

Huntington Ingalls Industries: capacity before volume

Internal ID: S&F-STR-301

Topic: Operations Strategy, Customer Strategy, Corporate Strategy

Industry: Aerospace & Defense

Source: Strategy & Finance

Publication date: 5 October 2026

License: Not specified

Student case | Information cutoff: July 30, 2026, 11:52 a.m. ET

At the July 30, 2026 cutoff, a hypothetical NNS leadership team faced a strategic implementation question. The Navy had just placed additional Block VI Virginia-class and Build II Columbia-class work into a long production horizon. HII's public materials described a large workforce and several talent pipelines, while government oversight reported that skilled trades take years to develop and that less experienced workers may need more supervision to avoid quality problems and rework. What should NNS strengthen first-and what controls should determine when work is released?

The case treats the role of NNS leadership and the decision below as hypothetical. It does not establish a pending internal decision, a proven NNS labor shortage, or that labor is the binding constraint.

The assignment

Assume you advise a hypothetical NNS leadership team. Recommend how to sequence workforce-capacity investments and operating controls over the next 18 months as Block VI Virginia-class and Build II Columbia-class work meets existing obligations. Explain how you would balance experienced-worker hiring and retention with training, knowledge transfer, supervisor capacity, quality, suppliers, facilities, design changes, and Navy scheduling.

Propose a small set of leading indicators and a review cadence that could guide work release. Distinguish what is established by public evidence from what internal data you would need. The 18-month horizon and any proposed targets or thresholds are teaching constructs, not HII commitments. Do not estimate site-level wages, attrition, labor availability, training throughput, productivity, or unit economics from this case.

A joint award with a defined work split

On July 29, HII announced approximately **\$76.6 billion in combined contract modifications to HII's Newport News Shipbuilding and General Dynamics Electric Boat (GDEB)**. The modifications cover five additional Columbia-class submarines, nine additional Virginia-class submarines, and infrastructure funding. HII said NNS would be the delivery yard for six of the planned Virginia boats and would construct six module sections for each Columbia boat. The announced amount is joint; HII did not disclose an NNS or HII-only allocation, contract margin, labor budget, or award-specific production economics. It is not appropriate to treat \$76.6 billion as HII revenue or backlog. (Exhibit 1)

The announcement expands a substantial existing portfolio. At December 31, 2025, NNS reported \$29.9 billion of backlog, including \$14.6 billion unfunded. At June 30, 2026, HII reported \$57.3 billion of consolidated remaining performance obligations (RPO), with roughly 35% expected to convert to revenue through 2027. Segment backlog and consolidated RPO are different measures, dates, and scopes; neither establishes NNS capacity or the economics of a particular boat. (Exhibit 2)

Workforce: scale is not proficiency

HII reported approximately 44,000 employees across the enterprise at year-end 2025 and about 8,000 hires during 2025. It also reported more than 1,350 shipbuilding apprentices enrolled across more than 27 crafts and programs, and 1,096 Master Shipbuilders at NNS. Those measures differ in population, timing, and definition. They do not disclose NNS net hiring, trade mix, vacancy, apprentice placement, trainer availability, proficiency, or productive capacity.

GAO's February 2025 review found that all seven private Navy shipbuilders it examined faced recruitment, retention, or skill-level constraints. Shipbuilder documentation cited a three-to-five-year path to skilled-trade proficiency, and GAO noted that less experienced workers may need more supervision to avoid quality problems and rework. The report drew on documents, interviews, and site visits across the industrial base; it does not establish a causal estimate or a current bottleneck at NNS. A later GAO testimony in April 2026 described workforce observations as preliminary. (Exhibit 3)

Several explanations remain possible. A larger intake might expand future capacity while increasing near-term training and supervision demands. Retaining experienced workers may preserve knowledge, but retention alone may not create the future pipeline needed for multiple programs. Physical infrastructure, supplier readiness, design maturity, Navy funding and sequence, and contract terms may also affect execution.

Execution signals require careful reading

HII's 2025 filing described performance challenges at NNS in carrier construction and Virginia-class submarines, including unfavorable cumulative catch-up adjustments partly offset by contract incentives. NNS segment operating income nevertheless rose to \$331 million from \$246 million, largely due to Virginia-class contract adjustments and partly offset by carrier refueling and complex overhaul (RCOH) adjustments and incentives. In Q2 2026, NNS revenue was \$1.849 billion and operating income was \$111 million. HII also reported companywide cumulative catch-up adjustments of \$10 million favorable, including a \$28 million favorable adjustment on USS *John C. Stennis* RCOH and a \$48 million unfavorable adjustment on USS *George Washington* RCOH. These carrier items are not submarine results, and the aggregate segment data do not reveal labor productivity or quality by program. (Exhibit 4)

Contract estimates can change as cost, schedule, and incentive expectations change. Such accounting adjustments are relevant signals about contract execution, but they are not direct measures of physical throughput or the cause of an outcome. Students should avoid using segment earnings or carrier RCOH adjustments as a proxy for submarine labor performance.

What learning research can and cannot say

Argote, Beckman, and Epple studied Liberty Ship production across 13 World War II shipyards. Their model considers labor, shipways, yard effects, time, and a knowledge stock that can depreciate. They caution that cumulative output can overstate retained learning and suggest that routines and coordination may matter. Their unusual wartime setting and standardized vessel do not yield a modern nuclear-shipbuilding productivity parameter.

Bongers' analysis of three U.S. fighter-aircraft programs provides a secondary analogy: product variants and production interruptions may complicate learning. It uses annual acquisition and flyaway-cost data, and the authors identify data and estimation limitations. Neither study estimates HII's learning curve, the productivity effect of an NNS hiring plan, or the optimal work sequence. The mechanisms suggest questions about stable teams, work-package continuity, training, and learning capture; the public record does not quantify their effects at NNS.

A decision under incomplete operating data

Public evidence supports more than one diagnosis. Workforce proficiency and supervision could be important, but so could work-system coordination, supplier constraints, aging infrastructure, design changes, contract incentives, and Navy sequencing or funding. NNS's disclosed workshare also differs across the two submarine programs: NNS is the delivery yard for six Virginia boats and a module builder for Columbia. Public announcements do not provide the boat-level staffing plan or reveal how the two workstreams compete for particular trades, facilities, suppliers, or management attention.

The leadership team must decide whether to build capacity ahead of demand, emphasize experienced retention and training before releasing more work, or stage a hybrid approach. It must also determine how to distinguish a recruiting problem from a proficiency, quality, supplier, engineering, or schedule problem. The missing operational evidence is part of the decision: NNS has not publicly disclosed trade-level turnover, time-to-proficiency, apprentice graduation and placement, supervisor spans, labor hours by work package, first-pass yield, rework, or supplier-level delivery and quality measures.

Discussion questions

1. What is the decision at NNS, and which parts of the July 29 announcement are joint-award facts rather than HII-specific economics?
2. Which constraint hypotheses deserve priority: workforce scale, proficiency and supervision, coordination, suppliers, facilities, design maturity, contract terms, or Navy schedule and funding? What evidence would distinguish them?
3. How should NNS sequence experienced hiring and retention, apprenticeships, mentoring, and work release? What are the risks of adding people faster than the operating system can absorb them?
4. What leading indicators and review cadence would you recommend? Identify measures that would trigger expansion, pause, or re-sequencing, and state which are not publicly available.
5. How should leaders interpret HII's segment results and cumulative catch-up adjustments without confusing carrier RCOH outcomes, accounting estimates, and submarine productivity?
6. What can shipbuilding learning research contribute to the decision? Which findings should remain analogies rather than HII assumptions?

Exhibits

Exhibit 1. July 29, 2026 joint submarine award

Publicly announced scope	HII-described NNS role	Not disclosed
Approximately \$76.6B in combined modifications to HII NNS and GDEB; five additional Columbia boats, nine additional Virginia boats, and infrastructure funding	Delivery yard for six planned Virginia boats; construction of six Columbia module sections per boat	HII-only or NNS-only value, revenue, backlog, margin, labor budget, contract terms, or hull economics

The award amount and scope are as announced by HII. Do not allocate the combined amount to HII or infer a specific workshare value.

Exhibit 2. Selected workload measures

Measure	Reported value	Scope and date
NNS backlog	\$29.9B	Newport News segment, Dec. 31, 2025; includes \$14.6B unfunded
HII remaining performance obligations	\$57.3B	Consolidated, June 30, 2026; roughly 35% expected to convert through 2027

Backlog and RPO are not interchangeable. They have different scopes, measurement dates, funding conditions, and conversion schedules.

Exhibit 3. Workforce evidence and its limits

Evidence	Reported fact	What it does not establish
HII workforce	Approximately 44,000 employees at year-end 2025; about 8,000 hired during 2025	NNS net headcount additions, trade-level vacancies, attrition, or productive capacity
Training and experience	More than 1,350 shipbuilding apprentices across 27+ crafts/programs; 1,096 NNS Master Shipbuilders	Apprentice completion/placement, trainer availability, or site-specific mentoring capacity
GAO industrial-base review	Seven shipbuilders faced workforce constraints; documentation cited 3-5 years to skilled-trade proficiency	A current NNS-specific constraint or causal estimate of hiring's effect

Exhibit 4. Execution and contract-accounting context

Evidence	Period / scope	Interpretation limit
NNS operating income: \$331M vs. \$246M	FY2025 vs. FY2024	Increase largely reflected Virginia-class contract adjustments; carrier RCOH adjustments/incentives partly offset it
NNS revenue: \$1.849B; operating income: \$111M	Q2 2026	Segment totals do not isolate submarines, labor productivity, or quality
Companywide net cumulative catch-up: +\$10M; <i>Stennis</i> RCOH: +\$28M; <i>George Washington</i> RCOH: -\$48M	Q2 2026	Both named items concern carrier RCOH, not submarine performance

Exhibit sources

- HII, [July 29, 2026 joint award announcement](#), paragraphs 1-4.
- HII, [2025 Form 10-K](#), Item 1, pp. 5-8; Item 7, pp. 39-42 and 48.
- HII, [Q2 2026 Form 10-Q](#), Note 6, pp. 10-11; Note 7, p. 12; MD&A, pp. 21-25.
- GAO, [GAO-25-106286](#), workforce and infrastructure pp. 20-28; scope and methods, Appendix I, pp. 50-55. GAO, [GAO-26-109068](#), Apr. 22, 2026, preliminary testimony.
- Argote, Beckman, and Eppe (1990), “The Persistence and Transfer of Learning in Industrial Settings,” *Management Science* 36(2): 140-154, especially pp. 142-153. Bongers (2017), “Learning and Forgetting in the Jet Fighter Aircraft Industry,” *PLOS ONE* 12(9), sections on data, results, and limitations. Reading versions and scope are described in the research source register.

Case boundary: Company and GAO statements are attributed. Hypothetical role, horizon, controls, indicators, and thresholds are teaching constructs. Carril et al. (2026) is abstract-only and provisional in the research dossier; this case does not use it as a substantive empirical claim. No post-cutoff information is included.