



United States  
Office of Personnel Management

**Office of Merit Systems Oversight and Effectiveness**  
*Digest of Significant Classification Decisions and Opinions*  
1981  
No. 01-02

**Standard:** [Equipment Development: Grade-Evaluation Guide](#) (EDGEG)  
**Factor:** N/A  
**Issue:** Differentiating between Parts II and III

### **Identification of the Classification Issue**

An employee wrote to the Office of Personnel Management asking that his position, Supervisory Physical Scientist, GS-1301-14, be regraded at a higher level. The employee was the designated Project Officer (by an agency circular and later by an agency regulation) for two research projects. The employee was also designated Project Officer by his agency's Command Group and reported directly to the Commanding Officer of a major development command.

As Project Officer, the employee was delegated full line authority of the Commanding Officer for the accomplishment of the assigned mission as provided in his agency's regulations. As Project Officer, he served as the central focal point for a major command on the mission system; provided central management and coordination for program matters; monitored efforts of participating organizations and provided tasking/guidance as required to insure successful program accomplishment; and coordinated priorities, requirements analysis and documentation, objectives, resources and cost estimating, and various sub-efforts to effect maximum utility of program resources.

The question arose as to which part of the Equipment Development or Guide: Grade-Evaluation Guide is most appropriate for measuring the total worth of the subject position.

### **Resolution**

The Office of Personnel Management found that neither Part I nor Part III provided a satisfactory means for evaluating a Project Officer-type position since neither part fully measured the authority

and managerial demands explicit in this position. Part II, however, covers positions which manage the combined efforts of contractors and Government employees in accomplishing a specific development project. Positions properly covered by Part II of the Equipment Development or Guide: Grade-Evaluation Guide report to a Project Manager who in turn plans, directs and controls a development project with full authority to allocate agency resources within specific time frames. In this case, there was no designated Project Manager.

The Office of Personnel Management determined that the employee reported to the Commanding Officer of a subordinate development command who in turn reported to the Commanding Officer of a major command. The Office of Personnel Management concluded that the Commanding Officer of the Development command could be regarded as tantamount to a Project Manager in the sense implied in Equipment Development or Guide: Grade-Evaluation Guide.

In this case, the Office of Personnel Management went beyond the identification of a position by its organizational title, i.e., Project Manager, but rather identified the position which had the duties and responsibilities normally found in such a position. Since the Commanding Officer of the development command fully met the intent of Equipment Development or Guide: Grade-Evaluation Guide, it was proper for the Office of Personnel Management to consider this position the Project Manager without the imposition of the organizational title.