

Expanded E-Government

(G)	(Y)	(R)
<p>Must Meet All Core Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Value: all major systems investments have a business case submitted that meets the requirements of OMB Circular A-11 (Exhibit 53, Form 300). • IT Program Performance: On average, all major IT projects operating within 90% of Form 300 cost, schedule, and performance targets. • E-Government and GPEA implementation: (must show department-wide progress or participation in multi-agency initiative in 3 areas). • Citizen one-stop service delivery integrated through Firstgov.gov, cross-agency call centers, and offices or service centers. • Minimize burden on business by re-using data previously collected or using ebXML or other open standards to receive information. • Intergovernmental: Deploying e-Grants or Geospatial Information one-stop. • Obtaining productivity improvements by implementing customer relationship management, supply chain management, enterprise resource management, or knowledge management best practices. 	<p>Achievement of Some but not All Core Criteria; No Red Conditions</p>	<p>Has Any One of the Following Conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 50% of major IT investments have a business case per OMB Circular A-11 (Exhibit 53, Form 300). • On average, all major IT projects operating at less than 70% of Form 300 cost, schedule and performance targets. <p>Fulfills not more than one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizen one-stop service delivery integrated through Firstgov.gov, cross-agency call centers, and offices or service centers. • Minimize burden on business by re-using data previously collected or using ebXML or other open standards to receive information. • Intergovernmental: Deploying e-Grants or Geospatial Information one-stop. • Obtaining productivity improvements by implementing customer relationship management, supply chain management, enterprise resource management, or knowledge management best practices.

Budget and Performance Integration

(G)	(Y)	(R)
<p>Must Meet All Core Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated planning/evaluation and budget staff work with program managers to create an integrated plan/budget and to monitor and evaluate its implementation. • Streamlined, clear, integrated agency plan/budget sets forth outcome goals, output targets, and resources requested in context of past results. • Budget accounts, staff, and specifically program/activities are aligned to support achieving program targets. • Full budgetary cost is charged to mission accounts and activities. Cost of outputs and programs is integrated with performance in budget requests and execution. • Agency has documented program effectiveness. Analyses show how program outputs and policies affect desired outcomes. Agency systematically applies performance to budget and can demonstrate how program results inform budget decisions. 	<p>Achievement of Some but not All Core Criteria; No Red Conditions</p>	<p>Has Any One of the Following Conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and budgeting separate with little collaboration. Levels of organization have little and formal communication. Focus on getting funds for independent use. • Traditional budget request with little attempt to tie resources to results or communicate with other than budget technicians. • Excessive numbers of accounts, historical anomalies, accounts that fund illogical parts of programs. Centralized accounts that fund program resources; accounts that fund multiple programs with little in common. • No attention to charging cost to the right bureau, let alone the activity. Substantial costs "mixed up" at the agency or bureau level. Program managers lack authority over resources. • Focus on getting money for a good cause. Justification by anecdote. Little focus on outcomes, or how program influences them.

A(夏白)

A TOOL TO EVALUATE FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The Administration's efforts to link budget and performance began with last year's budget. The fifth element of the President's Management Agenda -- budget and performance integration -- stresses making budget decisions based on results. This year, that link was formalized. A new instrument for assessing government programs in an objective and transparent manner, called the Program Assessment Rating Tool, was introduced. The PART evaluates a program's purpose and design, planning, management, and results and accountability to determine its overall effectiveness.

For years, advocates of good government have been trying to find ways to improve accountability, focus on results, and integrate the performance of programs with decisions about budgets. As the *Budget* volume details, Presidents throughout the latter half of the 20th Century sought by various means to make performance matter.

Early efforts date to the Truman Administration's 1951 budget. With the 1993 passage of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), the Congress directed the Executive Branch to seek improvements in the effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability of federal programs by having agencies focus on program results. Former Congressman and then-Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Director Leon Panetta called it, "a major step toward making the government accountable to the American people by making it clear what the taxpayers are getting for their money and removing some of the red tape that bedevils all of us. As every other enterprise has learned, government officials must manage for results, not just rules and regulations." While well-intentioned, GPRA did not meet its objectives. Through the President's Budget and Performance Integration initiative, augmented by the PART, the Administration will strive to implement the objectives of GPRA.

What Is the PART?

The PART is an accountability tool that attempts to determine the strengths and weaknesses of federal programs with a particular focus on the results individual programs produce. Its overall purpose is to lay the groundwork for evidence-based funding decisions aimed at achieving positive results. The PART consists of approximately 30 questions, depending on the type of program. The PART's first three sections, focusing on program purpose, strategic planning, and management, follow a yes/no format. The fourth hones in on results. It uses a four-point scale to note partial achievement of goals. Answers must be substantiated by a brief narrative explanation and evidence. Each individual "yes" answer points to a potential high level of performance overall. A "no" answer indicates no evidence is available, or the program has failed to perform.

The accompanying table provides a brief description of the four sections along with examples of programs that scored high and low in 2004. For more detailed information regarding PART guidance and PART worksheets, visit the OMB website at www.omb.gov.

THE PART, IN SECTIONS

Section	Description	Low Score Example	High Score Example
Program Purpose and Design Weight = 20%	To assess whether the program design makes sense and the purpose is clear	Dept. of Energy Advanced Technology Program – no clear need for the program; private sector does similar research	Dept. of Health and Human Services Health Centers – clear program; purpose commonly held by interested parties
Strategic Planning Weight = 10%	To assess whether the agency sets valid annual and long-term goals for the program	Dept. of Justice Cybercrime – no long-term, outcome-oriented goals or annual performance goals	Dept. of Energy National Nuclear Security Adm. Facilities and Infrastructure – 10-year Comprehensive Site Plan integrates and prioritizes projects
Program Management Weight = 20%	To rate agency management of the program, including financial oversight and program improvement efforts	Dept. of Energy Gas Exploration and Production – could not document a comprehensive system for tracking cost, schedule, and performance	Social Security Adm. Supplemental Security Income for the Aged – strong financial management and accountability practices, allowing tracking of full actual costs
Program Results/ Accountability Weight = 50%	To rate program performance on goals reviewed in the strategic planning section and through other evaluations	Office of National Drug Control Policy Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign – no evidence that paid media messages have a direct effect on youth drug-related behavior	Dept. of Commerce National Weather Service – improved accuracy and timeliness of forecasts and warnings

Each section includes a series of questions designed to elicit specific information about a program's performance. The questions also are weighted. Their weighting can be altered to emphasize key factors that may be more or less relevant for a specific program. A "not applicable" response is used for questions not relevant to the program, with an appropriate explanation. While these two flexibilities were provided in recognition that one size does not fill all, they were used in only limited cases.

As the nearby table shows, each section is assigned a weight as well, in order to generate an overall assessment. This year many agencies furnished incomplete information. A number of programs were not able to demonstrate results, but will need to in the future. Examples can be found throughout this volume.

The next table illustrates the key questions from each section of the PART.