder.” “Pay problems for civilians even though it was as simple as switching UICs.” “Incorrect info put out by HRO saying civilians can do ninety days housing search when its 45 days.” “Housing process is backed up. I found a place in 7 days; they said come back in 3 weeks for processing.”

**Other Topics to Consider**

There were a number of topics discussed by focus group and interview participants that are noteworthy. Below is a sample of the comments for each topic.

**Resources and Supply**

(2 major negative): Participants discussed their perception of a lack of resources and supplies. Samples of the comments are presented below.

**Civilian comments:** “Unable to get work done due to lack of resources, such as computers, phones, vehicles, and travel reimbursement.” “We are a new command headquarters with starting new job. There is no efficiency with lack of tools.” “Lack of physical resources, need to use personal items such as cars, phones, and computers to complete our job.”

**Workflow**

(2 major negative): Participants discussed their concerns regarding conducting work outside their position description and the lack of work processes. Samples of the comments are presented below.

**Civilian comments:** “I am doing jobs outside my PD, I am a GS 11 should not have the same responsibilities as a GS12.” “Our original PDs were written with a lack of complete knowledge of what was needed.” “No staff officer page on how to do correspondence.” “I am an Action officer who came with tactical background, but no experience as a staff officer and staff processes.” “There is a lack of written guidance. New rules and processes come out verbally -
only good for those in the room at the time.” (Discussion regarding Standard Operating Procedures) “Many documents have to go through a lot of people. No electronic routing. Paper folders get lost all the time causing delays.”

**Command Climate**

(2 major negative): Comments in junior enlisted focus groups and interviews concerning command climate indicated that in the past there were problems, but, these problems have been addressed by the command and they report seeing improvements over the past few months. Comments suggest that operational tempo can negatively contribute to command climate. No comments are included in this document because comments might identify participants.

**Host Nation Relationship**

(2 major negative and 1 minor negative): There are different issues from BG civilian employees and junior enlisted participants. BG participants indicated concerns regarding visas. Junior enlisted was concerned about their treatment by local nationals. Below are samples of their comments.

**Civilian comments:** “Navy stopped visiting visas for parents and grown children.” “Families have trouble sponsoring family visas.” “There is a double standard for Bahraini immigrants and military standards.”

**Military comments:** “Off base drivers are dangerous. They make gestures or flirt. Ask if they want coffee.” “Someone stole my bike from off-base residence.” “There is a lot of prostitution.” “Have to be careful, not sure what people will do.” This is a safety issue.” “I just have people whistle at me.” “I had women co-workers who had people follow them.” “I have read it on the force protection reports.” “I have experienced inappropriate things.” “You can call NCIS (force protection report). You can get locals involved.”  

(b) (3) (B)

“Women get targeted a lot. Honking horns.” “Had good experience with command personnel.” “I feel the locals are not very…women get heckled.” “A car full of men tried to get me into their car.” “I felt the sponsor could have warned me. I am straight out of high school. Sponsorship has gotten better over the year.”

**Resource Prioritization**

(1 major negative): One focus group discussed Chief watch standing concerns. A sample of their comments is provided below.

**Military comments:** “Admiral stated he wanted a Chief at all times. Nine Chiefs rotate. We are out of our shop two weeks at a time. Your only job is to be there. Twelve hours of sitting.” “It seems to be a knee jerk reaction to a sexual harassment incident. It is completely pointless to have a Chief there. The harassment allegation was dismissed.” “It is a preventative solution that did not happen at night. There is an O-5 on watch.” “Door handling watch when visitors come - We have to open their door. Eight people must be on-duty to open 3 sets of doors.”
Medical and Dental

(1 major negative): A civilian focus group discussed the concerns regarding medical and dental services. A sample of their comments is provided below.

Civilian comments: “Citizens have to go out in town for medical, pay at the time of service and wait to be reimbursed.” “Retirees can’t use base facilities or Tricare Prime. Have to use Tricare Standard.” “If you file a claim under $150.00, you will not get reimbursed. You will get a portion back if the bill is over $150.00.” “Base clinic is not equipped to handle more people.” “Healthcare is cost prohibited. What cost $60.00 in US cost $800.00 here. Need more insurance options for overseas.”

Policy and Process

(1 major negative): A civilian focus group (BG) discussed their concern about policy and process issues related to their unique employment status. A sample of their comments is provided below.

Civilian comments (BG): “We are confused over regulations - who do we work for. Salary regulations don't specify if you work for BAH or Navy.” “Don't fall under BAH for visas.” “Holiday regulations don't follow BAH.” But, we sometimes fall under 690-3.” Navy not consistent with taking responsibility, they are using for negative but not positive, won’t let us go to Europe because Navy is responsible, but when someone dies, the Navy is no longer responsible.”

Mission

(1 major positive): A civilian focus group made a point to discuss the positive impact mission has on job performance, mission accomplishment, and QOL. A sample of their comment is provided below.

Civilian comments: “Citizens are here because they love the mission, choose to be here, and are dedicated to the Navy and the Navy’s goal. It’s a calling to be here.”

Base Amenities

(1 major positive): A civilian focus group indicated that the base amenities had a positive impact on QOL. A sample of their comment is provided below.

Civilian comments: “My wife likes it here. Money provides for nice house.”