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Executive Summary

The Naval Inspector General (NAVINSGEN) conducted a command inspection of Naval Supply Systems Command (NAVSUP) from 6-15 July 2016. Our last command inspection of NAVSUP was completed in 2011. The inspection team consisted of NAVINSGEN staff, augmented with subject matter experts from Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA), U.S. Fleet Forces Command (USFF), Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition (ASN(RD&A)), Navy Installations Command (CNIC), Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR), Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR), Naval Intelligence Activity (NIA), Naval Facilities and Engineering Command (NAVFAC), Naval Safety Center (NAVSAFCEN), Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy for Policy (DUSN(P)), Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS), and Special Security Office - Navy (SSO Navy).

During our visit, we assessed the command’s overall mission readiness in execution of its echelon 2 responsibilities. Moreover, we assessed their functions and tasks as defined by various laws, policies, and regulations and as specifically outlined in OPNAVINST 5450.349, Mission, Functions, and Tasks of Commander, Naval Supply Systems Command, dated 25 April 2012. We assessed administrative programs, facilities, safety and environmental compliance, security, and Sailor programs. Additionally, we conducted surveys and facilitated focus group discussions to assess the quality of work life (QOWL) and quality home life (QOHL) for Navy military, civilians, and their families.

This was an above-average inspection. Prior to the inspection, we solicited input from Fleet and Type Commanders, and their feedback was largely positive. Additionally, we were impressed with NAVSUP’s self-assessment process. It began early, included guidance from key leadership, monthly updates to senior leadership, and progressed in complexity over time, indicating an organization continuously probing deeper into its own processes. We believe this process directly contributed to the success of the inspection.

MISSION PERFORMANCE

The Mission Performance Team utilized survey and focus group responses, document review, group discussions, and face-to-face interviews to gather information and assess NAVSUP mission performance.

Mission, Functions, and Tasks

NAVSUP is accomplishing its assigned mission, functions, and tasks (MFT) albeit with risk in areas where the headquarters staff lacks robust oversight and/or staff depth. Past budget and personnel cuts have forced NAVSUP to delegate numerous functions to subordinate commands, and the small size of the headquarters staff limits their ability to provide robust oversight. While delegation of tasks is a normal Navy occurrence, we believe that oversight of delegated items is a function of the command, and in those areas where they lack oversight, NAVSUP is accepting a low-moderate amount of risk. We recommend NAVSUP mitigate this risk by inspecting these mission functions during recurring echelon 3 command inspections. NAVSUP’s MFT is out of 3-year periodicity; a draft revision was under internal review at the time of the inspection.
Fleet Material Support
NAVSUP’s work in generating Performance Based Logistics (PBL) contracts is noteworthy. These PBL contracts have reduced costs across the enterprise, as they are incentivized to create win-win solutions for Navy and industry. Feedback from Fleet and Type Commanders is generally positive, and the Fleet is involved at appropriate points in the process.

Logistics and Base Operating Support
NAVSUP is executing its functions to develop workload ashore requirements for Littoral Combat Ships (LCS) and USS Zumwalt (DDG-1000). Staff knowledge in this area is excellent, and their efforts align with the Chief of Naval Operations’ (CNO) guidance. However, Navy Information Application Product Suite server unreliability negatively impacts Fleet readiness by necessitating work that the system was designed to eliminate.

Acquisition Logistics Support to Program Executive Offices and Program Managers
Based on a Memorandum of Agreement with NAVSEA, NAVSUP ceased performing Integrated Logistics Assessments, even though it is listed in their MFT. Since this may impact other systems commands (SYSCOMs), we believe this decision requires approval from the Chief of Naval Operations (OPNAV) staff.

Contracting
NAVSUP has the significant responsibility of providing contracting for commands that lack contracting authority, and they have delegated contract writing to subordinate commands (Fleet Logistics Centers). NAVSUP headquarters personnel knowledge is adequate; however, the command lacks a sufficient number of personnel to provide robust oversight.

Quality of Life Programs
NAVSUP maintains appropriate oversight of the Navy Exchange Service Command and quality of life programs, with a few exceptions. We recommend increased oversight of the Navy Lodge Program and the Navy Food Management Team inspections. In addition, we observed a policy gap related to Flag Mess ashore. Flag Mess Ashore policy oversight effectively ceased when Morale, Welfare, and Recreation functions transferred from the Bureau of Naval Personnel to CNIC.

Navy-wide Policy and Program Management
NAVSUP is effectively executing its function of providing Navy-wide policy and program management. NAVSUP policies are largely current, and most programs are well managed; however, we recommend NAVSUP conduct annual audits of the Navy’s Fuel Card Program.

Headquarters Functions
Human Resources
We concur with NAVSUP’s self-identified concerns over hiring timelines and locality pay. While NAVSUP’s metrics for end-to-end hiring timelines are better than the echelon 2 average, they exceed the Navy’s goal of 80 days, adversely impacting the command’s mission. Additionally, NAVSUP’s inability to offer Washington DC locality pay is negatively impacting the command’s ability to hire and retain the highest quality work force, since federal jobs in neighboring counties qualify for this pay adjustment.
Financial Management
NAVSUP expressed concerns about the Navy Working Capital Fund-Supply Management. In fiscal years 2015 and 2016 (FY15-16), the Office of Budget (FMB) directed NAVSUP to be the vehicle for mitigating liquidity issues in the Navy Working Capital Funds. As directed, NAVSUP created artificial surcharges by temporarily re-pricing specific items. These transactions resulted in multiple negative impacts to NAVSUP and other customers. Furthermore, we believe the continued adjustments in two successive years suggest that the Navy has not addressed the root cause of the liquidity issue.

Strategic Planning
NAVSUP’s strategic planning process was comprehensive. They researched industry and fellow SYSCOM plans to determine best practices, and ensured alignment with CNO’s Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority.

Continuity of Operations
The NAVSUP Continuity of Operations Plan is one of the most comprehensive plans we have assessed. It is not only sound on paper, but also in execution. Recommendations from our 2011 NAVSUP Command Inspection were adopted.

Manpower
The Manpower Program is not compliant with governing instructions. In recent years, NAVSUP has made many changes delegating headquarters functions to its echelon 3 commands. NAVSUP has not conducted a Shore Manpower Requirements Determination, which is required following a significant change in scope or mission purpose, significant organizational changes, or when subordinate organizational relationships are altered.

Training
FLTMAPS records indicate NAVSUP’s GMT completion rate for FY14 and FY15 were 64% and 84% respectively.

SECURITY
Command Security Overview
NAVSUP Security Programs are appropriately arranged with a majority of the responsibilities assigned to the Facilities, Safety, and Security Division (N10) within the N1N5 Directorate. Operations Security (OPSEC) is within the N3N4 Directorate and Cybersecurity and Personally Identifiable Information (PII) are within the N6 and NOGC (Legal) Directorates, respectively. OPSEC is managed by one civilian employee as a major collateral duty, and one Reservist.

NAVSUP has a robust command oversight program that conducts reviews of subordinate echelon 3 and 4 commands on a rotating 3-year schedule, with plans to add OPSEC oversight to the program.
Information Security
NAVSUP’s Information Security Program is not fully compliant with governing directives. NAVSUPINST 5530.1E, Naval Supply Systems Command (NAVSUP) Security Manual, does not have all required information security elements of a command security instruction. Although the security staff is knowledgeable, all command personnel do not fully understand or comply with all security policies, programs, or regulations.

Personnel Security
NAVSUP’s Personnel Security Program is compliant with governing directives with minor administrative deficiencies noted.

Industrial Security
NAVSUP’s Industrial Security Program is not fully compliant with governing directives. NAVSUP headquarters maintains 31 contracts; five are classified. The Contracting Officer’s Representative is not conducting all required duties specified by governing directives for classified contracts.

Physical Security and Antiterrorism Force Protection
NAVSUP’s Physical Security/Antiterrorism Force Protection Program is compliant with governing directives.

Operations Security
NAVSUP’s OPSEC Program is not fully compliant with governing directives. NAVSUP recently established an OPSEC Program and expects to be fully compliant and effective if adequate resources, manning, and command emphasis continue at current levels. The DUSN(P) Security Directorate conducted a Security Assistance Visit in April 2016, and the improvements were evident during this inspection.

Counterintelligence Training
NAVSUP’s Counterintelligence Training Program is not compliant with governing directives. This was self-identified and NAVSUP has initiated a process to correct the issue in the near term, with long-term processes in place to maintain the program into the future.

Cybersecurity
NAVSUP’s Cybersecurity Program is compliant with governing directives. NAVSUP has a dedicated Information Technology staff performing the cybersecurity mission and consistent oversight of subordinate commands.
**Personally Identifiable Information**

NAVSUP’s PII Program is not fully compliant with governing directives. The PII Program has repeat findings from the NAVINSGEN 2011 NAVSUP Command Inspection. The NAVSUP Privacy Act Team conducts meetings, but the discussions are high level, actionable items are not documented, and processes are not in place to prevent the inadvertent release of PII.

**Insider Threat**

We reviewed NAVSUP’s compliance with the Department of the Navy’s (DON) Insider Threat Program governing directives. Overall, NAVSUP has a strong security enterprise that significantly limits vulnerabilities that could support an insider threat.

**FACILITIES, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENERGY CONSERVATION, AND SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH**

NAVSUP is effectively executing mission requirements with respect to facilities, environmental, and energy conservation. Oversight of subordinate command safety programs is effective, but the headquarters safety program is not fully compliant with governing instructions.

The NAVSUP Safety and Occupational Health Program is not fully compliant. NAVSUP has no Operational Risk Management Program, and tracking of motorcycle riders in the command requires improvement. Additionally, there is no formal means for the Commander to oversee the effectiveness of the NAVSUP enterprise safety program, and the NAVSUP Safety Manager lacks the technical expertise to provide in-depth direction and oversight to lower echelon industrial activities.

Oversight and direction of NAVSUP enterprise infrastructure is effective, but working capital funded facilities requirements may not be based on the Department of Defense (DoD) Facility Sustainment Model; corrective measures are underway.

Environmental Programs are compliant, and we observed notable progress since our last inspection with respect to the Consolidated Hazardous Material Reutilization and Inventory Management Program - the program is 97 percent fully implemented; the remaining 5 sites will be fully implemented by the end of FY17.

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

NAVSUP’s Resource Management Programs are effective and executed in accordance with governing instructions, with the exception of one program assessed as not fully compliant.

**Personal Property Management**

The Personal Property Management (PPM) Program is not fully compliant with governing instructions. The Accountable Property Officer has not completed appropriate PPM training.

**PREVENTION AND RESPONSE**

NAVSUP’s Prevention and Response Programs are effective and executed in accordance with governing instructions.
COMMAND OVERSIGHT

NAVSUP’s Command Oversight Programs are effective and executed in accordance with governing instructions, with the exception of three programs that are assessed as not fully compliant.

Legal/Ethics/Freedom of Information Act

NAVSUP’s Legal/Ethics/Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Programs are not fully compliant with governing instructions. Although the programs have many effective elements, there are three areas where the programs are not compliant with governing instructions.

Ethics

The Ethics Program is not fully compliant with governing instructions. An otherwise excellent Ethics Program is weakened by failure to adhere to the 60-day initial review requirement relating to Confidential Financial Disclosure reports (OGE 450s).

Freedom of Information Act

The FOIA Program is not fully compliant with governing instructions. The NAVSUP FOIA Program is not meeting FOIA response time requirements.

Victim and Witness Assistance Program

The Victim and Witness Assistance Program (VWAP) is not fully compliant with governing instructions. NAVSUP does not provide enterprise oversight of the VWAP Program. VWAP was not included as an item of interest during regular inspections, and procedures do not exist to ensure compliance with governing regulations or VWAP requirements articulated by regional commanders.

ANALYSIS

Survey and focus group discussions found that QOHL and QOWL at NAVSUP are higher than the historical echelon 2 command averages. Rated on a 10-point scale, the NAVSUP QOHL and QOWL are 8.54 and 6.83, respectively; the corresponding echelon 2 command historical averages are 8.10 and 6.69.

Morale and Command Climate

The top three topics discussed included command communication, work hours/schedule, and professional knowledge and development. Command communication and work hours/schedule were viewed as positive. Professional knowledge and development was viewed as negative by civilians, but as positive by military. Other noteworthy discussions included the impact of locality pay and the lengthy civilian hiring process.

SAILOR PROGRAMS

All Sailor Programs were fully compliant. This was the first FY16 command inspection where all Sailor Programs were assessed as fully compliant.
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Observations and Findings

MISSION PERFORMANCE

The Mission Performance Team utilized survey and focus group responses, document review, group discussions, face-to-face interviews, and feedback from Fleet and Type Commanders to gather information and assess the mission performance of Naval Supply Systems Command (NAVSUP). These findings were applied to the functions and tasks as assigned in OPNAVINST 5450.349 (Mission, Functions, and Tasks of Commander, Naval Supply Systems Command), dated 25 April 2012.

NAVSUP’s mission is to provide for the material support needs of the Navy for supplies and supporting services by developing and issuing Navy policies and methods for the procurement, safeguarding, distribution, and disposal of naval material; to ensure Navy policies and methods are fully integrated and aligned with those of other Department of Defense (DoD) logistics support providers; to provide technical guidance and direction to naval activities concerning execution of supply policies and methods; to provide spare and repair parts, assigned supplies, logistics services, and quality of life services to naval units and other authorized customers; to coordinate weapon system life cycle support and other requirements and efforts with DoD components to ensure Navy logistics support needs are met effectively and efficiently.

Our overall assessment is that NAVSUP is effectively executing its complex mission of providing for the material support needs of the Navy. NAVSUP has pioneered supply solutions and adopted best practices from other government entities and private industry to meet readiness requirements while attempting to minimize costs. However, staff reductions, information technology (IT) constraints, and reorganization efforts initiated by NAVSUP several years ago have encroached on their ability to exercise the full scope of oversight across its broad portfolio. Future Major Headquarter Activity (MHA) manpower reductions will further exacerbate NAVSUP’s ability to perform oversight of subordinate commands.

We reviewed the following mission areas:

- Fleet Material Support
- Logistics and Base Operating Support
- Acquisition Logistics Support to Program Executive Offices and Program Managers
- Navy Field Contracting
- Quality of Life Programs
- Navy-wide Policy and Program Management

Additionally, we inspected the following headquarters command functions:

- Human Resources
- Equal Employment Opportunity
- Command Managed Equal Opportunity
- Financial Management
- Strategic Planning
- Continuity of Operations
- Manpower
Training

**Mission, Functions, and Tasks**

NAVSUP is an echelon 2 shore activity that reports to the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) for execution of logistics sustainment and operating forces support responsibilities. NAVSUP is the immediate superior in command and is assigned administrative control of four echelon 3 activities and their subordinates: (1) NAVSUP Weapon Systems Support, (2) NAVSUP Global Logistics Support, (3) Navy Exchange Service Command (NEXCOM), and (4) NAVSUP Business Systems Center. Figure 1 outlines the organization of the headquarters staff and subordinate commands.

NAVSUP’s MFT instruction is dated 25 April 2012 and is out of 3-year periodicity, as required by OPNAVINST 5400.44A, Navy Organization Change Manual. NAVSUP has developed a draft revision that is under internal review.

**Recommendation 1.** That NAVSUP update and submit a draft MFT instruction for OPNAV staff’s review and signature.

NAVSUP is accomplishing its assigned MFT, accepting risk in areas where the headquarters staff lacks robust oversight and/or staff depth. Past budget and personnel cuts forced NAVSUP to delegate many functions to subordinate commands, and the small size of the headquarters
staff limits their ability to provide robust oversight. While delegation of tasks is a normal Navy occurrence, it does not absolve the NAVSUP Commander from his oversight duties. We recommend that NAVSUP mitigate this low-moderate risk by inspecting these mission functions during recurring echelon 3 command inspections.

**Recommendation 2.** That NAVSUP inspect MFT during recurring echelon 3 command inspections.

Commander, NAVSUP is also charged with duties and responsibilities as Chief of the Navy Supply Corps. In this capacity, he is the community leader for approximately 3,000 Supply Corps officers and 20,000 Sailors within 3 logistics ratings. We believe he is emphasizing the Chief role over that of the Commander due to the challenges related to the Glenn Defense Marine Asia contracting scandal that has absorbed his focus.

**Fleet Material Support**

Per their MFT, NAVSUP is tasked with providing “cradle to grave” material support for naval and allied surface ships, submarines, aircraft, and expeditionary forces. While many of these functions are executed at the headquarters level, some are delegated to subordinate commands. Overall, we found NAVSUP to be effectively executing these missions. The staff interfaces with systems command (SYSCOM) program offices, Fleets, Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), General Services Administration (GSA), and other NAVSUP activities to improve maritime and aviation readiness. NAVSUP’s work in generating Performance Based Logistics (PBL) contracts is noteworthy. These PBL contracts reduce costs across the enterprise, as they are incentivized to create win-win solutions for Navy and industry. Customer feedback is generally positive, and the Fleet is involved at appropriate points in the process.

**Total Asset Visibility**

NAVSUP effectively manages the Navy’s Total Asset Visibility Program. Through material control processes, NAVSUP monitors and tracks the receipt, storage, and issuance of assets worldwide. These processes also integrate Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) requirements into their receipt and disposition management. NAVSUP staff periodically brief the Commander on inventory accuracy and discrepancy metrics.

**Integrated Logistics Support**

OPNAVINST 5450.349 tasks NAVSUP to provide Integrated Logistics Services (ILS) in support of new ship construction and repair and modernization efforts. NAVSUP delegates this function to NAVSUP Global Logistics Support (GLS). We observed limited headquarters oversight of the delegated ILS functions, and they are not inspected as part of their periodic echelon 3 command inspections. Ownership and management are not distinctly clear as they reside in the NAVSUP N31 and N41 program offices. The actual execution of the ILS mission occurs at the echelon 3 and 4 levels, which are located in close proximity to the Fleet where construction and repairs actually occur. NAVSUP recently appointed a supervisor to oversee the ILS Program, but metrics reporting and audits have not been conducted.

**Logistics and Base Operating Support**

As an enterprise, NAVSUP is effectively executing logistics and base operating support functions as tasked in their MFT. Many of the discrete tasks that comprise this function are delegated to
NAVSUP GLS and NAVSUP Weapons System Support (WSS) in accordance with their respective MFT instructions.

Global Logistics Planning and Execution Support
NAVSUP delegated the global logistics planning and execution support task to NAVSUP GLS via NAVSUPINST 5450.127, Mission, Functions and Tasks of Naval Supply System Command Global Logistics Support. GLS provides logistics planners to major numbered Fleets and other operational staffs to ensure NAVSUP resources and capabilities are supporting operational requirements. Oversight of these planners is executed via periodic operational logistics (OpLog) updates to the NAVSUP Commander, ensuring top-down alignment within the enterprise and optimal support to operational staffs.

Workload Ashore
OPNAVINST 5450.349 tasks NAVSUP to develop workload ashore requirements, where applicable, for warfighter enterprises; develop policy, strategy, and business plans required to implement a workload ashore strategy for Navy operating forces. In general, terms, this task defines NAVSUP’s role in the larger “Distance Support” strategy set forth by the CNO’s 2007 Memorandum for Distribution, Navy Distance Support Policy. Distance support and workload ashore are concepts that seek to reduce shipboard manning aboard the Littoral Combat Ships (LCS), ZUMWALT-class destroyers, and GERALD FORD-class aircraft carriers. These concepts seek to enable manning reductions for legacy ship classes by transferring shipboard work ashore. To execute this task, NAVSUP is fully engaged with program offices, resource sponsors, and Type Commanders (TYCOMs) to optimize support for remote supply workload.

Although NAVSUP processes and personnel have significantly eased the shipboard supply workload, especially for LCS, unreliability and replication faults in the Navy Information Application Product Suite (NIAPS) server undermine workload ashore initiatives. NIAPS is the specified ship-to-shore communications medium per CNO’s Navy Distance Support Policy memorandum. Multiple Fleet customers and NAVSUP staff reported that system reliability is a concern. The cross-SYSCOM seam in NIAPS (NAVSUP is responsible for applications, Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR) is responsible for hardware) inhibits efficient and timely redress of documented deficiencies. Cumulatively, this presents risk that manning reductions enabled by the workload ashore initiative will result in the remaining, reduced number of personnel having to work overtime to overcome deficiencies in the automated communications system, and a greater likelihood of supply failures that adversely impact Fleet readiness.

Transportation and Distribution
OPNAVINST 5450.349 tasks NAVSUP to manage Navy transportation and distribution processes and the Service-wide transportation account. Additionally, the instruction tasks NAVSUP to, Provide regional transportation and distribution services; provide material processing, management and warehousing services. Although we observed limited NAVSUP headquarters oversight of these tasks, we did not find specific problems with the execution of these functions.
Ordnance Inventory Management
OPNAVINST 5450.349 tasks NAVSUP to serve as centralized inventory manager for all Navy conventional, non-nuclear ordnance and United States Marine Corps aviation ordnance; provide life-cycle program logistics support to PEOs and program managers for all conventional naval ordnance. NAVSUP delegated these responsibilities to NAVSUP GLS through the GLS MFT instruction. We observed limited oversight of these tasks from NAVSUP headquarters. NAVSUP has no ordnance inventory decision-making authority as ordnance is procured by program offices and belongs to the Fleet. NAVSUP’s role is limited to tracking inventory and making allocation recommendations.

We noted that NAVSUP GLS tracks ordnance loading in shipboard magazines that is not approved for shipboard use (Supply Code 9). This policy violation is usually due to embarked Marines loading unapproved ordnance aboard amphibious ships, and it may be done without ship’s force awareness or understanding. We did not observe processes to raise this safety issue to leadership’s attention, neither within NAVSUP nor at the Surface TYCOMs.

**Recommendation 3.** That NAVSUP staff ensures Supply Code 9 ordnance (not approved for shipboard use) loaded into shipboard magazines is briefed on a periodic basis to the NAVSUP Commander and to the surface warfare enterprise for corrective action.

Bulk Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricants
NAVSUP carries out its bulk fuel function through the NAVSUP Energy Office, co-located with DLA and its Army and Air Force counterpart Service Control Point offices located at Fort Belvoir. This group is responsible for delivering bulk and retail petroleum services, overseeing inventory management and quality surveillance (chemistry), fuel infrastructure stewardship, and ensuring compliance of regional naval fuel activities. Sound planning, management, engineering, and operations have been achieved with cross-functional, customer-oriented teams, coordination, and promulgation of policy and procedures, auditability, and robust field inspections. “Great Green Fleet” priorities are implemented by ensuring alternative fuels and biofuels are operationally transparent to the operators, rather than requiring Navy and Marine Corps platforms to be re-engineered or retrofitted. Overall, the business is running well; however, the NAVSUP Energy team self-identified some key opportunities to ensure the Bulk Fuel Program remains viable in the future:

- Non-labor budget cuts, including travel dollars for oversight functions (field inspections), fuel barge overhauls required by DoD 4715.6-R1, Regulations on Vessels Owned or Operated by the Department of Defense, and operation of flight line refueling trucks, present operational risk.
- Naval Facilities Engineering Command facility contracting timelines have caused a backlog of shore fuel tank repairs.

Information Technology and Information Management Solutions for Logistics and Financial Requirements
Mission activities for IT and information management (IM) are well managed by NAVSUP IT staff. Our team reviewed NAVSUP’s processes for IT and IM solutions for logistic and financial requirements and found that NAVSUP is meeting mission requirements. However, the NAVSUP
IT staff is unable to explore and test new logistics and financial solutions with the current level of manning.

**Acquisition Logistics Support to Program Executive Offices and Program Managers**

NAVSUP is effectively executing its acquisition logistics support functions with minor deficiencies. NAVSUP relies upon platform managers and liaison officers embedded within program offices and other SYSCOMs to support acquisition programs. NAVSUP assigns resources, delegates selected tasks to subordinates, and maintains SYSCOM and program-specific battle rhythm meetings and reports to achieve a “best fit” approach for each SYSCOM.

**Independent Logistics Assessments**

OPNAVINST 5450.349 tasks NAVSUP to validate program office compliance with specific acquisition logistics policies by conducting Independent logistics assessments. NAVSUP is not conducting independent logistics assessments (ILAs) on the program offices they support; instead, they are participating in Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA)-led ILAs on program offices. NAVSUP and NAVSEA Commanders signed a memorandum of agreement (MOA) in 2015, which transferred responsibility for several logistics functions (along with manpower) from NAVSUP to NAVSEA. NAVSEA agreed to perform ILAs; however, the fact that this task is specified in an OPNAV instruction warrants OPNAV approval.

**Recommendation 4.** That NAVSUP gain OPNAV approval of ILA reassignment via updated MFT instructions for both NAVSUP and NAVSEA.

**Integrated Logistics Support Policies, Tools, and Standards**

OPNAVINST 5450.349 tasks NAVSUP to establish an effective approach in standardizing acquisition logistics and life cycle sustainment by creating common logistics processes and defining common requirements and to collaborate with other SYSCOMs and stakeholders to fully integrate logistics support policies, tools, and standards. In its performance of these tasks, NAVSUP lacks a formal measurement process to determine if NAVSUP platform assistance resources and liaison officers are providing effective support to the assigned program offices and whether NAVSUP policies are promoted or considered in the acquisition life cycle of these program offices. Many of the life cycle logistics and integration functions are delegated to NAVSUP WSS via the WSS MFT instruction. Although informal communication and integration are in place, there does not appear to be any formalized methodology by which NAVSUP measures function execution.

Additionally, we observed the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Program presents some significant logistics challenges to the Navy:

- JSF delivery delays create numerous supply chain challenges, including cost increases due to parts obsolescence and unplanned replacement part demand not included in original life span planning.
- JSF Contractor Logistics Support (CLS) model and retirement of legacy F/A-18A-D may significantly impact Navy and NAVSUP to include challenges drawing down the entire organic legacy Navy F/A-18 supply and maintenance support infrastructure, significant reduction of Navy working capital sales and collateral impacts of this revenue.
reduction/cost sharing model, and the challenges and historic shortfalls of the CLS model in an operational logistics support model.

**Contracting Support, Oversight, and Review**

The MFT tasks NAVSUP to provide contracting for supplies and services throughout the Navy for which no other contracting activity, office, or command is delegated contracting authority. Additionally, the MFT also tasks NAVSUP to perform oversight and review of all activities with [NAVSUP]-delegated contracting authority and other activities as directed by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Acquisition and Procurement) or higher-level authority.

NAVSUP does not directly contract for any supplies or services; they delegate all contract writing to subordinate commands (Fleet Logistics Centers). NAVSUP performs oversight of delegated contracting through the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP). PPMAP centers are embedded within the same Fleet Logistics Centers where contracting work is performed. While the most recent PPMAP inspection graded NAVSUP as “satisfactory,” we believe that NAVSUP must continually stress the independent and objective nature of the embedded PPMAP centers to ensure impartial reviews.

**Recommendation 5.** That NAVSUP assess PPMAP oversight of contracting processes to ensure independent and impartial reviews.

NAVSUP conducts post-award contract reviews for clause compliance, which is noteworthy. These reviews have yielded in a dramatic Government Furnished Property (GFP) compliance increase, from four to 99 percent. Tracking of government property is a Navy-wide special interest area in support of audit readiness, and NAVSUP has exceeded expectations in ensuring compliance. If this same methodology were used across the Navy at the pre-award level, the Navy could significantly increase clause compliance, and reduce risk exposure and costs; we view this as a best practice.

**Provide Policy and Procedures for Simplified Acquisition**

OPNAVINST 5450.349 tasks NAVSUP to serve as the Department of the Navy (DON) executive agent by providing Navy-wide policy and procedures for simplified acquisition as defined in Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR). NAVSUPINST 4200.85, List of Prohibited and Special Attention Items for Simplified Acquisitions, dated 25 April 2005 (with two subsequent change transmittals) governs this area. To document policy updates, NAVSUP emails updates to key personnel and then stores them in a Contracts Knowledge website. This method may introduce unnecessary risk of policy updates not reaching the required audience and/or contracting personnel executing outside of NAVSUP authority.

**Recommendation 6.** That NAVSUP publish a revised Simplified Acquisition Procedures instruction, incorporating all changes published via email or website.

**Quality of Life**

NAVSUP is tasked with responsibility for several DON programs that directly impact Sailor quality of life. We assessed their oversight of NEXCOM, to include Navy Exchange operations, Navy Lodge, Ships Store Program, and Uniform and Protective Clothing Engineering Support, as well as Household Goods, Postal Service, Food Service, Cash and Retail Operation Management, and Presentation Silver Programs. Our findings aligned with NAVSUP’s self-assessment - that
NAVSUP is effectively promulgating Navy-wide policy and providing oversight of subordinate command execution of these programs.

Navy Exchange Operations, Navy Lodge, and Ships Store Program
NAVSUP provides program management for Navy Exchange, Navy Lodge, and Navy Ships Stores. NAVSUP delegates program management and execution of these functions to NEXCOM, and maintains appropriate oversight through financial audits and its command inspection program. During inspections, NAVSUP utilizes subject matter experts from the Marine Corps Exchange and Reservists with retail store expertise to assist with the mission performance evaluation. However, we observed NAVSUP has historically provided little to no oversight of the Navy Lodge program; this is an area for improvement.

Household Goods Program
The NAVSUP Household Goods (HHG) office administers the Navy Personal Property Program, represents the Navy on DoD and joint Personal Property policy boards, and provides advisory opinions to the Board for Correction of Naval Records (BCNR) on personal property matters. HHG manning was reduced from 7 to 4 billets in 2012, and 2 of the 4 current billets were vacant at the time of our inspection; the HHG Director and 1 of 3 Action Officer billets. This resulted in the delegation of duties to NAVSUP GLS, a limited ability to perform oversight, and a limited ability to provide advisory opinions to the BCNR in a timely manner.

The HHG staff routinely provides subject matter expert support to NAVSUP Inspector General during command inspections and audits. Deficiencies are predominantly administrative in nature due to sound enterprise control measures already in place. The inspections also afford the opportunity for field personnel to provide direct feedback on policy concerns. For example, NAVSUP HHG advocated for the recent Joint Travel Regulations change that now allows single Sailors assigned to ships undergoing a homeport shift within the continental United States to ship their vehicles at government expense.

Official and Personal Mail Program
NAVSUP oversees the Navy’s postal program, and promulgates policy for the official mail and personal mail programs. Postal operations manning at NAVSUP is lean but effective. The two-member shop recently completed a multi-year effort to standardize ship-mailing addresses across the Fleet, reducing costs and increasing reliability. Further, the office has engaged the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) to revise the longstanding United States Postal Service (USPS) Publication 38, Postal Agreement with the Department of Defense. The suggested revision adds military mail to existing USPS international mail performance metrics, ensuring military mail is prioritized to the same degree as other USPS items.

Food Service Program
NAVSUP is the technical warrant holder for general ship specifications, contract guidance and alteration proposals as they relate to food service spaces and galley design. As such, NAVSUP is the program manager for life cycle management, fiscal training, Fleet assistance for food service management, the administration of the Navy’s Food Service Program, and acts as the culinary specialist rating technical advisor. NAVSUP collaborates regularly with stakeholders and attends annual meetings to review and evaluate the most current food service equipment
technology in order to improve efficiency and productivity. This process has resulted in the installation of Ethylene Control Devices into Navy afloat storerooms to extend fruit and vegetable shelf life, and the procurement of high performance combination ovens, eliminating the continued need for deep fat fryers.

NAVSUP promulgates Food Service Program policy via Publication 486 (Food Service Management General Messes) and utilizes the Food Service Management (FSM) Program for accounting functions. FSM is one of 49 applications that reside on the NIAPS platform, and previously discussed reliability issues generate extra work for shipboard personnel and shore support to ensure accurate and timely provisioning. We also observed room for improvement in NAVSUP’s review of Navy Food Management Team inspection results. NAVSUP Headquarters should more closely review these results for trend analysis and identification of potential policy gaps. We also noted a lack of standardization regarding meal payments for foreign military ship riders, a routine occurrence during multi-national naval exercises. Further, our inspection identified a policy gap with respect to the Private Mess Ashore Program. Issue paper D-1 provides further detail.

Cash and Retail Operation Management Program
NAVSUP is responsible for life cycle management, fiscal training, and Fleet assistance for Navy Cash. Navy Cash is a stored value card partnership between the Navy and U.S. Department of Treasury’s Bureau of Fiscal Service. The Navy Cash Program is administered by ship Disbursing Officers and enables Sailors to make cashless purchases at ship stores and vending machines. The Navy incurs little risk through the Navy Cash Program, as the Treasury funds the program to include all transaction fees and overdrafts. Navy Cash implementation has been a resounding success, and has reduced the amount of hard currency required on U.S. ships by approximately 80 percent. NAVSUP reviews subordinate command audits of the Navy Cash Program for trend analysis and helps determine training requirements for Supply Corps Officers. NAVSUP is proactively addressing current and future Navy Cash concerns. The DDG-1000 class was designed without disbursing infrastructure and without a billeted Disbursing Officer; but it was designed to utilize Navy Cash for ship’s store and vending operations. NAVSUP is monitoring workload to ensure the lone supply officer is not overly burdened with Navy Cash system management.

Presentation Silver
NAVSUP manages the Secretary of the Navy’s Presentation Silver Program, which consists of 9,348 pieces appraised at $18.9M. NAVSUP performs management functions, and has instituted several oversight controls to reduce risk of loss or damage. Our inspection validated NAVSUP’s self-assessment and its 2015 Managers Internal Control (MIC) evaluation that considered its management controls effective and adequate.

Engineering Support for Uniforms and Organizational Clothing
NAVSUP delegated the task of conducting research, development, testing, and evaluation and engineering support of uniforms to NEXCOM. NAVSUP oversight is principally conducted through audits as well as its MIC and command inspection processes. We were encouraged to learn that NEXCOM is managing its uniform procurement similar to weapon system acquisition processes in an attempt to proactively address technical, quality, design, and logistical matters.
Of note, NEXCOM reported difficulties for vendors to source materials that are compliant with the Berry Amendment. The Berry Amendment is a statutory requirement that restricts DoD from using funds appropriated or otherwise available to DoD for procurement of food, clothing, fabrics, fibers, yarns, other made-up textiles, and hand or measuring tools that are not grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States.

**Navy-wide Policy and Program Management**

NAVSUP is tasked with providing Navy-wide policy and program management for assigned functions. NAVSUP supply policies are largely current, and most programs are well managed; however, some programs lack oversight and lack execution of required reviews.

**Financial Cards**

NAVSUP established the DON Consolidated Card Program Management Division (CCPMD) in 2012 to accomplish their assigned financial card functions. This division manages all Navy Financial card programs to include Government-wide Commercial Purchase Card (GCPC), Government Travel Charge Card (GTCC), Fleet (Fuel) Card, Air Into-plane Reimbursement (AIR) Card, Ship’s bunkers Easy Acquisition (SEA) Card, and the Swipe SEA Card. Card programs are managed through oversight, policy issuance, as well as involvement with the development, generating, tracking, and reporting of metrics. All card programs are well managed, with one minor exception – the Fleet (Fuel) card. NAVSUP is not conducting annual reviews of the program or annual card inventories, as outlined in NAVSUPINST 4200.98A, Department of the Navy Fuel Card Program. NAVSUP staff self-reported they are not conducting these reviews due to manning shortfalls.

**Defense Travel System**

The MFT tasks NAVSUP as the Navy’s Program Office for the Defense Travel System (DTS). The DTS team provides oversight by periodically reviewing databases to validate separation-of-duties and monitoring FIAR compliance.

**Headquarters Functions**

In addition to reviewing MFT execution, NAVINSGEN also inspected NAVSUP’s accomplishment of basic headquarters functions. In general, we found these functions to be satisfactory, with only a few exceptions.

**Human Resources**

The headquarters Human Resources Office (HRO) staff services 383 civilian employees at NAVSUP headquarters and all employees at 14 subordinate activities. NAVSUP’s HRO servicing center is the Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR) Operations Center Philadelphia. The NAVSUP HRO staff and OCHR Philadelphia Director have regular status meetings, and this collaboration appears to be working well. NAVSUP’s end-to-end hiring timelines average over the past three years has been 112 days. While this time exceeds the Navy’s goal of 80 days, it is shorter than a majority of echelon 2 commands we have inspected.

**Locality Pay**

We received multiple indications from pre-inspection surveys, focus groups, and interviews with NAVSUP HRO staff that the inability to offer Washington DC locality pay is negatively impacting the command’s ability to hire and retain the highest quality work force. Federal jobs
in neighboring counties qualify for this pay adjustment, while NAVSUP employees do not qualify because NAVSUP is located in Cumberland County. The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) recently included Cumberland County in the newly created Harrisburg locality, but decided to keep neighboring York and Adams counties within the DC locality (to avoid a pay decrease for these workers). As a result, we believe this constraint may be enduring and will challenge NAVSUP to explore the full spectrum of recruiting incentives and continue to offer the flexible work schedules their employees’ desire.

Interim Performance Management System
We reviewed a random sample of NAVSUP’s civilian employee performance plans for FY15-16. They reflected timely execution of requirements as established by the Interim Performance Management System DON Handbook.

Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act Certification
NAVSUP’s Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA) Program Manager monitors workforce compliance with the DON DAWIA Operating Guide. Ninety-seven percent of enterprise DAWIA-coded billets have current DAWIA certifications, as required by DoDI 5000.66, Operation of the Defense Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics Workforce Education, Training, and Career Development Program.

Equal Employment Opportunity
Overall, the NAVSUP Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Program is effective in supporting civilians and military supervisors; however, we identified minor deficiencies and areas for improvement. NAVSUP met submission timeliness requirements for informal EEO complaints with one exception. NAVSUP EEO office is staffed at 55 percent, which limits their ability to be involved in key decisions regarding strategic workforce planning and recruitment, succession planning, selections for training/career development opportunities, and other workforce changes. NAVSUP policy letters require annual update, and two required positions remain vacant.

Deficiency 1. The Federal Women’s Program and the Hispanic Employment Program positions are not filled, as required by 5 C.F.R., Subpart B and Title 29 C.F.R., Part 1614.102 (b)(4).

Deficiency 2. The NAVSUP Commander’s EEO, Diversity, Anti-Harassment, and Anti-Retaliation policy letters, dated 28 April 2015, were not re-issued annually, as required by EEOC MD-715, Part G, Essential Element A and Department of the Navy, Civilian Human Resources Manual (DON CHRM), Subchapter 1601, page 2, paragraph 3a.

Command Managed Equal Opportunity
NAVSUP’s Command Managed Equal Opportunity (CMEO) Program is not compliant with OPNAVINST 5354.1F, Navy Equal Opportunity Policy. Overall, the program meets most administrative requirements; however, the CMEO billet is temporarily gapped due to the retirement of the previous CMEO Manager. NAVSUP attempted to mitigate this issue by temporarily assigning CMEO duties to a Sailor assigned to a subordinate command and the current EEO. This is suboptimal and may lead to conflicts of interest in future cases. Fortunately, NAVSUP does not have any active equal opportunity (EO), hazing, or sexual harassment complaints; nor have they had a formal or informal EO complaint in the last 36
months. This situation will be resolved when the prospective command climate specialist reports later this year.

**Deficiency 3.** NAVSUP does not have a CMEO Manager who has attended an approved CMEO Manager’s course prior to assuming duties, as required by OPNAVINST 5354.1F.

**Financial Management**

NAVSUP is properly executing its financial management responsibilities. NAVSUP receives allocations for appropriated funds and delegates obligation authority for Navy Working Capital Funds (NWCF) to subordinate commands for quarterly execution. Additionally, NAVSUP fully participates in FIAR assessments with the Office of Budget (FMB), and performs oversight of subordinate activities through command inspections and centralized monitoring of reconciliation activities. However, two items are worthy of mention: Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software challenges and Navy Working Capital Fund-Supply Management liquidity.

Navy ERP is the Navy’s program of record software for financial management, acquisition, and wholesale and retail supply. Over half of the Navy’s Total Obligation Authority (TOA), in excess of $65B, is managed by Navy ERP. In 2013, the program shifted from full deployment to a sustainment status, and funding was dramatically reduced (from $180M in 2013 to $64M in 2016). The reduction in funding, and the corresponding loss of personnel expertise had a negative impact on the commands that utilize the software (NAVSUP, NAVAIR, SPAWAR, NAVSEA, ONR, SSP, and others). Additionally, the smaller program office has been unable to correct the backlog of open defects and design change requests from end users. At NAVSUP, we observed these defects are materially impacting accounting practices and workload. In some cases, extensive workarounds and manual data manipulation are required to support financial and supply chain management operations. However, we are aware that Navy is considering an increased budget for ERP and a revised governance model for this important program.

In fiscal year 2015 (FY15), FMB directed NAVSUP to be the vehicle for mitigating liquidity issues in the NWCF. As directed, NAVSUP created an artificial surcharge by temporarily re-pricing a specific set of items that would be used in specific customer transactions identified by FMB to inject $300M cash into the fund. This surcharge was approved by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Director for Revolving Funds. This same issue emerged in FY16, and same method of adding $200M of liquidity was used with NAVSUP items. These repeated transactions impacted NAVSUP sales figures and cost recovery rates, requiring continued adjustments to reflect actual business revenue; and they impact cost models needed for planning and programing purposes. Additionally, by assessing the surcharge to a single customer (NAVAIR), it negatively impacts the buying power of that customer until an alternate source of funding is identified to offset the outlay. Finally, since this method of injecting cash into the NWCF was used in two consecutive years, it suggests that the Navy has not discovered or addressed the root cause of the specific working capital fund components responsible for the negative cash flow.
Strategic Planning
The NAVSUP strategic planning process remains effective (as noted during the NAVINSGEN 2011 NAVSUP Command Inspection). NAVSUP has improved its strategic planning process by benchmarking their plan with other Navy SYSCOMs, U.S. Army Materiel Command, and industry and by soliciting an external review by academia. The NAVSUP strategic plan is an effective business model approach comprised of three strategic priorities that span sixteen focus areas. Each focus area is linked to a specific line of effort established in the CNO’s Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority. Multiple factors ensure alignment with NAVSUP enterprise execution, namely the annual issuance of Commander’s Guidance, the assignment of an Office of Primary Responsibility by focus area, and the establishment of focus area goals, measures, and milestones. NAVSUP developed a comprehensive strategic planning battle rhythm that includes bi-weekly whiteboard strategic planning sessions with the NAVSUP Commander, monthly Executive Committee meetings that include focus area updates, mid-year reviews, assessment surveys, year-end reviews, stakeholder summits, employee reviews, and plan publication.

Continuity of Operations
The NAVSUP Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) is compliant with OPNAVINST 3030.5B, Navy Continuity of Operations Program and Policy, and represents the most comprehensive echelon 2 COOP Plan we have encountered in recent years. NAVSUP oversight of subordinate command COOP Programs is robust. We identified two best practices: (1) the requirement for delegated authority successors to keep a log of important decisions while exercising that authority, and (2) the recommendation that all NAVSUP COOP responsible personnel complete two Federal Emergency Management Agency online training courses: Continuity of Operations Awareness (0546.A) and Introduction to COOP (0547.A).

Manpower
The Manpower Program is not compliant. In recent years, NAVSUP has made many changes delegating headquarters functions to its echelon 3 commands. With Major Headquarters Activity reductions pending, a current Shore Manpower Requirements Determination (SMRD) is required. As stated in OPNAVINST 1000.16L, Navy Total Force Manpower Policies and Procedures, an SMRD is required following a significant change in scope or purpose of a command’s mission, significant organizational changes, or subordinate organizational relationships altered. As NAVSUP has evolved, shifting its focus to a more enterprise-wide view and moving many functions from headquarters to echelon 3, clearly delineating its manpower requirements is critical. The NAVSUP Manpower Analysis Team may wish to consult with OPNAV N12 on SMRD modeling processes and formulas.

Deficiency 4. NAVSUP has not conducted an SMRD after significant change in its organization and subordinate organizational relationships. Reference: OPNAVINST 1000.16L, Section 4, 400, paragraph 5d; and Section 4, 402, paragraphs 3 and 4.

Records Management
The NAVSUP Records Management Program is not fully compliant with SECNAVINST 5210.8E, Department of the Navy Records Management Program. Records are not captured and
preserved prior to staff departing the command. Records management is not part of the check-in and checkout process for senior personnel, and training requirements were not completed.

**Deficiency 5.** NAVSUP does not have a Records Management process to ensure all records are captured and preserved prior to staff departing the command. References: SECNAVINST 5210.8E, paragraph 5u and Enclosure 5.


**Training**

NAVSUP demonstrated execution of FY16 GMT requirements, as well as the plan in place for civilian and military personnel; however, the Command did not have sufficient FLTMPS documentation to show completion statistics for FY14 and FY15.

**Recommendation 7.** That the NAVSUP Training Officer collaborate with divisions/departments to develop a single headquarters training program and consider establishing a Planning Board for Training (PB4T) approach. Reference: OPNAVINST 3120.32D, Chapter 3, paragraphs 3.2.19 and 3.3.13, and Chapter 8, paragraphs 8.6-8.9.

**Civilian Training**

Civilian training requirements are not completed as required by SECNAVINST 12410.25, Civilian Employee Training and Career Development, and the DON Office of Civilian Human Resources Mandatory Training webpage. NAVSUP’s overall FY 14 and FY15 civilian training completion rate was 36 percent and 45 percent, respectively. NAVSUP headquarters FY16 overall civilian training completion rate was 49 percent at the time of the inspection.

**Deficiency 7.** NAVSUP did not complete applicable mandatory training for its civilian workforce. Reference: SECNAVINST 12410.25, paragraphs 5f and 5h(3); DON Office of Civilian Human Resources Memo 12410 dated 11 December 2015, Mandatory Training for DON Civilian Employees, paragraph 4; OCHR Mandatory Training webpage.

**General Military Training**

General Military Training (GMT) is not completed by all military personnel as directed by OPNAVINST 1500.22H, General Military Training Program, and NAVADMINs 264/13 and 202/14, General Military Training Schedule FY14 and FY15. FY14 GMT and FY15 GMT completion rates were 64 percent and 84 percent, respectively. NAVSUP FY16 GMT is on track and stood at 69 percent complete at the time of our inspection.

**Recommendation 8.** At the end of each fiscal year, NAVSUP should record a snapshot of FLTMPS to capture training of personnel on board for archival purposes.
SECURITY PROGRAMS AND CYBERSECURITY/TECHNOLOGY

Command Security Overview
A majority of the NAVSUP Security responsibilities are assigned to the Command Security Manager (CSM) and the Physical Security Officer, who are assigned to N10 (Facilities, Safety, and Security) within the N1N5 Directorate and are responsible for Information, Personnel, Industrial, Physical Security, and Insider Threat Programs. The Operations Security (OPSEC) Manager is assigned to N41 (Fleet Support) within the N3N4 Directorate. Cybersecurity and Personally Identifiable Information responsibilities are assigned to N6 and NOGC (Legal), respectively.

NAVSUP issued NAVSUPINST 5530.1E, Naval Supply Systems Command (NAVSUP) Security Manual, which consolidated Personnel, Information, Industrial, Physical, and Antiterrorism Force Protection (ATFP) Programs into a single instruction to provide guidance for headquarters and subordinate commands. NAVSUP also issued NAVSUPINST 3070.2, Operations Security, to provide OPSEC requirements. NAVSUPINST 5530.1E does not have all required elements of a command security instruction, as required by SECNAV M-5510.36, Department of the Navy Information Security Program, and SECNAV M-5510.30, Department of the Navy Personnel Security Program. A revised version of NAVSUPINST 5530.1E is in draft.

NASUP has a robust command oversight program that conducts security reviews of subordinate commands on a rotating 3-year schedule. The NAVSUP oversight program meets requirements delineated in SECNAV M-5510.36 and SECNAV M-5510.30. NAVSUP plans to add OPSEC to the oversight program, however, as the OPSEC Program is newly implemented, there had been no reviews at the time of our inspection.

Information Security
NAVSUP’s Information Security Program is not fully compliant with SECNAV M-5510.36. NAVSUPINST 5530.1E does not have all required Information Security elements of a command security instruction, as required by SECNAV M-5510.36 and SECNAV M-5510.30.
Deficiency 8. NAVSUPINST 5530.1E does not meet the minimum required elements of a command security instruction. References: SECNAV M-5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2; and SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C.

Deficiency 9. NAVSUPINST 5530.1E does not assign specific responsibilities for briefings and debriefings. References: SECNAV M-5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2h; and SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C, paragraph 1b(3).

Deficiency 10. NAVSUPINST 5530.1E does not identify the chain of command. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2b.

Deficiency 11. NAVSUPINST 5530.1E does not delineate command-specific classified reproduction controls. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2m.

Deficiency 12. NAVSUP Security Servicing Agreements are not specific and do not clearly define the security responsibilities of all participants. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36 Section 2-10, paragraph 2.

Deficiency 13. NAVSUP does not ensure military and civilian personnel whose duties significantly involve the handling, creation, or management of classified information are documented on performance evaluations. References: DoDM 5200.01, Volume 1, DoD Information Security Program: Overview, Classification, and Declassification, Enclosure 2, paragraph 7h; SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 2-2, paragraph 2k; and SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2.1, paragraph 5h.

Deficiency 14. NAVSUP is not maintaining records of annual security refresher briefings. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 4-8.

Deficiency 15. Not all classified documents are portion marked properly. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 6-5.

Deficiency 16. Not all derivatively classified documents contain the “Derived from” or the “Multiple Sources” lines. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 6-9.

Personnel Security
NAVSUP’s Personnel Security Program is compliant with SECNAV M-5510.30 with minor administrative deficiencies noted.

Deficiency 17. NAVSUPINST 5530.1E does not contain a list of areas within the command authorized for general visiting and clearly identify all areas which are off-limits to visitors. Reference: SECNAV M5510.30, Appendix C, paragraph 1b(5).

Deficiency 18. Position sensitivity levels are not accurately reflected in numerous position descriptions. Reference: SECNAV-5510.30, Section 5-3.

Industrial Security
NAVSUP’s Industrial Security Program is not fully compliant with SECNAV M-5510.36. NAVSUP is required to have an Industrial Security policy in place, as stipulated in SECNAV M-5510.36. NAVSUP headquarters maintains 31 contracts, of which five are classified.
SECNAV M-5510.36 requires Contracting Officer’s Representatives (CORs) to assist in the development and signing of the Contract Security Classification Specification, DD Form 254 (DD-254). The CORs have not been conducting these duties for contracts, which require access to classified information.

**Deficiency 19.** CORs assigned classified contracts are not consistently signing DD-254s. References: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2-6 and Section 11-5, paragraph 1.b.; and NAVSUPINST 5530.1E, Enclosure (1), Chapter 4, paragraph 2(b)2.

**Deficiency 20.** NAVSUP DD-254s do not include the requirement to include and support counterintelligence (CI) awareness reporting and training on all classified contracts. Reference: DoDI 5240.06, Counterintelligence Awareness and Reporting (CIAR), paragraph 2c.

**Deficiency 21.** NAVSUP does not have a Security Servicing Agreement or a Memorandum of Understanding or Agreement with other commands in support of cleared contractors or long-term visitor groups at NAVSUP. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2-10, paragraph 1f.

**Deficiency 22.** At least one DD-254 for classified contracts contained errors in blocks 10, 11, and 13. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 11-5, Exhibit 11A.

**Physical Security and Antiterrorism Force Protection**

NAVSUP’s Physical Security/ATFP Program is compliant with OPNAVINST F3300.53C, Navy Antiterrorism Program, and OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2, Navy Physical Security and Law Enforcement Program. NAVSUP provides ATFP oversight of its lower echelon commands through the execution of AT Program assessments.

The NAVSUP headquarters building as required by DoD 5200.08-R, Physical Security Program.

**Deficiency 23.** NAVSUP does not rotate removable lock cores on an annual basis. Reference: OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2, Enclosure (1), paragraph 0209.d.

NAVSUP has not provided Naval Support Activity (NSA) Mechanicsburg a list of its Restricted Areas, as defined in OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2. NAVSUP has two Open Storage Secret areas, which are posted as “Restricted Areas.” As a tenant activity aboard NSA Mechanicsburg, OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2 requires that the NAVSUP Commander provide NSA Mechanicsburg’s Commanding Officer a list of NAVSUP’s Restricted Areas.

**Deficiency 24.** NAVSUP has not designated its Restricted Areas in writing, and has not notified the host installation of the Restricted Area locations. Reference: OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2, Enclosure (1), Article 0210, paragraph g.

All USPS mail received at NSA Mechanicsburg is processed through a central mail handling facility prior to delivery to NAVSUP;
Additionally, the document has not been signed/approved by the NAVSUP Commander and does not include the standard operating procedures (SOPs) to be utilized.

Special Security Programs
NAVSUP does not have a dedicated Special Security Program. Due to the limited number of Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI)-indoctrinated personnel and lack of an onsite SCI Facility, NAVSUP has coordinated with a co-located subordinate command to handle administrative matters for NAVSUP’s SCI-indoctrinated personnel.

Operations Security
NAVSUP’s OPSEC Program is not fully compliant with SECNAVINST 3070.2, Operations Security (OPSEC), and OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Operations Security. The OPSEC Program is managed by a civilian as a collateral duty with one Reservist providing support to the program. NAVSUP recently established an OPSEC Program and expects to be fully compliant and effective if adequate resources, manning, and command emphasis continue at the current levels.

NAVSUP requested a Security Assistance Visit from the Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy for Policy Security Directorate, and improvements were evident, especially regarding the handling of critical information. Since the program is new and the requirements to conduct training, oversight, and management were not conducted prior to the establishment of the program, full compliance will not be obtained for FY16.

NAVSUPINST 3070.2, has all of the required elements of a command OPSEC instruction, as required by DoDM 5205.02-M, DoD Operations Security (OPSEC) Program Manual, and SECNAVINST 3070.2. We reviewed the NAVSUP Critical Information List (CIL) and it is adequate to address NAVSUP-specific critical information. NAVSUP should consider further refining the document to focus on areas within the command’s mission and responsibilities. As the CIL is newly issued, many staff members were unaware of the specific requirements. Continued effort is required to ensure the CIL is understood by the staff and considered during the conduct of their day-to-day duties.
NAVSUP conducts required OPSEC training to assigned personnel, but has not conducted specialized training for personnel involved in the public release of information. NAVSUP headquarters OPSEC training completion for FY16 was 51 percent.

**Deficiency 28.** NAVSUP does not conduct required specialized training for OPSEC Program Managers/Coordinators, public affairs personnel, contracting specialists, and personnel responsible for the review and approval of information intended for public release. References: DoDD 5205.02E, DoD Operations Security (OPSEC) Program, Enclosure 2, paragraph 11(l); and CJCSI 3213.01D, Joint Operations Security, Enclosure A, paragraph 6.i.(2).
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Deficiency 34. NAVSUP does not maintain CI awareness training records for five years. Reference: DoDD 5240.06, Enclosure 3, paragraph 3e.

Cybersecurity
NAVSUP’s Cybersecurity Program is compliant with SECNAVINST 5239.3C, Department of the Navy Cybersecurity Policy, and DoDI 8500.01, Cybersecurity. NAVSUP has a dedicated IT staff performing the Cybersecurity mission. NAVSUP provides consistent oversight to subordinate commands.

NAVSUP uses dual-use video teleconferencing (VTC) coder-decoders (CODECs) for classified and unclassified VTC transmissions. The CODEC is not visible from the transmission area and VTC participants cannot see the “classified/unclassified” electronic switch indicator. An electronic indicator is required to be placed within sight of VTC participants to ensure that secure information is not mistakenly transmitted on an unclassified transmission.

Deficiency 35. NAVSUP VTC CODECs do not have an indication visible to VTC participants indicating if the signal is secure or unclassified. Reference: Video Services Policy Security Technical Implementation Guide, (Version RTS-VTC 7340) Rule ID SV-55769r1, Information Assurance Control: PEPF-1.

Personally Identifiable Information
NAVSUP’s Personally Identifiable Information (PII) Program is not fully compliant with SECNAVINST 5211.5E, Department of the Navy (DON) Privacy Program. The NAVSUP PII Program has repeat findings from the NAVINSGEN 2011 NAVSUP Command Inspection. The NAVSUP Privacy Act Team (PAT) conducts meetings, but the discussions are high level, and do not document actionable items to prevent the inadvertent release of PII. Additionally, NAVSUP has not retained semi-annual spot check records for the last three years.

Deficiency 36. NAVSUP PAT does not identify ways to ensure no inadvertent releases of PII and establish best business practices. Reference: SECNAVINST 5211.5E, paragraph 30a(2).

Deficiency 37. NAVSUP does not track annual PII training for military, civilian employees, or contractors. Reference: ALNAV 070/07, Department of the Navy (DON) Personally Identifiable Information (PII) Annual Training Policy, paragraph 1a.

Deficiency 38. NAVSUP does not maintain an auditable record of PII semi-annual spot checks. Reference: ALNAV 070/07, paragraph 1b.

Insider Threat
We reviewed NAVSUP’s compliance with SECNAVINST 5510.37, Department of the Navy Insider Threat Program. Since the Navy is still in the process of implementing the Insider Threat Program, the items reported in this section constitute a high-level summary of our findings.

Following a review of the command security programs, we performed a horizontal examination of our findings to identify seams in day-to-day security practices, which should be addressed to enhance overall NAVSUP Security Program readiness.

Personnel at NAVSUP are generally aware of their surroundings and are knowledgeable of general security requirements. However, we observed non-compliance with command security
regulations. NAVSUP recently implemented an OPSEC Program, and strengthened their programs in the traditional security pillars (Personnel, Information, Industrial, and Physical Security). A notable positive policy limiting security vulnerabilities is the paper disposition policy. A 100 percent shred policy has been implemented, with sufficient locked bins and awareness training, resulting in no sensitive or PII waste being located in general garbage dispensers. However, NAVSUP had several shredders that did not meet the minimum requirements for the destruction of PII, sensitive, or classified material. A best practice is to replace all shredders with those found on the NSA’s Evaluated Products List, which are certified to destroy classified information.

Recommendation 10. That NAVSUP remove non-compliant shredders and replace with shredders that are on the NSA/CSS Evaluated Products List for High Security Crosscut Paper Shredders.

Integration of threat into the NAVSUP OPSEC Program requires more active integration of available external resources into command processes. Several elements of the command (Physical Security and Emergency Management) work closely with other DoD and local resources to maintain cognizance over dynamic threats. By expanding this process to the OPSEC Program, a more robust picture of the threat environment will be developed. NAVSUP should work with NCIS to develop a tailored command threat assessment addressing risks to specific programs, missions, and facilities.

Overall, NAVSUP has a strong security enterprise, significantly limiting vulnerabilities of an insider threat.
FACILITIES, SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND ENERGY CONSERVATION

The Facilities, Safety, Environmental, and Energy Team assessed management, oversight, compliance, and execution of programs associated with each subject area via document reviews, data analysis, site visits, focus group and survey comments, and interviews with NAVSUP staff members. We found the self-assessment that NAVSUP headquarters prepared in advance of our inspection aligned well with our observations during the inspection.

Facilities Management
Headquarters Facility Management
We found the NAVSUP headquarters facility program is well managed, as evidenced by the lower than normal number of comments in the pre-event survey for this inspection. Trouble tickets are consolidated, prioritized, and then relayed to NSA Mechanicsburg Public Works Department for induction and execution.

Enterprise Infrastructure Oversight
NAVSUP provides products and services via NWCF with responsibility to maintain and operate facilities that support NAVSUP enterprise functions across the globe. As a result, NAVSUP plans and budgets for Facilities Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization (FSRM) in its annual NWCF budget. Oversight and direction of facility programs across the NAVSUP enterprise is provided via data calls, and more formal guidance (NAVSUPINST 11000.10A, Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization, Minor Construction, and Civil Engineering Support Equipment Project Management Procedures) has been drafted and routed for signature to improve enterprise-wide facility requirement development and tracking. However, interviews with NAVSUP staff indicated their uncertainty with FSRM requirement accuracy displayed in NAVSUP’s NWCF budget exhibits. The facilities sustainment requirement may not be based on the DoD Facilities Sustainment Model (FSM), as required in DON budget guidance. In order to provide sound guidance FSRM guidance to its NWCF activities, NAVSUP needs to verify the currency and accuracy of the facilities sustainment requirement, which provides a common projection of expected facilities sustainment costs. While the inspection was underway, NAVSUP staff members were working to resolve the issue.


Safety and Occupational Health
We noted progress since the 2011 NAVINSGEN NAVSUP Command Inspection, but agree with self-identified shortfalls in Safety and Occupational Health (SOH) programs. NAVSUP’s self-assessment highlighted the risk to NAVSUP enterprise safety performance resulting from declining Base Operating Support safety services provided by Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC). This is a Navy-wide risk that aligns with assessments in numerous NAVINSGEN area visit and command inspection reports over the past three years. NAVSUP also self-identified that the Safety Manager’s lack of technical proficiency continues to limit effective engagement and participation in echelon 1-sponsored safety working groups, committees, or
special initiatives. This is a repeat finding from the 2011 NAVINSGEN NAVSUP Command Inspection and constrains NAVSUP’s ability to provide tailored, in-depth direction and oversight on safety matters to their lower echelon industrial activities. We noted some key improvements since the last command inspection, including completion of required training by command safety personnel and conduct of recurring assessments of subordinate command safety programs.

Headquarters Safety Program
Several elements required by OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, Navy Safety and Occupational Health Program Manual, were missing or nascent at NAVSUP headquarters. Safety training was incomplete and the Traffic Safety Program does not meet instruction requirements, though the command has a limited number of motorcycle riders and drivers under the age of 26.

**Deficiency 39.** Manager/supervisor safety training is not properly conducted. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, paragraph 0602.b.(1).

**Deficiency 40.** Safety information and documents are not posted on command bulletin boards, as required. References: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, paragraph 0207.b.(1), 0207.b.(25), and 1002.b.

**Deficiency 41.** The NAVSUP Motorcycle Safety Representative has not completed required Enterprise Safety Applications Management System training. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.12J, paragraph 6.l.(1).

**Deficiency 42.** NAVSUP does not have a current list of military motorcycle riders. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.12J, paragraph 6.l.(3).

**Deficiency 43.** NAVSUP is not maintaining current information for the military motorcycle riders in their command. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.12J, paragraph 6.l.(3).

**Deficiency 44.** NAVSUP was unable to provide documentation for completed Motorcycle Safety Training or follow-on training that is required within 60 days. References: OPNAVINST 5100.12J, paragraphs 12.e.(11) and 12.e.(4).

**Deficiency 45.** NAVSUP headquarters personnel under the age of 26 years old have not received required traffic safety annual refresher training. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.12J, paragraph 8.a.

Oversight of Safety Programs
NAVSUP monitors lower echelon safety programs through the NAVSUP Inspector General command inspection program. Interviews and documentation demonstrate this process is active and value-added. NAVSUP submits the required top-level roll-up of area of concerns to the Naval Safety Center. However, NAVSUP’s self-assessment does meet instruction requirements, as their subordinate commands only submitted their top five concerns; thus, headquarters did not review the complete self-assessments in order to develop an overall self-assessment of the NAVSUP enterprise and its corresponding improvement plan. Moreover, there is no formal means for the Commander to oversee the effectiveness of the NAVSUP enterprise safety program, especially with respect to the hazardous industrial activities – such
as ordnance and hazardous materials handling and material handling equipment operations – that are performed by lower echelon commands.

**Deficiency 46.** NAVSUP is not properly reviewing subordinate self-assessments. References: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, paragraphs 0204.d. and 0505.

**Recommendation 12.** That NAVSUP SOH program manager brief the Commander quarterly on the effectiveness of the NAVSUP enterprise safety program.

NAVSUP did not have evidence of an Operational Risk Management (ORM) Program, though it is required for all echelon 2 commands and SYSCOMs.

**Deficiency 47.** NAVSUP has not established an ORM Program. Reference: OPNAVINST 3500.39C, paragraphs 6.c. and 6.d.

**Deficiency 48.** NAVSUP has not designated an ORM Manager or Assistant Manager. References: OPNAVINST 3500.39C, paragraphs 6.g.(2) and 6.h.(2).

**Deficiency 49.** ORM training is not conducted as required. References: OPNAVINST 3500.39C, paragraphs 6.h.(4) and 6.h.(5).

**Acquisition Safety**

SYSCOM Commanders are required to ensure that SOH aspects are considered, designed, and engineered into all procured ships, aircraft, weapons, equipment, materials, supplies, and facilities in an effort to comply with system safety engineering and management principles. We noted that NAVSUP has established mechanisms to integrate safety into the front end of the procurement process and by participating in the System Safety Advisory Board established by OPNAVINST 5100.24B, Navy System Safety Program Policy, is minimally meeting its SYSCOM responsibilities, but its representative to the board does not have the technical background required to meet the intent of the instruction, thereby introducing risk that SOH is not being fully considered in NAVSUP-supported acquisitions.

**Environmental**

A review of NAVSUP headquarters operations was conducted regarding compliance with policies and procedures on Air, Hazardous Material Control and Management (HMC&M), Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act, Solid Waste, Hazardous Waste, Storage Tanks, Green Procurement, and Shipboard Operations. Since operations are focused on policy, oversight, and program management, NAVSUP headquarters does not have responsibility for managing day-to-day compliance requirements with major environmental laws and regulations. NSA Mechanicsburg handles most environmental program responsibilities and provides guidance on applicable local regulations to ensure compliance with environmental laws. NAVSUP deals primarily with pollution prevention and HMC&M Programs, which are well managed.

**Consolidated Hazardous Material Reutilization and Inventory Management Program**

The Shore Environmental Program instruction requires NAVSUP to implement and sustain standardized Consolidated Hazardous Material Reutilization and Inventory Management Program (CHRIMP) procedures for total asset visibility and life-cycle management of hazardous material products and services at all Navy installations ashore. CHRIMP is the Navy’s
standardized methodology to procure, stock, distribute, and eventually dispose of materials as waste.

We noted significant progress in CHRIMP implementation since the 2011 NAVSUP Command Inspection. This functionally has been implemented at 97 percent of Navy installations and sites, with the remaining sites scheduled for implementation in FY17.

**Deficiency 50.** NAVSUP has not fully implemented CHRIMP as required. Reference: OPNAV M-5090.1, Chapter 23, paragraph 23-4.3.

**Energy Conservation Program**
We found NAVSUP energy conservation programs compliant with governing directives and instructions. The NAVSUP facilities staff develops, funds, and oversees execution of effective energy projects, such as LED lighting, footprint consolidation, and installation of pony chillers to achieve energy savings. Building energy managers participated in NSA Mechanicsburg Energy Working Group meetings, and good coordination with the Installation Energy Manager was evident.
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS
The Resource Management Team assessed five programs and functions. Our findings reflect inputs from survey respondents, onsite focus group participants, document review, direct observation, and face-to-face personnel interviews.

The following programs and functions are well administered and in full compliance with applicable directives:

- Government Commercial Purchase Card
- Government Travel Charge Card

Personal Property Management
The NAVSUP Personal Property Management (PPM) Program is not fully compliant with SECNAVINST 7320.10A, Department of the Navy (DON) Personal Property Policies and Procedures. The NAVINSGEN 2011 NAVSUP Command Inspection found that the PPM Program was nonexistent. Since 2011, a Command Property Officer (CPO) was assigned in writing and received the required training. The enterprise-wide PPM Program is well run, but the headquarters program has not been firmly established; instead, it appears as if the headquarters PPM has been run by the enterprise CPO. The NAVSUP headquarters Accountable Property Officer (APO) was assigned in May 2016, has not yet received training, is not knowledgeable, and is not actively managing the program. Custodian’s letters of appointment and training records were reviewed and found to be in order, inventories have been conducted, disposition records on pilferable materials are in order, and equipment is accounted for by appropriate inventories. In its oversight role for lower echelon commands, NAVSUP is fulfilling its responsibilities.

Deficiency 51. NAVSUP APO has not completed appropriate PPM training. Reference: SECNAVINST 7320.10A, Enclosure 1, paragraph 4(b)(2)(e).

PREVENTION AND RESPONSE
The following programs and functions are well administered and in full compliance with applicable directives:

- Casualty Assistance Calls Program
- Hazing Training Compliance
- Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention
- Overseas Screening
- Sexual Assault Prevention and Response
- Suicide Prevention
- Transition GPS

COMMAND OVERSIGHT
The following programs and functions are well administered and in full compliance with applicable directives:
Legal/Ethics/Freedom of Information Act

Legal/Ethics/Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Program is not fully compliant. Overall, NAVSUP has effective Legal/Ethics/FOIA programs. There are, however, three areas where programs fail to comply with governing instructions and/or regulations.

Ethics

The Ethics Program is not fully compliant with governing instructions. With the exception of one item, NAVSUP’s Ethics Program is outstanding. Led by the Commander, the subject of ethics and ethical decision-making permeates training, leadership development, and communications with the NAVSUP enterprise and Supply Corps community. However, an otherwise excellent Ethics Program is weakened by failure to adhere to the 60-day initial review requirement relating to Confidential Financial Disclosure reports (OGE 450s). In 2015, the initial review of OGE 450s by an ethics official fell far outside the 60-day requirement. Of the 167 OGE 450s filed, only two were reviewed within the 60-day timeline mandated by Federal regulations. Of the remaining reports, 18 received review anywhere from 99 to 200 days after filing; with the remainder receiving initial review anywhere from 200-330 days after filing. In 2016, there was only minor improvement. Of the 149 OGE 450s filed, 10 met the 60-day review requirement and an additional 46 were reviewed within 95 days. At the time of the inspection, 93 files were awaiting review.

**Deficiency 52.** OGE 450 files were not reviewed by ethics counselors within 60 days.  
Reference: 5 CFR 2634.605 paragraph (a).

Freedom of Information Act

The FOIA Program is not fully compliant with SECNAVINST 5720.42F, DON Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Program. FOIA requests must be processed within 20 days of receipt; the deadline may be extended to 30 days if additional time is needed and can be negotiated with the requestor. Two of five cases pending at NAVSUP exceeded the FOIA processing guidelines; one case has been pending for over a year. This particular request requires coordination with subordinate command. There was a partial release of information provided by the subordinate command, but there were no records of what remained outstanding, when and by whom releases were made, and no record of correspondence with the requestor. The second overdue request for materials was submitted to the command in April 2016. The records are at NAVSUP and awaiting legal review before release. At the time of the inspection, there had been no correspondence with the requestor to discuss a new timeline for release of materials.

**Deficiency 53.** NAVSUP FOIA Program is not in compliance with FOIA response time requirements. Reference: SECNAVINST 5720.42F, section 11.a.(2).
Victim and Witness Assistance Program

The NAVSUP Victim and Witness Assistance Program (VWAP) is not fully compliant with OPNAVINST 5800.7A, Victim and Witness Assistance Program (VWAP). VWAP responsibilities for echelon 2 commands include the following: (1) ensure that VWAP administrative procedures and programs are implemented and maintained; (2) that VWAP is included as an item of interest during regular inspections; (3) that subordinate commands actively support VWAP initiative of regional and TYCOMs; (4) that Victim Witness Liaison Officers (VWLO) and Victim Witness Assistance Coordinators (VWAC) are appointed per OPNAVINST 5800.7A; and (5) that subordinate commands comply with VWAP requirements outlined in governing instructions and mandated by regional commanders within whose geographic area commands are located. VWACS are responsible for educating command personnel of the rights of crime victims and witnesses.

NAVSUP provides no enterprise oversight of the VWAP program. The NAVSUP VWAC and Inspector General reported that VWAP is not included as an item of interest during regular inspections and no procedures exist to ensure compliance with governing regulations or VWAP requirements articulated by regional commanders. There is no record of command personnel being educated regarding the rights of crime victims and witnesses.

**Deficiency 54.** NAVSUP did not ensure that VWAP administrative procedures and programs are implemented and maintained; did not include VWAP as an item of interest in inspections, and did not ensure that subordinate commands actively support region VWAP programs.

Reference: OPNAVINST 5800.7A, paragraph 8b.
Appendix A: Summary of Key Survey Results

PRE-EVENT SURVEY

In support of the NAVSUP Command Inspection held 6-15 July 2016, NAVINSGEN conducted an anonymous online survey of active duty military and DON civilian personnel from 2 May to 10 June 2016. The survey produced 223 respondents (29 military, 194 civilian). According to reported demographics, the sample represented the NAVSUP workforce with a 5 percent margin of error at the 95 percent confidence level. Selected topics are summarized in the sections below. 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 NAVSUP average QOWL, 6.83, was slightly higher than the historical echelon 2 average, 6.69 (Figure A-1). The overall NAVSUP average QOHL, 8.54, was significantly higher than the historical echelon 2 average, 8.10 (Figure A-2).
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Figure A-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 A-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.

Quality of Work Life
Figure A-3 compares females and males on their rating of QOWL. There were no significant differences in how females and males rated QOWL. Figure A-4 compares military and civilian participants on their rating of QOWL. There was a significant different between military and civilian ratings on QOWL. Military participants tended to rate QOWL towards higher end of the 1 to 10 scale. There was more variability in Civilian ratings of QOWL.
Figure A-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.

Figure A-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 advancement opportunities (30 percent), awards and recognition (30 percent), leadership support (26 percent), and command morale (26 percent) factors had a significant negative impact on the participant QOWL rating.

Comparisons between demographic groups yielded more specific results. The top drivers for civilian participants’ QOWL rating included award and recognition (34 percent), advancement opportunities (34 percent), leadership support (30 percent), command morale (29 percent), and command climate (26 percent). Military were generally positive across all of the factors. The top drivers for Female participants’ QOWL rating included award and recognition (38 percent), advancement opportunities (37 percent), and training opportunities (23 percent).

Participants were asked to rate their perceptions regarding leadership guidance, specifically, “I have adequate leadership guidance to perform my job successfully.” Twenty-three percent of the civilians responded negatively to this question. There was a follow-on question that asked those respondents who reported negatively on leadership guidance to elaborate on their response. There were several dominant themes expressed in their comments; communication, perceived micro-management/lack of trust, and leadership. Examples of participant’s comments include:

Communication
“There is little to no communication from leadership. The communication that is received from [name and title deleted] is less than adequate.” “You are never told you are doing a good job but if there is a mistake, you are the first one to blame whether it is your fault or not.” “My leadership does not provide any type of feedback or any type of training.” “Senior leadership is in their own world. Only guidance comes in form of PR events and announcements. No real concern for the day-to-day activities at the top levels.” “My boss goes to meetings and I seldom hear what goes on in those meetings.” “Lack of communication from leadership – No information on changes affecting organization; no staff meetings, etc. Performance meetings are non-existent and feedback is minimal in written form - does not provide relevant feedback.”

Perceived Micro-management and Lack of Trust
“Leadership needs to provide guidance on how to do a process, not just do it themselves and show the end result. Leadership is too hands on and does not allow the staff to learn the
process, hence limiting the growth potential.” “[My supervisor] is a micromanager who does not really give you a chance to perform your duties within your position.” “My supervisor is very indecisive, avoids conflict, micromanages, and falls asleep at their desk.” “Lack of empowerment, no faith in senior level specialists to make decisions.” “Allow people to do their job, not micromanage.” “… leadership over manages day-to-day work completely inconsistent with supervisory controls documented in my PD. Not fully trusted by the senior civilian in the code. Very demoralizing.”

Leadership
“[Name deleted] is unprofessional and disrespectful to [deleted] subordinates.” “My Leadership has a habit of talking about co-workers to other co-workers causing a very tense/hostile work environment.” “My Leadership lacks the leadership skills and professionalism.” “Our direct supervisor continually says one thing and does another.” “Employees are not made to feel like they are valuable by leadership and are treated as “a number” instead of a person.” “Respect my position. Let me have a voice in areas that impact me and my team.” “My supervisor in my section is rude and has no people skills … demeans people and is not a good listener.” “Our [supervisor] also loses their temper before getting all of the information.” “The leaders in my [division] are very unprofessional.” “Always being punished because workload is not being completed on time and then told to work until is completed without OT pay.” “[My Supervisor] has decision paralysis [and is] is afraid to make the wrong decision.” “I don’t feel as though I’m a member of the team.” “[My Supervisor], is one of the worst ever. He doesn’t do his job! He plays favorites. If he doesn’t like you he threatens and bullies you.” “My first line supervisor is not a people person and is extremely rude to his subordinates. He is consistently negative and makes you feel like you’re stupid and speaks to you like if you were a child. He interrupts you when you speak and has no consideration of others.” “Leadership is understaffed and as a result ends up focusing on administrative matters just to get by.” “My boss plays favorites with his friends.” “[Name deleted] and [Name deleted], committing unethical behavior, prohibited personnel practices and violating merit systems principles.” “There is a great disconnect between that level and midlevel management. I feel midlevel management/supervisors lack the tools, resources, and time to be effective leaders.” “Mid-level management is understaffed and overworked.” “There isn’t a clear vision or strategy for our organization.”

Awards
Participants were asked to rate their perceptions of awards and recognition; specifically, “The awards and recognition program is fair and equitable.” Twenty-nine percent of the civilians responded negatively to this question. There was a follow-on question that asked those respondents who reported a negative on awards and recognition to elaborate on their response. There were several dominant themes expressed in their comments.

Perception of Lack of Visibility
“Appears to be non-existent.” “I can’t remember the last time that we have gotten recognition or an award.” “What awards and recognition program?!”
Perception of Lack Recognition
“Departmental/team leadership no longer makes presentations of awards. Or, even gives notification that one was given a monetary award.” “Rarely is anyone in my code acknowledged by the immediate supervisor for a job well done.” “No recognition for over and above the duties assigned, staying after normal duty hours to complete tasks assigned at the last minute. Supposed to be available after normal working hours without discussion or given overtime or comp time. It’s just expected.” “The awards and recognition program is lacking. Senior leadership is out of touch with the actual work being done, therefore they’re not in a position to know what work should be recognized and/or awarded.” “Awards and recognition do not need to have a monetary value associated with it. A simple plaque or certificate would certainly suffice or a coin from the admiral.”

Perception the Program is Small or Lacks Funding
“Current award system is small, very little time-off awards or on the spot.” “All award money is saved for end of year performance awards meaning on the spot monetary awards are not recognized by the command.” “Awards are handed out few and far between, we aren’t recognized enough for all of the hard work that we put in daily.” “I have seen people in my workspace or other areas that have given 110% to what they do and all they get is a ‘YOU MAKE A DIFFERENCE COUPON.’ We used to give out cash awards or commander’s coin’s; I have not seen one coin passed out [in] the 5 years that I have been here.” “Award pots have been very small for time-off and performance.” “NAVSUP is not transparent when it comes to awards and recognition. Very little time-off awards, few group/special act awards, etc.”

Perception of Favoritism
“Favoritism runs rampant throughout NAVSUP HQ, therefore it’s a safe deduction that the awards & recognition program follows suit.” “Favoritism is showed. Same people [are] nominated year after year.” “I have seen the same teams get awards over and over.” “The people who get awards are those held in high esteem by the front office, those who are politically connected from an office environment standpoint. People who interact infrequently with those in the front office are seldom nominated for an award, or if nominated, are seldom given an award. It is who one knows - not what one knows - that dictates if one receives an award.” “When there are awards (which are few and far between), there is a lot of favoritism.” “We do not know who, when or for what reason these awards are issued. Therefore, we cannot possibly know that the award program is equitable or fair.” “Employees are not rewarded based on their performance.” “If my supervisor writes poorly, my award suffers.”

Command Morale and Climate
The survey asks participants to expand on their perceptions of command morale and command climate factors. Considering the above analysis suggests that 26 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 A-5 illustrates the results of these ratings. The factors significantly above the 20 percent baseline
indicating a negative impact on command morale and climate are Favoritism and Communication both up and down the chain of command.

**Command Morale and Command Climate**

![Diagram showing distribution ofCommand Morale and Command Climate questions from the pre-event survey.](image)

**Figure A-5.** Distribution of Command Morale and Command Climate questions from the pre-event survey. The x-axis represents the percentage of survey participants and the y-axis lists the questions. The red shows the percentage of negative ratings for each question and green the number of positive ratings. The black horizontal line represents the 20 percent baseline. Any red bars that are at or to the right of the baseline represent a significant impact.

**Equal Opportunity**

The survey had a follow-up question for those (only 8 percent) who reported a negative impact on the question “My command Equal Opportunity Program (EO - to include Equal Employment Opportunity & Command Managed Equal Opportunity) is effective.” There was not a dominant theme. Some example comments include: “No communications from EEO.” “The word confidential means nothing to management here, you share your personal feelings and everyone knows about it.” “This command’s Equal Opportunity Program has gone too far and has created a culture of fear within the hiring process. In order to avoid any chance of Equal Opportunity violations our organization has sterilized the hiring process to the point where we’re hiring unqualified people for vital positions.” “The EEO program is poorly managed and the employees working there are poorly trained. EEO investigations are poorly done, if an EEO complaint is lucky enough to be investigated in the first place.”

**Quality of Home Life**

Overall, participants had a positive response to all the QOHL questions. Figure A-6 compares females and males; females and males rated QOHL comparably. Figure A-7 contrasts military and civilian participants on their rating of QOHL military and civilians rated QOHL equivalently. 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:

- Quality of home
- Quality of the childcare available
- Shopping and dining opportunities
- Quality of the school for dependent children
- Recreational opportunities
- Access to spouse employment
- Access to medical/dental care
- Cost of living

The aggregate of all survey participants indicated that participants rated all the factors mostly positive. None of the factors approached the 20 percent baseline of negative responses. Comparisons between demographic groups indicated neither differences between males and females nor differences between military and civilian participants.
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**Figure A-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 A-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 and 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 no inadequacies identified.

**Comment Question**

The last question on the survey asks participants to submit comments about other impacts on their QOL. Comment trends seem to fall into these general topic areas, positive climate comments, and negative comments concerning leadership, work hours and compensation, corporate tools and resources, hiring process, and miscellaneous. A sample of their comments is presented here.

**Positive Comments**

“My command takes things like creating the best possible work environment very serious.” “I really enjoy my work and the people in my area. It’s truly a great place to work.” “All-in-all, this is a great place to work, knowing that my command’s efforts have a direct impact on the ability of the Navy to remain effective in its missions.” “I felt very welcomed, everyone was nice and greets me by my name whenever they see me.” “Great place to work! People are very friendly, willing to do their job and help out with other projects at the same time, which is why I enjoy working here at NAVSUP. There are lots of teamwork and cross code training and upward mobility.”
Negative Comments:
Leadership
“Disparate treatment, being targeted, being talked about to other co-workers, not being able to tell my side of the story before being disciplined. Leadership not taking responsibility for their actions or lack of action.” “There is a great deal of favoritism at Headquarters. Different rules for different people.” “Currently, we cannot go directly up the chain without going through the person making the decisions; in other words our concerns are not forwarded, and decisions are made without the information from the people doing the work.” “I feel that if you are not male and friends with leadership, do not anticipate any opportunity for advancement.” “Some leaders could be better at being part of the team vice just an executive.” “The rampant age discrimination, favoritism and prohibited personnel practices, to include nepotism, has to stop when it comes to consideration for employment or promotion. Civilian employee morale is sapped when relatives of NAVSUP employees, to include spouses and children, or well-connected retired Navy officers get hired or promoted when they are obviously not the best qualified.” “The NAVSUP HQ senior leaders do not want to support working grade employees, they only do it when it supports the views.” “There are different rules for different people.”

Work Hours and Compensation
“Senior Leaders frown upon employees at any level from working any type of overtime and compensatory time. This either forces them to work it for free or off the books. I believe employees who are performing their duties outside of working hours are entitled to be compensated IAW higher-level policy. This practice needs to stop and it starts with the top down.” “Understaffed. No Overtime pay.” “Work demands require more than 40 hours to do my job. Asking for compensation or consideration (comp time, overtime, etc.) is not an option. Simply quitting at 40 hours and not completing the work is not an option, either.” “Travel Comp time is highly contested from senior leadership even if in support of mission.” “Credit hours not allowed, employees expected to work over normal day, command does not want to approve credit hours.”

Corporate Tools and Resources
“The new collaboration tool is a nice idea, but not very useful. The tool is hard to use and has limited functions - it doesn’t integrate with MS Office.” “Command-supplied computer equipment/software not adequate to complete my work. N6 is completely unsupportive. Whenever asked for assistance, the first response is always ‘No.’ They won’t check into whether something can be done or whether there are other solutions to solve our problems. They just say ‘No.’” “NAVSUP Intranet is ineffective - current, constantly updated processes should be there for everyone’s use. They are not, and in fact, documented processes rarely exist for activities that we do on a daily basis. It is a struggle and time-waster learning new things by trial and error. We are constantly saying to ourselves ‘It shouldn’t be this hard.’” “Our IT group is not helpful or willing to research ways to solve problems or provide innovative technology.”

Hiring Process
“Civilian personnel process (hiring) is entirely too cumbersome and takes too long.” “I believe this command needs to work a bit more on hiring practices and reviewing who they place in leadership roles here, not everyone is a leader.” “Too many retired military officers get hired
into senior leadership positions instead of promoting civilians.” “The recruitment process is designed exclusively to make the process equal for each interviewee and not to select the best candidate.”

Miscellaneous Comments
“While workforce decreases, work only increases.” “Job performance suffers when one ‘emergency’ item after another creates a situation where daily business is not valued and cannot be accomplished, creating dissatisfaction for customers.”
Appendix B: Summary of Focus Group Perceptions

On 6 July 2016, NAVINSGEN conducted focus groups and interviews with various active duty military (18) and civilian personnel (52) for a total of 70 participants. 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 B-1). Note takers transcribed focus group proceedings, which were subsequently coded by the NAVINSGEN staff to protect the confidentiality of participants.

Matrix B-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 B-1 lists focus group topics that were expressed as a major impact on the mission, job performance, or QOL in at least two groups. The overall tone of the focus groups interviews was positive. Participants seemed to be forthcoming with their participation and discussions were lively.
Table B-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>Communication</td>
<td>↑↑↑</td>
<td>↓↓↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Hours/Schedule</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Knowledge &amp; Development</td>
<td>↑↓</td>
<td>↓↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>↓↓↓</td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/Process</td>
<td>↓↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning/Manpower</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.

Communication
The most frequently mentioned topic in the focus groups centered on communications. Comments concerning communication were mostly positive. Comments from participants indicate that the Commander NAVSUP sets the trend for which he expects all leaders in NAVSUP to follow. Participants expressed the notion that employees understand what is expected of them. Overall, NAVSUP’s town hall meetings are well liked. Participants suggested that there is room for improvement at the unit level. Some participants’ perceptions are that direct supervisors are not passing necessary information down the chain. Below are samples of the type of comments from participants.

Civilian Comments
“I came from [deleted] and it is a breath of fresh air.” “I like the Admiral’s town hall meetings a lot. He takes 1 hour to discuss items with us. He answers questions verbatim.”
“Communication is pretty good now; we actually get a little too much information. I have never been at a command that communicates this well.” “The town hall meeting is a good thing; they way that the Admiral answers all the questions submitted is good.” “They use email and twitter in their communications.” “Town halls are done by the Admiral, and are well received. The Admiral sets the trend for leaders’ communication across the organization.” “I get a lot of communication from the town hall meetings. Where it breaks down is my unit level. Communication is grossly lacking.” “The ACOM level of communication isn’t as good.” “Supervisors are not telling employees that their training and travel is approved.” “I put a
request for travel, which is being funded by another organization, up my chain of command three weeks ago and the request is still in routing. I have not heard back.” “Sometimes I check the system - there may be a gap due to an employee (not here that day, didn’t get the word, or didn’t get the word right).”

Military Comments
“There are a lot of civilians here. It is challenging to adapt. We do joke and coke though. When I first arrived [deleted] leads did not function well. We worked things out though.” “Town halls are great.” “Some information that is put out by leadership may not always trickle down well.” “Very top heavy organization; sometimes all the information does not get shared, or communicated which is frustrating when an action officer is not cc’d or brought into the meeting.”

Work Hours/Schedule
Comments from participants indicate that the civilian employees are pleased with the flexibility and variety of options of their work hours. Additionally, some of the participants enjoyed the autonomy and trust they receive from their supervisor to conduct their work. Senior members of the command reported that they are working to ensure employees are compensated for all the hours worked. Below are samples of the type of comments from participants.

“We have a variety of options, 9 hour days, and 10 hour days.” “Quality of life here at NAVSUP is so much better due to work schedules.” “Provided it is okay from management, we can work a standard eight hour day or adjust it so that we have an RDO once every other week or work ten hour days get an RDO once a week. I also really enjoy the fact that I can come in early in the day and leave earlier, so long as we are here during peak working hours.” “Job Autonomy - this might be only for my code. But for the most part I have free reign to do the job I need to do in the way that suites me. Meaning if I need to work certain actions today and other types of action tomorrow, I am free to do so. My supervisor would only step in if in some part of my performance I wasn’t up to the standards.” “I think we are good in this area. In general, workers are not working longer hours than they are being compensated for. We are working to ensure that employees are paid for all hours worked.”

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 that this topic as having a negative impact on mission, job performance, and/or QOL. Military participants expressed a very positive impression. There was also a difference in perspective between civilian supervisors and civilian non-supervisors. Non-supervisors reported that if training is not mandatory, it is not a priority. They also said professional development outside their position descriptions was not available to them. They expressed concern about not being competitive for promotions as a result. Supervisory perceptions expressed that training takes away from day-to-day work and learning their job. Supervisors report that the “culture pushes me to approve unnecessary training.” Contrarily, military participants are very pleased with the number of fully funded professional development opportunities. Below are samples of the type of comments from participants.
Civilian Non-Supervisor Comments
“Management doesn’t have time for training. Military supervisors are not getting training on civilian systems, when they do, they transfer soon afterwards. Turnover is too high.” “Training that is not mandatory will not be a priority.” “There is no upward mobility. I can’t get training outside of my PD in order to change my dead end job so I am stuck.” “There are no other positions for admin/secretaries to move up to. They need to make a position called ‘admin officer’.” “[Reference to job title deleted]…all 160 people in the office think I need to do things for them, but they are not in my PD. I am doing everything myself with no help from management with respect to career guidance and training. I have no individual development plan. My career is at a standstill.”

Civilian Supervisor Comments
“When people go to training, it is difficult to get the main line functions of the office done.” “Some people spend their entire career going to training.” “Need to get the basics before attending advanced training, such as project management.” “Culture pushes me to approve unnecessary training.”

Military Comments
“There are a lot of fully funded professional development and training opportunities.” “Most people who apply get approved for them unless there is a direct conflict.” “Command sends out emails advertising training opportunities.”

Travel
The topic of travel was indicated to be a negative impact on mission, job performance, and/or QOL. Both military and civilian focus group participants indicated travel as negative. Some of the concerns expressed included the length of time for the travel approval process. Communication about the status of the request is lacking. There is a perception that travel is not consistently applied across the domain. NAVSUP employees are limited to traveling during regular work hours often precluding their ability to attend early morning meetings and conferences at TAD locations. The lack of funding is impacting travel. For example, travel is not being approved and government vehicles are no longer available for use to meetings to the DC area. There is a perception of inequity in the approval process. Samples of the type of comments from participants are included below.

Civilian Comments
“It takes months for approval and then the meeting you needed to attend has already passed. We support the fleet but can’t do it.” “Approval depends on who you are.” “Process for travel approval is too lengthy.” “Day before travel will never be approved.” “There is no comp time given for meetings that end at 4pm and have to go home that day.” “Travel money is running out 3-4 months before the end of the fiscal year. How is that money being allotted?” “We do not have purview on how they prioritize travel dollars spending.” “Travel requests to conduct training that could save the command significant money in the long run within a major program is being denied due to a lack of travel funds while other travel is being approved for people to attend GSA conferences and other trips. We spend 60% of our day fixing mistakes in this program because people are lacking training.” “With technology today, there is no reason for
SEEs and supervisors to get paid to go to DC for an hour meeting. They should be able to use VTC or teleconferencing technology.”

**Military Comments**

“Government vehicles were just taken away. There are a lot of trips to DC. We can get POV reimbursement via DTS; however, it would be less administrative burden if we had government vehicles. The base does not have 15-passenger van to move people/visitors around for meetings or short trips.” “Some organizations interpret the use of travel compensation time differently. Some avoid the issue completely, and some use it to their advantage (i.e. travel Sunday for a Monday morning meeting).”

**Policies/Processes**

The topic of policies/processes was indicated to be a negative impact on mission, job performance, and/or QOL. This topic was identified by civilian participants. They reported that there are programs that lack clear policy. Examples the participants provided include the EAP, telework, and time and attendance. The results of the lack of clarity are inconsistent application across the domain. Another concern discussed included the time and process for updating outdated policies. They reported that the process is too difficult and not efficient. As a result, they report policies are not updated. A sample of their comments on this topic is included below.

**Supervisor Comments**

“There are programs that lack policy. For example, EAP program, HQ has no EAP program.”

“Signature authority was taken away from the ACOM. It takes 3 months to get a little memo approved.” “Time and attendance is another area that has not been looked at.”

**Non-Supervisor Comments**

“Policy change approval process takes a long time.” “If a supervisor does not like it, it gets disapproved and you get no second chance of fixing it without going through the whole process again.” “It seems that the policy change approving process is not applied evenly across the command.” “To get a policy changed, it needs to be reviewed by many departments and the process takes a long time. Instead we stick with old outdated policies that are costing us a lot of time.”

**Manning/Manpower**

Although Manning/Manpower is listed last in the Table B-1, this topic garnered a lot of attention. Both military and civilian participants indicated that this topic has an impact on mission, job performance, and/or QOL. The perception is the command is one deep in many of its positions and is reactive vice proactive. Participants say important things are getting done; but the command is losing the ability to be flexible and handle emergencies. Additionally, MHA cuts to action officers contribute to the loss of flexibility. The loss of AOs because of MHA will impact the swiftness NAVSUP will be able to respond to last minute requests as well as losing the Fleet experience that AOs bring to the command. Participants believe that it takes too long to hire someone, which will enhance the negative impact of MHA cuts. As a means to mitigate this impact, participants reported ADSW are frequently being used to fill the gaps. Participants reported MOU’s between NAVSUP and the base are being utilized to help with the collateral duties. Below is a sample of the comments made by participants.
Supervisor Comments
“We are so busy we have to pick and choose which subcategories to get done.” “We are so busy that there is no time to get resources. Sky is not falling in, but requires us to be SMEs in various programs.” “It is hard to gain momentum, can’t get something off the ground.” “The challenge is that we are understaffed. We are 1 deep.” “We need to do succession planning but we can’t do that.” “Staffing takes time and by the time you’re ready to hire, the applicant is gone on to another job.” “NAVSUP is very conservative. We follow all the rules, and that makes up lose because no one else follows them.” “If more cuts are needed, SES need to be involved even when it only involves military, due to the ramifications at all levels.” “No one ever looks at what we can’t do with cuts; expectation from big Navy is that we can work miracles with the resources that we have left.” “Firefighting when it comes to capabilities after cuts, command is reactive, we haven’t had time to really assess and be proactive.” “Don’t know what we don’t know yet.” “We tend to say ‘Yes’, then later we figure out how we are going to do it.” “We contract for those who cannot contract for themselves - [Senior non-Navy commands] asks us to do contracting since we do it faster and better, but the resources to do that come out of hide.”

Military Comments
“There are very few junior enlisted to mentor. I can mentor junior officers. There are junior enlisted that I can mentor at tenant commands like WSS, GLS, and Naval Reactors.” “It is sad how many military positions that have been cut. Military members are action officers/catch all for everything, whereas civilians can only do what is in their PD and can only work so many hours.” “The command promotes progression in careers, but that creates openings that takes time to backfill which causes open gaps in civilian manning.” “There is no observable intern program like you see at other major commands, but we do see a lot of ADSW.” “MHA cuts will cause some activity to be performed with no military involvement, which is a perspective that is helpful for many of our fleet supporting projects.” “We have spread some collateral duties with the lower echelon commands on base to maximize resources. MOUs have been put in place to meet these collateral duty requirements.” “With employee cuts, we may have some actions that were occurring, and needed, that we are not even aware of. We’ll find out what was important when it comes up.” “With reduced manning, our ability to flex and/or meet large demands is further diminished. “Civilians will get their job done, but they are limited by work hours and PD, whereas military will remain a 24x7 resource with more duties per person.” “On the positive side, some requirements have been pushed appropriately down to the Echelon III, but their problem now is they are getting leaner too.” “Vacant SES positions create a burden, adding extra work to the subordinate personnel. It takes a very long time to hire and fill those vacancies.” “The running joke is that we are OPNAV N4 North, since more execution is being pushed down to us.”

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.

Accountability
(1 major negative and 1 moderate positive) Non-supervisors discussed their perception of a lack of accountability and some behaviors they have seen in the office. Supervisors discussed
how accountability and responsibility have been promulgated down the chain. Samples of the comments are presented below.

Non-Supervisor Comments
“In the past I have seen people talk on the phone all the time, curse people out, and minimal actions are taken by supervisors.” “Responsibilities are not balanced. I have seen senior GSs sitting in their cubicle just reading a book and not working.” “Sometimes you see people are sitting on their [buttocks], while you’re working really hard. They may be a higher grade than you, which really chaps your [buttocks].” “We do not do a good job of training supervisors on soft skills or people skills.” “Previous military have it, but we don’t do it with civilian supervisors. We promote the most technically competent.” “We take someone who is technically proficient and promote them to supervisor and don’t provide them with skills to deal with employee performance issues.” “I am shocked and amazed at what I have seen in lack of accountability. I have seen employees walking around the office with no shoes and others driving around remote controlled cars.” “We took a brand new employee over to a senior employee’s cubicle to help clean it because of an ant infestation. They found spoiled food and mouse droppings. It has literally become a free for all.”

Supervisor Comments
“Responsibilities have been pushed down to the SES level as it should have been in the past.” “As of 18 July, travel approval will be at the ACOM level.”

Command Climate
(1 major and 1 moderate positive) Comments in focus groups and interviews concerning command climate were positive. Below are examples of participant comments.

Civilian Comments
“Life is sweet here.” “It has a 180 degree turnaround compared to three years ago.”

Military Comments
“Master Chief is hands on.” “We have ample time to PT.” “People are friendly.”

Funding
(1 major negative and 1 moderate negative) Funding issues were discussed in a civilian supervisor group and a senior military group. Below are samples of their comments.

Civilian Supervisor Comments
“In IT, a lot of requirements come out, but without funding.” “The ability to use year-end money is gone.” “For example DOME, IUID, etc., if there is no budget, then the requirement is low priority.” “There are too many stove pipes; not everything is needed.” “I receive budget and execution, but they won’t give priorities on systems; should I support a new or old weapons system? NAVSUP can make priority decisions, but it would be better served for the user Echelon 3 or the requirement owner to make the decision.” “Big Navy sets requirements, but does not provide funding so the action becomes low priority.” “Sometime later, an auditor will ask why we aren’t supporting that program, and we have no proof to verify why we didn’t commit funds to that program, so we have to work extra hard and start that program up.”
Military Comments
“We are seeing the beginning stages of it getting harder to get funding for equipment. The supply, support, sustainment model is not necessarily in synch even though the requirements are not changing.” “Funding pressures may cause us to cut capabilities that we may need.” “Sometimes we get unwanted (plus up) funding. We just got $2.6MM and now we have to re-assign resources that were working other tasking.” “New effort to review all OPNAV base documents that task NAVSUP to understand that if resources get cut, this is what capabilities we lose.”

Leadership
(1 major negative and 1 moderate positive) Civilian non-supervisors reported favoritism. Military participants report positive leadership impact. A sample of participant comments is below.

Civilian Non-Supervisor Comments
“There is major favoritism.” “Tasking from leadership is borderline unethical.” “With questionable ethical areas, we are told to do it anyhow.” “We are asked to allow non-NMCI users to use our computers under our logon.” “Telework depends on the supervisor.”

Military Comments
“Front office is great.” “My boss supports me.”

Performance Management
(1 major and 1 moderate negative) The topic of performance management came up for both supervisors and non-supervisors. Samples of their comments are below.

Civilian Non-Supervisor Comments
“Here at NAVSUP, GS-12s are doing GS-13 work.” “PDs are way out of date and management doesn’t care. Nothing is ever done to fix it.” “People do work not within their PD.” “It has been 6 years and nothing has been done [since PD was updated].” “Other duties as assigned are supposed to be 5%, but they end up being 25-30%.” “If PDs were redone, 80% of the people would have higher GS levels.”

Civilian Supervisor Comments
“PDs have not been looked at in some time. Today I pulled up a PD and it hasn’t been updated in 3 years.” “I recently pulled one and it is in NSPS format.” “We had to give back-pay due to PDs not being updated in a timely manner.”

Hiring Process
(1 Major and 1 moderate negative) A civilian supervisor and military group indicated that the hiring process was a major negative impact on mission, job performance, and/or QOL. A sample of their comments is present below.

Civilian Supervisor Comments
“NAVSUP has no control over overseas hiring, which is fragmented with OCHR and CNIC owning parts. Metrics are 80-200 days overseas.” “HR folks in Mechanicsburg and San Diego staffing and classification is good.” “It is hard to compete when an employee can go 7 miles down the road and get a 12% pay increase [a discussion about locality pay].” “We are doing some good
work in hiring new college grads to get new bodies in and creating some ladder progression opportunities.”

Military Comments
“The length of time it takes for a vacant billet to get filled is an exorbitant amount of time.”
“There does not seem to be any true owner or consistency of the process.”
“I have waited months for a Position Description to be created, causing delays.”
“The hand-offs between OCHR and NAVSUP HRO causes delays in hiring.”
“It is very hard for civilians not already in government service, or prior military, to get a job with the government. This obstacle impacts our talent pool opportunities.”
“We should look at career ladder positions. People get hired in as a GS12, but the next available position is a GS14.”
“You have to leave the organization in order to advance to the next level.”

Base/Command Amenities
(1 major positive and 1 minor negative) Overall, military are happy with the base/command amenities. Samples of their comments are presented below.

Military Comments
“I am surprised this base has such a small NEX.”
“MWR, Gym and other shops are good.”
“CDC does not support times that the military works (i.e. 0600-1800). Close at 1700, and you will be fined if late.”
“Lactation room is great! I can support my child, and still do my job.”

Awards and Recognition
(1 Major negative) A civilian non-supervisor group reported that awards and recognition had a major negative impact on mission, job performance, and/or QOL. See a sample of their comments presented below.

Civilian Comments
“Most of the recognition we get is what we write-up about ourselves.”
“When the award is only 1.89% of your salary, why go out of your way to get more recognition?”
“I have no knowledge of an awards program instruction.”
“There is an awards program, but there is no real interaction between employee and boss and why you got what you got. It just shows up in your paycheck.”
## Appendix C: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</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>57%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership opportunities</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Hours/Schedule</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement opportunities</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and recognition</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command morale</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command climate</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of workplace facilities</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>31%</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>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>76</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>Factor</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of home</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the school for dependent children</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the childcare available</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping &amp; dining opportunities</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to spouse employment</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to medical/dental care</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</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>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</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>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</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>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15%</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>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</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>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</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>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</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>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</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>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</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>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</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>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</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>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28%</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>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

__________ is occurring 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>Fraternization</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Sex Discrimination</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Discrimination</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazing</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following tools and resources are adequate to accomplish the command’s mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workspace</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intranet</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have adequate leadership guidance to perform my job successfully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication down the chain of command is effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication up the chain of command is effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My performance evaluations have been fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</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>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</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>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</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>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</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>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</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>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</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>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8% 15% 19% 46% 13%

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20% 80%

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>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74% 17% 0% 9%
Appendix D: Issue Papers

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Issue Papers that follow require responses to recommendations in the form of Implementation Status Reports (ISRs). If you are an Action Officer for a staff listed in Table D-1, please submit ISRs as specified for each applicable recommendation, along with supporting documentation, such as plans of action and milestones and implementing directives.

- Submit initial ISRs using OPNAV Form 5040/2 no later than 6 January 2017. Each ISR should include an e-mail address for the action officer, where available. This report is distributed through Navy Taskers. ISRs should be submitted through the assigned document control number in Navy Taskers. An electronic version of OPNAV Form 5040/2 is added to the original Navy Tasker Package along with the inspection report, upon distribution.
- Submit quarterly ISRs, including "no change" reports until the recommendation is closed by NAVINSGEN. When a long-term action is dependent upon prior completion of another action, the status report should indicate the governing action and its estimated completion date. Further status reports may be deferred, with NAVINSGEN concurrence.
- When action addressees consider required action accomplished, the status report submitted should contain the statement "Action is considered complete" and should include documentation to substantiate that determination. However, NAVINSGEN approval must be obtained before the designated action addressee is released from further reporting responsibilities on the recommendation.
- NAVINSGEN point of contact for ISRs is [Redacted].

Table D-1. Action Officer Listing for Implementation Status Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMAND</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION NUMBER(S) XXX-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNS</td>
<td>009-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issue Paper D-1: Flag Mess Ashore Program

References:
(a) BUPERSINST 1710.11C, Operation of Morale, Welfare and Recreation Programs (cancelled).
(b) CNICINST 1710.3, Operation of Morale, Welfare and Recreation Programs
(c) NAVSUP Publication 486, Food Service Operation Handbook
(d) OPNAVINST 5450.349, Mission, Functions and Tasks of Commander, Naval Supply Systems Command
(e) OPNAVINST 5450.339, Mission Functions and Tasks of Commander, Navy Installations Command

Background: The Flag Mess Ashore Program was established to permit operational commanders an ability to provide meals in a secure space for mission related matters consistent with established protocol requirements.

Though not recognized as a Category A, Category B, or Category C MWR program, NAVPERSCOM (PERS-65) performed policy oversight and program administration functions for Flag Mess Ashore Programs in accordance with Reference (a), paragraph 2325. Shore commands desiring a Flag Mess Ashore Program were required to request approval from NAVPERSCOM (PERS-65). Moreover, commands operating a Flag Mess Ashore were required to submit an annual fiscal year financial statement that included all income and expenses for the fiscal year. Reference (a) was subsequently cancelled when Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC) N9 assumed Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) program oversight.

Reference (b) details CNIC policy concerning MWR Programs; section 2131, titled Flag Mess Ashore directs personnel to reference (c), NAVSUP Publication 486. Reference (c) provides Flag Mess Afloat guidance but does not address Flag Mess Ashore functions and responsibilities. The respective mission, functions, and tasks instructions for NAVSUP, reference (d), and CNIC, reference (e), do not specify Flag Mess Ashore Programs.

CNIC N9 grants approval for the establishment of a Flag Mess Ashore Program, but has not promulgated policy and has expressed that it lacks the authority to provide program oversight.

Discussion: Neither NAVSUP nor CNIC is conducting oversight, performing financial statement audits, or promulgating policy for Flag Mess Ashore Programs.

Recommendation: 009-16. That Director, Navy Staff assign NAVSUP, CNIC, or other command the Flag Mess Ashore Program policy oversight responsibilities.