Why GAO Did This Study

Since 2007, the Departments of Defense (DOD) and Veterans Affairs (VA) have been testing a new disability evaluation system designed to integrate their separate processes and thereby expedite veterans’ benefits for wounded, ill, and injured servicemembers. Having piloted the integrated disability evaluation system (IDES) at 27 military facilities, they are now planning for its expansion military-wide.

Part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 required GAO to report on DOD and VA’s implementation of policies on disability evaluations. This report examines: (1) the results of the agencies’ evaluation of the IDES pilot, (2) challenges in implementing the IDES pilot to date, and (3) whether DOD and VA’s plans to expand the IDES adequately address potential future challenges. GAO analyzed data from DOD and VA, conducted site visits at 10 military facilities, and interviewed DOD and VA officials.

What GAO Recommends

GAO is making several recommendations to improve DOD and VA’s planning for expansion of the new disability evaluation system, including developing a systematic monitoring process and ensuring that adequate staff is in place. DOD and VA generally concurred with GAO’s recommendations and provided technical comments that GAO incorporated into the report as appropriate.

What GAO Found

In their evaluation of the IDES pilot as of February 2010, DOD and VA concluded that it had improved servicemember satisfaction relative to the existing “legacy” system and met their established goal of delivering VA benefits to active duty and reserve component servicemembers within 295 and 305 days, respectively, on average. While these results are promising, average case processing times have steadily increased since the February 2010 evaluation. At 296 days for active duty servicemembers, as of August 2010, processing time for the IDES is still an improvement over the 540 days that DOD and VA estimated the legacy process takes to deliver VA benefits to members. However, the full extent of improvement of the IDES over the legacy system is unknown because (1) the 540-day estimate was based on a small, nonrepresentative sample of cases and (2) limitations in legacy case data prevent a comprehensive comparison of timeliness, as well as appeal rates.

Piloting of the IDES has revealed several implementation challenges that have contributed to delays in the process, the most significant being insufficient staffing by DOD and VA. Staffing shortages were severe at a few pilot sites that experienced caseload surges. For example, at one of these sites, due to a lack of VA medical staff, it took 140 days on average to complete one of the key features of the pilot—the single exam—compared with the agencies’ goal to complete this step of the process in 45 days. The single exam posed other challenges that contributed to process delays, such as exam summaries that did not contain sufficient information for VA to determine the servicemember’s benefits and disagreements between DOD and VA medical staff about diagnoses for servicemembers’ medical conditions. Cases with these problems were returned for further attention, adding time to the process. Pilot sites also experienced logistical challenges, such as incorporating VA staff at military facilities and housing and managing personnel going through the process.

As DOD and VA prepare to expand the IDES worldwide, they have made preparations to address a number of these challenges, but these efforts have yet to be tested, and not all challenges have been addressed. To address staffing shortages and ensure timely processing, VA is developing a contract for additional medical examiners, and DOD and VA are requiring local staff to develop written contingency plans for handling surges in caseloads. However, the agencies lack strategies for meeting some key challenges, such as ensuring enough military physicians to handle anticipated workloads. They also do not have a comprehensive monitoring plan for identifying problems as they occur—such as staffing shortages and insufficiencies in medical exams—in order to take remedial actions as early as possible.