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Executive summary

Introduction

1 This review examined two NZDF projects being undertaken to:
   a determine the numbers of people required in uniform (the Force Structure Project); and
   b ensure that all positions are filled by military or civil staff members at the correct rank, trade and skill level (the Right People in the Right Place in the Right Numbers at the Right Time at the Right Cost (R5) Job Evaluation Review Project).

2 These projects are primarily being undertaken to determine the optimum size and shape of the NZDF’s personnel force structure to meet current and future output delivery.

3 Field work for this review was completed in June 2011.

Background

4 A range of options for military capabilities was determined for the purpose of the Defence White Paper 2010. It was recognised that a robust analysis of the numbers of personnel required to sustain the chosen option would be necessary as part of its implementation.

5 The purpose of the personnel Force Structure Project was to establish the numbers of personnel required in uniform. These numbers were then validated through an examination of all trades and branches. The Force Structure Project made modifications to the NZDF’s Personnel Capability Planning Model, through which the minimum number of military personnel needed to deliver the NZDF outputs is determined. These modifications incorporated the results of a number of earlier reviews of the model.

6 The purpose of the personnel R5 job evaluation review, initiated early in 2009, is to evaluate the job size of trade/rank positions. The outcome of the review enables the NZDF to know the appropriate rank or qualification required for each military and civil staff position. The R5 evaluation also indirectly provides a means of achieving personnel savings by posting adjustment where an incumbent is of a higher rank than a post requires.
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7 A robust determination of its required personnel strength should assist the NZDF realise the benefits and savings from the Value for Money and Defence Transformation Programme activities.

Overview

8 The personnel Force Structure Project has determined the optimum numbers of personnel required in uniform. Its assessment is that the strengths of each Service should be:

a Navy 2,149
b Army 5,600
c Air Force 2,224
d Senior officers\(^1\) 81

9 The second phase of the project is the development of employment profiles that ensure all branch and trade groups have relevance to NZDF outputs. This will be followed by mapping, for each trade and branch group, the posts needed for deployment, those required to sustain a mission, and those necessary for employing personnel when not deployed or preparing to deploy. With the exception of the Army, employment profiling is complete. Post mapping is expected to be completed on schedule by December 2011. The final phase of the project will be the documentation and presentation of a standardised pan NZDF personnel force structure. This is expected to be completed on time by December 2012.

10 The personnel Force Structure Project has been appropriately coordinated with and informed by other concurrent personnel related activities.

11 The R5 job evaluation review project is almost complete, with only job evaluations at the corporal equivalent level outstanding. The need to evaluate this rank is being reassessed.

12 Workforce planners have passed resized job details to the personnel capability development directorate for inclusion in force structure development initiatives. Some 80 posts will have the post rank level downgraded. Posting action is being progressed to rebalance these posts. This is being done concurrently with the Civilianisation project.

\(^1\) Tri-Service colonel equivalents and above.
The R5 team has assisted with job evaluations for new civilian posts being established under the NZDF’s civilianisation project. This has slowed progress on completing the R5 work, which is now expected to finish by the end of 2011.

Summary

The personnel Force Structure Project is well into phase 2 of the project and, with the exception of the Army, post mapping has begun. This phase is expected to be completed on schedule by December 2011. Phase 3 of the project, involving the documentation and presentation of a standardised pan-NZDF personnel force structure, is expected to complete as scheduled in December 2012.

The R5 project is a major undertaking. The project has achieved almost all of its goals. The benefits of the project are being realised through the input to the Civilianisation project. Sustained benefits will be realisable once posting adjustments have been made to match the person filling a position with the job size.

It is important that the NZDF does not lose the benefits of the effort applied to the personnel Force Structure Project and the R5 project. The NZDF needs to fully embed personnel strength modelling and job evaluation processes into its routine establishment management processes.

We consider that both projects have been appropriately managed and are on target to deliver a credible assessment of the NZDF’s military personnel needs. The NZDF needs, however, to maintain sufficient project resources if the project target dates are to be achieved. In respect of project management, we concluded that:

a. both projects are aligned to strategy and have appropriate governance;
b. appropriate terms of reference exist;
c. project management is effective;
d. project resourcing requirements and associated costs were identified. However, the personnel resource applied to the projects was significantly less than the number sought by the projects. This lack of resources was mitigated through the provision of temporary assistance from the Services;
e. there has been effective communication across the NZDF; and
f. regular progress reports have been provided to project steering committees and other stakeholders.
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Chief of Defence Force Response

Chief of Defence Force response

1 The content and observations are accepted. Given the importance of the Force Structure Project and R5 Project, it is reassuring to note the positive commentary on the effective management and appropriate conduct of the Projects.
Section 1
Introduction

Introduction
1.1 This review examined two NZDF projects being undertaken to:
   a  determine the numbers of people required in uniform (the Force Structure Project); and
   b  ensure that all positions are filled by military or civil staff members at the correct rank, trade and skill level (the Right People in the Right Place in the Right Numbers at the Right Time at the Right Cost (R5) Job Evaluation Review Project).

1.2 These projects are being undertaken primarily to determine the optimum size and shape of the NZDF’s personnel force structure to meet current and future output delivery.

1.3 Field work for this review was completed in June 2011.

Background
1.4 The Defence White Paper set out the Government’s strategic direction for the NZDF. The White Paper identified the military capabilities needed to support Government policy objectives. A range of options for military capabilities was developed during preparatory work. The NZDF acknowledged that it needed to do a robust analysis of the numbers of personnel required to deliver the chosen option as a first step in the actual implementation of the option chosen.

1.5 At the same time, fiscal restraints compelled the NZDF to find ways to reduce expenditure.

1.6 The Value for Money Review, which complemented the White Paper, found scope for substantial savings and redirection of funds to make current capability more affordable. The Review identified a number of potential workforce cost-reduction initiatives. The civilianisation by the NZDF of a large number of previously military positions is an example of a Value for Money initiative.
Section 1 - Introduction

1.7 The NZDF had, before the Value for Money Review, already begun a number of activities to improve business and organisational efficiency and effectiveness. The Defence Transformation Programme (DTP) was the principal activity.

1.8 The two personnel-related projects that we have examined are intended to deliver a robust assessment of the number of people the NZDF requires and their trade, rank and skill levels. By validating the personnel requirement, the NZDF can assure itself and its stakeholders that it is expending no more on its personnel strength than is required to deliver effective military capability with the assets it possesses.

Approach

1.9 We examined these two initiatives, to assess whether they were being managed in accordance with good practice, and whether they would lead to the desired outcomes. We looked particularly at:

a governance (senior management involvement, alignment with strategy);

b planning (objectives, realistic timelines, delivery);

c management, (project framework, inter-relationship with other projects, risk);

d resourcing (sufficient personnel skills);

e communication (internal and external); and

f monitoring and reporting (timely and accurate, progress/outcomes).
Section 2
Personnel Force Structure Project

Introduction

2.1 The intent of this project was to determine the optimal number of military personnel the Services require with the right skills and the right readiness to deliver the NZDF mission/outputs out to 2015/2035. The project also aimed to establish the level of uniformed personnel below which the NZDF should not go in pursuing efficiency gains, without risking the ability to deliver outputs.

2.2 The project was to validate and refine the numbers derived through a process of employment profiling. It would then develop a distribution map of all military positions that would allow assessment of the personnel costs of a capability.

2.3 The Executive Leadership Team (Defence Force Leadership Board)\(^2\) agreed Terms of reference for the project in April 2010. CDF gave approval to those Terms of Reference in July 2010. The Defence Force Leadership Board Strategic Human Resources Committee provides overall governance.

2.4 The Project Manager reports to the governance committee through Assistant Chief Personnel (Project Owner) and VCDF (Project Sponsor).

Planning/delivery

2.5 The project has four phases:

a Phase 0 – to confirm the assumptions underlying the Military Capability Options used for determining personnel numbers required to deploy operational force elements. The project used the missions depicted by Military Capability Option 20, Schedule 4,\(^3\) as its base.

---

\(^2\) The Executive Leadership Team has become the Defence Force Leadership Board. To avoid confusion, we use the latter term throughout this report.

\(^3\) A variety of Military Capability Option scenarios were developed for the Defence White Paper to determine options for military capabilities that could be available for Government. Option 20 broadly reflects the 'middle pathway' recommended to the Government.
b Phase 1 – to determine the ideal personnel numbers at lieutenant colonel rank and below required for each corps, trade and branch to deploy and sustain force elements. Also to determine the optimal strength of officers at colonel (E) and above to deliver and sustain senior military leadership.

c Phase 2 – to develop the employment profile of for each corps, trade and branch to show how it contributes to the selected missions. Also to develop a post map for senior officers showing contribution to the provision of succession for senior military appointments.

d Phase 3 – to present the employment related information on all the NZDF’s corps, trades and branches in a standardised way. Accurate assessment of the personnel costs of a capability would follow, enabling decisions on trade-offs where funding is restrained.

Phase 0

2.6 The project completed phase 0 in October 2010. The phase 0 paper identified the capability bricks associated with the force elements needed both as part of an initial deployed force and as a rotation element. The paper also identified headquarters posts and standing commitments such as UN deployments that the NZDF must meet. An effective date of 2015 was used to calculate the personnel growth required for capabilities being introduced into service.

Phase 1

2.7 Phase 1 – personnel required in uniform analysis – went to the Force Structure Project governance committee in December 2010. The project used a modified Personnel Capability Planning Model to determine personnel numbers. The Personnel Capability Planning Model is a scenario-based planning tool used to identify the requirement for uniformed personnel to meet different deployment options.

2.8 Current policy on the use of the Personnel Capability Planning Model is contained in Defence Force Order 10/2001 Personnel Capability Planning Model (PCPM). Since the issue of DFO 10/2001 there have been several reviews of the model. These reviews noted that while the basic structure of the model was appropriate for assessing uniformed personnel requirements, certain elements needed improved definition. For the current exercise, modifications were incorporated into the model that included:

a an improved definition of military specialists, leadership structural overlay, and personnel under training;
b the integration of personnel requirements for joint organisations into service personnel calculations; and

c the incorporation of a standing commitments element for UN operations.

2.9 A secondary outcome of the project is to develop a new Defence Force Order outlining the modified Personnel Capability Planning Model as one of its deliverables.

2.10 The Personnel Capability Planning Model has two distinct steps. In the present exercise, the assumptions agreed through phase 0 were used to determine the sustainable strength of the deployed forces and other force elements, for instance, support for EC 1\(^4\) tasks and standing UN commitments. This is the number of operational personnel required in uniform.

2.11 The second step added military support roles and a structural overlay to maintain optimum corps, trade and branch structures and allow for effective development and career management. This step also adds numbers to provide for such needs as sea/shore ratios.\(^5\) This made up the number of support personnel required in uniform. Together, operational and support provided the total number of personnel required in uniform.

2.12 The steering committee accepted the numbers for the Navy and Air Force but not those for the Army. Numbers for the Army were recalculated after a revision of the deployed force requirements and modification of certain structural overlay assumptions. Army personnel required in uniform numbers were reduced from 7,062 to 5,914. The Defence Force Leadership Board accepted the revised assessment.

2.13 The final Phase 1 personnel required in uniform figure for the Army was subsequently set at 5,600. This is comprised of a 5,400 ceiling set by Cabinet plus 200 for enhancement of Special Forces. Phase 2 is using the 5,600 number.

2.14 Application of the Personnel Capability Planning Model (and subject to the modification in paragraph 2.13) to this point (November 2010) indicated personnel needs as shown in Fig 2.1.

---

\(^4\) Employment Context 1 - Security Challenges and Defence Tasks in NZ and its environs.

\(^5\) Shore billets provide Navy personnel with an essential respite from sea service, and personnel in these non-seagoing positions provide the resource for shore based support, training and administration. Although not quite so defined, similar positions are also required to provide respite for Army and Air Force personnel.
Fig 2.1: PCPM calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>PCPM ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>ACTUAL NUMBERS AT 30 OCT 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>2,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>4,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>2,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Service senior officers7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>(included in above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,054</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,708</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 2**

2.15 The Personnel Capability Planning Model identifies the minimum number of personnel required to be in uniform to enable the delivery of outputs. The model does not determine the personnel needs for individual units. Historically, the Services carried out periodic establishment reviews for this purpose. Phase 2 of the personnel force structure project involves a review of all NZDF establishments through validation and refining of the number, shape and distribution of uniformed personnel posts.

2.16 The first stage of phase 2 involves determining employment profiles to ensure that all corps, trades and branches have relevance to the NZDF’s and Services’ missions. As well as establishing the alignment between the branch or trade and the mission, these profiles collate pertinent information to inform decision making around:

- a career management and development;
- b training needs;
- c introduction of new equipment;
- d sustainability requirements;
- e remuneration; and
- f development of doctrine.

2.17 Part of the employment profiling task involves looking for efficiencies through the amalgamation of trades where this is feasible.

2.18 Employment profiles for the Navy and Air Force were completed as scheduled by July 2011. The ongoing Army transformation process, which has yet to complete finalising the details of the future Army force structure, has delayed development of employment profiles for that Service.

---


7 Colonel (E) and above.
2.19 The second stage of phase 2 is the production of position maps, identifying for all corps, trades and branches those posts that are required to deploy the mission, those required to sustain the mission, and those for employing personnel when not on deployment or preparing to deploy. This provides the foundations of a mechanism against which informed decisions on personnel capability trade-offs can be made in the future.

2.20 Mapping of posts commenced in July 2011. We were told that the delay in completing Army employment profiling because of the work on Army transformation should not impact on the completion of post maps. The NZDF expects to complete phase 2 of the personnel force structure project by December 2011. We think this target date could be at risk unless sufficient resources are applied for the remainder of the current year.

2.21 The first tranche of DTP organisational restructuring and civilianisation necessitated an update to the NZDF establishment. This updated establishment is being used for the post mapping process currently under way. The final result of organisational change and post mapping of military personnel may require a refinement of the Personnel Capability Planning Model at the end of phase 2.

Phase 3

2.22 Phase 3 of the project, involving the documentation and presentation of a new, standardised pan-NZDF personnel force structure model is yet to be formally approved, and may be conducted outside the force structure project. The NZDF will use this model, scheduled to be completed by December 2012, to help develop and optimise personnel growth strategies by taking into account output priorities, funding availability and trade regeneration lead times.

2.23 We note that an original purpose of the model was to enable assessment of the personnel implications of capability and force structure proposals. We would expect that once the NZDF has completed the current assessment of personnel required in uniform, there will be consistent application of the Personnel Capability Planning Model on every occasion of changes in force structure or the addition or deletion of capabilities or platforms.

Relationship with other activities

2.24 The personnel force structure project was to leverage and complement, as much as possible, information available within the Services as well as other pan-NZDF actions such as the Defence Transformation Programme, Value for Money implementation, and R5.
2.25 The DTP reorganisation, R5 job evaluation review and civilianisation activities have each impacted on the structure of corps, trades and branches. While changes from each of these activities have informed the personnel force structure project, the validation process undertaken under Phase 2 will identify any posts which may have been civilianised but which should filled by military personnel. The Project will also identify, for resolution by the Services, any mismatch between the post job sizing and employment group requirements.

2.26 The project utilises all approved trade sustainability models developed by the Services along with the employment profiling commenced by the Air Force prior to the project. If a corps, trade or branch sustainability model is reviewed, once approved any changes will be incorporated in the Force Structure Project’s deliverables. An example of such a review is the current RNZAF Technical Trades Review.

**Resourcing**

2.27 The NZDF did not initially accord the project priority for personnel resources to ensure completion within the target timeframe. We understand that at its commencement only one full-time person was assigned, and that external stakeholders commented adversely on this level of resourcing.

2.28 The greatest need for resources was for phase 2 of the project, where personnel were required to facilitate workshops and assist Service trade/branch representatives to develop employment profiles and prepare post maps. Requirements were identified as a project manager plus seven others.

2.29 Only two Air Force personnel have been posted to the project. While the Army transformation team has provided assistance, and the project manager conducted Navy workshops, we consider the level of resourcing less than desirable. Although we were told that the project is expected to meet its deadlines, we think timely completion remains at risk.

**Communication**

2.30 Communication on the project was delivered as planned to Service stakeholders through Service leadership briefings. Awareness was also generated through NZDF and Service news publications.

2.31 Workshop facilitators briefed trade and branch sponsors and stakeholders as part of the preparation for employment profiling and post mapping.

2.32 We think that communication has been effective and appropriate.
Monitoring and reporting

2.33 Routine quarterly reports on progress have been provided to the Defence Force Leadership Board Strategic Human Resources Committee. The Joint Personnel Forum (now the Personnel Capability Management Board) and other stakeholders received reports monthly.

2.34 Project schedule and progress reports have been made available through the Defence Personnel Executive site on the NZDF intranet.

Conclusion

2.35 The personnel Force Structure Project is well into phase 2 of the project and, with the exception of the Army, post mapping has begun. This phase is expected to be completed on schedule by December 2011. Phase 3 of the project, involving the documentation and presentation of a standardised pan NZDF personnel force structure, is expected to be completed on time in December 2012.

2.36 We consider that the project has been effectively managed and is on target to deliver a credible assessment of the NZDF’s military personnel needs. There is, however, a risk that if insufficient project resources are applied, the project’s target dates will not be achieved.

2.37 The personnel force structure project has been appropriately coordinated and informed by other concurrent personnel related activities. The impetus must be maintained to allow timely completion.
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Section 3
R5 Job Evaluation Review Project

Introduction

3.1 The Right People in the Right Place in the Right Numbers at the Right Time at the Right Cost (R5) Job Evaluation Review project was initiated to support the implementation of the NZDF’s performance based Military Remuneration System. The intent was to evaluate a range of positions at each rank level with the results being used to determine mid-point salary ranges within the Military Remuneration System.

3.2 The scope of the project has broadened to use recognised commercial job evaluation systems to validate the rank level for military positions and the grading of civilian positions.

3.3 The Defence Force Leadership Board approved terms of reference for the project in June 2009. The Personnel Capability Management Board, under the chairmanship of Assistant Chief Personnel, provides overall governance of the project. The project manager reports to the Board through Assistant Chief Personnel.

Project progress

3.4 The objectives of the project are to:

a evaluate all existing military and civilian roles within the NZDF;

b confirm the current state of trade and branch structures and to inform and validate any new personnel force structure; and

c assist in developing an effective overall personnel performance measurement system for the NZDF.

3.5 Positions are being evaluated through a number of phases:

a Phase 1 – Brigadier and colonel (E) and warrant officer ranks. All positions.

b Phase 2 – Lieutenant colonel (E) (including civilians). All positions.

c Phase 3 – Major (E) and staff sergeant (E). A sample of positions representative of the different trades/branches.
Phase 4 – Captain (E), sergeant (E) and corporal (E) positions. A sample of positions representative of the different trades/branches.

3.6 The evaluation of ranks is intended to cascade down from the top so there is a clear and direct link from the position being evaluated to the one above.

3.7 Over 2,000 interviews and evaluations have been undertaken to the end of June 2011. Fig 3.1 shows the numbers evaluated at each rank. Evaluations of brigadier (E), colonel (E) and lieutenant colonel (E) were conducted using the Hay Group system as this is used widely across the public sector. A selection of positions at each rank group below lieutenant colonel (E) were interviewed and evaluated. These positions were moderated by the relevant Service and then by a tri-Service process. The Services then applied the results to similar positions across the applicable rank level.

![Fig 3.1 Positions evaluated by equivalent rank](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>POSTS EVALUATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier, colonel</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant colonel</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant officer</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff sergeant</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>125 (to date)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 The job evaluation and moderation process for officers is complete. The Steering Committee approved the results of job sizing on brigadier (E) and colonel (E) posts in December 2009. The NZDF chose not to evaluate officer positions below the rank of captain (E).

3.9 Job sizing for warrant officers is complete. Evaluation of remaining ranks is nearing completion although the Navy is having difficulty applying the results from its sample of evaluated chief petty officer (staff sergeant (E)) positions to those that were not evaluated. Further analysis may be required. Sergeant (E) positions are in the final stage of moderation.

3.10 Evaluations of corporal (E) positions have commenced. However, the value of completing the process for corporal (E) is being reviewed.

---

8 In all three Services, there are few established posts for officers below the rank of captain. Officers below that rank are generally regarded as still being under training.
3.11 Lieutenant colonel (E) positions and below identified for resizing have been referred to the personnel Force Structure Project to confirm whether the position is still required and could be considered for civilianisation.

3.12 Job evaluation is a key component of the NZDF’s civilian remuneration structure. All senior civilian positions have been evaluated, as have those positions affected by organisational reform resulting from the Defence Transformation Programme and Civilianisation. Priority is currently being given to the more than 300 military positions being civilianised, each of which needed a new job description and job sizing to determine the grading for the position.

3.13 The NZDF intends incorporating the R5 job evaluation process into its ongoing human resource management systems. In future it will undertake regular assessments of new or altered positions on a regular basis. Policy and procedures will be developed to embed job sizing as a routine activity.

3.14 The project was originally scheduled to be completed in April 2010. However, substantial changes in the organisational structure over the period have required some positions to be evaluated more than once. Resources that were being applied to the R5 project have been assisting in the evaluation and sizing required for civilianisation. This, along with limited personnel resources, has contributed to delays with the project.

Job sizing

3.15 In order to enable positions to be properly evaluated, robust job descriptions were developed to accurately reflect roles, accountabilities, skill sets and expected outputs. Resources and assistance were provided by the project team to assist position holders prepare good position descriptions.

3.16 As reported above, the Hay Group job evaluation system was used for assessing senior positions while the Mercer IPE system was used for other ranks. External contractors were engaged to assist in undertaking the assessments for senior officers and to provide quality assurance for the process involved.

3.17 Following the assessment of job size and moderation on both a Service and tri-Service basis, finalised senior officer job sizes were approved by CDF. Service Chiefs are approving the remainder.
3.18 The project has developed a standard job description template for all positions. This template provides a base for future accountability and reporting. It will also facilitate ongoing performance management. All position details are now held in a data base pending approved and transfer into the Defence Human Resource Management Information System.

Application to workforce planning

3.19 The NZDF is using the results of the R5 project, in conjunction with the Force Structure Project, to adjust the NZDF establishment and realign the workforce. We were told that the moderated job evaluations have not yet been applied to formal establishment changes in the NZDF human resource information system. It had been intended to apply the changes from 1 July 2011 but this has been delayed until early September 2011.

3.20 The NZDF told us that the R5 evaluations indentified approximately 30 officer and 50 other rank posts where the incumbent was ranked above the appropriate level. This also assisted in the determination of the number of personnel who would be impacted under the Civilianisation Project. Posting action to rebalance posts and ranks is expected to achieve savings through reduced personnel costs.

3.21 Each Service’s Review Board (for military) and the Defence Personnel Executive (for civil staff) is managing surplus personnel identified through job resizing. Any reassignment of personnel is taking place in conjunction with other personnel initiatives, notably civilianisation.

Resourcing

3.22 The NZDF identified a need for a project manager and six personnel to assist in developing job descriptions and to undertake interviews of incumbents of positions being evaluated. Local HR managers and administrators were to assist in writing job descriptions and interviewing.

3.23 Only two personnel, in addition to the project manager, were posted full time to the project. While this lack of direct resources caused some delays to the project we were informed that, through careful phasing of ranks being assessed and with the assistance provided by HR personnel and administrators located at bases and camps, the project has proceeded at an acceptable pace.

3.24 As noted in para 3.14, R5 project resources have assisted with job evaluation and sizing of new positions created through the civilianisation project. This has impacted on the progress of the R5 project.

3.25 External contractors were employed to assist in the evaluation process.
Communication

3.26 Leadership briefings provided communication about the project to Service stakeholders. NZDF and Service news publications and information posted on the NZDF intranet provided more general communication.

3.27 Personnel received information sheets about the job evaluation process and how it would be carried out. The large number of people who were interviewed as part of the evaluation process meant that knowledge about it was widespread.

Monitoring and reporting

3.28 The project has maintained regular reporting to the Defence Force Leadership Board and other stakeholders. Individual reports on the outcome of evaluations of each rank have been provided at the appropriate level for approval and for recommendations on action to be taken.

Conclusion

3.29 The R5 project is a major undertaking. We understand there has not in recent years been any similar organisation-wide evaluation of military positions.

3.30 The project has achieved almost all of its goals and we think that it has been conducted in an appropriate manner. The benefits of the project are being realised through the input to the Civilianisation project. Sustained benefits will be realisable once posting adjustments have been made to match the person filling a position with the job size.

3.31 It is important that the NZDF does not lose the benefits of the effort applied to the R5 project and fully embeds job evaluation processes into its routine personnel establishment management processes.
Section 3 – R5 Job Evaluation Review Project
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