

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT  
ATLANTA OVERSIGHT DIVISION  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA

CLASSIFICATION APPEAL DECISION

Under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code

**Appellant:** [Appellant]

**Position:** **Supply Technician**  
**GS-2005-6**

**Organization:** [Air Force installation]

**Decision:** **Supply Technician**  
**GS-2005-5**  
(Appeal Denied, Position Downgraded)

**OPM Decision Number:** C-2005-05-02

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathy W. Day  
Classification Appeals Officer

10/7/97\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Copies of Decision Sent to:**

[Appellant]

[Installation Personnel Officer]

HG USAF/DPCC  
1040 Air Force Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20330-1040

HQ AFPC/DPCFL  
550 C Street West, Suite 57  
Randolph AFB, TX 78150-4759

Mr. William Duffy  
Chief, Classification Branch  
Field Advisory Services Division  
Defense Civilian Personnel  
Management Service  
1400 Key Boulevard, Suite B-200  
Arlington, VA 22209-5144

## **Introduction**

On August 11, 1997, the Atlanta Oversight Division, Office of Personnel Management, accepted an appeal for the position of Supply Technician, GS-2005-6, [Air Force installation]. The appellant is requesting that her position be changed to Supply Technician, GS-2005-7.

The appeal has been accepted and processed under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code. This is the final administrative decision on the classification of the position subject to discretionary review only under the limited conditions and time outlined in part 511, subpart F, of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

## **General Issues**

The appellant furnished a copy of her former position description and a proposed position description as part of her classification appeal. However, the class, grade or pay system of a position to which the employee is not officially assigned by an official personnel action is neither appealable nor reviewable by our office (section 511.607 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations).

The appellant compares her current position to other positions in the Customer Service Element (CSE). By law, we must classify positions solely by comparing their current duties and responsibilities to OPM standards and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). Since comparison to standards is the exclusive method for classifying positions, we cannot compare the appellant's position to others as a basis for deciding her appeal.

The appellant assists the Customer Service Liaison with unusual workloads and performs the Customer Service Liaison duties in his/her absence. The duties performed in the absence of another employee are not considered in determining the grade of a position (The Classifier's Handbook, chapter 5).

To help decide the appeal, an Atlanta Oversight Division representative conducted a phone audit of the appellant's position. The audit included interviews with the appellant on September 10, 1997, and her immediate supervisor on September 11, 1997. In reaching our decision, we have reviewed the audit findings and all information furnished by the appellant and her agency, including her official position description.

The appellant disagrees with the agency's classification decision for factors 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

## **Position Information**

The appellant is assigned to [Position Number]. The appellant, supervisor, and agency have certified to the accuracy of the position description.

The Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, Section III. E, states that a position description is a statement of major duties, responsibilities, and supervisory relationships of a given position. The description of each position must be kept up to date and include information about the

job which is significant to its classification. While the appellant's position description is basically accurate, we found duty 1E, monitoring the Reporting Organization Field (ROF) Base Change Report, is no longer performed. Since the classification of a position is based on an evaluation of the current duties and responsibilities performed, as assigned by management, the position description should be amended to exclude work that is not currently performed.

Based on the above, the appellant's duties and responsibilities for classification purposes involve responsibility for records management functions in the Customer Service Element. She is the ROF monitor with responsibility for the accuracy of organization account records for base organizations and maintains and updates the Standard Base Supply System (SBSS) Stock Number Users Directory (SNUD).

The appellant performs a variety of supply support clerical and administrative duties to establish, maintain and change organization account records for base organizations to purchase equipment and supplies for training. She obtains standardized organization information from each base or tenant organization (e.g., organization title, identification code, maintenance information and central system code, parcel post address, delivery point and destination, pickup point, etc.) and coordinates accounting and finance data with the Defense Finance Accounting Service (DFAS). She identifies and verifies the appropriate codes in the Air Force Equipment Management System (AFEMS) and codes organization information into the system. She notifies organizations when accounts are available for use.

The appellant updates and makes changes in AFEMS based on receipt of change notices from headquarters or at the request of base organizations. She maintains and prepares the Organization Effectiveness Report, conducts monthly and quarterly reconciliation reviews, and identifies discrepancies. She contacts tenant organizations, other command ROF monitors, installation agencies, and wing training managers to resolve discrepancies and make changes or corrections to reflect accurate information.

The appellant maintains the SSBS SNUD. She processes additions, changes or deletions in the SBSS and ensures the accuracy of the record based on change notices issued by higher headquarters or the requesting organization. She periodically conducts inventory checks of supplies to ensure the SBSS reflects accurate stock levels for the base supply system.

The appellant refers rejected workload completed by lower level supply technicians to the supervisor or work leader. She conducts on-the-job training on proper procedures and practices to process transaction codes, reviews the daily document register, identifies data errors and processes changes. She advises the supervisor on performance, progress, training needs, and possible disciplinary problems of employees performing records maintenance tasks.

The appellant's supervisor makes assignments by defining objectives, priorities and deadlines, and assists the employee with unusual situations which do not have clear precedents. The appellant plans and carries out the successive steps and handles problems and deviations in the work assignment in

accordance with instructions, policies, previous training, or accepted practices. Completed work is usually evaluated for technical soundness, appropriateness, and conformity to policy and requirements. The methods used in arriving at the end results are not usually reviewed in detail.

### **Standards Referenced**

Supply Clerical and Technician Series, GS-2005, May 1992.

### **Series Determination**

The agency placed the position in the Supply Clerical and Technician Series, GS-2005. The appellant does not contest the agency's series determination.

The GS-2005 series includes positions involved in supervising or performing clerical or technical supply support work necessary to ensure the effective operation of ongoing supply activities. It requires knowledge of supply operations and program requirements and the ability to apply established supply policies, day-to-day servicing techniques, regulations, or procedures. The nature of the appellant's duties and responsibilities are such that her position meets the definition of the GS-2005 series.

### **Title Determination**

The GS-2005 series specifies the title *Supply Technician* for all positions GS-5 and above.

### **Grade Determination**

The GS-2005 series is written in the Factor Evaluation System (FES) format. Under the FES, positions are placed in grades on the basis of their duties, responsibilities, and the qualifications required as evaluated in terms of nine factors common to nonsupervisory General Schedule positions.

A point value is assigned to each factor based on a comparison of the position's duties with the factor-level descriptions in the standard. The factor point values mark the lower end of the ranges for the indicated factor levels. For a position factor to warrant a given point value, it must be fully equivalent to the overall intent of the selected factor-level description. If the position fails in any significant aspect to meet a particular factor-level description in the standard, the point value for the next lower factor level must be assigned, unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect which meets a higher level. The total points assigned are converted to a grade by use of the grade conversion table in the standard.

Under FES, positions which significantly exceed the highest factor level or fail to meet the lowest factor level described in a classification standard must be evaluated by reference to the Primary Standard, contained in Appendix 3 of the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards. The Primary Standard is the "standard-for-standards" for FES.

### Factor 1 - Knowledge Required by the Position:

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts that a worker must understand to do acceptable work, such as the steps, procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles, and concepts; and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply this knowledge. The agency credited the position at Level 1-4. The appellant does not contest their decision. We disagree.

At Level 1-3, the work requires knowledge of standardized supply regulations, policies, procedures, or other instructions relating to the specific functions assigned. Most positions require familiarity with one or more automated supply data bases to enter, correct, and retrieve recurring reports and to structure and retrieve specialized reports. Employees use a sound working knowledge of the structure of the local supply organization and the organizations serviced. Employees use this knowledge and ability to perform a range of standard clerical assignments and to resolve recurring problems.

Level 1-3 is exceeded. While much of the appellant's work is of a recurring nature and requires the application of standardized rules, regulations and procedures, some aspects of her work involve the resolution of problems that go beyond the recurring application of standardized procedures and processes. For example, some transactions cannot be processed according to established guidelines. One such example is an automated conversion program with established guidelines which are not always accepted in the prescribed formats. The appellant must prepare a manual write-up following established supply system procedures for the program to accept the data. If the rejected data error is not the result of a procedural or input error, the appellant coordinates with an equipment designer or systems administrator to resolve the problem. The appellant obtains stock items for purchases of equipment and supplies. Sometimes item managers locate less expensive equipment or alternative supplies that may not be listed in the SBSS. When this occurs, the appellant conducts a cost analysis and determines if the item is compatible with existing equipment or supply description (i.e., length, size, weight, height, and costs, etc.) While the appellant works within the established supply system, some procedures used require an extension beyond normal practices.

At Level 1-4, the highest level in the standard, work requires a thorough knowledge of governing supply regulations, policies, procedures, and instructions applicable to the specific assignment. Employees use this knowledge to conduct extensive and exhaustive searches for required information; reconstruct records for complex supply transactions; and/or provide supply operations support for activities involving specialized or unique supplies, equipment, and parts such as special purpose laboratory or test equipment, prototypes of technical equipment, parts and equipment requiring unusual degrees of protection in shipment and storage, or others that are unique to the organization's mission or are seldom handled. This knowledge is also used in positions performing routine aspects of supply specialist work based on practical knowledge of standard procedures, where assignments include individual case problems related to a limited segment in one of the major areas of supply management (e.g., cataloging, inventory management, excess property, property utilization, or storage management).

Level 1-4 is not fully met. The appellant performs work which requires a degree of ingenuity and resourcefulness, but does not require a level of knowledge sufficient to conduct extensive and exhaustive searches for required information, reconstruct complex transactions, or support unique requirements. For example, stock items consist of administrative supplies and equipment and some technical equipment for training. There is no evidence in the appeal record that the parts and equipment are specialized or prototype items, or require complex transactions or special shipping and handling. Organization records may require extensive information and coordination but do not result in problems dealing with a segment of a major area of supply management. In addition, the GS-7 level position in the organization is responsible for coordinating unusual and/or critical supply support requirements. The appellant's work does not meet the full intent of Level 1-4. Although the position exceeds Level 1-3, it fails to fully meet the intent of the next higher level, and the lower level must be credited.

Level 1-3, 350 points, is credited for this factor.

#### Factor 2 - Supervisory Controls:

This factor covers the nature and extent of direct or indirect controls exercised by the supervisor, the employee's responsibility for carrying out assignments, and how completed work is reviewed. The agency credited the position at Level 2-3. The appellant believes her position does not require supervision.

At Level 2-3, the highest level in the standard, the supervisor makes assignments by defining objectives, priorities, and deadlines, and assists the employee with unusual situations which do not have clear precedents. In some circumstances, the employee works independently from the supervisor or specialist in a remote location. Contact with the supervisor is infrequent, although usually available by telephone and periodic on-site visits. Continuing assignments are usually performed with considerable independence. The employee plans and carries out the successive steps and handles problems and deviations in the work assignments in accordance with instructions, policies, previous training, or accepted practices in the occupation. When the employee assists a supply specialist in performing segments of more complex technical operations, the work may be subject to closer technical guidance and control. Completed work is usually evaluated for technical soundness, appropriateness, and conformity to policy and requirements. The methods used in arriving at the end results are not usually reviewed in detail.

Level 2-3 is met. The appellant performs routine work with considerable independence and is expected to complete work with little technical direction. However, the supervisor provides technical guidance on unusual or complex issues, policies and procedures, and jointly discusses plans and deadlines and methods of approach on special assignments or projects with the appellant. Most of the work is self-generated by the AFEM or requested by base organizations, and the appellant independently carries out these routine assignments (e.g., establishing organization records, updating SBSS stock items, etc.) within established guidelines. The supervisor is kept informed of progress and problems as they arise. Special projects are assigned by the supervisor who discusses the

requirements, time frames, and deadlines for completion. When she assists the Customer Service Liaison with cataloging functions, the appellant is also subject to some degree of review. The supervisor does not review the day-to-day work assignments but does review completed work products to ensure work is coded accurately and that system changes are input into the systems within established time frames.

At Level 2-4, as described in the Primary Standard, the supervisor sets the overall objectives and resources available. The employee and supervisor, in consultation, develop deadlines, projects, and work to be done. The employee, having developed expertise in the line of work, is responsible for planning and carrying out the assignment, resolving most of the conflicts that arise, coordinating the work with others as necessary, and interpreting policy on own initiative in terms of established objectives. In some assignments, the employee also determines the approach to be taken and the methodology to be used. This employee keeps the supervisor informed of progress and potentially controversial matters. Completed work is reviewed only from an overall standpoint in terms of feasibility, compatibility with other work, or effectiveness in meeting requirements or expected results.

Level 2-4 is not fully met. Although some aspects of the appellant's work appear to meet this level, we find the appellant's work is routine, is performed in accordance with established procedures and guidelines, and is subject to review for adherence to policy and procedures. The appellant does not develop plans, deadlines, or the methods of approach to accomplish work because there are existing processing procedures in place. She does not interpret policy to resolve conflicts or deal with issues where policy or controversial issues arise. Therefore, Level 2-4 cannot be credited.

This factor is evaluated at Level 2-3, for 275 points.

### Factor 3 - Guidelines:

This factor covers the nature of guidelines used and the judgment needed to apply them. The agency credited this factor with Level 3-2. The appellant believes Level 3-3 is appropriate.

At Level 3-2, procedures for doing the work have been established and a number of specific guidelines are available in the form of supply regulations, policies, and procedures. The number and similarity of guidelines and work situations require the employee to use some judgment in locating and selecting the most appropriate guidelines, references, and procedures for application and in making minor deviations to adapt the guidelines in specific cases. At this level, the employee may also determine which of several established alternatives to use. Situations to which the existing guidelines cannot be applied or significant proposed deviations from the guidelines are referred to the supervisor.

Level 3-2 is met. Guidelines include agency system manuals, standard operating procedures for processing transactions, supply regulations and policies which are directly applicable to the work. For example, the appellant furnished copies of the AFEMS manual and cited several chapters that



clearly define the work performed, as well as the procedures used to log-on, input, change, delete, correct, and extract data. The appellant determines which guideline or procedure is applicable to the handling of each specific action and determines when minor deviations from the guides are appropriate.

At Level 3-3, guidelines are not completely applicable or have gaps in specificity. The employee uses judgment in interpreting and adapting guidelines such as policies, regulations, precedents, and work directions for application to specific cases or problems. The employee uses judgment in interpreting and adapting guidelines such as policies, regulations, precedents, and work directions for application to specific cases or problems. The employee analyzes the results of applying guidelines and recommends changes.

Level 3-3 is not met. Although the appellant's assignments include resolving problems that arise in the course of continuing work, the guidelines available are applicable to the work and require little or no adaptation. The appellant is not authorized to make significant deviations. The only deviations permissible are those where higher authority has delegated responsibility to the local installation to develop local procedures or policies unique to the command. In this situation, the supervisor has responsibility for development of local policies affecting the work, not the appellant.

During the interview, the appellant was asked to supply examples where she deviated from existing guidelines or where guidelines were not directly applicable to the problems or issues dealt with. However, she was not able to supply examples of work she adapted or deviated from existing guidelines and agreed to the fact that the guidelines are applicable to the work. Although the appellant may have a wealth of knowledge and experience from her former position as a supervisor where she was required to establish local procedures, adapt or deviate from established guidelines, her current position does not require her to do so.

This factor is evaluated at Level 3-2, for 125 points.

#### Factor 4 - Complexity:

This factor covers the nature, number, variety, and intricacy of tasks, steps, processes, or methods in the work performed; the difficulty in identifying what needs to be done; and the difficulty and originality involved in performing the work. The agency credited level 4-2 for this factor; however the appellant believes 4-3 is correct.

At Level 4-2, the work consists of duties that involve related steps, processes, or methods, including work such as performing routine aspects of technical supply management functions in support of a specialist. The employee decides what to do by recognizing the existence of and differences between a few easily recognizable situations and conditions, and choosing a course of action from among options related to the specific assignment. Actions to be taken by the employee or responses to be made differ in such things as the source of information, the kind of transactions or entries, or other differences of a factual nature.

Level 4-2 is met. The primary work involves the establishment and maintenance of the ROF organization account records for base organizations and maintenance of the SNUDs in the SBSS. The work involves using established procedures and determining the correct processes to establish, update and change organization information in the AFEMS and ensure the accuracy of items in the local supply system.

At Level 4-3, the work involves unusually complicated or difficult technical duties involving one or more aspects of supply management or operations. The work at this level is difficult because it involves: (a) actions that are not standardized or prescribed; (b) deviations from established procedures; (c) new or changing situations; or (d) matters for which only general provision can be made in regulations or procedures. This typically involves supply transactions which experienced employees at lower grades have been unable to process or resolve, or which involve special program requirements for urgent, critical shortage items requiring specialized procedures and efforts to obtain. The employee decides what needs to be done depending on the analysis of the subject, phase, or issues involved in each assignment, and the chosen course of action may have to be selected from many alternatives. Decisions are based largely on the employee's experience, precedent actions, and the priority assigned for resolving the particular problem. The methods and procedures used to resolve each issue vary based on the circumstances of each individual case. The work involves conditions and elements that the employee must identify and analyze to discern interrelationships with other actions, related supply programs, and alternative approaches.

Level 4-3 is not met. The appellant's work involves the application of established processes and procedures, rather than the nonstandard actions contemplated at this level. Her initial input and maintenance of organization account records does not involve using alternative approaches or analyzing interrelations with other supply programs. She is not responsible for the resolution of problems which other personnel could not resolve using established procedures nor is she responsible for the type of urgent, critical shortage items described at this level. Her actions are selected from among a few alternatives rather than the many possibilities depicted at Level 4-3, and the intent of this level is not met.

This factor is evaluated at Level 4-2, for 75 points.

#### Factor 5 - Scope and Effect:

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work, as measured by the purpose, breadth, and depth of the assignment, and the effect of work products or services both within and outside the organization. The agency credited Level 5-2. The appellant believes Level 5-3 is appropriate.

At Level 5-2, the work involves execution of specific rules, regulations, or procedures and typically comprises a complete segment of an assignment or project of broader scope, such as when assisting a higher grade employee. The work of supply service affects the accuracy, reliability, or acceptability

of further processes or services in meeting customer requirements in supported organizations and other supply units.

Level 5-2 is met. The appellant's primary responsibility involves the maintenance of organization account records following established processes and procedures and maintaining the SBSS. This work affects the accuracy of the AFEMS and the SBSS systems and the ability of the base organizations to effectively purchase supplies and equipment for training.

At Level 5-3, the work involves dealing with a variety of problem situations either independently or as part of a broader problem solving effort under the control of a specialist. Problems encountered require extensive fact finding, reviewing information to coordinate requirements, and recommending actions to resolve conditions or change procedures. The employee performs the work in conformance with prescribed procedures and methods. The results of the work affect the adequacy of local supply support operations, or they contribute to improved procedures in support of supply programs and operations.

Level 5-3 is not met. Although the appellant resolves problems arising in the course of her continuing work, those problem solving efforts typically do not involve extensive fact finding or recommendations for changes. For example, the appellant's fact finding relates to such matters as identifying the correct data elements to use to code organization information, or determining comparable stock items equipment or supplies which are not available in the SBSS or listing less expensive items on the SBSS for use by the requesting organization. Furthermore, the appellant's work does not affect the adequacy of the entire supply program, but directly affects the local base supply program.

This factor is evaluated at Level 5-2, for 75 points.

#### Factor 6 - Personal Contacts and Factor 7 - Purpose of Contacts:

These factors measure face-to-face contacts and telephone dialogue with persons not in the supervisory chain and the purpose of those personal contacts. The same personal contacts must serve as the basis for the level selected for both factors. The agency originally evaluated Factor 6 at Level 3, but amended their evaluation to Level 2. The appellant believes Level 6-3 is correct.

#### *Personal Contacts*

At Level 2, personal contacts are with employees in the same agency, but outside the immediate organization. Persons contacted generally are engaged in different functions, missions, and kinds of work, such as representatives from various levels within the agency or from other operating offices in the immediate installation, or, with members of the general public such as individuals or groups in a moderately structured setting (i.e., they are usually established on a routine basis at the employee's work place or over the telephone, the exact purpose may be unclear at first, and one or more of the parties may be uninformed concerning the role and authority of other participants). Typical of

contacts at this level are employees at approximately the same level of authority in shipping companies, vendor employees concerned with the status of orders or shipments, and others at comparable levels.

Level 2 is met. The appellant has regular and recurring contacts with employees, item managers and other ROF monitors throughout the agency including vendors, as well as finance and accounting personnel at DFAS.

At Level 3, contacts are with individuals from outside the employing agency in a moderately unstructured setting (i.e., the contacts are not established on a routine basis, the purpose and extent of each contact is different, and the role and authority of each party is identified and developed during the course of the contact). Typical of contacts at this level are supply employees in other departments or agencies, inventory item managers, contractors, or manufacturers.

Level 3 is not met. The appellant's personal contacts outside her agency are established on a regular basis, and the role and authority of the persons contacted are known to the appellant in advance of the contact or established early in the contact. For example, her contacts with other ROF monitors are to obtain organization information; contacts with vendors are to obtain information on stock items or for resolving discrepancies in delivery; and her contacts with DFAS are to obtain accounting data for establishing or changing organization account records.

This factor is credited at Level 2.

#### *Purpose of Contacts*

At Level b, the highest level described in the standard, the purpose of contacts is to plan, coordinate, or advise on work efforts or to resolve operating problems by clarifying discrepancies in information submitted by serviced organizations, resolve automated system problems causing erroneous transactions records, or seek cooperation from others to resolve complicated supply actions.

Similar to Level b, the appellant's personal contacts not only include exchange of factual information, but also include contacts to coordinate work and resolve problems. For example, the appellant's contacts include written and verbal contacts with serviced organizations to resolve discrepancies in organization account records and with system administrators to update or change data files. These contacts also include providing on-the-job training to other supply technicians to give technical guidance in the processing of transactions.

At the next higher level, the purpose of contacts is to influence, motivate, interrogate, or control persons or groups who may be fearful, skeptical, uncooperative, or dangerous, and require skill in approaching the person or group to obtain the desired effect, such as gaining compliance with established policies and regulations by persuasion or negotiation, or gaining information by establishing rapport with a suspicious informant. There is no evidence in the appeal record that the appellant's personal contacts involve the use of persuasion or interrogation as described.

The purpose of contacts is credited at Level b.

The combination of contacts at Level 2 and the purpose of contacts at Level b, equates to 75 points using the matrix on page 18 of the GS-2005 standard.

#### Factor 8 - Physical Demands:

This factor measures the requirements and physical demands placed on the employee in performing the work assignment, including the agility and dexterity required, and the extent of physical exertion.

At Level 8-1, the work is primarily sedentary. The employee may sit comfortably to do the work. There may be some walking, standing, bending, carrying of light items such as papers, books, or small parts. No special physical demands are required to perform the work.

At Level 8-2, the work requires some physical exertion such as long periods of standing; walking over rough, uneven, or rocky surfaces; recurring bending, crouching, stooping, stretching, reaching; or similar activities. This level of physical demand occurs, for example, when employees are regularly assigned to activities such as tracing misplaced items or conducting physical inventories in warehouses, depots, and other storage areas, or when they are regularly involved in stocking and retrieving items from shelves and cabinets.

Although the appellant sometimes works in a stockroom or warehouse environment to check supply items on hand, the appeal record shows that her primary work is sedentary and in an office environment. The work in the stockroom or warehouse may require the appellant to lift objects on a very limited basis, and stockroom or warehouse personnel are available to perform the heavier lifting. The appellant's work does not regularly require the full extent of physical effort described at Level 8-2.

This factor is credited at Level 8-1, for 5 points.

#### Factor 9 - Work Environment:

This factor considers the risks and discomforts in the employee's physical surroundings, and the safety precautions required.

At Level 9-1, the employee typically works indoors in an environment involving everyday risks or discomforts which require normal safety precautions typical of such places as offices or meeting rooms. Observance of normal fire regulations is required. The area is adequately lighted, heated, and ventilated.

At Level 9-2, the work environment involves moderate risks or discomforts which require special safety precautions, such as working around moving warehouse equipment, carts, or machines.

Employees may be required to use protective clothing or gear such as masks, gowns, safety shoes, goggles, hearing protection, and gloves.

Similar to Level 9-1, the appellant's primary work environment is an office setting, with the normal risks and discomforts found in that setting. Although the appellant sometimes works in a stockroom or warehouse environment, as discussed under the previous factor, the appeal record does not show that her stockroom/warehouse work includes working around warehouse equipment or other moving equipment, or that she is regularly exposed to significant risks and discomforts such as those described at Level 9-2.

This factor is evaluated at Level 9-1 for 5 points.

<b>SUMMARY</b>		
<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
1. Knowledge Required by the Position	1-3	350
2. Supervisory Controls	2-3	275
3. Guidelines	3-2	125
4. Complexity	4-2	75
5. Scope and Effect	5-2	75
6. Personal Contacts and 7. Purpose of Contacts	2-b	75
8. Physical Demands	8-1	5
9. Work Environment	9-1	5
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>985</b>

A total of 985 points falls within the range for GS-5, 855 to 1100 points, according to the Grade Conversion Table in the GS-2005 standard.

### **Decision**

This position is properly classified as a Supply Technician, GS-2005-5. This decision constitutes a classification certificate issued under the authority of section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code. The certificate is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the Government.