

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PART ASSESSMENTS¹

¹This document contains details of the most recent program assessments as of the date the 2005 Budget was published (February 2004). Programs originally assessed for the 2004 Budget were reassessed only where evidence showed an agency's rating was likely to change. Programs not reassessed are presented in this document in the form of reprints of the original worksheets and are footnoted "FY 2004 Budget".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Rating	Page
Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	3
DOI Wildland Fire Management.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	13
Energy and Minerals Management.....	Adequate.....	29
Energy Resource Assessments.....	Moderately Effective.....	37
Geologic Hazard Assessments.....	Moderately Effective.....	53
Habitat Restoration Activities.....	Moderately Effective.....	73
Indian Forestry Program.....	Adequate.....	87
Indian Law Enforcement.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	95
Indian School Construction.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	102
Indian School Operations.....	Adequate.....	113
Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	119
Mineral Resource Assessments.....	Moderately Effective.....	127
Minerals Revenue Management.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	141
National Fish Hatchery System.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	155
National Historic Preservation Programs.....	Moderately Effective.....	170
National Mapping.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	181
National Park Service Facility Management.....	Adequate.....	198
National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship.....	Moderately Effective.....	208
National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	218
Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Studies.....	Moderately Effective.....	228
Partners for Fish and Wildlife.....	Adequate.....	247
Reclamation Hydropower.....	Effective.....	258
Recreation Management.....	Adequate.....	270
Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	279
Rural Water Supply Projects.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	291
Science & Technology Program (S&T).....	Effective.....	303
Title XVI Water Reuse and Recycling.....	Moderately Effective.....	324
Tribal Courts.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	336
Tribal Land Consolidation.....	Moderately Effective.....	342

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	The AML program purpose is to provide a safer and cleaner environment by reclaiming and restoring as much land and water as possible that was degraded by pre 1977 coal mining operations. The program is implemented through cooperative partnerships between Interior's Office of Surface Mining (OSM) and participating States and Indian tribes -- 26 States and three Indian Tribes.	1) The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1997 (SMCRA), P.L. 95-87, 30 U.S.C. 1231 & 30 U.S.C. 1333, establish the program. The primary program purpose is to reclaim eligible abandoned coal mine sites by removing health, safety, general welfare, and environmental hazards. 2) OSM 's Strategic Plan states that OSM's primary goal is to protect society and the environment from the adverse effects of past coal mining operations. 3) The National Association of Abandoned Mine Land Programs (representing the 26 States and Indian Tribes with approved AML programs and OSM), established in 1995, promulgated a "Declaration of Shared Commitment". This declaration describes the partnership roles of the Federal/State/Tribal governments in caring out the program.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	SMCRA established a specific program and a dedicated funding source (tonnage based reclamation fee assessed on current coal production) to address the need. Over \$3 billion in unreclaimed coal-related health and safety hazards remain to be addressed by the program. In addition, there are general welfare, environmental, and non-coal problems that exist. While over half of the reclamation fees are paid by western coal mine operators, the preponderance (80%) of the unreclaimed coal-related health and safety hazards are located in the Appalachian Region -- States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Virginia, and Ohio.	1) SMCRA, together with its accompanying legislative history, documents the need to reclaim abandoned coal mine lands. 2) OSM's Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System (AMLIS) contains information (cost, problem type, units, location, etc.) for the over 4,600 known listed sites containing remaining coal-related health and safety hazards. 3) Resolutions from the National Governor's Association and Western Governor's Association express the need to continue reclaiming abandoned coal mine hazards that threaten the citizens of their States.	20%	0.2
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	SMCRA established a funding source and formula grants process to provide eligible States and Indian tribes the resources needed to reclaim impacts from abandoned coal mine lands where no responsible party can be found. For the most part, States and Tribes do not supplement their OSM grant to reclaim abandoned coal mine sites.	SMCRA established the basic framework of the AML Program - State/Tribe ability to assume reclamation primacy following the approval by the Secretary of the Interior of the individual reclamation program tailored to specific needs of the State/Tribe within the nationally mandated requirements. This State/Tribe lead concept helps assure that the AML program as a whole has a significant impact in addressing the problems and needs.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	Prior to passage of SMCRA few States had an abandoned mine program, and these were typically under funded. Currently, there is no other federal program that earmarks funds for the reclamation of abandoned coal mine sites, and for the most part, states rely on the program to address health and safety needs. In addition, a nationwide reclamation fee collection program mitigates competitive disadvantages that might occur if only selected States tried to raise adequate funds to address the remaining abandoned mine hazards within their borders. A nationwide program also encourages the exchange of reclamation expertise and provides cross-training opportunities.	This is evidenced by the Congressional findings concerning the widespread existence of abandoned mine health and safety hazards on 1.5 million acres of land and 11,500 miles of streams, and the need for a nationwide program to address these hazards that led to the enactment of SMCRA. More recently, the 5/17/00 testimony on behalf of the Interstate Mining Compact Commission before the House Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources made clear the unique contributions achieved through this cooperative federalism program. At Congressional hearings, the cooperative nature of the program also is highlighted. In addition, OSM provides its partners with extensive and well received technical training. The training program itself is collaborative, with almost 50% of the instructors being State/Tribal employees.	20%	0.2
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	SMCRA has the goal to reclaim all abandoned coal mine sites using fees on current coal production to pay for reclamation. The underlying authorizing legislation requires one-half of the fees collected within a state to be return to the state for restoration. If a state has restored its entire abandoned coal mine land the state can use its grant for other purposes. Many states have restored all of their abandoned coal mine sites and are using their grants for other purposes. Two-thirds of abandoned sites remain to be reclaimed. It has taken OSM, working with the states, 25 years to restore only one-third of the sites. As the program is authorized, it will take another 50 years to reach its goal, a length of time that is too long.	Testimony of States/Tribes and citizen organizations at Congressional appropriations hearings consistently address the adequacy of funding. As evidenced by appropriations bills introduced in the House and Senate, many consider the annual discretionary appropriation process to be less than optimum as a mechanism for providing the collected reclamation fees to address the reclamation problems and needs.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					100%	80%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)						
	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	Yes	The primary goal of the Abandoned Mine Land (AML) Program is the elimination of health and safety hazards brought about by past coal mining practices. The long term goal is to reclaim an additional 40,000 acres from the baseline fiscal year of FY 1998 by the end of FY 2005. This goal is accomplished through grants to twenty three states and three Indian tribes. OSM has as a secondary long term goal to improve the timely processing of grants. <i>[Note: When referring to acres in terms of the strategic plan, OSM is referred to a standardized acre. Because this program deals with many types of hazards (i. e. open shafts, mine fires, land slides etc.) OSM in collaboration with the States and Indian tribes developed a formula which converts each of these types of problems into standardized acres.]</i>	1) OSM's Annual Report for FY 2001; 2) OSM's Strategic Plan for FY 2000 - FY 2005; and 3) the draft Department of the Interior Strategic Plan. The Department's draft plan includes the AML program under two areas -- Resources Protection under "Improve the health of watersheds and landscapes" and Serving Communities under "Protect lives and property."	14%	0.1
2	<i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	OSM measures AML progress in terms of acres reclaimed on an annual basis. This goal is commensurate with the budget request, but keeps in mind the overall 40,000 acres long-term goal.	1) OSM's Annual Report for FY 2001; 2) OSM's Strategic Plan for FY 2000 - FY 2005; and 3) the draft Department of the Interior Strategic Plan.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	OSM's policy require that grantees and OSM field representatives meet at least annually to discuss restoration planning for upcoming years. These meetings, which are intended to focus on program effectiveness as opposed to process, provide a forum for both OSM and the States and Tribes to evaluate how the individual program can contribute to achieving the overall program goals. They also allow OSM and its partners to decide what needs to be done in the upcoming year to enhance meeting the overall program goals. As mutually reached state and Tribal plans for the upcoming year are developed, they are finalized in a Performance Agreement between the state/Tribe and OSM. These meetings are documented in the OSM prepared Annual Report specific to each State or Tribe. These reports are available on the OSM Website.	1) OSM's Directive AML-22, "Evaluation of State and Tribal Abandoned Mine Land Programs"; and 2) Individual State and Tribal Annual Reports.	14%	0.1
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	While OSM's mission of reclaiming historic mining related problems is unique, OSM and its grantees do regularly collaborate with Federal and State agencies that have responsibility for environmental quality, historic preservation, mine safety and construction management where AML reclamation projects overlap.	1) Past and ongoing cooperative projects between the States and other Federal agencies; and 2) Appalachian Clean Streams Program projects completed in partnership with EPA, Corps or Engineers or other agencies.	14%	0.1
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	No	Audits have been conducted by the Inspector General's office and the General Accounting Office, but these tend to focus on process rather than performance. However, OSM has done an internal evaluation of the program in anticipation of the expiration of the fee collection authority. This study, while not independent, does focus on the program's performance over the past 25 years.		14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	Yes	The primary current Strategic Plan goal for the AML Program is acres of coal-related health and safety abandoned mine land acres reclaimed. The "acres reclaimed" measure is a statistical conversion of the various measurement units (e.g., miles, acres, feet, gallons, etc.) that are associated with the 30 problem types (e.g., highwalls, open shafts, mine fires, etc.) that are part of the AML inventory. As part of the budget formulation process, a calculation is made as to the estimated acres that can be reclaimed at a given level of funding. This information is used in the budget and performance plan.	In determining the program budget for a given year, a calculation is performed to determine the estimated amount of reclamation that will occur as a result of a particular grant funding level. By examining different funding levels, policy makers can estimate the on-the-ground reclamation impact of their decisions	14%	0.1
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	In fiscal 2002, The Department of the Interior (DOI) began a major effort to revamp its strategic planning processes and measures. OSM staff participated in focus group meetings with key DOI customer and stakeholder groups. Regular discussions with internal and external program stakeholders helps to ensure that strategic planning takes into account the concerns and goals of the various involved groups.	In developing the draft DOI Strategic Plan, internal OSM teams examined the current strategic plan and made changes to fit into the new plan. In addition, teams comprised of OSM staff and State/Tribal partners in the regulatory and reclamation programs were formed and workshops are being held. These workshops will result in developing clear measurable objectives in accordance with the draft DOI plan and with outcome measures for use by OSM/States/Tribes.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					100%	86%

Section III: Program Management (Yes, No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	Grantees regularly report on the status of their programs through the grant reporting process and provide input into the Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System (AMLIS) prior to commencing a project and upon completion of a project. Information gathered is used to determine the status of the program for funding purposes.	1) AMLIS input as required by OSM Directive AML-1, Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System.; and 2) Grant Annual Performance and Financial Reports provide information on the status and progress of the annual 3-year grant on a project-by-project basis.	16%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, sub grantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	OSM and its grantees, in a partnership effort, determine the performance goals in a published Annual Performance Agreement. Oversight and on-site reviews are conducted to ensure that the goals are being met. Consequences of not meeting goals could include not reobligating funds to the State after the initial grant period has expired.	1) Annual Performance Agreements; 2) Division Chief Performance Standards; 3) A-133 audits; and 4) Ad hoc reviews of State and tribal records conducted by the field grants and program staff.	12%	0.1
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	Historically, the AML program has had problems getting States and Tribes to obligate grants. However, for Fiscal Year 2002 OSM has finally reduced grants to states and tribes unobligated balances significantly from about \$31 million in Fiscal Year 2001 and earlier to \$18 million in Fiscal Year 2002. In addition, OSM has made strides to reduce grant recoveries. OSM's efforts ensure that states and tribes are using the funds provided to meet the goals of the AML program.	Department's apportionment and reapportionment schedules (132s and 133s)	12%	0.1
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	N/A	The AML Grant Program is a formula grant program, and therefore incentives are not applicable. However, most grantees have sophisticated, well-established systems to measure and achieve efficiencies. OSM does not mandate specific performance goals or efficiency or productivity targets.		0%	
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	No	Although DOI complies with managerial cost accounting standards, it does not yet have a financial management system that fully allocates program costs and associates those costs with specific performance measures. This requirement might be met through Activity Based Costing (ABC), which DOI is adopting for each of its bureaus.		12%	0.0
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	OSM's Division of Financial Management has received clean audit reports for the past 11 years and has established internal control procedures for proper and timely payments. Detection of erroneous payments is part of OSM's program management function carried out by grants specialists through on-site reviews.	OSM's annual financial audit results which are reprinted in OSM's Annual Report. According to OSM's Division of Financial Management, the erroneous payment rate is not tracked because this figure is insignificant. This has not been an OIG audit issue.	12%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	OSM's review of AML Programs was changed in 1995 to evaluate performance rather than process. OSM meets annually with each State or Tribal program to discuss areas of concern and enters into formal written agreements to address management concerns. OSM is one of the first Bureaus to begin adapting Activity Based Costing to identify management deficiencies.	1) Individual State and Tribal Annual Reports; and 2) Directive AML-22, "Evaluation of State and Tribal Abandoned Mine Land Programs"	12%	0.1
8 (B 1.)	<i>Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?</i>	Yes	The Annual Performance Agreement for each grantee is the basis of oversight. The Agreement includes on-site reviews, reviews of expenditures, and program and performance reviews. One to two reviews per grantee are conducted annually, focusing on internal controls and management of the program.	1) Grant Performance Reports; and 2) reviews conducted as agreed to in the Annual Performance Agreements.	12%	0.1
9 (B 2.)	<i>Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?</i>	Yes	OSM collects, compiles, and disseminates grantee performance information through the OSM Annual Report. This report is distributed in hard copy and is available on OSM's Website.	OSM's Annual Performance Report.	12%	0.1
Total Section Score					100%	88%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	Large Extent	Since the program began in 1977, it has eliminated problems on over 214,000 acres of land and waters. These problems were the direct result of past coal mining practices. These problems include a myriad of types of hazards, including mine fires, landslides, and subsidence. A complete list of the problems that are encountered in the AML program, along with the reclamation accomplishments in each is attached. Additional health and safety problems caused by other types of mining were eliminated on over 18,000 acres.	1) Abandoned Mine Land inventory System; 2) OSM 's Annual Reports; and 3) OSM's Coal Fee study.	20%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	<p>Long-Term Goal I: Increase the number of acres reclaimed</p> <p>Target: Beginning in FY 1998, eliminate 40,000 acres of Abandoned Mine Land coal related hazards by the end of FY 2005.</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p> <p>Over 40,000 acres have been reclaimed since the end of FY 1997. Except in the first year of our plan, we have consistently exceeded our goal. We are currently in the process of reevaluating these goals and in partnership with the programs, may develop either additional goals and measures, or revise upwards our current ones.</p>					
2	Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?	Large Extent	Beginning in FY 1998, OSM set an annual goal of acres reclaimed under the program. In FY 1998, OSM reached 90% of the goal. Thereafter, we exceeded the goal by 48%, 50% and 44%. Given that the goal has been exceed, OSM needs to reassess its method of calculating or data collection before there is certainty that OSM is meeting its goals.	1) GPRA reports to the Department of the Interior; and 2) OSM's Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System. One reason that OSM exceeds its goal is that only when OSM implemented performance based goals, did states and tribes begin updating OSM's automated project data base on completed activities.	20%	0.1
<p>Key Goal I: To increase the numbers of acres of abandoned mine lands reclaimed.</p> <p>Performance Target: In FY 2001 (latest data available), the goal was to reclaim 8,600 acres.</p> <p>Actual Performance: In FY 2001, 13,808 acres were reclaimed.</p> <p>Key Goal II: Increase the number of grants processed within 60 days of receipt.</p> <p>Performance Target: Improve each year over the prior year until 100% is reached</p> <p>Actual Performance: In FY 97, the rate was 92%. It was 90% in FY 98, 93% in FY99, and 100% in FY2000. OSM will continue to track this goal.</p>						
3	Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?	Yes	The AML Enhancement Rule, implemented in 1999, leverages AML funds with outside sources by allowing project reclamation contractors to remove and sell the coal at the reclamation site. Thus far, states have completed 4 projects under this rule. The estimated cost of reclamation without the rule was over \$1.5 million. With the rule, the cost to the programs was approximately \$133,000. This is a savings of over 90%, freeing about \$1.2 million to be spent on other projects. The Clean Streams portion of the program leverages Federal reclamation funding with state and private funding.	1) AMLIS.; 2) 64 Fed Reg 7470 (Feb12, 1999) "Abandoned Mine Land (AML) Reclamation, Enhancing AML Reclamation); and 3) Clean Streams Program guidelines.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Yes	The Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service have programs to eliminate AML type problems. They are newer and smaller programs. A similar program within the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the Superfund. This program, over the years, has a high ratio of overhead to accomplishments when compared to the OSM program. The Superfund program may have higher administrative costs because of the type of hazardous wastes involved.	1) AMLIS; 2) OSM FY 2004 Budget; and 3) The National Center for Policy Analysis briefing paper "Superfund: History of Failure.	20%	0.2
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	No	While evaluations done on individual programs are favorable, national audits focusing on the overall effectiveness of the AML program have not been done.		20%	0.0
Total Section Score					100%	67%

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: DOI Wildland Fire Management

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	<p>The 10-Year Comprehensive Fire Strategy has 4 goals. While clear, these goals are set out as co-equal and could benefit from being prioritized. Generally speaking, the agencies (DOI & USDA) put threats to human life and property as the highest priority.</p> <p>Firefighting and fuels reduction resources can be directed at two different purposes: (1) protecting homes and buildings and (2) protecting natural resources. In some areas, both purposes can be met with the same resources, but in other circumstances these two purposes may compete for limited resources. Determining the appropriate balance between these purposes can be subjective and complex. As a result, funds may not be targeted in the most cost-effective manner.</p>	<p>10-Year Comprehensive Strategy (August 2001); 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan (May 2002).</p> <p>The 1995 Federal Fire Policy and the 2001 update of that policy promote the re-establishment of fire adapted ecosystems to reduce large fires and protect communities.</p> <p>The 10-Year Strategy established 4 goals:</p> <p>(1) Improve Fire Prevention and Suppression; (2) Reduce Hazardous Fuels; (3) Restore Fire-Adapted Ecosystems; and (4) Promote Community Assistance.</p>	25%	0.3
2 <i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	<p>Wildfires are normal events in the life of a forest and other wildlands, however, they can inflict damage to lives, property, and, in some cases, natural resources when they burn out of control. The DOI/USDA wildland firefighting program provides skilled firefighters, specialized equipment, and rapid response capability to respond to wildland fires in a way that many states and localities would be incapable of themselves. This capability is not matched by any other firefighting organization. Fire management on federal lands also falls within the land-management missions of the federal firefighting agencies. Without the DOI wildland fire management program, many communities would be unequipped to protect their own lands and property.</p>	<p>Reciprocal Fire Protection Agreement Act of 1955</p> <p>Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976</p> <p>Disaster Relief Act of 1974</p> <p>National Indian Forest Resources Management Act of 1990</p> <p>43 USC 1469 (authorizes DOI Secretary to perform work due to emergencies)</p>	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3 <i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	<p>The intent of the program is to protect homes and communities from fire while, as nearly as possible, allowing fire to function in its natural ecological role. The DOI fire program consists of six major activities, each addressing a different aspect of the fire problem. The Interior bureaus fund wildland fire programs on over 500 million acres of public lands and leverage funds by entering into cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies and State and local governments to share resources and protection responsibilities.</p> <p>The federal contribution and impact of the program are significant, but little evidence exists regarding the long-term impact of the current program on fire management goals. The impact of changes in funding in addressing the fire problem may depend on which aspects of the program are affected. Due to the competing goals of the program, wholesale increases or decreases are unlikely to significantly impact goal achievement, but targeted changes may help achieve desired results.</p>	<p>FY 2003 BLM Budget Justifications (Wildland Fire Management); National Fire Plan ("A Report to the President in Response to the Wildfires of 2000, September 8, 2000")</p> <p>The six components of the fire program include: Preparedness – representing the readiness to respond to wildland fires; Suppression – representing the response to wildland fire ignitions; Burned Area Rehabilitation – representing the efforts to minimize site degradation as a result of fires; Hazardous Fuels Management – representing the treatment of wildland fuels to reduce the fire hazard should an ignition occur; Wildland Urban Interface Fuels – representing the treatment of fuels adjacent to the wildland urban interface to reduce the potential for wildland fire to threaten communities; and Rural Fire Assistance – representing assistance, primarily in the form of grants, to rural and volunteer fire departments that may provide assistance in responding to wildland fires.</p>	20%	0.2
4 <i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	<p>As part of its land management responsibilities, each bureau is responsible for firefighting on the lands it manages. There are no other programs designed to accomplish this mission on DOI lands. The DOI bureaus work cooperatively with the Forest Service and States to leverage funds and extend the impact of the program. These programs are complimentary and not redundant. Under these arrangements, fire protection responsibilities are exchanged and scarce resources are shared. Some aspects of fire management (e.g., fuels treatments) may not be coordinated as well as possible among bureaus and with other related programs (e.g., BLM restoration programs), but they are not duplicative of one another, and the agency is actively working to improve coordination to better utilize its resources.</p>	<p>2001 Federal Wildland Fire Policy; National Fire Plan ("A Report to the President in Response to the Wildfires of 2000, September 8, 2000"); Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 2002; Federal Wildland Fire Leadership Council Charter</p>	25%	0.3

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 <i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The current mechanism of direct federal management is consistent with each bureau's statutory responsibilities to manage the land under its control. The bureaus have agreements to share both suppression and fuels personnel and equipment as needed to efficiently accomplish program goals. They utilize seasonal employees, contract for aircraft, hire emergency firefighters, and utilize partnerships with state and local governments, the military, and foreign nations to provide wildland firefighting on the federal lands. Highly mobile national resources such as hotshot crews, smokejumpers, helicopters, and airtankers are used where necessary to extend local or regional firefighting capabilities.	National Interagency Mobilization Guide (March 2002); Interagency fire management agreements between BLM, BIA, NPS, FWS, USFS, state, local, and foreign governments.	10%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	100%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)					
1 <i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	Yes	<p>The 10-Year Implementation Plan defines program outcomes and performance measures to achieve the following four goals:</p> <p>(1) Improve fire prevention and suppression; (2) Reduce hazardous fuels; (3) Restore fire-adapted ecosystems; and (4) Promote community assistance.</p>	<p>10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan; Draft DOI strategic plan goals and measures.</p> <p>The 10-Year Implementation Plan includes the following four major goals:</p> <p>(1) Improve fire prevention and suppression so that losses of life are eliminated, and firefighter injuries and damage to communities and the environment from severe, unplanned and unwanted wildland fire are reduced. (7 measures)</p> <p>(2) Reduce hazardous fuels...to reduce the risk of unplanned and unwanted wildland fire to communities and to the environment. (3 measures)</p> <p>(3) Restore fire-adapted ecosystems so that ecosystems are restored, rehabilitated and maintained...in a manner that will provide sustainable environmental, social, and economic benefits. (3 measures)</p> <p>(4) Promote community assistance so that communities at risk have increased capacity to prevent losses from wildland fire and the potential to seek economic opportunities resulting from treatments and services. (5 measures)</p>	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2 <i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	No	DOI is in the process of revising its Departmental Strategic Plan and, while the Department has developed performance measures under the 10-Year Implementation Plan, it has not yet finished development of long-term or annual performance goals with quantifiable, discrete targets and baseline data. In addition, some performance measures are vague and in need of greater definition.	10-Year Implementation Plan; Draft DOI Strategic Plan measures. Performance measures are linked to each of the four 10-Year Strategy goals and include monitoring provisions. There are some terms that are difficult to define at the macro-level (e.g., defining the wildland urban interface, communities-at-risk, the appropriate size of buffers to protect a community, or priority watershed) and which will need additional clarification.	14%	0.0
3 <i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	No	As DOI received a <i>No</i> on Question 2 of this section, it is difficult to make the case that all partners are able to support program planning efforts by committing to the goals of the program. Contractors are required to report on performance (e.g., fuels reduction projects), and grants are monitored to ensure that the grantee (e.g., a local firefighting unit) uses the funds as specified. However, taking a broader view of the wildland fire problem, partners include state, local, and private partners responsible for fuels reduction work on adjacent private or state lands. Along with the Forest Service, DOI is working to improve reporting of performance, and some partners have committed to performance goals in the 10-Yr implementation plan, but much work remains to be done in actually collecting meaningful performance information for work done on state and private lands.	DOI reports on fuels reduction projects the same regardless of whether they are performed in-house or by contract. A new database reporting system now being implemented, "NFPORS", will identify critical data for agency accountability in meeting performance targets. The database will also link fire assistance grants and information requirements. This is an area that will require close collaboration and monitoring. The program received a <i>No</i> on Question 2 of this section. Therefore, the program must receive a <i>No</i> answer to this question.	14%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4 <i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	No	The DOI bureaus have a longstanding practice of coordinating with one another and with the Forest Service and State and local agencies in fire suppression efforts. Increasingly, this coordination is spilling over into other areas of the fire program, but much work remains in this regard, particularly in working with state and local collaborators. A recent GAO report indicated that DOI and the Forest Service have developed, or are developing, numerous strategies for reducing hazardous fuels that are not linked and that have different goals and objectives primarily because they have planned and managed their lands on an agency-by-agency basis for decades. NAPA also reports that better coordination is needed in program areas such as the production and implementation of cross-boundary, landscape-scale natural resource and fire management plans and community fire-hazard reduction programs. It is also unclear if or how DOI fuels and fire rehabilitation work is coordinated with other DOI or USDA work with the broad goal of land restoration.	Numerous GAO and NAPA reports and testimony, including: GAO Report 01-1022T, "The National Fire Plan: Federal Agencies Are Not Organized to Effectively and Efficiently Implement the Plan", July 31, 2001 GAO Report 02-158, "Wildland Fire Management: Improved Planning Will Help Agencies Better Identify Fire-Fighting Preparedness Needs", March 2002. GAO Report 02-259, "Severe Wildland Fires: Leadership and Accountability Needed to Reduce Risks to Communities and Resources", January 2002. NAPA "Wildfire Suppression: Strategies for Containing Costs", September 2002.	14%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 <i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	Yes	The National Fire Plan and Wildland Fire Management program have been under steady and rigorous evaluation since the Plan was implemented following the fires of 2000. A number of independent reviews are currently ongoing, but no regular process has been established. Numerous GAO and other independent evaluations have been fairly critical of various parts of the fire program for both DOI and USDA. However, most reviews thus far have not been truly "comprehensive". GAO also has several ongoing reviews covering (1) suppression, (2) fuels reduction, and (3) burned area rehabilitation and restoration.	Numerous GAO and NAPA reports and testimony, including: GAO Report 01-1022T, "The National Fire Plan: Federal Agencies Are Not Organized to Effectively and Efficiently Implement the Plan", July 31, 2001. GAO Report 02-158, "Wildland Fire Management: Improved Planning Will Help Agencies Better Identify Fire-Fighting Preparedness Needs", March 2002. GAO Report 02-259, "Severe Wildland Fires: Leadership and Accountability Needed to Reduce Risks to Communities and Resources", January 2002. NAPA, "Study of the Implementation of the Federal Wildland Fire Policy", December 2000. NAPA, "Managing Wildland Fire, Enhancing Capacity to Implement the Federal Interagency Policy, December 2001. NAPA, "Wildfire Suppression: Strategies for Containing Costs", September 2002.	14%	0.1
6 <i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	Yes	The Wildland Fire Management budget structure was realigned in 2002 to correspond with the goals and work activities of the program in response to guidance from OMB and Congressional Appropriations Committees. The program budget is divided into the following categories: (1) preparedness, (2) suppression, (3) fuels reduction -- WUI vs. non-WUI, (4) burned area rehabilitation, and (5) rural fire assistance. Program goals are roughly aligned in the same manner.	For both previous measures and the new measures included in the 10-Year Implementation Plan, one or two measures is in place for each of the 5 budget line items.	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	<p>DOI is in the process of revising its strategic plan. The fire program goals and measures will be included in this integrated framework in two principal mission areas: Serving Communities (Protecting Lives, Resources and Property) and Resource Protection (Improving the Health of Watersheds and Landscapes). This approach reinforces the role of fire in the management of natural resources and is consistent with the principal outcome goals of the fire program: 1) protecting communities and 2) preserving, protecting and restoring ecosystems.</p> <p>However, there remains some cause for concern. At the moment, it appears that all of the 18 measures from the 10-Yr Implementation Plan will be included in the Department-Wide DOI Strategic Plan. With so many measures and no apparent priority among measures, it is unclear what measures managers and/or policy officials will choose to focus on or how effectively the agency will operate utilizing so many measures. The ultimate result of this effort is as yet unknown.</p>	10-Year Strategy Implementation Plan; Draft fire measures for inclusion in the DOI Department Strategic Plan.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	57%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)					
1 <i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	No	<p>DOI and USDA have been preparing financial and action plans each year under the national fire plan and have submitted an end-of-year accomplishment report for 2001. However, the plans appear to be primarily intended to meet Congressional reporting requirements; it is unclear whether the information in the plans is of sufficient detail to really be used to evaluate performance and manage the program.</p> <p>DOI is establishing a standard automated data collection system for reporting accomplishments. When complete, this information will serve as an interagency database for reporting program accomplishments. The system should reduce the potential for duplication and erroneous information reporting. The data will be used to correlate expenditures with losses. As more data becomes available, trends will be analyzed to validate that accomplishments at local, state and national levels are moving in the desired direction.</p>	FY 2001 and FY 2002 DOI/USDA Action and Financial Plans	14%	0.0
2 <i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	No	Performance measurements do not appear to effect accountability at the program level, nor do they appear to inform budget discussions, though DOI has indicated this is changing. Currently, managers are evaluated based on defacto performance measures of controlling fires without the loss of life or property. The agencies readily admit that suppression cost-control is not a significant factor, especially when homes are involved.	Little or no discussion of performance in budget requests, promotions, or post-fire reviews. Also, no incentives now exist for States and localities to provide cost-share funds or to narrowly define the areas eligible for federal funding.	14%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3 <i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	<p>Funds have generally been obligated in a timely manner. Bureaus regularly review obligation reports and provide analysis to the Department, and during the fire season, OMB receives obligation reports weekly. DOI experienced some temporary delays after receiving large increases in FY 2001, and it is unclear whether delays will persist for fuels reduction activities. However, the fuels program faces inherent difficulties in the use of prescribed fires due to unpredictable weather and smoke management issues. DOI has developed a plan to attempt to minimize delays of fuels reduction projects. All other parts of the program appear to be obligating funds in a timely manner.</p> <p>There is some concern that, due to the lack of a clear definition of the "wildland-urban interface", funds for fuels reduction projects intended to reduce risks to communities may be used for projects with questionable impacts on at-risk communities. However, there is little clear evidence of this and because the WUI definition is so broad, it difficult to pin the agency down on this.</p>	Recent quarterly SF 133 reports on obligations; reviews as part of the yearly budget process; weekly fire obligation reports during fire season.	14%	0.1
4 <i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	No	<p>The agency does not perform systematic or formal cost comparisons for positions within this program. It is unclear whether recent hiring in this program was based on meaningful private sector cost and performance comparisons. DOI <u>has</u> indicated that it intends to contract for 50% of WUI fuels projects in FY 2004.</p> <p>The 10-Year Strategy and Implementation Plan refer to "cost-effective fire protection", but it remains unclear that the agencies really know what this means, and the term is not adequately defined in the 10-Year Strategy.</p>	DOI has indicated that it currently leaves decisions about competitive sourcing and cost comparisons to individual managers but is beginning to address this issue Dept.-wide.	14%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 <i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	Yes	The agency charges all fire-related activities and indirect costs that are under their direct control to the fire appropriation. Indirect costs of CSRS employee pensions and FEHBP program costs are not captured.	2003 BLM Budget Justifications	14%	0.1
6 <i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	No	<p>Fund allocation and reporting are complicated in Interior because each bureau uses a different finance system. Data in systems is not integrated, and reports are produced manually on an ad hoc basis.</p> <p>BLM's independent auditor identified accounting for intra-departmental transactions (which occur frequently in the fire program) as a material internal control weakness.</p> <p>Despite these complications, the bureaus utilize budget activities and subactivities within existing financial systems to track expenditures for each component of the wildland fire management program. The programs also use project numbers to track funding for each wildland fire incident and for each fire rehabilitation and fuels reduction project, allowing DOI bureaus to accurately identify specific costs for wildfires, rehabilitation projects, and fuels treatment projects.</p>	<p>FY 2000-2001 Independent Auditor's Report on BLM's Financial Statements; Reviews as part of the yearly budget process; weekly fire obligation reports during fire season.</p> <p>DOI indicates its bureaus routinely monitor obligations throughout the year to ensure proper use of funds and to prepare monthly reports for the Department. Agencies also prepare annual operating budgets, which provide program cost targets to their applicable regions, states, and field units. All offices from the national office to the individual field units are responsible for limiting obligations to their assigned cost target (with the exception of emergency accounts).</p>	14%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	<p>The Office of Wildland Fire Coordination was established in 2001 to provide for cross-bureau consistency in program policies, practices, and budgets. The budget structure was changed in 2002 to better reflect the nature of the work and to improve accountability.</p> <p>The Wildland Fire Leadership Council was established in April 2002 to support the implementation and coordination of the National Fire Plan and the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy.</p> <p>DOI and USDA are also working on a new fire preparedness planning model to replace the current "Most Efficient Level" (MEL) model which suffers from a lack of transparency and, in a sense, treats funding needs (i.e., budget) as an output of the planning process rather than an input.</p>	Wildland Fire Leadership Council Charter; BLM Budget Justifications.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	43%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
-----------	------	-------------	---------------	-----------	----------------

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1 <i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	Small Extent	<p>Prior to completion of the 10-Year Implementation Plan, long-term goals for the fire program were largely non-existent, with goals existing primarily for GPRA purposes and measuring mostly widgets. (See "Key Goals" listed under Question 2 below.) The new measures adopted in the Plan represent a significant improvement, and the "small extent" rating reflects this progress. However, no data presently exists to evaluate performance, there are too many measures (18) to adequately assess priorities, and the measures lack the clarity and targets needed to be considered long-term goals.</p> <p>Regarding the more generic goal of the fire program to "reduce the risk of wildland fire to communities and the environment", only in recent years have the agencies acknowledged that past practices of fully suppressing fires has actually made the hazardous fuels buildup problem worse. The culture of the fire program has not significantly changed to move away from this full-suppression mentality.</p>	<p>10-Year Strategy Implementation Plan; BLM's FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan and FY 2001 Annual Performance Report; Agency acknowledgement that past actions have made the problem worse and fire research results that indicate many areas of the west are overgrown with understory vegetation that increases the risk of catastrophic fire.</p> <p>Note: The measures listed below represent the measures from the 10-Year Implementation Plan that OMB considers could most appropriately be considered priorities and long-term goals, but improvements could still be made to improve the focus on outcomes.</p>	20%	0.1
---	--------------	---	--	-----	-----

<p>Long-Term Goal I: Improve Fire Prevention and Suppression: losses are life are eliminated, and firefighter injuries and damage to communities and the environment from severe, unplanned and unwanted wildland fire are reduced.</p> <p>Target: No targets have been set. DOI has included 7 measures to this effect in the 10-Year Implementation Strategy. For example, DOI plans to measure average gross costs per acre for suppression and emergency stabilization and rehabilitation by size class and fire regime for fires (i) contained within initial attack, (ii) escaping initial attack, (iii) within wildland-urban interface areas, (iv) outside wildland-urban interface areas, (v) in areas with compliant fire management plans, and (vi) in areas without compliant fire management plans.</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward Unknown. In 2003, the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, States, Tribes, and local officials, will establish baseline data within their goal: respective jurisdictions. It is not clear how meaningful the information collected will be, as there is still not a clear definition of such things as the "wildland-urban interface". Moreover, as there are no incentives for cost-control nor a clear articulation of what "cost-effective fire protection" means, the integration of performance measurement and program management is likely to remain tenuous.</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal II: Reduce Hazardous Fuels: hazardous fuels are treated, using appropriate tools, to reduce the risk of unplanned and unwanted wildland fire to communities and to the environment.</p> <p>Target: No targets have been set. DOI has included 3 measures to this effect in the 10-Year Implementation Strategy. For example, DOI plans to measure the number of acres treated that are 1) in the Wildland-Urban Interface or 2) in condition classes 2 or 3 in fire regimes 1,2, or 3 outside the wildland urban interface, and are identified as high priority through collaboration consistent with the Implementation Plan, in total, and as a percent of all acres treated. A corresponding efficiency measure will track acres treated per million dollars gross investment.</p>

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Actual Progress achieved toward Unknown.	Measures not yet tracked. Again, better definition and deliniation is needed. For example, clarifying that the performance goal of WUI goal: hazardous fuels reduction to provide the greatest protection to those most in need by identifying a targeted set of communities and actions that can be achieved with current funding levels.			
	Long-Term Goal III: Restore Fire-adapted ecosystems: fire-adapted ecosystems are restored, rehabilitated and maintained, using appropriate tools, in a manner that will provide sustainable environmental, social, and economic benefits.	Target: No targets have been set. DOI has included 3 measures to this effect in the 10-Year Implementation Strategy. For example, DOI plans to measure the number of acres in fire regimes 1,2, or 3 moved to a better condition class, that were identified as high priority through collaboration consistent with the Implementation Plan, in total, and as a percent of total acres treated.			
	Actual Progress achieved toward Unknown.	Measures not yet tracked. DOI must work to ensure that it has a handle on what can reasonably be accomplished given limited resources goal: and to ensure that funds are targeted to the highest priorities (i.e., forest and rangeland restoration must be defined to be reasonable and achievable).			

2	<i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Small Extent	Previous goals were inadequate and new goals are still being developed. Thus, it is not possible for DOI to be meeting its annual performance goals at this time. However, past performance indicates that DOI meets or comes close to meeting its annual performance goals in this program. FY 2001 data (shown below) indicates that DOI met 3 of its 5 annual performance goals last year. The fuels treatment program was significantly expanded in 2001, and DOI did not meet its performance target for that year, in part due to weather conditions that significantly reduced the use of prescribed burning. DOI's performance in meeting its previous performance goals is also tempered by the fact that previous performance targets were output-oriented and were not determined through research or to challenge managers to improve. Recognizing the limitations of these measures, DOI and USDA have developed and agreed to common performance measures for the fire program (see previous question).	BLM FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan/FY 2001 Annual Performance Report; BLM Budget Justifications; 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan.	20%	0.1
---	--	--------------	---	---	-----	-----

	Key Goal I: Percent of fires contained on initial attack Performance Target: 95% Actual Performance: 95%
	Key Goal II: Percent and number of rural fire departments assisted Performance Target: 25% (830) Actual Performance: 45% (1,445)
	Key Goal II: Percent of highest priority community-at-risk projects completed Performance Target: 3% Actual Performance: 3%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score	
		Key Goal II: Number of fire facilities under construction, reconstruction, or maintenance Performance Target: 52 facilities Actual Performance: 45 facilities				
		Key Goal III: Number of acres receiving fuels treatments to reduce hazards and maintain ecosystem health Performance Target: 1,400,000 acres Actual Performance: 728,000 acres				
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	No	There is no evidence to indicate that DOI has improved efficiency or cost effectiveness in the fire program on the whole. Although prior years' goals were loosely defined, the agency is working to target resources and overcome barriers to long-term success. However, DOI does not seem to have a good handle on what "cost-effective fire protection" means nor do they have sufficient incentives for managers and other stakeholders to take cost into account. Incentives are needed to encourage prioritizing protections for communities-at-risk, completing restoration work, and cost sharing with states, local governments, and private partners. There is currently little incentive for communities to contribute their own funds to the process to reduce local risks or to take steps to improve community planning and zoning requirements.	No clear evidence of improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness.	20%	0.0
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Yes	The Forest Service is the only other federal agency that accomplishes similar wildland fire management work. On the whole, DOI seems to have somewhat more control over fire suppression costs than USDA, which had a serious anti-deficiency problem in 2000. However, in other areas of the fire program, performance of both agencies appears to be similar. Data is not yet available to compare performance between the two agencies on the common measures developed as part of the 10-Year Implementation Plan.	GAO Report 02-259, "Severe Wildland Fires: Leadership and Accountability Needed to Reduce Risks to Communities and Resources", January 2002. GAO Report 02-158, "Wildland Fire Management: Improved Planning Will Help Agencies Better Identify Fire-Fighting Preparedness Needs", March 2002.	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 <i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	No	Historically, independent reviews (GAO, IG, etc.) have been conducted frequently in response to policy changes, significant events, appropriation changes, and normal oversight from the executive branch and Congressional oversight committees. The fire program is currently the subject of three different audits by the General Accounting Office and NAPA recently completed a broad review of the suppression and fuels reduction programs. Recent GAO reviews have been fairly critical of several aspects of the fire program.	Numerous GAO and NAPA reports and testimony, including: GAO Report 01-1022T, "The National Fire Plan: Federal Agencies Are Not Organized to Effectively and Efficiently Implement the Plan", July 31, 2001 GAO Report 02-158, "Wildland Fire Management: Improved Planning Will Help Agencies Better Identify Fire-Fighting Preparedness Needs", March 2002. GAO Report 02-259, "Severe Wildland Fires: Leadership and Accountability Needed to Reduce Risks to Communities and Resources", January 2002. NAPA "Study of the Implementation of the Federal Wildland Fire Policy", December 2000. NAPA, "Managing Wildland Fire, Enhancing Capacity to Implement the Federal Interagency Policy, December 2001. NAPA, "Wildfire Suppression: Strategies for Containing Costs", September 2002.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score				100%	33%

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

- 1.1 Is the program purpose clear?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
Explanation: BLM manages approximately 700 million acres of subsurface minerals underlying public, private, and state ownerships. The purpose of this program is to provide the energy and minerals resources the nation needs while balancing these needs with other uses of the public lands as well as private landowner's surface rights. While various minerals are treated somewhat differently under various authorizing legislation, the ultimate goal in all cases is to promote the responsible use of energy and mineral resources.
Evidence: Key authorizing legislation includes: Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, Materials Act of 1947, Geothermal Steam Act of 1970, Indian Mineral Development Act of 1982.
- 1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
Explanation: These programs clearly address the nation's demand for energy and minerals production.
Evidence: President's National Energy Policy, May 2001 BLM-Managed Lands Provide: 35% of the Nation's Coal Production, 48% of the Nation's Geothermal Production, 11% of the Nation's Gas Production, 5% of the Nation's Oil Production
- 1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
Explanation: BLM is responsible for permitting the energy and minerals development of federally-owned subsurface minerals. There is no overlap in terms of responsibility with any other authority. Moreover, BLM enters into cooperative agreements with state and federal agencies in order to eliminate redundancy and promote efficiency where development may cross jurisdictional boundaries or where surface and subsurface ownership varies.
Evidence: As an example of coordination, the 1991 Tripartite Memorandum of Understanding between BLM, MMS, and BIA delineates each agency's responsibility for oil and gas leasing. Similarly, a 2001 MOU between BLM, OSM, and BIA delineates responsibilities for coal mining on Indian lands.
- 1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%
Explanation: BLM does not charge users for some costs directly associated with permitting development. BLM regulations prevent managers from recovering a larger portion of agency costs. In many cases, this has constrained BLM's ability to meet quickly changing market demands for applications for permit to drill (APDs). While many energy and minerals activities are programmatic in nature and so not suitable for cost recovery, BLM could recover more permit-specific costs by charging permittees in connection with APDs and reexamining the appropriateness of the level of fees that it currently charges for a number of other permit-specific activities. In December 2000, BLM published a proposed cost recovery rule to address this problem, but has not yet taken action to complete the rule. BLM also faces an inherent balancing act in meeting public demand for minerals development while providing for other uses of the public lands, such as recreation, grazing, etc. However, from planning through implementation, the program attempts to address and respond to this inherent problem.
Evidence: Inspector General Report 95-I-379 (January 1995) found that, at the time, BLM was losing roughly \$8 million per year in forgone receipts by not charging appropriate cost recovery fees. A 1996 Solicitor Opinion clarified BLM's authority to charge users for appropriate costs.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: In an effort to meet the Nation's energy demands in 2004 and beyond, the BLM has developed a series of actions, schedules, and assignments outlining how the Bureau will efficiently and effectively implement the President's National Energy Policy. BLM conducts extensive land use planning to insure that resource uses consider local, state and national needs.

Evidence: BLM National Energy Plan task status reports and tracking of time-sensitive land use plans related to energy development.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: In developing this PART, BLM has established seven new long-term performance measures for this program. While the new measures are still largely output-based, they represent a significant improvement over previous measures. The new measures provide a better link between program performance and industry demand, and the measures can be better understood by a person who is not closely involved in the program. Also, an efficiency measure has been added for the oil and gas program.

Evidence: BLM has developed the following seven new performance measures:- Percent of permits and lease applications processed (fluid, solid, and non-energy minerals);- Percent of permits processed within 35 days of receipt of a complete application (fluid minerals);- Percent of permit violations corrected on first notice (fluid minerals);- Percent of non-compliance and trespass actions resolved (non-energy minerals);- Percent of required inspection and enforcement reviews completed;- Customer satisfaction with permitting process (%), energy minerals); and- Average cost per permit (APD) processed (fluid minerals).

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Baseline data and targets have not yet been developed for BLM's new program measures.

Evidence: NA

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: BLM has developed seven new annual performance measures that directly link to the new long-term measures.

Evidence: In addition to long-term targets, annual targets will be established for the measures listed under 2.1, and these targets will be used to measure annual progress.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Baseline data and targets have not yet been developed for BLM's new program measures.

Evidence: NA

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: BLM's Energy and Minerals programs do not generally have grantees or cost sharing partners; however, BLM's federal partners such as MMS have similar goals for production of energy and federal revenues. State and tribal governments are often cooperators in regional EISs for energy and minerals programs. For example, in Montana, the Crow Tribe, the state DEQ and the state Board of Oil and Gas Conservation were co-preparers of the statewide Oil and Gas EIS. Contractors are also extensively used to accomplish work such as cultural clearance surveys, biological assessments and planning documents.

Evidence: Examples include the MOU in place with the California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources and BLM Wyoming's statewide Biological Assessment contract.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: No regular independent evaluations are conducted for the Energy and Minerals programs. However, BLM regularly evaluates its Oil and Gas program in each state. The members of the evaluation team are drawn from throughout the agency and are allowed to collect evidence and make independent recommendations. BLM also recently contracted for a detailed survey of its energy customers in order to try and improve agency responsiveness to industry needs.

Evidence: Oil and Gas Program Evaluations: Wyoming, California and New Mexico.2002 Energy Customer Surveys Results (Coray Gurnitz Consulting, February 2003)

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Each program change in the budget request is tied to a specific annual target that supports long term goals. For example in recent years, BLM requested program increases to support a higher level of APDs processed (based on demand) and a higher level of inspections. These targeted increases supported the goal of higher levels of natural gas production from lands under DOI management and responded to geographically specific demands from industry.

Evidence: Budget Justification and Performance Information, 2004

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: In developing this PART, BLM has developed new program performance measures, a key deficiency.

Evidence: See performance measures listed above.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: Each BLM field office regularly reports program outputs in BLM's Management Information System (MIS). State Offices and the Washington Office review these accomplishments against targets at several points in the year. Budget allocation adjustments and corrective actions are taken after these reviews are completed. BLM also conducts periodic reviews of specific offices in various aspects of the programs to determine compliance with guidance and direction. BLM has indicated it is developing a series of self-assessments so that offices can certify compliance with program guidance.

Evidence: Performance analysis for 2004 Budget Development 2001 Budget Analysis - Coal Management

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: BLM program managers evaluations have elements that are directly tied to output measures and budget performance. BLM evaluates the work performance of all employees annually. Senior level managers performance is reviewed quarterly. Where appropriate, field manager evaluations include key Energy & Minerals program goals. Many elements within an employee's annual evaluation are tied to agency output measures. BLM tracks performance on 2 specific objectives related to energy. Each objective has an assigned senior manager with lead responsibility for tracking/reporting completion or implementation progress, as well as the current status of each objective. There is also an established target date for completion or implementation. The Director's Tracking System presents the Director with the ability to track key program measures. The Director can see in real time what has been reported compared to targets for key output measures. The report also shows costs by program element.

Evidence: Performance analysis for 2004 Budget Development Management-by-Objective Status Reports identify key work activities. Each task has an assigned senior manager and a target due date. BLM Manager Evaluations are directly linked to key National Energy Plan tasks that are tracked regularly by BLM.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: BLM has established a guideline for its offices to allow no more than 2% carryover. In the Energy and Minerals programs, 3.7% of available funding was unspent at the end of 2001 and 0% at the end of 2002. Internal reviews are also used to ensure that funds are spent for the intended purpose.

Evidence: MIS report Year End Carryover, 2001-2002, Cost Management Report: 2002 Spending by work activity 2001 Budget Analysis - Coal Management

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: The BLM uses its MIS to track the performance and unit costs for all programs. An annual performance analysis is conducted to compare offices in achieving reduced unit costs and maximum output. BLM is a leader in the Department of the Interior in implementing IT solutions to improve management processes. BLM's Activity-Based Costing (ABC) system and MIS are being used as templates for other bureaus and DOI works to develop an integrated Department-wide system.

Evidence: Performance analysis for 2004 Budget Development GAO Report 03-503 identifies BLM's performance budgeting system as an example that may be duplicated by the Forest Service in order to improve accountability.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: BLM enters into a wide variety of agreements with industry, state governments, and other federal agencies which have jurisdiction and/or interest in BLM energy and minerals actions. BLM, BIA and MMS have formally documented the division of responsibilities and provided for information exchange related to mineral leasing. BLM, BIA and OSM recently established an MOU to document responsibilities of the agencies for Indian Coal Management. BLM employees participate in various groups to ensure proper coordination. These groups include the Department's Indian Mineral Steering Committee and MMS's Royalty Policy Committee.

Evidence: 1991 and 2001 Tripartite MOUs governing coordination of programs on Indian lands Charter of the Indian Mineral Steering Committee Charter and sample agenda for the Royalty Policy Committee

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: BLM has received seven consecutive unqualified audit opinions, of which the energy and minerals program is a significant component. Key to its success has been the availability of timely and accurate financial information made available to all employees through its MIS. BLM has also met or exceeded its goals under the Prompt Payment Act, and goals to reduce or eliminate erroneous payments.

Evidence: Independent audit evaluations and unqualified audit opinions.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: BLM has identified deficiencies and developed and implemented plans to improve procedures and correct the deficiencies. Examples include corrective action taken on drainage and inspection and enforcement problems.

Evidence: APD Streamlining Memos Inspection and Enforcement Strategy

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Previous performance measures were inadequate in determining program performance. New measures have been developed, but baseline data and targets are not yet available, so progress cannot be demonstrated.

Evidence: See explanation and evidence for Questions 2.1 and 2.2.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

- 4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%
- Explanation: As with BLM's long-term performance goals, previous performance measures were inadequate in determining program performance. New measures have been developed, but baseline data and targets are not yet available, so progress cannot be demonstrated.
- Evidence: See explanation and evidence for Questions 2.3 and 2.4.
- 4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 25%
- Explanation: Despite overall problems with the program's performance goals, a performance analysis conducted for FY 2004 budget development generally showed increasing program effectiveness from 2001 to midyear 2003. Expenditures are more closely aligned with performance this year than previously. In some areas, unit costs are increasing as tasks become more complex.
- Evidence: Performance analysis for 2004 Budget Development
- 4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%
- Explanation: Industry data is generally not comparable. Although some state governments may perform similar functions on state lands, the operations are performed under a different set of laws and may not have comparable published data.
- Evidence: NA
- 4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%
- Explanation: Various reviews of specific program components have highlighted problems in those components. BLM has addressed some of the problems highlighted in these reviews, but has yet to fully address others.
- Evidence: Inspector General (IG) Report 01-I-297 (March 2001) on BLM's Stripper Oil Well Royalty Rate Reduction program found that BLM had yet to act on 2 of 4 previous IG recommendations for this program. Inspector General Report 95-I-379 (January 1995) found that, at the time, BLM was losing roughly \$8 million per year in forgone receipts by not charging appropriate cost recovery fees. BLM has yet to implement an appropriate cost recovery program. IG Report 99-I-358 (March 1999) on BLM's Drainage Protection program provided 4 recommendations which BLM accepted. The IG considers these recommendations resolved.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy and Minerals Management

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Land Management

Measure: Percent of permits and lease applications processed. (Measures reduction in backlog; fluid, solid, and non-energy minerals tracked separately.)

Additional Information: Tracks how well BLM is meeting overall industry demand for minerals permit applications and whether or not a backlog of permit applications is developing.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------------------

Measure: Percent of permits processed within 35 days of receipt of a complete application (fluid minerals).

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Percent of permit violations corrected on first notice (fluid minerals).

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Percent of non-compliance and trespass actions resolved (non-energy minerals).

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Percent of required inspection and enforcement reviews completed. (Fluid, solid, and non-energy minerals tracked separately.)

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Customer satisfaction with permitting process. (Percent; fluid, solid, and non-energy minerals tracked separately.)

Additional Information: This measure tracks satisfaction of BLM's customers such as leaseholders, coal operators and mineral purchasers.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy and Minerals Management

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Land Management

Measure: Average cost per permit (APD) processed (fluid minerals).

**Additional
Information:**

Year

Target

Actual

Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Mission of the Energy Resources Program (ERP), as stated in the program's 5 year plan and other planning documents, is to assess the energy resource potential of the Nation and the World (exclusive of U.S. Federal offshore waters) and the environmental and human health impacts of energy production and use in order to plan for a secure energy future and allow for the strategic use and evaluation of resources.

Evidence: Legislative mandates (1.1A). The ERP mission is consistent with: (1) the mission and goals of the DOI Strategic Draft Plan (2003-2008) (1.1B) under Mission Area "Resource Use" - Manage or influence resources to enhance public benefit, promote responsible use, and ensure optimal value - Energy; DOI Strategic Goal "Manage natural resources to promote responsible use and sustain a dynamic economy;" (2) the USGS Strategic Plan (2000-2005) Mission Goal to "Provide science for a changing world in response to present and anticipated needs to expand our understanding of environment and natural resource issues on regional, national, and global scales and enhance predictive/forecast modeling capabilities;" (3) the Geology Science Strategy (2000-2010) Goal 3 -- Advance the understanding of the Nation's energy and mineral resources in a global geologic, economic, and environmental context (1.1C). The NRC review of the ERP (1999) specifically states that the role of the ERP is clearly defined, fulfills a mission essential to the federal government, and is unique from that of other federal agencies (1.1D).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The ERP is responsible for assessing national and international energy resources and conducting research in order to perform those assessments. A sound, scientific knowledge base is needed to assess available resources and the impact of using those resources, and to put such information into a context as to allow decision makers to understand and weigh the costs, risks, and benefits of energy usage. The ERP addresses these challenges by generating and providing objective, science-based energy information essential for shaping policies regarding domestic and foreign energy resources, making sound decisions regarding Federal land use, and maintaining a healthy domestic energy industry.

Evidence: Energy is one of the most important components of the world's economy. The U.S. is 85% dependent upon fossil fuels. Net energy imports have risen in the last 2 decades and total energy consumption is expected to increase more rapidly than domestic production, requiring increased net energy imports (EIA, 2003 - 1.2A). Adequate and reliable supplies of affordable energy, obtained in environmentally sustainable ways, are essential to economic prosperity, environmental and human health, and political stability. The NRC review (1999) (1.2B) stated that "the products of the ERP are important to the economic, environmental, and security future of the U.S." EIA states that "The USGS petroleum assessments provide an important foundation for geologic, economic, geopolitical, and environmental studies. With many of the world's economies intrinsically linked to energy resource availability, such studies provide essential long-term strategic guidance" (1.2C). The National Energy Policy (1.2D) cites ERP NPRA and ANWR 1002 assessments as the authoritative estimates of undiscovered oil and gas resources in Alaska.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The ERP role is clearly defined and unique from other Federal, state, local, or private entities. The ERP focuses research to define the geologic factors that control the abundance, distribution, quality, and location of energy resources. ERP research focuses on defining technically recoverable undiscovered oil and gas resources, coal resources and reserves, coalbed methane, framework and process studies for all these commodities as well as gas hydrates, and the environmental and human health factors associated with the production and use of energy resources.

Evidence: Other Federal agencies that work on energy-related issues (MMS, BLM, USFS, DOE, EIA) do so in mutually exclusive areas (1.3A). The NRC review clearly stated ERP's unique role in this regard.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: ERP is designed to conduct research and scientific assessments on energy resources. ERP employs an expert federal workforce with extensive experience in energy research, assessment, geochemical, and related expertise, such as IT. Based upon feedback ERP actively seeks, projects purposes, methodologies, and scopes have evolved over time. ERP partners with others (federal agencies, states, academia, industry consortia), and by leveraging funding, expertise, and facilities, ERP maximizes the impact of science accomplished, lessons learned, and products produced. Laboratories are operated at regional USGS centers where costs are shared with other programs.

Evidence: To gauge ERP's effectiveness and evolve its energy research, stakeholder and partner feedback is actively sought by many venues, including: (1) NRC reviews (see 2.8 for specific steps taken by ERP from NRC review feedback), (2) customer surveys (1.4A), (3) interacting with customers at scientific and technical meetings, (4) calling and e-mailing customers, (5) ERP membership on interagency steering committees (1.4B). ERP scientists develop state-of-the-art methodologies and techniques for energy assessments and are recognized leaders in this field. ERP seeks outside validation of its methodologies, assessments, and studies to ensure that no major flaws are present.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: ERP's mission concentrates on providing original, geologically based, non-biased energy information to policy makers, land and resource managers, other federal agencies, foreign governments, nongovernmental groups, industry, academia, other scientists, and decision makers. Program funding is directed at achieving program goals, namely understanding and assessing the fossil-energy resources of the Nation and the World and the environmental impact of energy resource production and use.

Evidence: ERP's funds go to scientific projects dedicated to the program's goals and mission. Funding procedures follow USGS and GD guidelines which are outlined in section 3. However, energy resource information is the "real" ERP resource that reaches intended beneficiaries. ERP research plays a role in shaping U.S. and international policy, as indicated in press release in (1.5A). Because ERP's purpose is to provide energy information, ERP systematically and proactively seeks feedback from intended beneficiaries, in order to determine that products are useful, data are timely, methodologies are sound. To seek meaningful feedback, ERP employs a number of mechanisms (also outlined in 1.4): (1) Customer Surveys (1.5B); (2) Customer Listening Sessions (1.5C); (3) web statistics (1.5D); (4) scientific and technical stakeholder meetings; (5) calling and e-mailing customers/partners; (6) participating in interagency steering committees (1.4B). The ultimate beneficiary of ERP's work is the public. Results from ERP studies are in GEODE, are found on ERP web sites, on CD's available to all, and are presented at scientific and academic forums.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program did not have long term measures that focus on outcomes. The measures largely focus on outputs and process (customer surveys). Goals in the 5 year plan were not specific enough to evaluate performance. New measures were developed in the PART process.

Evidence: Outcome goals of the draft DOI Strategic Plan (Resource Use - Energy) include "improve information base, resource management and technical assistance." The current ERP 5-year plan lists 4 major objectives that encompass the work conducted by ERP in order to fulfill its mission. These objectives are: (1) To understand and assess the fossil-energy resources of the Nation and the World; (2) To understand the geologic framework and processes of energy resources; (3) To understand and evaluate the environmental impact of energy resource production and use; (4) To deliver energy resource information to land and resource managers, energy policy makers, other scientists, academia, private industry, environmental groups, and other non-governmental entities. All ERP-funded projects support one or more of these goals.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Long term targets and timeframes for ERP are listed as 5-year objectives in the program's 5-year plan. It is difficult to determine whether targets are ambitious for the following reasons: program goals and the narrative for 5 year plans are too broad to be considered measures, they do not include time frames or specific products. Annual project work plans contain more detail and time frames, but are not clearly linked to achieving goals in the 5 year plan.

Evidence: ERP 5 year plans, GPRA reports.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Annual performance measures are representative of the overall, broader program mission and goals and serve to illustrate progress on assessing the Nation's and World's energy resources and the impact of their development. GPRA goals address annual performance by reporting, on a quarterly basis the following: number of systematic analyses and investigations delivered to customers, number of long term data collections maintained, number of stakeholder meetings, and number of data delivery systems maintained. All these measures directly relate to the long term goals listed in 2.1 and the ERP 5 year plan. All annual goals support the long term goals outlined on the measures page. Illustrations showing the connection between ERP long and short term goals, GPRA, the GD Science Strategy, USGS Strategic Plan, DOI Strategic Plan, and the President Business Reference model are found in (2.1A). Each annual measure achieved provides evidence of progress towards long-term goals, but there is not sufficient information to determine adequate progress.

Evidence: Annual performance measures demonstrate progress toward ERP's long-term goals and are found in GPRA measures and project plans.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Baselines and targets for ERP projects are listed in the GD Annual Science Plans, annual project work plans and proposals, and in annual federal budget justifications. ERP-funded projects develop new project proposals every year that are consistent with ERP program priorities and goals, to report progress, and make necessary changes to project direction. These project proposals are reviewed annually by a Program Council composed of senior energy scientists, both internal and external to ERP. The Program Council makes recommendations on project progress and ensures that the targets are appropriate, ambitious, and obtainable. Annual measures are documented in tasks for each project and reviewed at the end of the year before additional funds are given out. ERP-funded teams are also reviewed annually by an internal USGS review team and periodically by an external to USGS review team.

Evidence: Baselines and targets include project funding projections, annual project proposals/plans, and targets are established through budget initiatives and annual budget planning. One project proposal, for Alaskan Petroleum Studies for FY2001, FY2002, and FY2003 is included in (2.4A). All project proposals contain objectives, strategy, impacts, products, collaborators, work plans, outreach, publications proposed and delivered, and accomplishments. The Alaskan Petroleum Studies project assesses the hydrocarbon resources of Alaska - an ambitious undertaking. Alaska contains some of the largest hydrocarbon accumulations in the U.S. and is one of the most hotly debated areas in the world. To meet all short and long term targets, this project outlined its annual and long term priorities, worked consistently toward understanding the framework and processes of hydrocarbon occurrence in Alaska, processing and interpreting seismic information, etc. in order to assess the resources in Alaska in a timely fashion. See also gas hydrate example of project annual goals related to ERP long term goals in 2.3.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: ERP does not fund any work that is not directly linked to and in support of ERP research, annual, and long-term goals. ERP has no grantees, but does have a Cooperative Agreement program with a number of State Geological Surveys. All partnerships and agreements are covered by some formal document (MOU, letter of intent, statements of work, etc.) outlining duties, expectations, and products. All contracts must have a statement of need and be directly tied to an ERP-funded project in order to be approved. As program goals are broad, it is difficult to evaluate the performance impact of partnerships.

Evidence: Where appropriate, ERP forms partnerships to work with others with specific needs, data, knowledge, facilities, where ERP has been asked to help or where there is an ERP need to meet its annual and long term goals. Some partnerships are collaborative and expertise only is shared; others are cost-shared, in terms of facilities, data, or funding (e.g. 2.5A is an agreement between ERP and Geological Survey of Canada for gas hydrate research). Other agreements are in-kind - CRADA's developed with industry and academia to explore for and research coalbed methane (2.5B). Both of these kinds of agreements contribute to the short term goals of understanding the nature, occurrence, and distribution of the resource (gas hydrates or coalbed methane) to fulfill the long term goal of assessing the technically recoverable resource. Other agreements are funded by partners (2.5C - Interagency Agreement with BLM for coalbed methane) where ERP possesses an expertise needed by another agency, thereby providing the scientific information necessary for BLM to produce their Environmental Impact Statement.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Comprehensive, independent program reviews are conducted by the NRC on a periodic basis (approximately every 5 years). ERP uses these reviews to help improve ERP performance, efficiency, and effectiveness. In addition, all projects are reviewed annually by a Program Council composed of senior energy scientists internal and external to the program to ensure progress on project and program goals and to adjust work as needed to meet long term goals, customer needs, emerging energy needs, and evaluate effectiveness and relevance of project work. Furthermore, when major program elements are developed, such as methodologies for oil and gas assessment, ERP seeks outside review and validation. ERP seeks customer input and feedback on a regular basis. All ERP projects also seek feedback from customers, partners, and stakeholders to determine relevance and effectiveness and project development. ERP-funded teams are reviewed annually by an internal USGS review panel and periodically by a review panel external to USGS.

Evidence: The NRC reviews ERP periodically (approximately every 5 years). NRC recommendations are incorporated into ERP practices (details are found in 2.8). As noted in 1.4, ERP sought scientific and technical validation of its oil and gas assessment methodology. Also explained in 1.4 is the ERP-NPC working relationship to develop economic models for unconventional oil and gas. ERP members belong to a number of interagency steering committees that meet regularly, not only to discuss areas of mutual interest, but to obtain feedback of goals, methodologies, products, etc. A few if these interagency committees are listed in (2.6A). ERP members belong to international standardization bodies. ERP assessment projects actively seek input from state organizations and the private sector when developing the geologic models upon which the assessments are based. ERP outside validation comes in many forms - one example is that the ERP World Energy project was 1 of 3 finalists at the Institute of Petroleum for the International Platinum Award, for great international impact and innovation.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Program budgets are not clearly tied to annual and long term performance goals. The items listed in the GPRA table are not clearly tied to descriptions of actual activities within the text of the budget materials. Further sufficient, measurable long term performance measures did not exist to determine whether the budget was sufficiently tied to performance.

Evidence: ERP 5 year plan, Project Work Plans, Congressional Justifications.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The NRC review of the program identified a number of areas for program improvement, which have been implemented. The program 5-year plan has been aligned with the USGS and GD Strategic Plan and will be aligned with the DOI Strategic plan. Continuous strategic planning in the ERP anticipates changing policy environments and new developments in science and technology and identifies evolving needs for scientific and technical expertise. Continuous customer and stakeholder feedback also helps to shape ERP direction.

Evidence: ERP (1999) acted upon the recommendations of the NRC (1999) review: (1) NRC: maintain a strong research and knowledge base - ERP: after several years of focus on resource assessment, ERP separated framework and process studies from resource assessments, which aids in developing state-of-the-art assessment methodologies; (2) NRC: improve communication between the oil, gas, and coal sub-programs - ERP: ERP combined projects on a regional basis (Gulf Coast, Appalachian Basin, and Alaska) and these projects study all commodities in the region; (3) NRC: broaden ERP's portfolio to include all geologically based energy resources - ERP: ERP substantially developed coalbed methane and gas hydrate projects and developed a project entitled "Alternative Energy Resources of the Future" to provide periodic updates on the status of other commodities, such as heavy oil and oil shale that are predicted to remain a minor part of the energy mix in the next few decades.

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program does not assess and compare potential benefits to other efforts that have similar goals. ERP has a unique role and mission. but has a similar goal of better understanding energy resources as programs in state geological surveys and programs at DOE such as the Geothermal Energy program. There are demonstrable benefits to other programs, efforts, and organizations from the program. ERP does evaluate the efforts within the program to attain the best products and advances toward the short and long term goals possible. Though a formal cost/benefit has not been performed for ERP, cost benefit studies of other programs with open access to information policies suggest making information publicly available increases benefits to society. The NRC recognized benefits of ERP when it stated, "A significant duplication of effort would be the result if agencies were to develop internally the information provided to them by the ERP".

Evidence: ERP focuses its efforts on geographic areas, commodities, or studies that will further its short term and long term goals the most - usually in areas where there is relatively little known about the commodity. ERP compares potential benefits of projects within the program in order to balance basic and applied resources, while maximizing outputs and outcomes. ERP focuses on those resources with the greatest potential for meeting the nation's energy needs. ERP focuses on traditional resources of oil, gas, and coal, as well as frontier resources such as gas hydrates and coalbed methane, and only to a very small extent on resources such as oil shale and heavy oil. The knowledge gained from studying gas hydrates will substantially benefit the nation, especially as start up time for producing such new commodities is usually 5-10 years. Research is needed now to be prepared for when the technology and economics are conducive to development. ERP also focuses its efforts in frontier areas, such as Alaska, where little information exists, in order to provide the basic scientific information needed to make sound policy decisions. NRC review of ERP (pg 2)

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

2.RD2 Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The ERP uses a rigorous prioritization process as described above in sections 2.1 through 2.7, 2.RD1, and in section 3. The ERP takes into account and balances long range goals with current affairs, legislative mandates, requests from DOI and other DOI bureaus, stakeholder needs and input. Annual project plans are reviewed by the ERP Program Council to help determine prioritization, direction, mid-project course adjustment. Within project prioritization is critical to success as well, because many ERP projects, assessment projects in particular, are long term and ambitious and have many tasks to accomplish. The 5 year plan has listed priorities, but priorities are not clearly communicated through long term performance measures.

Evidence: ERP uses a rigorous prioritization process, employing long term goals and annual project planning and review. The long term and annual measures, goals, targets, customer feedback, partner input, etc. all described in 2.1-2.7 go toward prioritizing funding decisions. Each project submits a proposal every year. This allows the ERP Program Council to annually review each project and allows for a recalibration of the program every year. The ERP Program Council, with rotating membership of energy experts from ERP, other programs, and outside organizations, reviews projects to identify new ideas and partnerships, bring new expertise and perspective to project decisions, and to help ERP identify stakeholder needs. The prioritization process is housed under the broad goals and objectives of ERP, with annual adjustments determining what is of priority. Priorities in any given year include U.S. and global oil, gas, and coal assessment activities, research in support of these assessments and other agencies activities, and research where ERP contains significant expertise and has much invested such as gas hydrates, coal quality, and coalbed methane.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: DOI, USGS, and its Programs regularly collect performance information through customer and partner reviews and surveys. Feedback is incorporated into program plans and specific actions are taken in response. The DOI and Bureau Strategic Plans include partner and customer reviewed long term goals, annual performance measures, and GPRA measures. Progress on GPRA are verified quarterly and reported and updated annually. The USGS Director convenes annual listening sessions, recording needs of partners and informing them of response. The NAS/NRC reviews long term goals and program performance, utilizing blue ribbon panels of scientists and stakeholders. All projects are required to record detailed workplans, progress and products, and budgets by object class in the Bureau wide system BASIS+. Projects workplans and grant proposals are reviewed annually by Programs using advisory panels. Written feedback on performance is provided to project chiefs who must correct deficiencies or suffer budgetary penalties for non performance.

Evidence: Documents: Bureau Strategic Plan showing long term goals, measures, and annual GPRA targets (pp 9-15). GPRA update memo for FY-02, GPRA Reports for 03 and example of quarterly verification. Directors 03 Listening Session Report showing recommendations and actions taken. USGS Planning Model process showing performance requirements in program five-year plans (p.9) and collecting performance information in BASIS+ system (p.12-13). Overview diagram of planning process, Geology Strategic Plan, Geology Science Policy, Geology Annual Science Plan and example project of National Seismic Hazards Map. Energy Resources Program: ERP collects timely and credible performance information from a variety of sources: NRC reviews (see section 2.8 for detailed explanation of how ERP incorporated NRC recommendations); interagency steering committees that meet regularly, such as the EPCA committee (composed of USGS-ERP, BLM, USFS, DOE, EIA), which meets at least 4 times a year; annual Program Councils to review all project plans and progress; and whenever a major methodology is developed or product released.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: USGS holds senior management and program partners accountable for performance through performance evaluation, management process controls, and performance guidance provided in agreements, contracts, and grants. Measures for GPRA, financial management, and the Presidents Management Agenda are in all USGS SES performance agreements. Regional Executives and Program Coordinators are accountable for achieving performance as part of the USGS Planning Model. Grant programs have specific performance guidance and include rigorous review panels and budgetary penalties for non performance. Cooperative agreements with states and universities include specific requirements, products, and time schedules with payment penalties for non performance. Contracts for services are competed and contain specific quality and performance requirements and time schedules for services.

Evidence: Documents: SES Performance Plan Guidance and Trujillo Memo, USGS Planning Model responsibilities list (p.4-7). Contract and agency agreement requirements from the USGS Policy Manual. Energy Resources Program: All ERP partners are held accountable for cost, schedule, and performance results. One example is found in (3.2A), Assistance Award for "Assistance in the Development of Coal Resource Assessment Classification System and Evaluation of Coal Quality Data in the USGS Database." The contractual document contains a Scope, Statement of Work, Deliverable and Schedule for such, Background information on why such an Award is necessary, and contains the sentence "Final acceptance will be made upon completion of the work as required and data and reports delivered to the U.S. Geological Survey."

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The USGS has an established budget, allocation, and spending process that includes annual planning, quarterly and monthly reviews, and review of any funds allocation change over 25K. It has implemented management controls and measures to ensure dollars are allocated and obligated in a timely manner and spent for intended purposes. Budget planning to object class is done in the BASIS+ system, which ties budget to intended use. Allocation tables are constructed from BASIS+ and FFS is used to provide monthly and quarterly spending information by object class, to review obligation and debt, and take corrective action. Projects and their budgets are reviewed monthly by line managers and annually by Programs. Changes of over 25K are reviewed by both regional line managers and Programs as they occur. The Bureau conducts quarterly review of status of funds against performance measures. A certified Contracting Officer's Representative annually reviews and verifies contract funds are obligated and spent for intended purposes.

Evidence: Documents: USGS Budgeting and Finance diagram. FY02 Geology Annual Science Plan showing project science and funding targets. FY02 Allocation Process Memo showing appropriation actions and requirements. FY02 Program and admin office allocation tables to cost centers, projects, and accounts. These numbers are consistent with budget numbers in FY-02 Geology Annual Science Plan. FY02 National Seismic Hazard Map project/budget and FFS reports showing FY02 cost center spending on National Seismic Hazards Maps and dollars spent for intended use at project level. Spending progress by object class for all USGS for 02 2nd and 3rd quarters. Summary of Program quarterly obligations for FY02 showing consistent spending of appropriations for intended program. Final spending report for all FY02 Programs. Instructional Memos APS-2003-11-13 showing monthly management control requirements for accounts receivable, unbilled balances, and obligations-accruals-changes to allocations > 25K. Description of cost centers use of FFS monthly reports to inform account holders of spending progress and funds available.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Bureau is engaged in competitive sourcing for Visual Information Services, Building and Ground Maintenance, and Warehousing. These competitions will improve cost and timeliness of program publications and exhibits and the warehousing we use for major program assets. Geology mission critical information systems have submitted Capitol Asset Plans (Exhibit 300) to DOI and are in the certification and accreditation process. Geology programs are gaining efficiencies in timeliness and cost by serving digital data and analysis tools through common portals. In 2003, all Geology programs are developing Activity Based Costing for 2004 implementation. ABC will allow for comparisons of overhead costs across programs for research and assessments. Scientists are required to submit annual project work plans and budgets for review of progress, performance, and cost.

Evidence: Documents: April 2002 Memo from USGS Director announcing competitive sourcing, June 2003 update on competitive sourcing. DOI Capitol Asset Guidance. Examples of digital data initiatives and portals. Geology Science Planning Policy. Energy Resources Program: ERP IT improvements are numerous and some details are found in section 4.3. Another example is that ERP's geophysical processing project initiated a contract to provide a fast acquisition path for purchasing reflection seismic data from commercial vendors; ERP and other programs use this contract to acquire such data at a reduced cost and a timely manner; cost benefits of acquiring the data without the contract as compared to acquisition with the contract show that ERP has saved \$800,000 in the past 3 years - funds that can be used for other program purposes. The ERP Central Energy Team recently registered its services and data with a geospatial resource web portal called Geography Network, which caused usage to significantly increase after registration.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Geology Programs collaborate with federal, state, and local governments, industry, and academia towards the achievement of complimentary goals. Major partners are identified in the Geology Strategic Plan and in Program Five-Year Plans and include, but are not limited to, DOD, NSF, DOE, EPA, BLM, EIA, and DOI, State Geological Surveys, state and local resource agencies, and major consortia of academic, governmental, and industry groups. In general, USGS provides the broad scientific framework that provides context and support for partners to conduct work on a more specific or local basis. USGS establishes roles and responsibilities with partners through cooperative agreements, Memoranda of Understanding, or Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADA).

Evidence: Effective collaboration between ERP and others is evidenced by many working agreements ERP has with others. Listed in section 1.3 are some of these partnerships - gas hydrate research with DOE, MMS, BLM; coalbed methane work with BLM and industry consortia; BLM collaboration with EPCA; and many others, including State surveys. In all of these relationships, ERP plays a distinct and complementary role. Example: in the EPCA work, ERP provides estimates of undiscovered oil and gas resources underlying Federal lands and BLM provides the surface restrictions and impediments to development. ERP cooperative working relationships benefit both parties, and ERP scientists gain access to data, knowledge, and expertise as well as funding. Sometimes these relationships have other tangible benefits: members of the ANWR consortium requested ERP reprocessed reflection seismic data from ANWR. In return for this reprocessed ERP data, ERP acquired a corresponding number of miles of company owned seismic data at no charge. To acquire these data commercially would have required an expenditure of more than \$1.5 million.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The 2002 Audit findings of the Inspector Generals Office conducted by KPMG contained a "no opinion" result and cited 8 reportable conditions in their report dated January 24, 2003. Due the extent of financial management problems cited in the audit and the inability of the auditor to render an option, it is difficult to separate the program from cfinancial magement problems. USGS submitted a Corrective Action Plan that has been accepted by the Inspector Generals office. In his cover memo, the Asst. Inspectors General for Audits stated: "Based on the response and corrective action plan, all the recommendations are considered resolved but not implemented." Monthly meetings and reports on progress are being provided to DOI and thus far, many tasks are completed and all others are in progress. In the USGS matrix organization, line management and administration is responsible for financial, facilities, and personnel management. USGS Program Coordinators are responsible for scientific planning and coordination, budget formulation, and establishing and reviewing performance.

Evidence: Documents: April 11 Auditors Report 2003, Corrective Action Plan, and cover memo from Asst. Inspector General for Audits Roger LaRoche.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The USGS is taking the necessary steps to resolve management deficiencies. The USGS has aggressively addressed IT control weaknesses. Management control performance measures have been incorporated into all SES Performance Evaluations. An expert team has been formed and operating for the last 6 months to address audit issues and ensure completion of the Audit Corrective Action Plan. Extensive training is underway to address reported conditions and strengthen management practices. Administrative Instructional Memoranda outline in detail all financial processes and requirements. All Geology Programs use an annual review process and the BASIS+ system to review all program work and correct deficiencies. This is described in detail in 3.4 and 3.RD1. The NRC and FACA advisory panels conduct periodic reviews that make recommendations regarding program management, performance, and scientific direction.

Evidence: Documents: Corrective Action Plan Progress Report submitted to DOI showing progress or completion of all actions. Hord Tipton Memo providing improved results of March and April testing of DOI WAN's. Instructional Memoranda from 3.3. ERP is proactive in taking corrective measures when needed: (1) In the past, ERP released assessments periodically (~every 5 years). After the 1995 national assessment, with input from stakeholders, Program Council review, and critically looking at funding, FTE, proposed targets, partner needs, ERP made a systematic change in the process to "rolling assessments." Now, when an assessment is done, it is released rather than waiting for other regions to be finished, thus increasing ERP's timeliness and allows for concentration of limited resources. (2) From the post-appraisal (e.g. customer feedback) of the National Coal Assessment, ERP determined the next phase of assessment would be a methodological revision. Two existing coal projects were combined into 1 to streamline assessment functions. The letter outlining this decision and the prospectus before the combination and after are found in (3.7A).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

- 3.RD1 For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%
- Explanation:** Since 1996, Geology Programs have been a leader in conducting a division-wide competitive project proposal process using a prototype of the BASIS+ system now in use across the Bureau. Geology issues an annual call for project proposals called the Geology Annual Science Plan (also known as the Geology Prospectus) which contains scientific and funding guidance for all projects. The annual plan uses the Geology Science Strategy and Program five year plans for its organizing framework. Scientists are required to submit annual project proposals into the BASIS+ system for program review. The system is used to examine strengths and weaknesses in staff, scientific methodology, progress on goals, budgetary structure, use of funds and capital investments, and formulate final allocations. Reviews are conducted by scientific peers and include external scientific or stakeholder review. Earmarked funds are not excluded from review.
- Evidence:** Documents: Overview diagram of Geology Planning Process demonstrating management and review process. See also answers to 3.1 and 3.3 on planning and allocation processes.
- 4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%
- Explanation:** ERP completes projects that are related to long term goals in energy resource assessment, improved development of assessment methodologies, framework geologic studies, and research studies of environmental and human health impact of energy production and use. The goals in the five year plan are too broad, and do not have baselines or targets to determine if adequate progress has been achieved. While activity and timeline information is collected at the project level it is not clearly linked to long term goals.
- Evidence:** Examples of ERP contributions to long term performance goals: (1) The World Petroleum Assessment is the world reference standard for international policy development - it is the reference case for IEA's World Energy Outlook (2000,2001, 2002), EIA's International Energy Outlook (2000, 2001, 2002), and the benchmark reference case used by climate modelers at Stanford, MIT, and PEW Center; (2) The results of ERP's assessments of oil and gas resources in Alaska are considered the most objective available and used by the Administration and Congress in formulating energy policy, increased industry interest in NPRA before the lease sales, and used by most groups debating the pros and cons of development in this area (4.1B and 4.1C); (3) Because of ERP's nonadvocacy role, the Northern Cheyenne Tribe requested ERP assistance to evaluate the potential of coalbed methane resources on the Reservation (4.1D), information which will be used to set tribal policy.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Baseline and targets for ERP-funded projects are listed in annual science plans (the Geology prospectus), annual project work proposals and plans, and in documentation of base and initiative budgets. Cooperative and other agreements with other federal agencies, states, academia, etc. all have outlined periodic, usually annual, targets in the written document. See also sections 2.4 and 2.5.

Evidence: Annual priorities are established in the context of long-term goals (ERP 5-year plan, GD and USGS science strategies, DOI strategic plan) and performance is checked by management and Program Council review, approval and funding of both internal USGS projects and external partners. Project funding is adjusted annually based on performance and programmatic priorities. Annual targets are reported every quarter in GPRA. All contractual and working agreements have annual performance goals. See e.g. Assistance Agreement (4.2A) between BLM and ERP which outlines specific deliverables for the fiscal year for gas hydrate work. The EPCA inventory had a congressionally mandated deadline. To complete the work required in the short time available, very tight performance goals were necessary; targets were achieved and the interagency report was released on time. ERP assessments conducted in Alaska (see also 2.4) were done on time, in order to meet a variety of goals, such as conducting workshops open to all to create interest in NPRA lease sales in the time frame required by BLM. All annual goals work toward the long term goals.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: ERP has adopted a number of new technologies, methodologies, ways of conducting science that have increased efficiencies and cost effectiveness. ERP's effective use of IT and GIS have increased its efficiency tremendously (see also 3.4). While savings have occurred, there is no regularly collected data which facilitate cost effectiveness determinations over years, or permit comparisons across programs.

Evidence: ERP maps are now digital and most are GIS-based, significantly increasing their usability to a variety of users, not just traditional ones. ERP products are available over the web, reaching a much wider audience than in the past. Digital products have reduced costs for archiving and distributing products. The NERSL project has modernized its storage and near online retrieval systems, switching from CD-ROM to DVD capabilities increasing the amount of storage space and speeding retrievals. The geophysical processing project has evolved tremendously and provides seismic data acquisition, processing, and interpretation support to ERP and others; having an in-house service provides faster service and saves ERP a large amount of money (approx \$2 million over the last 5 yrs) which can be used for other scientific endeavors. In the past, ERP produced national assessments periodically. Now, ERP produces "rolling assessments," so that products are delivered in a more timely and efficient manner. Partnering has increased significantly to take advantage of expertise where it exists and fill short term skill needs.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Though there is not specific performance data to compare with other efforts, NRC reports and program partners suggest the program. However, many other programs have complementary missions. The ERP works with these other groups or they use data produced by ERP projects for their work.

Evidence: The NRC review of ERP specifically stated that ERP's role is clearly defined and unique (4.4A). Many agencies (listed in 1.3) and the private sector use ERP information: (1) oil and gas assessments feed directly into EIA forecasts; (2) See e-mails (4.4B) describing use of results from the organic geochemistry lab and other ERP projects; (3) Environmental groups use ERP assessments as the basis of their studies (4.4C); (4) The financial community requests "reality checks" on loan requests that use oil or gas as loan collateral and the IRS consults ERP concerning tax policy and reserve growth; (5) The NPC (a DOE FACA), charged with studying natural gas supplies is "using the USGS assessments as the basis" for their study (4.4D); (6) The NPC also requested ERP expertise in gas economic analysis (4.4E); (7) BLM requested ERP assistance in carrying out environmental responsibilities in land planning (4.4F). An important ERP role is to archive information, maps, data that would otherwise be destroyed or disintegrate, such as the NPRA data set rescued from NOAA (originally a billion dollar+ investment) and archived by ERP (4.4G).

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Independent review of the ERP by various groups have found the program to be effective and achieving results. These groups include the NRC, American Association of Petroleum Geology Core Committee, National Petroleum Council, and others as needed, such as the independent Geode review. Also testament to ERP's effectiveness is the vast amount of feedback ERP receives in the form of e-mails, letters, and verbal information indicating the breadth and scope of use of ERP products.

Evidence: The NRC review of ERP states: "the mission of ERP - to provide up-to-date and impartial assessments of geologically based energy resources of the nation and the world - is fully appropriate for a federal earth-science agency. The information and data are essential to the management of federal lands, to the understanding of the environmental impacts of the extraction and use of energy resources, and to the planning of national energy policy." Other examples: (1) AAPG reviewed/endorsed ERP assessment methodology (4.5A); (2) Other organizations use (OPEC) or adopt (Australian govt) ERP resource estimates; (3) EIA altered their conventional onshore natural gas production forecast as a result of an ERP study indicating that the predictions could not be met with domestic supply (4.5B); (4) the National Petroleum Council technology subgroup, tasked to determine if producing gas hydrates is feasible in the next 25 years, relies of ERP information and data (4.5C); (5) Geode was independently reviewed and found to have "significantly more functionality than ArcIMS software and is well positioned as an enterprise-level solution." (4.5D)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey

Measure: # of energy assessments provided to key stakeholders with the information necessary to make sound land use decisions and public policy.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2000	5	5	
2002	6	6	
2003	6	6	
2004	6		
2005	6		

Measure: Evaluate the environmental and human health impact of using energy resources to provide scientific information to key stakeholders in support of sound policy decisions.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2003	5	5	
2004	5		
2005	5		

Measure: % of formal USGS publications and scientific products receiving appropriate peer review

Additional Information: Indicates whether USGS is delivering energy resource information that is of high quality.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2002	100%	100%	
2003	100%	100%	
2004	100%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey

Measure: % of formal USGS publications and scientific products receiving appropriate peer review

Additional Information: Indicates whether USGS is delivering energy resource information that is of high quality.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	100%		

Measure: Number of decision-making/data delivery support systems

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	1	1	
2002	1	1	
2003	1	1	
2004	1	1	

Measure: Number of long term data collections maintained - 1) National Coal Resource Data System; 2) Organic Geochemistry Database; 3) National Energy Research Seismic Library; 4) World Coal Quality Inventory; 5) National Coal Quality Inventory

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002	5	5	
2003	5	5	
2004	5		
2005	5		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey

Measure: % of targeted analyses delivered which are cited by identified partners within 3 years after analysis is delivered.

Additional Information: Objective is to ensure that analyses and investigations delivered are actually used by their intended recipients within a short time of delivery, ensuring both relevance and timeliness.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2004	80%		
2005	80%		
2006	80%		

Measure: # of targeted basins with oil and gas resource assessments available to support management decisions.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	7	7	
2004	5		
2005	6		

Measure: Average cost of a systematic analysis or investigation (dollars in millions)

Additional Information: Average cost per analysis allows comparisons among different projects to determine how efficiencies can be achieved.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)
2003		2.75	
2004	2.75		
2005	2.75		

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The purpose of the USGS Hazards Program (earthquake, volcano, landslides, geomagnetism Global Seismograph Network) is to provide the Earth science data and information, analyses, and research needed to reduce the loss of life, property, and economic impact of geohazards.

Evidence: PL 95-124 (Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977) established National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program, defined Earthquake Hazard objectives & authorized USGS participation. Amendment PL 101-614 authorized USGS to: "characterize & identify earthquake hazards, assess earthquake risks, monitor seismic activity, and improve earthquake predictions". PL 93-288 (Disaster Relief Act of 1974) assigns USGS responsibility to work to reduce losses from and enhance public safety for volcano and landslide hazards through effective forecasting and warnings, based on current scientific information--DOI, USGS, Geology and NEHRP strategic plans establish hazards mission areas and set strategic goals for hazards activities. -- Program 5-year Plans

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program provides necessary information to DOI and other federal agencies, states, local governments and the private sector to make informed decisions pertaining to geologic hazard loss reduction or mitigation. Citizens, emergency responders, architects and engineers, and aviators rely on the USGS for objective, accurate and timely information on these hazards. Geologic hazards cause loss of life and property every year. For example:-- Earthquakes pose significant risk to 75 million Americans in 39 states and cause annual direct losses of \$4.4 billion per year.--The US is the third most volcanically active country, and 50 of the 70 potentially active US volcanoes have erupted in the past 200 years.--Landslides cause \$2-3 billion in damages and 25 deaths annually in the U.S., and are a national problem, affecting most states.

Evidence: PL 95-124, Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977, w/amendments, reviews need for earthquake hazard reduction and defines specific program objectives NRC report "Impacts of Natural Disasters" identified Northridge quake (1994) as most costly U.S. disaster. VHP 5-yr plan, appendix B, lists volcanic activity for 1999-2003; older activity in Smithsonian archive Science article on volcano monitoring advances, v.299, 28 Mar. 2003, p.2015-2030 National Landslide Hazard Mitigation Strategy, 2000, states that landslides result in deaths, injuries and property loss; the NRC Interim Report 2002 concurs that integrated program must be developed. Significant Landslide Events in the U.S. FEMA Publ. 366 (2000), provides estimated annualized losses for US quakes at \$4.4 billion

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: All of the hazards programs are closely coordinated with Federal and State efforts in risk and mitigation activities. For example, DHS (FEMA) has responsibility for response, assistance and promotion of mitigation practices, and NSF supports basic research in geosciences, engineering, and social and economic impacts. USGS provides unique skills and capabilities in hazards assessment, monitoring and notification, and research on effects and mitigation, and maintains offices and observatories to meet regional needs. USGS works closely and cooperatively with state geological surveys, emergency management offices, and local governments and private interests. No other agencies provide hazard assessments and long-term monitoring operations. There are no private companies involved in hazards monitoring and notification, although some re-package or reinterpret USGS data or products for commercial use.

Evidence: PL 93-288 (Disaster Relief Act of 1974) Sec. 202, elaborated in F.R. 42 19292-19296 expressly and uniquely empowers USGS to issue warnings and provide technical assistance for earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, landslides or other geologic hazards. USGS unique role validated by NRC reviews of VHP (2000) and LHP strategy (2002). PL 101-614 defines the "Responsibilities of Program Agencies" for NEHRP. The NEHRP Strategic Plan further defines agency roles and responsibilities. The NEHRP Policy Coordination Group (policy level) and the Interagency Coordination Committee (working level), both chaired by DHS (FEMA), ensure coordination of NEHRP, through regular meetings and ad hoc contacts, to resolve specific issues. Annexes to an USGS/NSF MOU define agency roles and responsibilities with respect to EarthScope and GSN. The National Space Weather Program Implementation Plan defines agency roles in geomagnetic monitoring.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Each of the Geologic hazard subactivities are funded and managed separately with individual outcomes and goals. As a result, overall program efforts are not coordinated, through the GD and USGS planning process, to ensure that resources are allocated across hazard areas for the purpose of reducing overall loss of life and property due to geologic hazards.

Evidence: DOI, USGS, and Geology Strategic Plans establish a framework of goals and activities [attachment 1.1]. NEHRP Strategic Plan shows major design elements of NEHRP program. PL 101-614 and PL 106-503, the 1990 and 2000 reauthorizations of NEHRP, made adjustments and clarifications to agency responsibilities within NEHRP. EHP 5-Year plan details implementing NEHRP and DOI/USGS/Geology strategic plans. VHP 5-yr plan describes observatory structure; cooperative agreements demonstrate effective partnerships. NRC review validates program structure.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Research and program resources are targeted at the highest hazard areas of the country. Research and program resources are targeted at the highest - hazard areas of the country. External grants are targeted at applied research tasks identified in planning documents, are limited to 1 or 2 years. Cooperative agreements for monitoring ensure that regional, state or local monitoring and notification needs are met. Both are fully competed and reviewed annually. Products are reviewed through a series of regional and national meetings. Lack of data connecting USGS science to reduced hazard losses makes it difficult to evaluate whether the program could more effectively target resources to result in the greatest reduction in loss of life and property due to geologic hazards.

Evidence: EHP Program Announcements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements. International Building Code (IBC) 2000 EHP Web Statistics reviews earthquake monitoring and notification operations. Report ATC-35 "Enhancing transfer of USGS research results into engineering practice," promotes engineering applications of EHP results. Resources targeted for public safety benefits by observatory agreements with clientele: Alaska interagency plan for aviation safety; MOU with Pierce Co. for lahar monitoring system on Mt. Rainier; OFR 01-453 on volcanism in Natl Parks; letters from superintendents & Director of NPS USGS OFR 97-289, Landslide Overview Map of the Conterminous U.S. GSN Standing Committee minutes & reports; USGS OFR 01-460, Review of GSN Program. Geomag. program data is reviewed daily by USAF and NOAA Space Environment Center.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The Hazard Program is focused on measures corresponding to four major elements: Hazard Assessments, Monitoring, Research and Outreach/Communications (see attachment 2.1). These measures are taken from the program's five-year plans and track directly the strategic goals and objectives of the Geology Discipline, the USGS, the DOI Strategic Plan and the President's Business Reference Model (see attachment 1.1). Improved measure were developed during the PART process and are included in the measures section, including a common measure across the USGS geological hazards activities. However across the USGS hazard programs (and related federal programs) there is not an outcome measure that captures the impact of, or reduced risk provided by federal activities.

Evidence: DOI and USGS Strategic Plans. Geology Science Strategy 2000-2010. Goals 1 and 2 pertain specifically to the hazards programs. Goal 1: Conduct geologic hazard assessments for mitigation planning. Goal 2: Provide short-term prediction of geologic disasters and rapidly characterize their effects. Hazards Programs Five-year Plans: establish specific tasks and priority ranking for work needed to achieve these goal Future Science Directions of the Earthquake Hazards Program lays out EHP's very-long-term goals. Advanced National Seismic System is described in USGS Circular 1188. Document was developed in collaboration stakeholders and describes equipment & facilities needed to achieve rapid, quantitative maps of earthquake impacts and early warning. Report of the Committee appointed to review the Global Seismograph Network, April 2003. Geomagnetism Program - Program Priorities 1999-2004.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Long term goals for Hazard programs are listed in the program's 5-year plan. With the exception of earthquake hazards, program goals and the narrative for 5-year plans are too broad and did not include time frames. Improved measures have been developed as part of the PART process and are included in the results section.

Evidence: Hazard Programs Five Year Plans, contain targets and timeframes for 5-yr tasks and objectives.USGS Circular 1188, "Requirement for an Advanced National Seismic System", ANSS Management Plan, ANSS, Technical Guidelines for Implementation of the ANSS. ANSS Annual Plan FY03.Open File Report 00-450 National Landslide Hazards Mitigation Strategy provides baselines and targets for LHP.Various EarthScope planning documents and the EarthScope annex to the USGS/NSF MOU. Southern California Earthquake Center - The SCEC Community Modeling Environment - An Information Infrastructure for System Level Earthquake Research.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Seven annual measures have been identified pertaining to each of the four program elements. These include the GPRA performance goals: 1) Number of monitoring networks maintained; 2) Number of real-time earthquake sensors installed and operational; and 3) Number of stakeholder workshops or meetings held. 4) Number of hazard and risk assessments completed.The hazards programs consistently meet or exceed the GPRA targets. An annual efficiency measure is the percent availability of GSN data, toward a long-term goal of 90% data availability. Annual measures achieved but as timeframes did not exist for all long term goals, it is difficult to assess whether adequate progress was achieved.

Evidence: GPRA documentation sets annual performance targets for network operations, installation of new instrumentation, hazard assessments and stakeholder meetings.Program Five Year Plans set out priority tasks for each program element. Annual USGS Director's Guidance and Geology Science Strategy give high-level guidance and solicit new project proposals or annual work plans.Annual work plans of internal projects and external grant proposals describe expected results and accomplishments. FY03 Project Work Plans and ReportsExternal grant solicitation and applications.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Annual baselines and targets for achieving the overall goals of using knowledge and technology to achieve loss reduction include: projections of planned enhancements to monitoring networks, new or revised hazard assessments and outreach activities. Baselines and targets are set in GPRA plans, program 5-year plans, capital asset plans (e.g., ANSS), and the GD annual science plan. Project proposals and annual work plans include additional annual targets for project-specific work. An annual measure for the GSN, percent data availability, tracks progress toward the long-term goal of achieving 90% recovery of GSN data.Specific baselines and targets for the Hazards Programs are given on the Measures spreadsheet.

Evidence: Current state of hazard assessments and data published or on web: Improvement measured against this documentation. Targets stated in annual Project Work Plans. Inventories of current ANSS instrumentation. Annual improvement targets set down in annual development plans of regions, summarized in GPRA goals & documents. Research targets defined in annual project work plans for internal projects, solicitations for external research, SCEC planning documents.VHP: Baseline in 2001 of 27% of 70 potentially active volcanoes had published assessments in 2001; target in 2004 is 37%. Baseline in 2001 of 61% of 70 potentially active volcanoes monitored in 2001; target in 2004 = 67%. Baseline in 1999 = 19 volcanoes with info. supporting public safety decisions; target in 2008 = 33. Baseline in 2003 is 5 active volcanoes with integrated geologic models; target in 2007 is 8 (PART Meas Tab, VHP 5-Year Plan, GPRA Docs).Annual targets for GSN stations installation & operations set by GSN standing committee, documented in committee Minutes. Annual GSN work plan gives performance goal.Annual work plan of Geomag. Project describes work to improve data quality.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: --At a high level, the Stafford Act and NEHRP commit the USGS and partnering federal agencies to a common set of public safety and loss reduction goals. USGS builds relationships with partners having complementary goals (e.g., NOAA, for ash cloud, landslide and tsunami hazards; NSF, for Earthscope) to leverage resources/expertise.--Cooperative agreements, competitive grants are employclose coordination through monthly reviews and annual reports.

Evidence: NEHRP Strategic Plan 2001-2005.EHP annual Program Announcement 04HQPA0001 includes the research priorities based on the 5-year plan.Five-Year Plans are used to set and publicize program priorities with partners, grantees, etc..ANSS Management Plan, ANSS Technical Guidelines, and a separate solicitation document for cooperative agreements are used to set priorities for the regional seismic network operations awards. Annual performance reports from grantees and cooperative agreements.Cooperative agreement with the American Planning Association for preparation of guidebook for land use plannersVHP Cooperative agreements with universities and AK-DGGS, and MOUs withother agencies support program goals.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Each Hazards program has periodically engaged the National Research Council (NRC) for comprehensive review, or for specific review of aspects of the program, and to identify future challanges. Numerous reports have been produced since 1977. For example, the NRC has been commissioned to conduct a cost-benefit study of earthquake monitoring. GSN and Geomagnetism have had similar reviews.EHP uses a permanent FACA committee, the Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee (SESAC), made up of independent, knowledgeable scientists, engineers, and state officials, that reviews the plans, progress, and performance measures of the EHP. The SESAC meets two to three times each year and reports to the USGS Director and the Congress. The ANSS National Steering Committee (NSC) is a sub-committee of the SESAC. It reviews and guides annual ANSS work and development. EHP also supports the standing Committee on Seismology of the NRC for general guidance on seismological research and practice.External input to all programs is obtained through stakeholder workshops.

Evidence: NEHRP reauthorization testimony, legislation and committee reports-Letter reports of the SESAC. -Reports of the ANSS National Steering Committee. - Minutes of the IRIS/USGS GSN Standing Committee.-Report of the ad hoc Committee to Review the USGS Geomagnetism Program, 1999-NRC Interim Report, Assessment of Proposed Partnerships to Implement a National Landslides Hazard Mitigation Strategy-VHP uses NRC reviews to identify program improvements-Attachment 2.6EH: List of "Independent Reviews of U.S. Needs and Efforts in Seismology and Earthquake Hazard Mitigation, 1977-2003". This list summarizes the findings and recommendations of 26 published reviews and studies of EHP and related activities.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
80%	80%	91%	80%	

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Program budgets are not clearly tied to annual and long term performance measures or goals in 5 year plans. Not all items listed in the GPRA table are not clearly tied to descriptions of actual activities within the text of the budget materials. Measurable long term performance measures only existed for earthquake hazards but these were not clearly reflected in congressional justifications or submissions to OMB to determine whether budget was sufficiently tied to performance.

Evidence: DOI, USGS, and NEHRP strategic plans. Geology Science Strategy and annual Geology Science Plan. Hazard Programs Five Year Plans. Budget justifications, given in the USGS Annual Budget Justification and Performance Information.VHP 5-year plan, annual VHP line-item justification in DOI Budget JustificationsExample of successful Initiative: Multi-Urban Hazards Initiative (e.g., Fact Sheet 99-4182)

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Individually, the subactivities of the hazard program have taken steps to correct strategic planning deficiencies identified by external reviews, examples are provided in the evidence column.

Evidence: EH:--recognized need for a standing advisory committee to give critical review/advice. In 2000, asked Congress to authorize an advisory committee in the reauthorization of NEHRP. In 2002, established the Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee (SESAC). --recognized inadequate management structure for ANSS. With ANSS partners, developed a management structure that included regional & national advisory and a Technical Integration Committee.--recognized need for coordinated management of the GSN. In 2001, formed MOU with NSF for joint oversight of the GSN, through the GSN Stdg. Comm.VH:--in response to 2000 NRC review, revised 5-yr plan to strengthen research capabilities, add new technologies (e.g., INSAR), open data policy, enhance monitoring and streamline management.LH:--A National Landslide Hazard Mitigation Strategy addressed Congressional concerns that landslide hazards needed more attention.

2.RD1 If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Hazards does not measure the benefit of reduced losses between the various geologic hazard or with programs with comparable goals outside the Geology Discipline or USGS. The benefits of nor within the Geologic Hazards program.--A recent OSTP/RAND Corp. study compared R&D efforts for pan-hazard loss reduction across federal Agencies, including earthquake, volcano, landslide and geomagnetic hazards. The report suggested improved analysis of loss data is necessary to determine proper allocation of R&D spending across hazards. The EHP Program Coordinator participated as a reviewer of this study.

Evidence: Stafford Act, NEHRP authorizations and the NEHRP Strategic Plan define agency roles.Rand Corp., 2003, Assessing Federal Research and Development for Hazard Loss Reduction, DRU-2992-OSTP.Federal responsibility for volcano monitoring & volcanoes on public lands (PL 93-288, Disaster Relief Act of 1974, Sec. 202, elaborated in F.R. 42 19292-19296 , 5-year plan, Letter from Director of NPS to Director of USGS)

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

- 2.RD2 Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%
- Explanation: 1. Long-range strategic planning documents set overall goals and priorities (e.g., NEHRP, DOI, USGS, and Geology strategic plans).2. Earthquake five-year plan details specific near-term objectives and tasks; these are prioritized and have timeframes.3. GD annual science plan and Director's guidance set and prioritize annual activities within the major program elements that conform to the strategic planning docs. 4. Proposals from individual projects are directed at these activities (or else competed through the Director's science initiative process).Based on these four processes, funds are allocated to specific projects by the program coordinators, in consultation with regional geologists.The IRIS/USGS GSN Standing Committee separately provides priorities for GSN activities.EHP priorities are additionally reviewed by its FACA committee (SESAC).
- Evidence: NEHRP Strategic PlanDOI Strategic PlanUSGS Strategic PlanGeology Annual Science Plan. EHP, VHP, LHP and Geomag. Five Year Plans. Annual Project ProposalsGSN Standing Committee Reports and Minutes. SESAC Committee reports and minutes
- 3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%
- Explanation: DOI,USGS, and its Programs regularly collect performance information through customer and partner reviews and surveys. Feedback is incorporated into program plans and specific actions are taken in response. The DOI and Bureau Strategic Plans include partner and customer reviewed long term goals, annual performance measures, and GPRA measures. Progress on GPRA are verified quarterly and reported and updated annually. The USGS Director convenes annual listening sessions, recording needs of partners and informing them of response. The NAS/NRC reviews long term goals and program performance, utilizing blue ribbon panels of scientists and stakeholders. All projects are required to record detailed workplans, progress and products, and budgets by object class in the Bureau wide system BASIS+. Projects workplans and grant proposals are reviewed annually by Programs using advisory panels. Written feedback on performance is provided to project chiefs who must correct deficiencies or suffer budgetary penalties for non performance.
- Evidence: Att. 3.1 illustrates/describes USGS planning and review processBureau Strategic Plan shows long term goals, measures & annual GPRA targets (pp 9-15). GPRA update memo for FY-02, GPRA Reports for 03 and example of quarterly verification. Directors 03 Listening Session Report shows recommendations and actions taken. USGS Planning Model process shows performance requirements in program 5-year plans (p.9) and collecting performance information in BASIS+ (p.12-13). Example project: National Seismic Hazards MapNRC periodically reviews program performance and direction using panels of scientists & stakeholders.Programs prepare annual science plans by goal and objective with budget targets for individual projects. Project Work Plans reviewed annually; feedback on performance and budget provided. Workplans annually updated including progress, products, outcomes & partner interactions. EHP: SESAC reviews projects on a 3-yr cycle. Similar process used for grant programs & cooperative agreements, incl. rigorous annual/triennial reviews VHP: Input from Air Line Pilots Association, FAA & industry representatives led to major, decade-long refocusing of VHP to address volcanic ash hazards to aviation (VHP 5-Year Plan, USGS Bulletin 2047, AK Interagency Ops Plan, Letter to Asst. Sec., DOI from ALPA 4/25, 2003).Customer surveys used to review product satisfaction.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: USGS holds senior management and program partners accountable for performance through performance evaluation, management process controls, and performance guidance provided in agreements, contracts, and grants. Measures for GPRA, financial management, and the Presidents Management Agenda are in all USGS SES performance agreements. Regional Executives and Program Coordinators are accountable for achieving performance as part of the USGS Planning Model. Grant programs have specific performance guidance and include rigorous review panels and budgetary penalties for non performance. Cooperative agreements with states and universities include specific requirements, products, and time schedules with payment penalties for non performance. Contracts for services are competed and contain specific quality and performance requirements and time schedules for services.

Evidence: SES Performance Plan Guidance and Trujillo MemoUSGS Planning Model responsibilities list (p.4-7)Contract and agency agreement requirements from the USGS Policy Manual. Cooperative agreements with states and universities include specific requirements, products, and time schedules with payment penalties for non performance. Examples: Alaska DGGS, and the Univ. Utah, Hawaii, and WA require specific monitoring, field work, telemetry, database, maintenance & QA, training and reporting activities, which directly contribute to program goals Contracts for services are competed and contain specific quality and performance requirements and time schedules for services.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The USGS has an established budget, allocation, and spending process that includes annual planning, quarterly and monthly reviews, and review of any funds allocation change over 25K. It has implemented management controls and measures to ensure dollars are allocated and obligated in a timely manner and spent for intended purposes. Budget planning to object class is done in the BASIS+ system, which ties budget to intended use. Allocation tables are constructed from BASIS+ and FFS is used to provide monthly and quarterly spending information by object class, to review obligation and debt, and take corrective action. Projects and their budgets are reviewed monthly by line managers and annually by Programs. Changes of over 25K are reviewed by both regional line managers and Programs as they occur. The Bureau conducts quarterly review of status of funds against performance measures. A certified Contracting Officer's Representative annually reviews and verifies contract funds are obligated and spent for intended purposes.

Evidence: Diagram of USGS Budgeting & Finance. FY02 GD Annual Science Plan shows project science & funding targets used for budgetingFY02 Allocation Process Memo shows appropriation actions & allocation requirementsFY02 allocation tables by Programs & administrative office give allocations to cost centers, projects, and accounts. Numbers consistent with budget numbers in FY-02 Geology Annual Science PlanFY02 National Seismic Hazard Map project and budget & FFS reports with FY02 spending at cost centers on National Seismic Hazards Maps show dollars spent for intended use at project levelSpending progress by object class for all of USGS for the 2nd and 3rd quarters of 2002Summary of Program quarterly obligations for FY02 show consistent spending of appropriations for intended programFinal spending report for all Programs for FY02Instruct. Memos APS-2003-11-13 show monthly mgmt control reqts for accounts receivable, unbilled balances & obligations, and accruals & changes to allocations > 25KDescription of how cost centers use monthly reports from FFS to inform account holders of spending & funds avail.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
80%	80%	91%	80%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The Bureau is engaged in competitive sourcing for Visual Information Services, Building and Ground Maintenance, and Warehousing. These competitions will improve cost and timeliness of program publications and exhibits and the warehousing we use for major program assets. Geology mission critical information systems have submitted Capitol Asset Plans (Exhibit 300) to DOI and are in the certification and accreditation process. Geology programs are gaining efficiencies in timelines and cost by serving digital data and analysis tools through common portals. In 2003, all Geology programs are developing Activity Based Costing for 2004 implementation. Since 1996, Geology Programs have been a leader in conducting competitive project proposal and review processes and project based costing using a prototype of the BASIS+system now in use across the Bureau. Scientists are required to submit annual project work plans and budgets for review of progress, performance, and cost.

Evidence: April 2002 Memo from USGS Director announcing competitive sourcing; June 2003 update on competitive sourcing; DOI Capitol Asset Guidance; Examples of digital data initiatives and portals; Geology Science Planning Policy; Geology Science Plan Policy; Program Examples: --Implementation of Akamai web server technology review in Washington Technology--EHP terminating its contract for a dedicated satellite data transmission link and moving to a leased satellite-internet communication service--ANSS stations are installed on the lowest-cost basis, using either regional operators or USGS technicians--ANSS uses multi-vendor contracts for procurement, so that competition ensures direct cost savings for equipment with highly technical specifications.--VHP Standardization on Earthworm seismic data software for processing and distribution of seismic data and on VALVE for time-series analysis of volcano monitoring data at all observatories (VHP-5 Year Plan)

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Hazards Programs collaborate with federal, state & local governments, industry, and academia towards achievement of complimentary goals. Major partners identified in the Geology Strategic Plan and in Program five-year Plans. Include DOD, NSF, NOAA, NASA, EPA, USDA, and DOI, State Geological Surveys, state and local emergency management offices, state & local agencies, and major consortia of academic, governmental, industry groups. USGS provides broad framework and support and establishes roles & responsibilities with partners through cooperative agreements, MOUs or CRADAs.

Evidence: PL 95-124 and subsequent reauthorizations established partnership between USGS, NSF, NIST and FEMA within NEHRP/NEHRP Strategic Plan, 2001-2005, reviews cooperation among the agencies. USGS Circular 1242 establishes guidelines for collaboration between agencies following an earthquake. Requisition for Landslide Loss Estimation Pilot Project with CA Dept. Mines & Geol. APA technical evaluation of report "Landslide Hazard and Planning" VHP leverages resources for volcano hazard monitoring, research and notification with NOAA, NASA, NSF, universities, (VHP 5-Year Plan, MOU's with NOAA, UAF/DGGS, NASA, NSF/EarthScope,), other USGS programs (InSAR budget initiative, FY03 DOI Budget Justifications, Long Valley Response Plan, USGS Bull. 2185). Key MOUs: Air Force Technical Applications Center on data exchange; Nuclear Regulatory Commission on hazard assessments; NOAA National Weather Service on tsunami warning; NSF on GSN & EarthScope; Univ. Alaska on Alaska Earthquake Info. Ctr.; Insurance Institute for Property Loss Reduction for quake loss reduction; Calif. Div. of Mines & Geol. on hazard studies & assessments;

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The 2002 Audit findings of the Inspector Generals Office conducted by KPMG contained a "no opinion" result and cited 8 reportable conditions in their report dated January 24, 2003. USGS submitted a Corrective Action Plan that has been accepted by the Inspector Generals office, In his cover memo, the Asst. Inspectors General for Audits stated: "Based on the response and corrective action plan, all the recommendations are considered resolved but not implemented." Monthly meetings and reports on progress are being provided to DOI and thus far, many tasks are completed and all others are in progress. In the USGS matrix organization, line management and administration is responsible for financial, facilities, and personnel management. USGS Program Coordinators are responsible for scientific planning and coordination, budget formulation, and establishing and reviewing performance.

Evidence: April 11 Auditors Report 2003, Corrective Action Plan, and cover memo from Asst. Inspector General for Audits Roger LaRoche.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: USGS taking necessary steps to resolve management deficiencies. USGS has aggressively addressed IT control weaknesses. Management control performance measures have been incorporated into all SES Performance Evaluations. An expert team was formed and for last 6 months addressed audit issues to ensure completion of Audit Corrective Action Plan. Training underway to address reported conditions and strengthen management practices. Administrative Instructional Memoranda outline detailed financial processes & requirements. Geology Programs use annual review process and BASIS+ system to review program work and correct deficiencies (described in 3.4 and 3.RD1). NRC and FACA advisory panels conduct periodic reviews that make recommendations regarding program management, performance & scientific direction. Example: In 2002, OMB identified a deficiency in security planning and implementation for ANSS, during Exhibit300 evaluation. In 2003, EHP overhauled procedures, made physical security upgrades and completed a new major application security plan. ANSS subsequently passed a management control review with no weaknesses identified. Revised Exhibit 300 has now received top ranking for security (5 of 5) in both contractor and DOI scorings.

Evidence: Corrective Action Plan Progress Report for April 2003 submitted to DOI, shows progress or completion of all actions. Memo from Hord Tipton shows improved results of March-April testing of DOI WAN's. Instr. Memo from Q3.3. Program Examples:--EHP recognized deficiency of not having standing advisory committee, asked Congress to authorize an advisory committee in the reauthorization of NEHRP. EHP subsequently established SESAC. -- EHP recognized deficiency of not having a management structure for ANSS. With ANSS partners, EHP developed a management structure to include regional and national advisory committees and a Technical Integration Committee to set stds. & specs.--USGS recognized need for coordinated management of GSN; formed MOU with NSF for joint oversight through the GSN Standing Committee.--VHP responses to NRC Review Recommendations (App. E, VHP 5-yr Plan)--VHP response to 2003 OMB review, began development of a National Volcano Monitoring System plan and incorporated it in 5-yr plan.--National Landslide Hazard Mitigation Strategy, developed through the NRC, built to address Congress concerns that landslide hazards were not given proper attention by USGS.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

- 3.CO1 Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%
- Explanation:** Proposals for grants are solicited by an annual Request for Proposals (RFP). The proposals are put in one of eight regional / topical panels for review. Each panel is multi-disciplinary and includes diverse representation from academia, industry, Federal, State and local government, and USGS. Each proposal is examined by five to seven scientists and engineers. The panels evaluate the technical merit of the proposals especially in the context of the development of an integrated program of research for that region with attention to specific research priorities, which are part of the Program RFP. All proposals are evaluated for their relevance and timeliness, technical quality, the competence and recent research performance of the PI and other researchers, and appropriateness and reasonableness of the budget. Each panel ranks the proposals being considered, and this ranking is considered final within each panel. Example: In 1998, the review panel denied funding to a new proposal because of the investigator's non-performance on a previous grant (see evidence).
- Evidence:** USGS Program Announcement 04HQPA0001 gives a detailed description of the process of solicitation and evaluation criteria. Approximately \$10,500,000 of the funds managed by the External component of the Earthquake Program are subject to a peer review process. Approximately \$9,000,000 of the funds go to awards considered by the review panels described above. An average of 90 to 100 new grants, and about 25 to 35 multi-year awards are made each year. --In FY2003, 101 new grants were awarded out of 232 proposals received.--Of the 101 new grants awarded in FY2003, 59% were awarded to investigators who had not received an award the previous year. --Similarly, in FY2002 50% of the 103 funded grants were awarded to individuals who had not received support in FY2001. Panel recommendation to deny funding based on past non-performance, 1998, appl. 8080. List of Panel Composition, 2003 review cycle. Publicly accessible web site: www.erp-web.er.usgs.gov. Also through "External Research" on the EHP website.
- 3.CO2 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%
- Explanation:** The Hazards Program management oversees the scientific performance of the grantees; it is the responsibility of the USGS Office of Acquisitions and Grants, National Assistance Program Branch to oversee expenditures, invoices, and other financial matters pertaining to the grants. The Hazards Programs work closely with the Office of Acquisitions and Grants. The Program conducts site visits to grantees institutions on a regular basis and attends various scientific meetings where grantees disseminate the results of their research.
- Evidence:** Documents related to each grant held by the EHP and the USGS Office of Acquisitions and Grants. Prior to FY2003, expenditures were reviewed as invoices were received for payment; typically quarterly. The final invoice was paid after the Final Technical Report was received. Currently, under the Payment Management System, the total funding is transferred directly to the awardees institution when the grant is awarded. Statements of Work require annual and final reports. Panels consider past grant performance as a principal review criterion. We have not terminated a grant because of performance since at least 1996, but see example of denied funding of a new grant application because of non-performance, in 3.CO1. Special Terms and Conditions for EHP external grants

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

- 3.CO3 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%
- Explanation:** Every active grantee is required to submit an Annual Summary Report at the end of each fiscal year. These reports are submitted in electronic format and are published on the Program's publicly available web site. When each grant is completed the grantee must submit a Final Technical Report which contains the results of his research. Copies of these reports are sent to the three main USGS libraries and are available there. In the past, only abstracts of the Final Reports were published on the Program web site, but beginning in FY2002, complete versions of the reports were put on the web site if the grantee provided the report in electronic format. Beginning in FY2004 grantees will be required to submit their Final Reports in electron format for publication in full on the Program web site.
- Evidence:** Publicly accessible web site: www.erp-web.er.usgs.gov. Provides full grant information and reporting. Also accessible through "External Research" on the main EHP website. Attached FY2004 RFP and review criteria.
- 3.RD1 For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%
- Explanation:** Since 1996, Geology Programs led a division-wide, competitive project proposal process using the BASIS+system. Geology issues an annual call for proposals called the Geology Annual Science Plan containing scientific and funding guidance for projects. The annual plan uses the Geology Science Strategy and Program 5 year plans for its organizing framework. Scientists are required to submit annual project proposals into the BASIS+ system for program review. System is used to examine strengths/weaknesses in staff, scientific methodology, progress on goals, budgetary structure, use of funds & capital investments, and formulate final allocations. Reviews, conducted by scientific peers, include external scientific or stakeholder review. Earmarked funds are not excluded from review. For EHP, SESAC evaluates the research program annually incl. all research activities at project level. Individual projects reviewed in depth every 3 years. Project performance judged by comparison with EHP 5 year plan.
- Evidence:** Overview diagram of Geology Planning Process demonstrating management and review process. See also answers to 3.1 and 3.3 on planning and allocation processes. Scientists propose work based upon the Geology Annual Science Plan which contains guidance for all projects within the framework of Geology Goals and Objectives and provides information on new opportunities and funding targets. Scientists submit annual project proposals and work plans for program review to determine progress, performance, and scientific soundness. The system is used to examine staffing, scientific methodology, progress on goals, budgetary structure, use of funds and capital investments, and formulate final allocations. Reviews are conducted by scientific peers and include external scientific or stakeholder review depending on the nature of the project. RGE quadrennial review documentation, SESAC periodic and annual reports, FY04 LHP Prospectus revisions

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: **LARGE EXTENT** Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Earthquake hazards was the only subactivity which had measurable long term goals with specific products, but this element demonstrated adequate progress towards goals. Activities reported to the right are each evidence of progress toward goals identified in 5 year plans. While progress was demonstrated, adequate progress is difficult to determine for volcanoes and landslides as long term goals were not clearly linked to specific products, timelines in 5 year plans, or budget justification materials.

Evidence: Reviewing accomplishments in 5-year plans:EH: --Natl. Hazards Maps, evolved from 6 broad qualitative zones nationwide to 150,000 points with quantitative information on expected seismic shaking, incorporated into IBC 2000 and IRC 2000.--In 1980, data analyzed by hand, notifications made by phone, taking hours. Analysis now automated, notifications by pagers & e-mail in minutes. Shakemaps incorporated into emerg. procedures in 4 at-risk urban areas, supported by aggressive ANSS annual station installation targets (> 400 stations in 4 yr)--GSN: exceeded goal of installing 128 stations in 20 yr.; approaching long-term data avail. goal of 90% VH: --real-time monitoring achieved at 26 of 41 remote Alaskan volcanoes, allowing timely aviation safety warnings for N. Pacific routes--since 1999, 13 new or updated hazard assessments providing basis for interagency response plans--major advances in the use of geodetic techniques for deformation monitoring at 14 volcanoes.LH: --Communities in 5 states incorporated hazard info. in land use or emerg. response plans--comprehensive National Landslide Hazards Mitigation Strategy developed. Geomag. prog. automated 11 of 14 observatories in 15 years.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: **YES** Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: GPRA annual performance goals (for hazard assessments, network operations, station installation, stakeholder meetings) have been established for all Hazards Programs and GSN. These goals, which involve partners such as the university-based operators of regional seismic networks, have been consistently met or exceeded. Additional annual goals (e.g., ANSS targets for station installation), set in annual work plans for program projects, are also consistently met or exceeded.

Evidence: GPRA based achievements are included in quarterly and annual GPRA reports. Annual plans and accomplishments are included in project work plans for the following year, and reviewed annually. Accomplishments through work carried out by partners under grants and cooperative agreements are included in annual reports and final reports.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Hazards program have focused on the aggressive use of technology and telecommunications to achieve cost efficiencies and improve the quality and effectiveness of data acquisition, processing and information dissemination. The program has not regularly collected data from which to measure efficiencies and systematically report them over time.

Evidence: Current earthquake notification procedures & products of EHP. EHP National Seismic Hazard Maps, EHP CDs, EHP web site - earthquake.usgs.gov International Building Code 2000 & International Residential Code 2000 Customer surveys: NEIC & National Seismic Hazard Maps, show over 90% satisfaction with services & products. Exploitation of remote sensing for volcano monitoring summarized in volcanoes.usgs.gov/About/What/Monitor/RemoteSensing/RemoteSensing.html Earthworm & VALVE technology summarized in VHP 5-year plan & abstract for NSF meeting, GIS application documented in volcanoes.usgs.gov/Products/SProdsDigital.html#Kilauea Outreach & communication improved with Smithsonian thru Weekly Volcano Update www.volcano.si.edu/gvp/reports/usgs/index.cfm APA Tech. eval. of report "Landslide Hazard and Planning" GSN: graph showing decreasing cost per station while increasing percent data availability

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: There is no specific data comparing USGS Geological hazards with other efforts. Private interests do not operate seismic or geodetic networks or maintain observatories and data analysis centers for rapid hazard notification. Instead, private interests re-package USGS results for economic gain in specialized applications (i.e., "value-added"). There is a substantial body of risk consultant groups that provide advice on risk to insurance companies, investors, banks, corporations, and other interests. On an international scale, there are no hazard programs of comparable scope and effectiveness, and USGS is routinely tapped for assistance in crisis response. Similar programs are the National Weather Service (NWS), in forecasting and reporting on weather conditions, and NSF for geosciences research. The budget of NWS is approximately \$800 M annually, not including other weather related research conducted at NOAA. Like the NWS, the EHP must report on earthquake activity on a 24x7 basis, and reports must be accurate and timely. EHP provides NWS-like functions and services for earthquakes, and supports research to improve these functions and services. A recent report by OSTP/RAND states The majority of natural hazards R&D spending supports weather-related hazards approximately 85%, and concludes that "earthquake R&D may ultimately prove a more cost-effective investment." NSF Geosciences research is not focused or directed at specific problems in earthquake hazard reduction.

Evidence: Budget of the United States NEHRP Strategic Plan RAND Corporation Report MR-1734-OSTP Assessing Federal Research and Development for Hazard Loss Reduction. CRADAs with Pacific Gas & Electric and Swiss Reinsurance. PASA's with USAID's OFDAMOU with Nuclear Regulatory Commission. MOU with Insurance Institute for Property Loss Reduction World leadership by VHP in volcano hazards: volcano hazard responses in 5-Year Plan, Appen. C; letter to Asst. Director, OFDA, from Secretary General of IAVCEI (1997), letter to Director USGS from Director NPS, 2003; letter from ALPA to Asst. Secretary, DOI, 2003, letter to NRC from Minard Hall, Instituto Geofisico, Ecuador Certificates of Commendation from Micronesia (LHP) Letter of commendation from National Monument (LHP) Corporate membership list of Seismological Society of America and Earthquake Engineering Research Institute. Recent report by OSTP/RAND states "majority of natural hazards R&D spending supports weather-related hazards approx. 85%; concludes that "earthquake R&D may ultimately prove a more cost-effective investment." NEIC out-performs ISC and all other EQ monitoring orgs.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The hazards programs periodically engage the NRC to review the scope, quality of research and general effectiveness of each program or program element/product. The most recent review of the VHP found it to be effective and achieving results. NRC's evaluation of LHP's National Strategy affirms the program's role in reducing losses and damage from landslides. EHP's employs an independent FACA oversight committee. Its charter states the "Committee shall advise the USGS Director on matters relating to the USGS participation in NEHRP, including the USGS's roles, goals, objectives within that program, its capabilities and research needs, guidance on achieving major objectives, and establishing and measuring performance goals." SESAC meets 2-3 times per year and prepares an annual report to the Director & Congress. EHP's effectiveness is witnessed by recent testimony given before Congress on NEHRP authorization, praising EHP's National Seismic Hazard Maps. Customer surveys report >90% satisfaction with NEIC and National Seismic Hazard Maps. Under an MOU with NSF, the GSN Standing Committee and IRIS committees review the GSN program. These reviews indicate that the program is effective in achieving results.

Evidence: SESAC report of September 2002 stated that USGS EHP "plays a central role in bringing science to the public good." Referring to earthquake monitoring products, "These products are an outgrowth of efforts to integrate and modernize regional and national seismic monitoring systems". May 2003 testimony on NEHRP reauthorization, T.D. ORourke, referring to national hazard maps: "USGS has successfully developed a procedure for translating earth science into information needed for seismic design" and L.D. Reaveley "This most important advancement was made possible through NEHRP". Both ORourke and Reaverley are engineers. Customer satisfaction surveys. e.g., for the National Earthquake Information Center and the National Seismic Hazard Maps surveys show over 90% satisfaction with these services and products. 2003 report of GSN review committee indicates "...success of the GSN as the primary tool of the worldwide seismological community...". NRC Report of 2001 validates USGS role and responsibility for monitoring, reporting & forecasting critical phenomena like earthquakes.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey

Measure: Reduced loss of life and property from geologic hazards (New Measure, Targets under Development)

Additional Information: Reduced loss of life and property indicates whether the program contributes to the outcome of avoided deaths and economic damage.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------------------

Measure: Cumulative number of ANSS seismic monitoring stations

Additional Information: Measure tracks the completion of urban networks contributing to real-time earthquake products (e.g., Shakemap); target set based on annual appropriated funding

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002		429	
2003	499	476	
2004	540		
2005	577		

Measure: Number of areas or locations for which geophysical models exist that are used to interpret monitoring data

Additional Information: Measure tracks development of models of earthquake occurrence in fault systems, magmatic systems in different volcanic settings, and landslide stability as a result of rainfall. Targets under development in draft 5-yr plan.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2003		3	
2004	3.33		
2005	3.66		

Measure: Percent data availability for real-time data from the Global Seismograph Network

Additional Information: Measure tracks progress toward the GSN's long-term goal of 90% data availability.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	90%	79%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey

Measure: Percent data availability for real-time data from the Global Seismograph Network

Additional Information: Measure tracks progress toward the GSN's long-term goal of 90% data availability.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002	90%	84%	
2003	90%	90%	
2004	90%		
2005	90%		

Measure: Data processing and notification costs per unit volume of input data from geophysical sensors in monitoring networks (in cost per gigabyte)

Additional Information: This measure indicates improvement in the scope and efficiency of real-time hazards monitoring.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2003		1,007	
2004	997		
2005	990		

Measure: Number of completed landslide hazard and risk assessments

Additional Information: Assessments require completion of landslide inventories, threshold calculations and other research on landslide processes

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
1996	1	1	
1999	1	1	
1999	1	1	
2002	1	1	
2003	1	1	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey

Measure: The number of counties, or comparable jurisdictions, that have adopted improved building codes, land-use plans, emergency response plans, or other hazard mitigation measures based on USGS geologic hazard information

Additional Information: Loss of lives and property and economic impacts from geologic hazards can be reduced through the adoption of improved building codes, land-use plans, and emergency response plans

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003		833	
2004	860		
2005	886		

Measure: Adoption of National Seismic Hazard Maps by NEHRP provisions and International Building Codes

Additional Information: Measure tracks incorporation of EHP quantitative hazards assessments into codes that regulate construction practices.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
1996	release new maps	achieved	
2000	IBC adoption	achieved	
2002	update maps	achieved	
2003	IBC revisions		
2009	update maps		

Measure: Number of urban areas for which detailed seismic hazard maps are completed

Additional Information: Measure tracks the delivery of special purpose maps and products for state regional and local risk evaluation and mitigation activities

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
1999	1	1	
2002	1	1	
2003	1	1	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey

Measure: Number of urban areas for which detailed seismic hazard maps are completed

Additional Information: Measure tracks the delivery of special purpose maps and products for state regional and local risk evaluation and mitigation activities

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	1		
2005	1		

Measure: Number of volcanoes for which information supports public safety decisions

Additional Information: Measure tracks the number of U.S. volcanoes for which there are response plans, warning systems or hazard awareness programs

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2002		45	
2003		48	
2004	49		
2005	50		

Measure: Percent of potentially hazardous volcanoes with published hazard assessment

Additional Information: Includes significant revisions and periodic updates of assessments and input to community response plans

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	27%	27%	
2002	30%	30%	
2003	34%	34%	
2004	37%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey

Measure: Percentage of potentially active volcanoes monitored

Additional Information: Includes network expansion, maintenance, and upgrades of monitoring instruments, communication and database management systems

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	61%	31%	
2002	63%	63%	
2003	66%	66%	
2004	67%		

Measure: Number of metropolitan regions where Shakemap is incorporated into emergency procedures

Additional Information: Measure tracks the ability to serve the emergency response community.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2002	1	3	
2003	3	4	
2004	5		
2005	5		

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: Habitat Restoration Activities

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	<p>The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) habitat restoration activities are consistent with, and directly support, the agency's mission under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), BLM's organic statute. There is a strong consensus among interested parties (e.g., Congress, states, environmental groups, and the general public) about the need for restoration work on BLM lands.</p> <p>Habitat restoration is a major component of the following BLM programs, each of which also corresponds to a budget subactivity in the Management of Lands and Resources and Oregon and California Grant Lands Appropriations or in the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Soil, Water, and Air Management - Rangeland Management - Riparian Management - Public Domain Forestry Management - Fisheries Management - Wildlife Management - Threatened and Endangered Species Management - Western Oregon Resources Management - Jobs-in-the-Woods - Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery 	<p>The mission of the BLM is "to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations".</p> <p>The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) provides for the: protection of resource values, preservation of certain lands in their natural condition, and compliance with pollution control laws, among other things. Other relevant statutes include:</p> <p>Endangered Species Act of 1973 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974</p>	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
		<p>Cross-cutting activities include restoration of threatened watersheds, restoration of at-risk resources and maintainance of functioning systems (upland and aquatic), recovery planning and recovery implementation for Federally listed species and special status species, invasive species management, and the Great Basin Restoration Initiative.</p> <p>For the purposes of this review, habitat restoration activities were defined as resource programs that support the "Resource Protection" mission area of DOI's Draft Strategic Plan by improving the health of watersheds and landscapes or sustaining biological communities on DOI-managed or influenced lands and waters.</p>	<p><u>Note:</u> This PART review does not directly cover land restoration work, such as fuels reduction or burned area rehabilitation, performed within the Wildland Fire Management program, as this is addressed in a separate PART review. This assessment does not cover abandoned mine land restoration activities, remediation of hazardous materials sites, or cleanup of current or past commercial energy and minerals operations.</p>		
2 <i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	<p>The combination of activities that constitute BLM's habitat restoration programs address specific interests, problems and needs such as rehabilitation of lands degraded by invasive species or past unsustainable livestock grazing, timber harvests, and mining practices. These are highlighted in BLM's strategic and annual performance plans and in policies and directives to the Bureau's field operations.</p> <p>Projects completed through these programs typically involve habitat and/or water quality improvement projects for which the natural resource impacts being addressed cannot easily be associated with a particular party/polluter or which address impacts of past land use practices. An example would be projects designed to address invasive species issues.</p>	<p>BLM's Annual Performance Plans (APPs) and Strategic Plan (as modified) address specific restoration problems and needs as outlined in relevant statutes, including:</p> <p>Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) Endangered Species Act of 1973 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974</p>	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3 <i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	BLM's restoration programs are designed to have a significant impact in addressing restoration issues, needs and challenges, and constitute the majority of such work conducted on BLM lands. BLM leverages its available funding through the interest and participation of volunteers and partners as well as through cost sharing agreements with State and local governments and non-governmental institutions. Several BLM restoration programs require leveraging appropriated funding with third-party in-kind contributions of materials, labor, and services.	<p>The BLM's Challenge Cost Share program has made significant contributions to restoration of public lands through development of partnerships, leveraged funding, and on-the-ground enhancements. Partners include Federal, State and local governments, private and non-profit groups, and individuals. In 2001, the BLM completed approximately 400 projects and received a greater than 2:1 match in funds, materials, and in-kind labor.</p> <p>Annually, thousands of volunteers contribute time and skills to assist, in part, with restoration efforts. During FY 2000, volunteers contributed over 750,000 hours, or the equivalent of \$11.6 million worth of work.</p>	20%	0.2
4 <i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	<p>Habitat restoration is an important component in meeting environmental goals on BLM lands. Under FLPMA, BLM is the principle party responsible for management of that part of the public domain known as "the public lands". BLM operates under a different statutory framework than other Federal land management agencies (NPS, FWS, and USFS), and BLM's restoration programs reflect its unique requirements. Many of BLM's habitat restoration functions, for instance, address the need to monitor, mitigate the effects of, and regulate authorized uses that would not be permitted elsewhere in the Federal estate.</p> <p>There is some overlap in "restoration" functions funded by the wildland fire management program. Fuels treatments may resemble other types of forestry and range management treatments, which in some cases are implemented to support habitat restoration objectives. Emergency rehabilitation, meanwhile, uses seeding and weed control techniques that might also be appropriate long-term restoration functions funded out of BLM's regular operating funds.</p>	<p>Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) Endangered Species Act of 1973 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974</p>	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
		In general, however, while BLM works with many partners to improve the condition and health of the public lands, BLM's role is not redundant with work performed by other entities. The nature of BLM's watershed/sub-basin approach involves many land ownerships in restoration activities. BLM works closely with its partners in developing and applying land health standards to the management of the public lands.			
5 <i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The current mechanism of direct federal management is consistent with BLM's statutory responsibilities to manage the land under its control, and provides BLM the flexibility needed to balance restoration program needs with other BLM programs, consistent with the agency's land use plans and multiple-use mandate under FLPMA. There is no clear evidence that another mechanism would better accomplish restoration work on BLM lands. Overall, individual BLM restoration activities address specific on-the-ground interests, problems or needs.	Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA)	20%	0.2
Total Section Score				100%	100%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)					
1 <i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	Yes	The 2003 Annual Performance Plan includes 4 long-term goals that directly relate to habitat restoration. Three of these goals are outcome goals. Goals are specific and, in most cases, appear to be ambitious, though none are efficiency goals. DOI is in the process of developing a new Departmental Strategic Plan, and these goals may be refined or replaced as part of this process.	FY 2003 BLM Annual Performance Plan. FY 2003 Long-Term Goals that relate to restoration activities are identified in Section 4.	14%	0.1
2 <i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	The 2003 Annual Performance Plan outlines four annual performance goals (a one-to-one relationship with the long-term goals) that directly relate to restoration. These performance goals demonstrate progress toward achieving the Bureau's long-term goals. However, discrepancies between planned and actual accomplishments are not fully explained and raise questions about the process by which annual targets are established. Since 2001 represented the first full year of data for these measures, it is expected that future targets will be better refined. (<u>Note</u> : Measures and targets may change upon completion of DOI's new strategic plan.)	For each FY 2003 long-term goal, there is a corresponding FY 2003 Annual Performance Goal. FY 2003 Annual Performance Goals that relate to restoration activities are specifically identified in Section 4.	14%	0.1
3 <i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	Grantees, contractors, and BLM's many partners are required to report on performance in a manner that allows BLM to tie accomplishments to annual and long-term goals.	BLM partners with many organizations interested in habitat restoration activities. For example, BLM and the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation jointly review and approve public land restoration projects funded through the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation and produce an annual report on accomplishments.	14%	0.1
4 <i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	BLM actively works with a variety of Federal and non-Federal partners to complete restoration projects and gives priority to projects that have multiple cost-sharing sources. Partners include historic trail organizations, the Forest Service and the National Park Service, the Nature Conservancy, the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation, the governments of Mexico and Canada, educational institutions, and the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. BLM's Challenge Cost Share program leveraged approximately \$16.4 million in 2002 with Federal funding of \$9.1 million.	BLM Budget Justifications; BLM Challenge Cost Share project list; NFWS/BLM 5-Year Report and partnership project list; BLM's Annual Volunteer Report; Multi-agency MOU and periodic updates on species conservation in sagebrush ecosystems; Various other MOUs, coordinating documents, and reports.	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
<p>5 <i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i></p>	No	<p>There are no independent evaluations (GAO, IG, etc.) addressing the wide breadth of BLM's habitat restoration activities, and few external reviews of specific component programs exist. There has been one GAO audit addressing a specific fisheries-related restoration issue in western Oregon; however, this audit was limited in scope to a very specific issue. The IG has also conducted one audit of BLM's "Rangeland Improvement Program" (IG Report 99-1-677) that could be considered a component of BLM's habitat restoration activities.</p> <p>BLM does conduct internal program-specific evaluations, but not on a regular, periodic basis. Historically, program evaluations have been more output-oriented rather than outcome-oriented.</p>	<p>GAO Report, 02-136: Land Management Agencies: Restoring Fish Passage Through Culverts on Forest Service and BLM Lands in Oregon and Washington Could Take Decades, November 2001.</p> <p>IG Report 99-1-677, BLM's "Rangeland Improvement Program", July 1999.</p> <p>BLM indicates it is working to develop a process by which evaluations are completed on a more regular basis.</p>	14%	0.0
<p>6 <i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i></p>	Yes	<p>While habitat restoration work is actually a subset of several BLM programs (each of which is defined as a specific budget subactivity), funding changes in these subactivities produce changes in performance that can be clearly tracked in BLM's Management Information System (MIS). This allows BLM to track the impacts of funding, policy, and legislative changes on habitat restoration programs as a whole.</p> <p>As BLM prepares its budget justifications, close coordination is maintained with the program's long- and short-term performance goals, and the agency is capable of identifying the impact of funding level increases or decreases on program outputs. The ability of BLM to predict the impact on outcomes, however, is less clear.</p>	<p>Through the agency's Planning Target Allocation (PTA) process, specific national-level direction relating to the completion of annual performance goals is provided to the field organizations (States). In addition, each State is requested to identify a projected specific workload measure to be accomplished based on an identified projected funding level.</p> <p>BLM includes a crosswalk table in its Annual Performance Plan indicating the budgeted amounts from each subactivity that contribute to the GPRA goal "Restore At-Risk Resources and Maintain Functioning Systems".</p>	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	<p>Through development of its Annual Performance Plan, BLM now undertakes a review of its long-term and annual performance goals. In addition to the Annual Performance Plans, BLM prepares program-specific strategic plans as needed to address significant resource issues and needs.</p> <p>In addition, DOI is in the process of developing a new, Department-wide Strategic Plan that better integrates the various bureau plans, with the intent to improve coordination among bureaus and better align activities based on meaningful outcome goals.</p>	FY 2000 - FY 2005 BLM Strategic Plan; Draft DOI strategic plan goals and measures.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	86%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes, No, N/A)					
1 <i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	<p>The BLM uses its Management Information System (MIS) to track program performance throughout the fiscal year. Performance indicators are used to show outcomes as they relate to GPRA requirements. Workload measures are used to show outputs and volumes. During development of the Annual Work Plan, workload targets are established by each State Office, as negotiated with Washington Office Program Leads for all BLM restoration activities. The MIS provides cost information that is up-to-date and accurate. The Bureau has 35 established workload measures or program elements to track restoration-related accomplishments. Most of the performance information collected is generally output-related, not outcome-related.</p> <p>In addition to the MIS, the Bureau collects information through data calls. For example, the fisheries, wildlife, and threatened and endangered species management program staff request qualitative and quantitative information to document work accomplished, partners, and project benefits.</p> <p>The Bureau also has standards in place to track contractor accomplishments.</p>	<p>BLM's Washington Office staff formally conduct reviews of States' progress toward meeting workload targets at midyear, third quarter, and end-of-year during each fiscal year. The Washington Office uses MIS information to examine BLM State accomplishments and recommend resource reallocations where workload targets are not being met. For example, the Bureau used FY 1999-2001 data to adjust State base funding and workload targets planned for FY 2003.</p> <p>Several Internal Memoranda have been issued relative to contractor performance, including IM 99-043, Performance-Based Service Contracts; and IM 97-91, A Guide to Best Practices for Past Performance.</p>	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2 <i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	<p>BLM's Employee Performance and Position Review Evaluation (EPPRR) outlines key annual performance expectations and standards by employee, including managers.</p> <p>Key program partners are held accountable through award and supervision of contracts, assistance agreements and cooperative agreements that contain specific requirements. BLM has attempted to emphasize the use of PBSCs bureau-wide and requires reporting of all PBSCs over \$100k in order to monitor the status of PBSC implementation across its offices.</p> <p>Specific annual workload accomplishment expectations are outlined in each manager's annual performance evaluation. BLM has indicated that it is now using this information in determining annual bonuses for senior managers.</p>	<p>Quarterly reviews of performance data are conducted by the Deputy Director, the State Directors and program leads. In addition, several annual performance measures have been included in the State Directors' performance evaluations and on the Director's Tracking System, a database management tool.</p> <p>Performance of program partners is evaluated as different authorizing documents (contracts, assistance agreements) are reviewed.</p>	14%	0.1
3 <i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	<p>The BLM's budget allocation process reinforces responsibility and accountability for all offices. The development of the Planning Target Allocation (PTA), which precedes the formulation of BLM's Annual Work Plan, determines base funding levels for the States, National Centers and Headquarters, identifies projects or issues which will be centrally funded, and distributes the remaining or "flexible funds" to the highest priorities. Funds must be spent or obligated to allow no more than 2% carryover with no overspending. This strategy allows for reasonable flexibility for unplanned events while ensuring tight funds control.</p>	<p>The BLM Washington Office formally conducts reviews of State's progress towards meeting planning targets at midyear, third quarter, and the end of each fiscal year. Reviews are conducted using the MIS to obtain up-to-date budgetary, financial, and fund status information. These reviews analyze unliquidated obligations and subactivity spending. States/Centers/Offices are asked to provide information for those subactivities where work/demand is exceeding funding capabilities, or identify those subactivities where funding is not needed for the remainder of the fiscal year so that it can be used by other states where restoration projects are ready to go.</p>	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4 <i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	No	While the agency has made significant progress in implementing IT systems (specifically, its MIS system) to improve cost measurement and comparisons across BLM offices, there is little evidence that such procedures have, up to this point, informed overall budget decisions between program areas. Program performance plans do not currently include efficiency measures, and in most cases, budget documents do not link discussions of performance to discussions of budget requests.	BLM Budget Requests to OMB; BLM Budget Justifications; Data/examples provided from BLM's MIS system.	14%	0.0
5 <i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	Yes	Aside from the inability to determine full costs that include retirement and health benefits (which are only available from the Office of Personnel Management), BLM can capture all other direct and indirect costs associated with habitat restoration work.	Displaying full costs for restoration is accomplished with BLM's Management Information System (MIS). MIS data indicates the cost for restoration activities in FY 2001 was \$210.9 million for all program elements (35 program elements associated with restoration) for resource protection, excluding OPM-managed retirement and health benefit costs.	14%	0.1
6 <i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	BLM's use of Activity Based Costing (ABC) as part of its MIS automated data warehouse has helped the agency demonstrate strong management practices for most activities, including habitat restoration. No material internal control weaknesses exist for issues that would specifically relate to BLM's habitat restoration programs.	FY 2000-2001 Independent Auditor's Report on BLM's Financial Statements; BLM has received unqualified audit opinions on its financial statements for the past 3 years. The BLM reviews expenditures to ensure that erroneous charges to the restoration activities do not occur. The MIS system is used to ensure that only proactive program work is charged against funding intended for restoration activities. The continued review of the unliquidated obligations report by State Budget Officers ensures that erroneous charges to restoration activities do not occur.	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	<p>Program evaluations of specific activities are conducted using a state-by-state approach over a multi-year basis using small teams, typically varying from 4 to 8 members, of resource and administrative professionals and managers who are experienced and knowledgeable of the program/activity being evaluated. Final evaluation reports are used to relay the evaluation findings and recommendations to the appropriate State for implementation. Follow up evaluations are used to verify implementation of the recommendations.</p> <p><i>BLM has also taken steps to implement recommendations from external reviews, such as the IG's report on BLM's "Rangeland Improvement Program". Three of the four recommendations from this IG audit have been implemented. Implementation of the remaining recommendation has been delayed for budgetary, project sequencing, and pilot study reasons.</i></p>	<p>Summary of FY 2000 - FY 2002 BLM Program Evaluations:</p> <p><u>FY 2000</u> Financial Procedures Review - Colorado (January 12, 2001)</p> <p><u>FY2001</u> 1. Noxious Weeds - Utah, Colorado (August 31, 2001) 2. Financial Procedures Review - New Mexico (July 31, 2001), Nevada 3. Resource Improvement Project & Land Management - Wyoming (May 14 - 18, 2001), Nevada (May 21 - 24, 2001)</p> <p><u>FY 2002</u> (Scheduled. Final reports may not be complete.) 1. Noxious Weeds - New Mexico (March 2002) 2. Public Domain Forestry/Forest Ecosystem Health & Recovery Fund - Alaska, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Wyoming (November 2001) 3. Wildlife, Fish, Botany and T&E Species - Alaska, Idaho, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah (Nov. 2001) 4. Financial Statements & Reporting 5. National Validation of Self-Assessment - Alaska (February 2002)</p>	14%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	86%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
-----------	------	-------------	---------------	-----------	----------------

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1	<i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	Small Extent	<p>BLM has met or is making measurable progress toward the long-term targets of all four of its long-term goals, three of which are outcome goals. However, it appears that BLM will be challenged in its efforts to meet three of these goals. It is unclear whether this is a result of unrealistic targets, poor performance, or a combination of the two. One additional potential problem lies in the inability of BLM to monitor resource conditions over time to accurately gauge the impacts of its activities on meeting long-term goals.</p> <p>BLM's performance in this program is complicated by its multiple-use mission, which requires that the agency balance many often-competing priorities. As priorities in one area change (e.g., energy resource development), it may become more difficult to achieve goals in other areas such as habitat restoration.</p>	Based on BLM's FY 2003 Annual Performance Report, it appears that the agency is on target to meet its long-term goal of improving populations of listed and sensitive species by FY 2005. However, the data in the report seems to suggest that BLM will be much more challenged in attempting to meet its other three long-term goals by FY 2005.	25%	0.1																				
<p>Long-Term Goal I: By FY 2005, implement water quality improvement prescriptions on BLM lands in 20% of watersheds within priority sub-basins that do not meet State/Tribal water quality standards.</p> <p>Target: 20%</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal: Cum. % of watersheds w/ prescriptions implemented</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FY00</u></th> <th><u>FY01</u></th> <th><u>FY02 Planned</u></th> <th><u>FY03 Planned</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>----</td> <td>5%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>								<u>FY00</u>	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02 Planned</u>	<u>FY03 Planned</u>		----	5%	6%	9%										
	<u>FY00</u>	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02 Planned</u>	<u>FY03 Planned</u>																						
	----	5%	6%	9%																						
<p>Long-Term Goal II: By FY 2005, achieve proper functioning condition (PFC) or an upward trend on BLM-administered riparian/wetland areas in 80% of the watersheds within priority sub-basins.</p> <p>Target: 80%</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal: Cum. % of watersheds achieving PFC or upward trend</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FY00</u></th> <th><u>FY01</u></th> <th><u>FY02 Planned</u></th> <th><u>FY03 Planned</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>----</td> <td>14%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>34%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>								<u>FY00</u>	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02 Planned</u>	<u>FY03 Planned</u>		----	14%	24%	34%										
	<u>FY00</u>	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02 Planned</u>	<u>FY03 Planned</u>																						
	----	14%	24%	34%																						
<p>Long-Term Goal III: By 2005, achieve an upward trend in the condition of BLM-administered uplands in 50% of watersheds within priority sub-basins.</p> <p>Target: 50%</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal: Cum. % of watersheds achieving upward trend</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FY00</u></th> <th><u>FY01</u></th> <th><u>FY02 Planned</u></th> <th><u>FY03 Planned</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>----</td> <td>8%</td> <td>16%</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Additional Output Measure (contributing to long-term goal)</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FY00</u></th> <th><u>FY01</u></th> <th><u>FY02 Planned</u></th> <th><u>FY03 Planned</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td># of acres treated to prevent noxious weeds</td> <td>290,000</td> <td>252,000</td> <td>245,000</td> <td>245,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>								<u>FY00</u>	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02 Planned</u>	<u>FY03 Planned</u>		----	8%	16%	26%		<u>FY00</u>	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02 Planned</u>	<u>FY03 Planned</u>	# of acres treated to prevent noxious weeds	290,000	252,000	245,000	245,000
	<u>FY00</u>	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02 Planned</u>	<u>FY03 Planned</u>																						
	----	8%	16%	26%																						
	<u>FY00</u>	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02 Planned</u>	<u>FY03 Planned</u>																						
# of acres treated to prevent noxious weeds	290,000	252,000	245,000	245,000																						
<p>Long-Term Goal IV: By FY 2005, achieve a stable or increasing trend in the resident populations of 50% of the plant and animal species listed or proposed for listing pursuant to the Endangered Species Act. Also, achieve a stable or increasing trend in the resident populations of 20% of the species identified by BLM as "sensitive".</p> <p>Target: 50% (listed or proposed species); 20% ("sensitive" species)</p>																										

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data				Weighting	Weighted Score
			FY00	FY01	FY02 Planned	FY03 Planned		
Actual Progress achieved toward								
	goal: Cum. % of populations (listed) w/ stable or increasing trend		----	28%	35%		43.5%	
	Cum. % of populations (sensitive) w/ stable or upward trend		----	10%	12.5%		16.5%	
2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?	Large Extent	BLM largely met or exceeded its annual performance goals in FY 2001. However, this is tempered somewhat by the fact that it is unclear how aggressive the targets actually were. Discrepancies between planned and actual accomplishments are not fully explained and raise questions about the process by which annual targets are established. Since 2001 represented the first full year of data for these measures, it is expected that future targets will be better refined. It is also unclear how accurate the data are given that BLM's resource monitoring activities are fairly limited.		See FY 2001 performance targets and actual performance below.			25%	0.2
		Key Goal I: In FY 2001, implement water quality improvement prescriptions on BLM lands in 10 watersheds (approx. 1%) within priority sub-basins that do not meet State/Tribal water quality standards; remediate 60 abandoned mines and plug/reclaim 15 orphas wells. (<u>Note</u> : Measure was new in 2001, and no baseline is available.)						
		Performance Target: 1% of watersheds (10) w/ prescriptions implemented 60 abandoned mines remediated 15 orphan wells plugged or sites reclaimed						
		Actual Performance: 5% of watersheds (50) w/ prescriptions implemented 47 abandoned mines remediated 47 orphan wells plugged or sites reclaimed						
		Key Goal II: In FY 2001, achieve proper functioning condition (PFC) or an upward trend in riparian/wetland areas in 100 watersheds (approx. 10%) within priority sub-basins. (<u>Note</u> : Measure was new in 2001, and no baseline is available.)						
		Performance Target: 10% of watersheds (100)						
		Actual Performance: 14% of watersheds (143)						
		Key Goal III: In FY 2001, achieve an upward trend in the condition of BLM-administered uplands in 50 watersheds (approx. 5%) within priority sub-basins and treat 235,000 acres to prevent the spread of noxious weeds and undesirable plants. (<u>Note</u> : Measure was new in 2001, and no baseline is available.)						
		Performance Target: 5% of watersheds (50) 235,000 acres treated to prevent noxious weeds						
		Actual Performance: 8% of watersheds (84) 252,000 acres treated to prevent noxious weeds						
		Key Goal IV: In FY 2001, achieve a stable or increasing trend in the resident populations for 50 (17.5%) of the plant and animal species listed or proposed for listing pursuant to the Endangered Species Act. Also, achieve a stable or increasing trend in the resident populations for 100 (8%) of the species identified by BLM as "sensitive". (<u>Note</u> : Measure was new in 2001, and no baseline is available.)						
		Performance Target: 17.5% of listed or proposed species (50) 8% of "sensitive" species (100)						
		Actual Performance: 28% of listed or proposed species (80) 10% of "sensitive" species (122)						

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3 <i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Small Extent	BLM's MIS allows the agency to track cost per output unit and thus compare efficiency across the organization and from one year to the next. Based on this information, BLM has made changes in the implementation of certain restoration activities and has been adopting best management practices from one state to another to allow for improved efficiencies. However, while internal BLM processes appear to be working well, external transparency needs to be improved.	BLM has provided documentation indicating some small internal adjustments have been made based on relative efficiencies identified (through its MIS) among its state offices.	25%	0.1
4 <i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Large Extent	The performance of BLM's restoration programs appear to compare favorably to other agencies' programs or activities with similar purposes and goals. However, there are no independent evaluations or comparisons of similar programs from which to make a comparison, and comparisons of performance measures is currently difficult. DOI's revision of its strategic plan and the agency's development of cross-cutting "common measures" will hopefully allow for better cross-comparison of DOI bureaus (BLM, NPS, FWS) in the future.	DOI and BLM FY 2003 Annual Performance Plans. The varying types of land and uses permitted on federally-managed lands make it difficult to make direct comparisons on the basis of acres treated or restored or of species improved.	25%	0.2
5 <i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	N/A	There are no independent evaluations (GAO, IG, etc.) addressing the wide breadth of BLM's restoration activities. There has been one GAO audit addressing a specific fisheries related restoration issue in western Oregon; however, this audit was limited in scope to a specific issue. In addition, there was one IG audit of BLM's "Rangeland Improvement Program" (IG Report 99-1-677) that could be considered a component of BLM's land restoration activities.	GAO Report 02-136, "Land Management Agencies: Restoring Fish Passage Through Culverts on Forest Service and BLM Lands in Oregon and Washington Could Take Decades" (November 2001) IG Report 99-1-677, BLM's "Rangeland Improvement Program", July 1999.		
Total Section Score				100%	50%

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Through treaties dating back to the 1800's and legislation starting with the Synder Act of 1921, the federal government has assumed a responsibility for the benefit, care and assistance of Native Americans throughout the U.S. for general support, including the management of Indian forests.

Evidence: The National Indian Forest Management Act (NIFRMA) of 1990 (25 U.S.C. 3101) allows the Secretary of the Interior to "take part in the sustainable management of Indian forest lands, with the participation of the land's beneficial owners, in a manner consistent with the Secretary's trust responsibility and with the objectives of the beneficial owners...".

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Prior to the passage of NIFRMA, Congress identified a series of findings that: Indian forests are among the tribes most valuable resources; the U.S. has a trust responsibility for the lands; Federal laws do not sufficiently assure the adequate management of these lands; tribal governments are making substantial contributions to the overall management of the lands; and there is a serious threat arising from trespassing and unauthorized harvesting of the resources.

Evidence: NIFRMA, P.L. 101-630 Sec. 302.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: While the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, and some states manage similar forestry programs within their respective areas, they do not service this population.

Evidence: Various treaties and legislation.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The overall objective of the Indian forestry program is to manage or assist Tribes with the management of their forests consistent with Tribal goals and objectives. There is no evidence that a different approach would be more efficient or effective.

Evidence:

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Nearly 50% of the BIA forestry appropriation is contracted by tribes through self-determination contracts and self-governance compacts.

Evidence: The following approximate percentages of the forestry budget categories are targeted at the field level rather than for overhead/administration: 100% of TPA; 87% of Non-Recurring; 50% of Regional Office Operations; 30% of Central Office Operations. In addition, tribes receive contract support for administrative expenses (i.e., personnel and accounting).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: BIA has a long-term performance goal to manage or influence resource use to enhance Tribal benefit and promote responsible use of forest products.

Evidence: See GPRA plans and the Department's FY 2004 Strategic Plan.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Indian forests cover over 17 million acres on 275 reservations in 26 states with a commercial timber volume of approximately 42 billion board feet with an annual allowable harvest of 779 million board feet. There are several performance measures that reflect the program purpose, including increasing the actual timber harvest to the level of the calculated allowable harvest or to the tribes expressed goals; and increasing the number of Indian forest lands covered under a Forest Management Plan (FMP), or forest implementation plans under an approved Integrated Resource Management Plan (IRMP).

Evidence: See GPRA plans and the Department's FY 2004 Strategic Plan.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The NIFRMA requires a FMP for each of the forested reservations. While BIA has made some progress, only 40% of the forested reservations have current FMPs and only 28 have IRMPs with an additional 46 under development. BIA has developed a goal to cover 100% of the tribes with a plan.

Evidence: See GPRA plans and the Department's FY 2004 Strategic Plan.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: BIA has developed a long term goal to have a forest management plan for 100% of Indian forest land.

Evidence: See GPRA plans and the Department's FY 2004 Strategic Plan.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Tribal forest programs under self-determination contracts and self-governance compacts are managed in accordance with their FMP and/or IRMP and report accomplishments to BIA and GPRA coordinators.

Evidence: Reporting requirements under BIA and GPRA, along with the self-governance funding agreements.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The BIA forestry program is subject to an independent evaluation every 10 years as required by NIFRMA. The first assessment was completed in the 1993, and the second was due to be published in the fall of 2003. In addition, some individual tribal forestry programs have elected to be evaluated by independent certifiers of sustainable forestry.

Evidence: NIFRMA, PL 101-630; 1993 Assessment by the Indian Forest Management Assessment Team; draft 2003 Assessment by the Indian Forest Management Assessment Team. In addition, a report is prepared every 5 years by the BIA, Office of Trust Responsibilities, that focuses on tracking the adequacy of funding and FTE levels.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: BIA has not met its goal for the past several years for harvesting and has lowered its goal. Budget requests do not reflect a reduction in the amount of funding needed to achieve a lower goal. In fact, both the FY 2003 enacted and FY 2004 budget requested a \$1.5 million increase to help narrow the gap between allowable and actual.

Evidence: Refer to budget narratives.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Strategic planning measures have been newly refined for FY2004. Forestry lies within the "Resource Use" quadrant of the Department's Mission and Outcome Goals contained within the Strategic Plan. Recently, six "Activities" for Activities Based Costing (ABC) were defined for measure within the Forestry Program.

Evidence: Refer to Strategic Plan Measure Definitions and ABC Activity Definitions for Resource Use - Forest Products .

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: Performance data is collected on an annual basis from all forest managers of Indian forests, both the federal managers and tribal forest manager partners. Data is used to produce an annual performance report to Congress. Performance data is frequently used to adjust annual allocations of non-recurring project-based funding.

Evidence: Allocation changes, based on performance or lack thereof in non-recurring forest development funding, are documented.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: SES Performance Plans include "Forestry Performance" for those managers who have forest responsibilities. In addition, forest managers are responsible for operating within their approved FMP or IRMP, and have performance measures of various types that enforce this responsibility.

Evidence: Examples of performance measures for forest managers and SES Performance Plan language. BIA has the ability to adjust funding levels. For example, no funds have been allocated to the Navajo Nation in the last 2 years due to the lack of an acceptable FMP.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: TPA funds are spent for general forest operations and for timber sale preparation and administration. Non-recurring funds are project specific and spent for forest development work (thinning and planting), inventory and management planning, woodlands management, watershed restoration, and increased timber harvest initiatives. Funds are obligated within their two-year funding cycle. Because most forestry work is project specific and dependent upon weather conditions, market conditions, wildland fire situation, etc., some project obligations understandably do not occur until the second year of the two-year budget cycle.

Evidence: Contracted funds are routinely examined via 638-contract audits and self-governance trust reviews to track expenditure timeliness and to ensure funds are being used for the intended purpose.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Of the tribes with forestry programs, 121 or 47% provide management services for their own forests. Compact/contract agreements permit tribes to use any cost savings achieved for related program purposes. In addition, Indian forests often are valued by the tribes for ceremonial or cultural purposes rather than as a source of revenue; therefore, cost efficiencies are not necessarily important or desirable. Tribes are encouraged to manage their programs for self-sufficiency; therefore, competitive sourcing to private entities to achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness would be contrary self-governance.

Evidence: Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (P.L. 98-638), as amended and Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-413)

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: Collaborations occur regularly with the U.S. Forest Service (FS), the Fish and Wildlife Service, the states and the forest industry. Some examples of FS collaborations are: the use of FS entomologists and pathologists as technical experts on reservations; the application of FS pest management funding for activities on reservations; and cooperative agreements with some FS offices for staff exchanges to improve efficiency. In addition, BIA partners with FS on a cooperative education agreement at Haskell University to train 20 students annually in resource management, including forestry.

Evidence: Refer to pest management allocations from the FS. Also, cooperative agreements regarding personnel exchanges occur at the field level.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

- 3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%
- Explanation: The FY 2002 Audited Financial Statement shows a BIA-wide material weakness for inadequate controls over financial reporting. However, the material weakness is not directly related to the forestry program.
- Evidence: FY 2002 Audited Financial Statements
- 3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 17%
- Explanation: The draft 2003 IFMAT-II executive summary shows that major progress has been made to 3 of the 4 major gaps identified by the 1993 team.
- Evidence: An Assessment of Indian Forests and Forest Management in the United States, June 2003, Executive Summary by the Second Indian Forest Management Assessment Team (IFMAT-II) for the Intertribal Timber Council.
- 4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%
- Explanation: The NIFRMA requires a forest management plan for each of the forested reservations. While BIA has made some progress, only 40% of the tribes have current FMPs and only 28 have IRMPs with an additional 46 under development.
- Evidence: BIA Greenbook and IFMAT-II
- 4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%
- Explanation: Annual performance goals are achieved in some years and not in others. The reasons behind this lack of achievement are somewhat different than not achieving the long-term goals. Achieving the annual goals can be hampered by: (1) severity of wildland fire season, as forestry staff can be drawn away from normal duties to perform wildland fire suppression duties, and large forest areas can be shut down from meaningful work accomplishment; (2) other weather conditions, such as extremes in any weather facet, can seriously detract from the number of productive work days in the forest; (3) market conditions for the forest products being produced (poor markets can slow production); and (4) expressed goals of the tribes differing from FMP as a result of a change in leadership.
- Evidence: Refer to GPRA reports and Report to Congress.
- 4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%
- Explanation: BIA has not met its goal for the past several years for harvesting and has lowered its projected harvest levels. The FY 2003 budget includes a \$1.5 million increase in TPA funds to target tribes with differences between actual and allowable harvests. The FY 2004 budget request contains an identical request. Data showing the effect of the increase for narrowing the gap between allowable and actual is not available.
- Evidence: BIA Greenbook

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The traditional cultural and spiritual connection between the tribes and their lands make them unique to comparisons to state or private entities whose goals may be more closely aligned to economic outcomes. However, because the BIA forestry program has a large timber sale component, a comparison to BLM or FS is not feasible. A recent GAO report on BLM Public Domain Lands found that a sharp decline in timber volume since 1990 is the direct result of the governmentwide shift from timber production to enhancing forest ecosystem health. BLM's timber volume in 2002 was 26 million board feet compared to BIA's harvest of 569 million board feet.

Evidence: GAO-03-615 - BLM Public Domain Lands - Volume of Timber Offered for Sale Has Declined Substantially Since Fiscal Year 1990

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The 2003 IFMAT-II report indicates progress has been made in several key areas since the 1993 IFMAT Assessment including narrowing the gap between Tribal and BIA forestry program visions with greater Tribal participation in planning and management. However, some gaps remain including the need for all forested reservations to have a management plan.

Evidence: Some individual tribal forestry programs have elected to be evaluated by independent certifiers of sustainable forestry, such as the American Forest and Paper Association or the First Nation Development Institute (FNDI) that provide third party certification that forest practices and harvesting methods are sustainable. However, FNDI found that "tribes that focus their forest management practices on ceremonial activities and use forest products predominantly for internal, non-commercial use may not be interested in the market-driven characteristics... of certification. See "The Place of Third-Party Forest Products Certification in Native American Forestry."

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs

Measure: Percentage of acres on forested reservations that have a forest management plan.

Additional Information: This long-term goal will measure the percentage of the 17 million acres covered by a forest management plan.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2003	44%		
2004	73%		
2005	76%		
2015	100%		

Measure: Percentage of forested reservations covered by forest management plans.

Additional Information: This goal measures the annual increment of the 275 forested reservations with a plan toward the long-term goal of covering 100% of the 17 million acres of tribal forests.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003		37%	
2004	39		
2005	40		
2006	41		
2007	42		

Measure: Percentage of current allowable annual harvest taken.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the gap between the actual annual harvest and the current allowable annual harvest.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003		73%	
2004	74%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs

Measure: Percentage of current allowable annual harvest taken.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the gap between the actual annual harvest and the current allowable annual harvest.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2005	76%		
2006	78%		
2007	80%		

Measure: Measure Under Development

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)
-------------	---------------	---------------	--

Measure: Percentage of acres of acres achieving desired conditions where condition is known and specified in management plans, consistent with applicable environmental laws and regulations, and Tribal goals and objectives.

Additional Information: This goal will ensure that Tribes are benefiting from the full potential for economic or cultural development as outlined in the forest management plans.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------------------

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
60%	43%	65%	0%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Statutory responsibilities of BIA's Division of Law Enforcement include: (1) enforcing federal and tribal laws; (2) investigating criminal offenses; (3) protecting life and property; (4) providing detention and correctional services; and (5) providing training, prevention and outreach programs.

Evidence: Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-379) [25 U.S.C. 2802(b)]

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: On Indian reservations, violent crime rates (657 per 100,000 residents) are higher than national average (506 per 100,000 residents); aggravated assault rates are higher (600 vs. 324); property crime rates are lower (1,083 vs. 3,618).

Evidence: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Fact Sheet (January 2003).

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Law Enforcement: Subject to federal statutes, tribal, federal and state agencies may carryout some law enforcement activities within Indian reservations. BIA coordinates operations with other federal, state and local agencies through formal agreements. In 2000, BIA and tribal agencies employed (full-time) about 2,300 law officers and 1,160 support personnel. Other federal agencies employed over 88,000 officers and 72,000 support personnel. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) conducts felony (criminal) investigations on Indian reservations. State/local agencies employed over 708,000 officers and 311,000 support personnel. Detention Facilities: BIA operates 20 facilities and tribes operate 48 facilities, with combined capacity of 2,100 inmates. DOJ replacement/renovation completed for 4 facilities, ongoing for 12 facilities, and planned for 4 facilities. Tribes also incarcerate prisoners at other federal, state, and local facilities.

Evidence: Law Enforcement: In 1999, DOJ began awarding Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) grants directly to tribal governments to support new police officer, criminal investigator, dispatcher, and detention officer positions. COPS Tribal Resources Grant Program may cover 75% of additional salary, training, and equipment expenses for 3 years. COPS Tribal Hiring Renewal Grant Program may cover 4th and 5th year salary/benefit costs for police officers. Other DOJ grant programs include COPS in Schools, Troops to COPS, Tribal Mental Health Community Safety Initiative, and Methamphetamine. U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) provides grant assistance for tribal police recruitment, training, and equipment. Detention Facilities: DOJ provides tribal grants for construction of detention facilities; BIA fund operations and maintenance.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: In FY 2002, BIA supported 206 Indian police agencies. Tribes managed 163 (79%) local agencies under Indian self-determination contract or compact agreements. BIA managed 43 (21%) agencies. BIA and DOJ have no formal coordination on tribal COPS grant applications, awards, and compliance oversight.

Evidence: Tribal COPS grant awards required to supplement BIA resources. BIA has not yet identified the tribal COPS positions scheduled for funding expiration under DOJ programs.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
60%	43%	65%	0%	

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: BIA program allocations use Base funding levels to maintain current services, with limited flexibility for significant redeployment of resources to target specific types, patterns, or geographic centers of crime.

Evidence: For FY 2005, BIA plans to target any new funding on specific problem areas, such as border security and violent crimes. BIA has no plan to address retention of personnel as COPS grants expire. Section 1.5 may be reassessed upon submission of 2005 budget/strategic plan.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: Long-Term Goal: By 2005, reduce the 2000 Part I (violent) crime rate from 16,500 to 10,500 reported crimes per 100,000 inhabitants.

Evidence: See Section on Performance Measures (Annual targets).

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: Targets for reducing crime rates may not be realistic because of adverse social-economic conditions on most Indian reservations.

Evidence: See Section on Performance Measures (Annual targets).

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: The Office of Law Enforcement and Security (OLES) has researched current literature and several reports from academic sources, other Federal law enforcement entities (including DOJ), and has met with the Director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police to discuss performance measures. OLES has recently drafted new performance measures from this research and will work with BIA and OMB to standardize and finalize the measures. These new measures will allow for more reliability in analyses of changes in resources over time once baseline data is established.

Evidence: There is currently no clear baseline year to use for BIA crime statistics. This is caused by two situations: 1) The OLES adjusted the data reporting requirements several times attempting to capture adequate and sufficient data to accurately reflect crime activities in Indian Country. These adjustments are now stabilizing. 2) Tribes and Law Enforcement District Offices have been less than consistent in reporting crime data. BIA and OLES are working together to reengineer the reporting process to ensure that timely and accurate data are received from all offices. Law Enforcement District Offices will work with Tribal Police Forces to improve consistency in reporting crime data.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: No baseline/trend data available as BIA is converting to DOJ approach in calculating crime rates. Targets for reducing crime rates may not be realistic because of adverse social-economic conditions on most Indian reservations.

Evidence: See Section on Performance Measures (Annual targets).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
60%	43%	65%	0%	

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: BIA standards established in regulations and manuals for uniformed police, criminal investigators, detention operations, radio communications and dispatch programs. Tribes have increased participation in BIA reporting system.

Evidence: BIA's Model Contracts/Annual Funding Agreements require tribes to conform to specific program standards for duties/responsibilities, hiring/training, equipment/uniforms, and operations/performance evaluations.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: No GAO or IG program impact reviews conducted in past ten years. BIA's Internal Affairs unit reviews compliance of tribal agencies with program standards/guidelines, such as personnel qualifications, training, operational procedures, and recordkeeping. Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA) conducting compliance reviews of BIA agencies on 439 standards. Site reviews completed/scheduled at 50 BIA agencies. CALEA assessment to be completed in November 2003.

Evidence: In 2002, DOI's Inspector General conducted a department-wide review of law enforcement programs. Report includes 25 recommendations for improving central leadership, organization, resource control and accountability. BIA cited a model for personnel and training standards, operations manuals, staffing redeployment, records systems, and incident reporting. IG report does not assess program performance and results. BIA has not yet provided program studies based on such statistics as officers and vehicles per capita/land area and response/arrest rates by types of offenses for making comparative evaluations among Indian reservations.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: BIA's program/budget plans did not anticipate expiration of initial COPS grants in 2003. BIA's 2003 and 2004 budget estimates did not provide for operations of new detention facilities.

Evidence: DOJ secured authority for tribal COPS renewal grants for 4th and 5th years. Recently, BIA and DOJ began coordinating on construction priorities for new detention facilities, which should help BIA to schedule operational resources needed for expansions in number of facilities.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: BIA's 2005 Strategic Plan expected to include proposals for program improvement.

Evidence: Section 2.8 may reassessed upon submission of 2005 Strategic Plan.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
60%	43%	65%	0%	

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: BIA compiles annual information from tribal law enforcement agencies on personnel and crime statistics for submission to DOJ. BIA-tribal agency participation has increased from 71% in 1998 to 87% in 2001. However, BIA does not yet use this more complete and reliable data for program management improvements, such as targeting program resources to locations with higher crime rates.

Evidence: U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Tribal Law Enforcement, 2000" (January 2003).

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Indian tribes operate 163 (79%) of BIA-funded law enforcement agencies under non-competitive contract/compact agreements. Model agreements require tribes to conform to BIA personnel, training, program regulations and standards, including record keeping and performance evaluation.

Evidence: Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act of 1974 (P.L. 98-638), as amended [25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.]. BIA has exercised authority to terminate tribal law enforcement contracts and resume direct management of services.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 15%

Explanation: BIA obligates all tribal contract/compact funds at start of fiscal year. Tribes receive separate contract support funding for administrative (i.e. personnel, accounting, procurement) services.

Evidence:

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Indian law enforcement is an inherent federal/tribal government function, not subject to competitive sourcing. Model contract/compact agreements permit tribes to use any cost savings achieved for related program purposes.

Evidence: Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act of 1974 (P.L. 98-638), as amended [25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.].

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: NO Question Weight: 15%

Explanation: BIA and DOJ need to coordinate on expiration of COPS grants. New COPS positions are funded for three years; extension grants for two additional years are authorized. BIA and tribes need to plan for the transfer of these additional personnel expenses.

Evidence: During FY 1999 - 2002, 48 BIA and tribal police operations received three annual COPS grants. Up to 125 COPS funded positions may have to transfer to BIA's FY 2005 Budget.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
60%	43%	65%	0%	

- 3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 15%
 Explanation: BIA conducts annual program and financial reviews of tribal contract/compact operations for compliance with program regulations and standards. Single Audit reports are also reviewed to resolve high risk, material, and other adverse findings.
 Evidence: BIA has recently terminated two tribal contracts for cause and resumed direct management of law enforcement.
- 3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 15%
 Explanation: No GAO or IG program impact reviews conducted in past ten years. BIA's Internal Affairs unit reviews compliance of tribal agencies with program standards/guidelines, such as personnel qualifications, training, operational procedures, and recordkeeping. CALEA conducting compliance reviews of BIA agencies on professional standards.
 Evidence: BIA has recently terminated two tribal contracts for cause and resumed direct management of law enforcement. BIA's 2005 Strategic Plan expected to include proposals for program improvement.
- 4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%
 Explanation: Number of PART I (Violent & Property) offenses have increased during the joint BIA-DOJ program initiative: 24,830 (1999); 24,815 (2000); 26,417 (2001); 29,323 (2002).
 Evidence: U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Tribal Law Enforcement, 2000" (January 2003).
- 4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%
 Explanation: No assessment/data available on number of BIA/tribal agencies that have achieved progress on annual targets for reduction in crime rates.
 Evidence: Comparative assessments could be conducted on tribal/reservation conditions, crime patterns, police, and court operations to establish local performance goals and targets.
- 4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%
 Explanation: Since BIA-DOJ Indian law enforcement initiative, BIA funding has increased from \$96.3 million in FY 1999 to \$159 million in FY 2003. BIA's FY 2004 Budget requests \$169 million for police and detention facility operations. DOJ funding has increased from \$182 million in FY 1999 to \$209 million in FY 2003. DOJ's FY 2004 Budget requests \$214.9 million, including \$30 million for COPS and \$35 million for new detention facilities.
 Evidence: No study/data available comparing efficiency and effectiveness of BIA law enforcement programs or agency operations.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
60%	43%	65%	0%	

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: No comparative study on effectiveness of BIA law enforcement to other federal/state/local operations.

Evidence: DOJ's reports on Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies and Federal Law Enforcement Officers provide personnel, operation, and crime data for trend and comparative analyses.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: BIA's 2005 Strategic Plan expected to include proposals for program improvement. CALEA reviews assess compliance with professional standards, not impacts and effectiveness of program operations.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs

Measure: Violent crime reported in Indian Country per 100,000 inhabitants.

Additional Information: In 2000, the Part I (violent) crime rate was 16,500 reported crimes per 100,000 inhabitants.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2001	15,000		
2002	13,500		
2003	12,000		
2004	10,500		
2005	10,500		

Measure: Police average response rate for Part I (violent) crimes, reported in minutes. (New measure under development.)

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Measures under development

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
-------------	---------------	---------------	---

Measure: No. of police officers per 1,000 inhabitants in Indian communities under 10,000 population.

Additional Information: Compare to 2.9 in non-Indian communities in 1996.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
1996		1.3	
1999		2.3	

**OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)
Capital Assets & Service Acquisition Programs**

Name of Program: Indian School Construction

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	Through treaties, the BIA education system was established to provide learning opportunities for non-public school American Indian and Alaska Native children. 25 CFR Part 32.4(i) allows parents a choice of sending their children to a BIA school rather than a public school. The Education Construction program enhances educational opportunities for Indian children by providing and maintaining safe and nurturing facilities in which to learn.	In treaties dating back to the 1800's and legislation starting with the Synder Act of 1921, the federal government has assumed a responsibility to provide an education, including the construction and maintenance of schools to Indian children who wish to attend an Indian school. Current laws governing Indian students include: No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the Snyder Act, and the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.	20%	0.2
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Approximately 48,000 students (less than 10% of all eligible Indian children) in 23 states attend the 185 elementary and secondary schools that form the BIA school system. Many of the schools in the BIA system have serious deficiencies that pose real threats to the students' health and safety and may make it difficult for them to learn.	25 U.S.C. 2005(b) requires the BIA to bring all schools, dormitories, and other Indian education related facilities operated by the Bureau or under contract or grant with the Bureau into compliance with applicable tribal, Federal, or State health and safety standards.	20%	0.2
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	Public laws are fairly prescriptive for guidelines governing what the BIA can regulate as far as the terms and conditions being negotiated between the tribes and the bureau. Once a project is funded, the tribes have a great deal of latitude on the project, including the choice to plan, design, and construct the project. BIA has very little flexibility to redirect projects as priorities change, or to compel a tribe to complete a project within a certain timeframe.		20%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	This response received a yes, because currently the BIA is the only entity performing this function for this population of Native American children. This does not mean that another entity couldn't perform the function. Every year throughout the country, new schools are built and existing schools are renovated by state and local school districts and private contractors. While school construction is not a process unique to the BIA, it serves a population which is not currently served by other programs.	BIA report to Congress on the integrity of school construction grants, May 1999.	20%	0.2
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	BIA awards contracts, compacts and grants for all of its construction projects. BIA also encourages the tribes to perform the work through contracts, grants and compacts in accordance with the BIA mission to promote self-determination.	Approximately 80% of the construction project work is performed through PL 93 638 (Indian Self-Determination), PL 103-413 (Self-Governance) compacts, and PL 100-297 Tribally Controlled Schools which allows tribes to delegate authority to their school boards. Although the actual construction of the schools is performed by contractors, there may be opportunity for further efficiency of the management functions within the account.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					100%	80%

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)

1	<i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	Yes	BIA has a long-term output goal that facilities will be in fair or good condition as measured by the Facilities Condition Index (FCI). THE DEPARTMENT HAS AGREED TO COME UP WITH MORE LONG TERM GOALS.	BIA has an FCI assessment completed by an independent contractor for 100% of its facilities. BIA has established a goal of attaining a .10 FCI or less for the overall condition of its facilities by FY 2007. The September 5, 2001 FCI of .265 will serve as the baseline for measuring improvement.	11%	0.1
---	--	-----	--	--	-----	-----

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	<i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	BIA has four annual performance measures (reduce the FCI and excess space; award replacement and major FI&R contracts).	NEED TO KNOW THE YEARLY TARGETS TO REACH LONG TERM GOAL AND ANNUAL GOALS.	11%	0.1
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	No	For new school replacement and major facilities improvement and repair projects, the program partners submit monthly status and financial reports showing summary of activities, funding outlayed to date, and current status of project milestones. However, construction starts are slow and often delayed due to design problems, negotiations with sovereign tribal entities, changes in tribal leadership that alter previous decisions, complex land acquisition approval processes, and religious and cultural considerations.	For the most part, the partners support the program. DOI has noted problems in the past caused by turnover of tribal government councils and its effect on the commitment to the program goals. BIA has provided sample reports submitted by the tribes and is providing OMB with monthly detail of the status of the backlog.	11%	0.0
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	BIA coordinates with public schools to develop education space guidelines for school construction as well as enrollment projections. In addition, BIA works with the National Indian School Board Association to convey program information and progress on projects.	BIA participates on the New Mexico State Public School Capital Outlay Task Force. In addition, the school construction programs conducts joint reviews with the BIA school operations program to evaluate replacement school applications to determine school replacement.	11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	No	BIA does not have a regularly scheduled objective process in place for independent evaluation of performance information.	GAO is performing an on-going audit mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act that will look at BIA's facilities management system; and the OIG is conducting a separate audit of project selection, planning, design, construction, as well as BIA's oversight and the tribal contracting process. Results from these studies were not available during the PART review, and there is no indication that the studies will be evaluating performance information rather than process. In addition, BIA's goals are being revised as a result of the PART; therefore, no evaluations of the new goals exist.	11%	0.0
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	No	Since FY 2001, BIA has received a large increase in its annual school construction budget with the assumption that the current level of \$293M over 5 years would be sufficient to eliminate the 2001 deferred maintenance backlog and prevent future backlog problems. BIA can provide no assurances that it will meet the Presidential commitment to eliminate the 2001 school maintenance backlog in 5 years.	BIA Budget Justification. BIA Reduction Plan	11%	0.0
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	BIA participates in the Department's Capital Planning and Investment Control Process (CPIC). BIA has developed a new Facilities Management Information System (FMIS) which contains data used to make strategic planning decisions. This system has the capability to set planning goals and benchmarks, and monitor progress.	BIA has an FCI assessment completed by an independent contractor for 100% of its facilities. The FCI will be tracked through the FMIS.	11%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
8 (Cap 1.) <i>Are acquisition program plans adjusted in response to performance data and changing conditions?</i>	No	BIA does not have the ability to adjust quickly to changing situations. BIA has little control over cost and established schedules for 80% of its program once the planning, design, and construction is contracted, granted or compacted to the Tribe. However, BIA, through its monthly project status meetings, reviews schedules, deviations from budget, and scope of work changes. Monthly summary status reports are adjusted to show changes.	BIA does make adjustments on occasion. For example, Jicarilla Dorm was funded in FY 2000; however, construction was delayed pending final design. Funds for Jicarilla Dorm were reprogrammed to the Northern Cheyenne Tribal School to repair a building destroyed by fire. Funding for Jicarilla Dorm was re-requested in the FY 2002 budget. Funding was provided in FY 2002; however, it should be noted that construction of the Jicarilla Dorm is being delayed again due to a dispute with the Tribe over size and cost of the project.	11%	0.0
9 (Cap 2.) <i>Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule and performance goals?</i>	Yes	The BIA has re-engineered its planning design and construction process to reduce the delivery time for a project from 7 to 3 years. BIA has contracted with an independent engineering firm to conduct cost analysis comparing BIA replacement school construction costs with public school costs. BIA has implemented two design-built projects to determine if schedule and costs can be reduced. BIA continues to implement value engineering on all school construction projects with a value greater than \$1M.	Re-engineering lab report, dated July 1996. The contract award document and the cost analysis comparison and findings are expected in October 2002. The design/build projects currently have inter-agency agreements awarded and value engineering reports.	11%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	56%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	BIA collects quarterly progress and financial status reports from its 638 contractors and grantees. In addition, BIA also conducts periodic field inspections to ensure quality of construction. The construction program is assessed as part of the regional program reviews conducted by BIA. BIA needs to better document how they use the information to manage the program.	BIA has a Facility Management Information System which includes data on identified improvement, repair (both current and deferred), and capital improvement needs. The system is used to develop and track replacement and facilities improvement and repair projects, develop budget requests, and determine facility conditions. BIA has also developed a facility condition index for each of its schools that is used as a benchmark to evaluate progress in improving facility condition and to determine priorities for funding allocation.	10%	0.1
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	43 CFR Part 12 permits BIA to place special conditions on grantees for project accountability. BIA uses a "high risk" ranking system to identify tribes with financial and management deficiencies. If a tribe cannot conform, sanctions such as limiting Federal funding to a cost-reimbursement basis, are implemented. The Director of Facilities/Construction performance agreement contains an element for timeliness of projects and financial management; however, it is very generic and not tied to performance goals.	OIG Semi-Annual Report, April 2002. See SES Performance Measures.	10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	BIA estimates it will carry over approximately \$138M (47%) of the \$293M appropriated in FY 2002. BIA carried over \$59 million (20%) of the \$292 million in FY 2001 funding. According to BIA, the amount of carryover is not unusual and compares favorably with other agency construction programs.	FY 2003 Initial Apportionment. While the funds are being spent for the intended purpose, there is growing concern that construction size and costs may be high relative to the declining number of students within the education program. The IG has stated that the bureau cannot provide assurances that funds are being spent wisely; however, audits are being conducted currently, and no evidence is available.	10%	0.1
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	While no contracts currently have incentives, BIA uses multiple program management methods, such as the Means National Cost Estimating System, to measure cost effectiveness of the program.	Incentives would only be applicable to 20% of BIA contracts. BIA is weighing options for adding incentives to non-tribal contracts.	10%	0.1
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	No	Although DOI complies with managerial cost accounting standards, it does not yet have a financial management system that fully allocates program costs and associates those costs with specific performance measures. This requirement might be met through Activity Based Costing (ABC), which DOI is adopting for each of its bureaus.		10%	0.0
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	The FY 2000 audited financial statements identified a need to improve controls over Construction-in-Progress as a material weakness. The FY 2001 audited financial statements show the problem has been corrected.	FY 2001 and FY 2002 Department Accountability Reports	10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	BIA developed the Facilities Management Information System (FMIS) in November 2000. It provides information for program decision making. Program reviews are conducted of the region's facility management operations under A-123 Internal Controls. BIA has completed its initial round of facility condition assessments.	OIG report 2002-1-0008, dated December 2001. "The bureaus are beginning the essential and critical tasks of assessing the conditions of their facilities, identifying the extent of deferred maintenance needs, and implementing the information systems necessary to effectively manage and maintain facilities."	10%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	<i>Does the program define the required quality, capability, and performance objectives of deliverables?</i>	Yes	Before any project is awarded there is an engineering design required with clearly defined project specifications or statement of work.	BIA provided a contract and statement of work for one of the FY 2002 replacement schools showing project specifications and timetable for completion. Contractors must submit monthly status and financial progress reports.	10%	0.1
9 (Cap 2.)	<i>Has the program established appropriate, credible, cost and schedule goals?</i>	No	BIA's final negotiated costs are often very different from original estimates. DOI does not impose discipline or effective remedial steps to correct the problem. BIA can provide no assurances that it will meet the Presidential commitment to eliminate the 2001 school maintenance backlog in 5 years.	The estimated cost of each replacement school project in the FY 03 budget varied widely from the estimates for the same schools in the FY 2002 5-year plan. BIA attributes the differences to the large infusion of funding beginning in FY 2001 and its effect on the design of projects. As of July 2002, of the 17 replacement/major projects funded in FY 2000, 10 have been completed, 4 are 78-88% complete, and 3 have not been started. Of the 17 replacement/major projects funded in FY 2001, 3 have been completed, 5 are 5-85% complete, and 9 have not been started. The size of new facilities in the face of a declining school population is also a concern.	10%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
10 (Cap 3.) <i>Has the program conducted a recent, credible, cost-benefit analysis that shows a net benefit?</i>	N/A	Cost benefit analysis is not applicable for the school construction program because BIA has fiduciary responsibilities to provide safe and functional schools to support the school operations program.			
11 (Cap 4.) <i>Does the program have a comprehensive strategy for risk management that appropriately shares risk between the government and contractor?</i>	Yes	Indian Self-Determination statutes establish roles and responsibilities for tribal contractors. In addition, BIA identifies and assesses the potential risks of tribes that may have an adverse effect on schedule, costs and scope of work.	BIA provided evidence such as performance bonding for subcontractors.	10%	0.1

Total Section Score	100%	80%
----------------------------	-------------	------------

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1	<i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	small extent	BIA has reduced its FCI from .26 to .21 with an increasing number of schools moving to fair/good condition.	BIA's September 2002 FCI report.	17%	0.1
---	---	--------------	---	----------------------------------	-----	-----

<p>Long-Term Goal I: An average Facility Condition Index of .10 or less. Target: Facilities are in fair or good condition as measured by the Facilities Condition Index Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>						
<p>Long-Term Goal II: BIA has agreed to come up with additional long-term goals. Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>						
<p>Long-Term Goal III: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>						

2	<i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	small extent	In FY 2001, Congressional funding was provided for 12 facilities improvement and repair projects and of that number, 9 awards were made. The goal to award funding for the next 6 schools on the replacement list was met.	In FY 2001, BIA had not established its FCI performance goal. BIA also does not have a goal for meeting the Presidential commitment.	17%	0.1
---	--	--------------	--	--	-----	-----

<p>Key Goal I: Reduction in the FCI Performance Target: Reduction from an FCI of XX to XX. Actual Performance:</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
			Key Goal II: Percentage of BIA's building square footage identified as excess. Performance Target: Reduce X% of its building square footage identified as excess to the BIA educational program as of 9/10/2002. Actual Performance:			
			Key Goal III: Improve the safety and functionality of Bureau schools and facilities. Performance Target: The Bureau will award 7 replacement school contracts from its Education Facilities Replacement Construction Priori Actual Performance:			
			Key Goal IV: Improve the safety and functionality of Bureau schools and facilities. Performance Target: The Bureau will award 8 Major Facilities Improvement and Repair contracts. Actual Performance:			
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	small extent	Through a re-engineering process, BIA reduced the average number of years for completion of a project from 7 to 3. BIA is close to adopting a new policy related to enrollment projections which will have a direct bearing on the size and cost of schools.	The Assistant Secretary has not signed off on the new policy at this time so it was not provided to OMB. In addition, the IG is reviewing BIA's school enrollment projections, and a preliminary findings report is expected soon.	17%	0.1
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Large extent	DOI believes that the Education Construction Program is the best managed construction program within the Department, and has no reason to be believe it is not comparable to other federal programs, but has not actually compared it to programs outside DOI. THIS SCORE MAY BE CHANGED AFTER STUDY IS RELEASED.	A comparison to a state school construction program with remote locations would be more useful than comparing the program with other low-scoring DOI construction programs. During the next several months, an independent engineering firm will be performing a comparison study of costs for 4 BIA schools with co-located state schools.	17%	0.1
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	No	BIA has conducted independent evaluations of portions of the program; however, the entire construction programs has not been evaluated. The IG reported that Departmental bureaus (including BIA) have been unable to establish an effective facilities maintenance program. The bureaus' efforts to implement facilities management systems and accurately identify the deferred maintenance backlog have been slow and uncoordinated. The Department needs to make sure that the projects in the five-year plan are legitimately part of the maintenance backlog.	OIG Audit - no 2002-1-0008	17%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6 (Cap 1.)	<i>Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?</i>	No	BIA has little control over cost and established schedules for 80% of its program once the planning, design, and construction is contracted, granted or compacted to the Tribe. Construction starts are slow and often delayed due to design problems, negotiations with sovereign tribal entities, changes in tribal leadership which can alter previous decisions, complex land acquisition approval processes, and religious and cultural considerations.		17%	0.0
Total Section Score					100%	28%

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)
Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: Indian School Operations

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	The mission of the BIA, Office of Indian Education Programs, is to provide quality education opportunities in accordance with the tribes' needs for cultural and economic well-being in keeping with the wide diversity of Indian Tribes and Alaska Native villages as distinct cultural and governmental entities.	In treaties dating back to the 1800's and legislation starting with the Synder Act of 1921, the Federal Government has assumed a responsibility to provide an education to Indian children. Mission statement 25 CFR Part 32.3, Pub.L 95-561 (as amended), and 25 CFR 39. "It is the responsibility and goal of the Federal government to provide comprehensive education programs and services for American Indians and Alaska Natives."	20%	0.2
2 <i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	BIA serves approximately 48,000 students in 185 schools located in 23 states and 63 reservations, representing 263 tribes, and includes the basic instructional program, student transportation, and administrative costs.	Nationwide there are approximately 517,000 Native American children: 465,000 (including BIA students) attend public schools, and the remainder attend private schools.	20%	0.2
3 <i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	BIA school operations program provides 78% of all Federal funding for BIA schools.	In FY 2002, total Federal funding was \$645M, with \$504M from BIA and \$141M from Education.	20%	0.2
4 <i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	BIA schools meet the unique cultural needs of American Indians, and serve children in remote and isolated communities not accessible to public schools. A limited number of Indian students attend boarding schools which are unique to state and local governments. However, less than 10% of all eligible American Indian and Alaska Native students attend BIA schools. In addition, BIA schools are accredited by state/regional agencies and must meet the same standards for education.	Of the 185 schools, 26 schools are on reservations in which there are no public schools, and 37 schools are more than one hour from the nearest public school. Of the 171 BIA schools operating in the 2001-02 school year, 96% were accredited under state or regional accreditation associations. There are 20,027 students in 54 boarding schools and 1,556 students in 14 dormitories.	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 <i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	BIA encourages the tribes to perform the work through contracts and compacts in accordance with the BIA mission to promote self-determination.	Currently 121 schools are currently contracted through P.L.. 93-628 (Indian Self-Determination) and P.L.. 100-297 (Tribally Controlled Schools Act) grants.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score				100%	100%

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	Yes	Current strategic planning documents include the long-term goals of improving the succession of Indian students to each educational level. The goals address: (1) student proficiency in math; (2) student proficiency in language arts; (3) student attendance, (4) teacher proficiency in use of new assessments; and (5) reduction in violence and substance abuse among students.	BIA Strategic Plan (current) BIA FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan Draft DOI Strategic Plan for FY 2003-2008	14%	0.1
2 <i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	The BIA FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan contains GPRA performance targets that are annualized targets for each of the measures above. The proposed goals and measures in the DOI strategic plan would also have annualized targets.	BIA FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan Draft DOI Strategic Plan for FY 2003-2008	14%	0.1
3 <i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	School boards, school staff, administrators and parents are involved in developing the consolidated school reform plan. Stakeholders assist in developing the strategic plan, goals and measures.	The consolidated school reform plan and annual report card are shared with all stake holders.	14%	0.1
4 <i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	BIA collaborates with the Department of Education to approve state education plans and the allocation of funds to individual schools. Each school works with the state to obtain teacher certification and accreditation.	BIA and Dept. of Education MOU and approved state plan. Individual state/regional accreditation and teacher certification. Multiple school attendance and curriculum policies.	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 <i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	Yes	An external evaluator conducts the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) with a team composed of education specialists. One-third of the schools are reviewed annually. Schools develop and implement action plans to address areas needing improvement. CIMP reports and action plans are maintained for each school reviewed.	Standardized state achievement tests are administered at all BIA schools.	14%	0.1
6 <i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	No	Budget request does not reflect program goals. Most of school operations funds are distributed by formula, not on factors related to goals and objectives. The schools are allowed to shift funds among program activities, for instance student transportation funds can be used for ISEP.	Local schools consider the unique needs of students when developing their school reform plan and consolidating resources available to implement the reform plan.	14%	0.0
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	BIA requires Corrective Action Plans when schools fail to achieve partial proficiency results. BIA adjusts its strategic plans yearly relative to actual accomplishments on annual targets. BIA and Education are collaborating to develop a criterion-referenced test aligned with national standards to assess student achievement while eliminating the cultural bias in the 23 state tests currently administered to BIA students.	Strategic plan for Office of Indian Education Programs and DOI. As of the Fall 2002, 25% of schools require corrective action plans.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	86%

Section III: Program Management (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
-----------	------	-------------	---------------	-----------	----------------

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	A student count is conducted annually to determine the Average Daily Membership; consolidated school reform plans and performance report cards are submitted annually. Based on the data submitted, schools not making adequate yearly progress in (partial) proficiency are placed on a corrective action plan.	OIEP provided lists of schools in corrective action for math proficiency: 26 schools made adequate annual progress in basic proficiency; 107 schools did not make progress this year; 2 are in year three of the plan; 6 are in year four and 38 schools have needed corrective action plans for the last 5 years.	14%	0.1
2 <i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	The director, deputy directors, education line officers and school principals have student achievement results as a critical element in their annual performance appraisal.	Eighteen principals were replaced and 56 teachers were released in SY 2002 due to performance.	14%	0.1
3 <i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	Based on a recent IG report of 4 sample schools, all 4 schools had questionable expenditures or inadequate financial plans. BIA has taken corrective actions at the schools. For the most part, it appears BIA schools are obligating funds in a timely manner and for the purpose intended. The Office of Audit and Evaluation coordinates responses to corrective actions found in the single audit reports.	IG report, Annual Financial Plan for Bureau operated schools; Audit Status Report. In FY 2002, there was a 71% closure rate on audit findings.	14%	0.1
4 <i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	BIA school funding is allocated by formula(s) without factors that provide for incentives. However, schools can reallocate BIA and Education funds to address needs and effectiveness consistent with a Comprehensive School Improvement Plan. The NCLBA provides for additional incentives/awards for schools that meet annual progress in student achievement.	BIA completed IT improvements by connecting all schools to the Internet. This has made teachers and students more proficient using modern technology to access/improve education skills and knowledge.	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?	No	Although DOI complies with managerial cost accounting standards, it does not yet have a financial management system that fully allocates program costs and associates those costs with specific performance measures. This requirement might be met through Activity Based Costing (ABC), which DOI is adopting for each of its bureaus.		14%	0.0
6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?	No	The Bureau received a clean audit for FY 00 and FY 01; however, BIA received a material weakness for inadequate controls over financial reporting.	FY 2001 Audited Financial Statements	14%	0.0
7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?	Yes	Financial management training have been provided to all education line officers and staff. Corrective action plan was submitted to the IG to address findings from the last IG audit.	Corrective action plan for BIA operated schools. Technical assistance and resource staff to provide on-site guidance to grant schools identified as high risk	14%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	71%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?	Small Extent	Of 169 schools, 24 are at/above 70% goal in Math, and 34 are at/above 70% goal in Language Arts.	26 schools are within 10% of 70% goal in Math, and 12 are within 10% of goal in Language Arts.	20%	0.1
a	Long-Term Goal I: Average proficiency score (expressed as a percentage) in Math. Performance Target: Achieve 70% by 2012 Actual Progress achieved toward goal: FY97: 38% FY98: 41% FY99: 43% FY00: 50% FY 01: 50% FY02:				
b	Long-Term Goal II: Average proficiency score (expressed as a percentage) in Language Arts. Performance Target: Achieve 70% by 2012 Actual Progress achieved toward goal: FY97: 39% FY98: 41% FY99: 41% FY00: 48% FY 01: 50% FY02:				
c	Long-Term Goal III: The Bureau will increase teacher proficiency in new assessments to 73 % by FY 03. Performance Target: FY97: NA FY98: NA FY99: 50% FY00: 59% FY 01: 73% FY02: 71% FY03: 73% Actual Progress achieved toward goal: FY97: NA FY98: 45% FY99: 54% FY00: 68% FY01: 69% FY02:				
d	Long-Term Goal IV : The Bureau will increase student attendance rate to 92 % by FY 03. Target: None. BIA plans to revise goal to national average (93%) by FY 2005. Actual Progress achieved toward goal: FY97: 90% FY98: 90% FY99: 91% FY00: 90% FY01: 90% FY02:				

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
e	Long-Term Goal V: The Bureau will provide for a 10% reduction in violence per school year through FY 03. Performance Target: FY97: NA FY98: NA FY99: NA FY00: NA FY 01: NA FY02: NA FY03: 7.624 Actual Progress achieved toward goal:					
		FY97: NA FY98: 9,963 FY99: NA FY00: 10,706 FY 01: 8,471 FY02:				
2	Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?	Large Extent	Of 169 schools, 82 are at/above FY02 (52%) target in Math, and 77 are at/above FY 02 (52%) target in Language Arts.	20 schools are within 10% of FY02 target in Math, and 13 within 10% of FY 02 target in Language Arts.	20%	0.1
a	Key Goal I: The Bureau provides for a 2% percent increase in proficiency of students in math achievement Performance Target: FY:97 NA FY98: NA FY99: 45% FY 00: 47% FY 01: 54% FY02: 58% FY03: 54% Actual Performance: FY97: 38% FY98: 41% FY99: 43% FY00: 50% FY 01: 50% FY02:					
b	Key Goal II: The Bureau provides for a 2% increase in proficiency of students in language arts achievement Performance Target: FY97: NA FY98: NA FY99: 45% FY00: 45% FY 01: 52% FY02: 52% FY03: 54% Actual Performance: FY97: 39% FY98: 41% FY99: 41% FY00: 48% FY 01: 50% FY02:					
c	Key Goal III: The Bureau will achieve teacher proficiency in new assessment to 73% Performance Target: FY97: NA FY98: NA FY99: 50% FY00: 59% FY 01: 73% FY02: 71% FY03: 73% Actual Performance: FY97: NA FY98: 45% FY99: 54% FY00: 68% FY01: 69% FY02:					
d	Key Goal IV: The Bureau will increase student attendance rate to 91% by FY 01. Performance Target: FY97: NA FY98: NA FY99: 93% FY00: 94% FY01: 93% FY02: 91% FY03: 92%					

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	0%	44%	0%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The LWCF Act clearly states the purpose is "to assist in preserving, developing, and assuring accessibility to all citizens . . . outdoor recreation resources" by "providing Federal assistance to the States in planning, acquisition, and development of needed land and water areas and facilities."

Evidence: Land and Water Conservation Act (LWCF) Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-4). Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission Report (1988). National Park System Advisory Board findings (1994).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The need for outdoor recreation opportunities is broadly recognized. Almost 40 years ago, the LWCF Act spoke of the need for outdoor recreation resources "to strengthen the health and vitality" of U.S. citizens; today, health advocates continue to cite that need. Many surveys show the importance of outdoor recreation for people's quality of life. States regularly pass bonds for outdoor recreation needs. Demand for hiking, camping, and other outdoor activities continues to increase.

Evidence: LWCF Act (16 U.S.C. 4601-4). See each of the 56 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans, or SCORPs.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program is well designed to assist State and local government efforts in providing outdoor recreation opportunities. Although the program duplicates State and local programs, the gap in non-Federal services is large enough to warrant a Federal program. Requirements for States to match funds and prepare statewide plans help to ensure that the Federal grants mesh with non-Federal responsibilities. Some other Federal programs (e.g., HUD's Community Development Block Grants, or CDBG) can support outdoor recreation activities, but LWCF grants have a much broader population of applicants.

Evidence: See a cross-cut comparison between LWCF and other Federal programs. NPS notes there are 87,000 units of governments that are eligible to receive LWCF State grants, compared to about 1,000 for CDBG grants. NPS also notes that 98% of all counties have received an LWCF grant at some point. NPS argues the gap in non-Federal efforts is best shown through surveys, various capital investment plans, and the large number of applicants willing to meet the 50 percent matching requirement.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program does not have sufficient program measures and reporting requirements to determine the overall effectiveness of the program. As a result, NPS cannot adequately document program results or verify the extent to which Federal funds are well targeted to meet program purposes.

Evidence: Section 6(d) of the LWCF Act (16 U.S.C. 4601-8) authorizes NPS to collect "other necessary information, as may be determined by the Secretary", but so far no performance information has been required from States. NPS will work cooperatively with the States to identify performance measures by 10/1/04 and begin collecting performance data no later than 10/1/05.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	0%	44%	0%	

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: States use the SCORP planning process and an "Open Project Selection" process to identify and select priorities that target beneficiaries most effectively. These processes ensure that no grant is funded without proof that it meets some need as defined by the State in the SCORP. NPS reviews the States final project selections to ensure that the Federal funds are passed on to the intended beneficiaries.

Evidence: See examples of State SCORP plans and Open Project Selection procedures. NPS notes that the 50/50 matching requirement also helps to ensure that funds go only to serious applicants, since half of the funds for each project must come from non-Federal sources.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS lacks salient, meaningful performance measures that capture the most important aspects of the program. NPS will need extensive coordination with State partners to develop adequate measures that support the goal in the new DOI Strategic Plan to "improve access to appropriate recreation opportunities on DOI managed or partnered lands and waters."

Evidence: No evidence provided to show that the program systematically collects information from States on program outcomes. NPS does track one measure (the number of acres made available for outdoor recreation through LWCF acquisition grants), but it still lacks adequate information on prior performance and future targets.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: See explanation for question 2.1.

Evidence: See evidence for question 2.1.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS lacks salient, meaningful performance measures that capture the most important aspects of the program. NPS will need extensive coordination with State partners to develop adequate measures that support the goal in the new DOI Strategic Plan to "improve access to appropriate recreation opportunities on DOI managed or partnered lands and waters."

Evidence: No relevant evidence available. Although the program has limited measures on its processing of grant applications, these workload measures do not demonstrate progress towards reaching long-term goals.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: See explanation for question 2.3.

Evidence: See evidence for 2.3.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	0%	44%	0%	

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program cannot measure and report on the performance of its partners as it relates to accomplishing the overall goals of the program. Nevertheless, evidence suggests that most State partners are committed to working with the program through (a) timely updates to their SCORPs, (b) obligation of funds, (c) project completion as outlined in grant agreements, and (d) post-completion site reviews.

Evidence: No relevant evidence available.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: No independent evaluations have been conducted since the 1980s, and no reviews are currently scheduled. As a result, DOI is strongly encouraged to conduct a review as soon as possible.

Evidence: GAO conducted a review of the program in 1981 and cited problems with the program. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission in 1988 evaluated the national need for outdoor recreation, and the American Planning Association reviewed the SCORP planning process in 1989, but these reviews did not focus on the overall effectiveness of the program.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Budget planning cannot be adequately tied to performance planning until sufficient outcome-based performance measures are developed. Program budget documents do not clearly indicate the full costs of achieving performance goals.

Evidence: No evidence was provided to show that budget plans are based on performance or results.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program has not completed any formal strategic planning, but has begun to work aggressively with States to identify program performance goals that are consistent with the new DOI Strategic Plan to "improve access to appropriate recreation opportunities on DOI managed or partnered lands and waters." NPS and the States will need to reach agreement on ways to measure performance and collect data that demonstrate progress in addressing these goals.

Evidence: There is no relevant evidence available.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	0%	44%	0%	

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS does not collect performance data related to key program goal and use that information to adjust priorities, allocate resources, or make management decisions. Although NPS does monitor how grantees obligate and use funds, that is a basic requirement and not a systematic process to monitor overall program performance.

Evidence: NPS and the States do not have a systematic process for setting and monitoring results-oriented performance targets. So far, the LWCF Grants Manual (Chapter 600.8) only describes the procedural requirements for State programs to comply with basic Federal grant requirements (e.g., appraisals, financial reporting).

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS does not require partners to set and meet cost, schedule and performance goals. Although the program does require State partners to meet certain Federal grant requirements (e.g., obligate funds within three years), these requirements do not represent specific performance standards. NPS has no systematic policy on how States may use grant funding for administrative purposes, so there is a wide variety of rates used by States to determine the amount of indirect costs charged against Federal funds.

Evidence: So far, the LWCF Grants Manual has no requirement for States to measure results using performance goals. NPS has not provided evidence of specific performance standards or incentives for program partners, or evidence that grant and contract awards consider past performance. NPS did provide limited evidence that it enforces compliance with Federal grant requirements.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The LWCF Act requires States to obligate grants within three years. NPS appears to have adequate procedures in place to encourage timely obligations, including a Special Reapportionment Account for funds that have been withdrawn or deobligated.

Evidence: LWCF Act section 6(b)(4), LWCF Grant Manual (chapter 600.3), reports on apportionments for 02, 03 and unobligated balances for 02 & 03.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	0%	44%	0%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program has not developed adequate procedures to measure and achieve efficiencies. It has begun to track average grant processing time, but more evidence is needed (e.g., future targets and written explanations of why processing time has not improved). The program has begun to make some IT improvements, and may be able to show improved efficiencies through the use of an electronic grant application and management system.

Evidence: The only efficiency measure shows that the average LWCF grant processing time has increased from 31 days in 2000 to 66 days in 2002. This is due to many factors, including a 168% increase in grants, but NPS needs to provide more information (e.g., written explanation for changes, outyear targets) before this becomes useful evidence. It also needs to find additional measures, such as cost per grant application processed, to track cost effectiveness in program application. NPS and DOI have taken steps toward electronic grant applications, which could improve program efficiencies by next year.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program coordinates with the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers (NASORLO) and individual State offices to ensure the grants go to projects consistent with the States SCORPs. The States, in turn, coordinate with NPS and other Federal agencies to ensure that the SCORPs are consistent with various Federal requirements. NPS conducts a limited review of SCORPs, but does not produce an annual report that compiles information from States on accomplishments and performance.

Evidence: Examples of State SCORPs show some meaningful collaboration with NPS and other Federal agencies. Coordination with other agencies shown in other grant manuals, such as U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Grants Manual, 660 FW 4); Federal Highway Administration (Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning); and USDA Forest Service (Eastern Region Recreation Blueprint). NPS still needs to work with grantees to jointly produce an annual report, performance goals, and grant announcements that demonstrate meaningful collaboration.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program manages payments through HHS's SMARTLINK system, which is used by many Federal grant programs. This system allows for up-to-date monitoring of grantee payments and draw-downs. Also, the NPS Accounting Operations Center (AOC) tracks obligations and provides regular updates. The program is not aware of any questioned costs or audit exceptions found under the Single Audit Act process. It is also using the Federal Audit Clearinghouse to monitor audits more closely.

Evidence: See description of SMARTLINK system. Also see example of AOC's reports generated through the Document Direct system.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program has been slow to address management deficiencies, partly because it is rebuilding after no funding during much of the 1990s. NPS and a NASORLO task force have identified portions of the Grants Manual that require updating, and are revising the State Review Workbook. NPS still needs to identify deficiencies in performance information.

Evidence: No evidence provided of an annual report or summary of accomplishments in meeting performance goals and addressing management deficiencies. However, NPS has made some initial efforts, such as convening a NASORLO task force and drafting updates for the State Review Workbook.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	0%	44%	0%	

3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS has a reporting system to track expenditures by grantees. It also reviews SCORPs and conducts post-completion site inspections to verify that funds are used for their designated purpose.

Evidence: The LWCF Grants Manual identifies procedures for site visits, periodic inspections, SCORP reviews, and post-completion inspections. NPS still needs to document the annual accomplishments from grantee activities.

3.BF2 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program does not collect performance information in a user-friendly manner. NPS should prepare an annual report that includes information on project accomplishments, annual expenditures by state, workload measures, and performance results.

Evidence: NPS did not provide evidence of grantee performance data. NPS did publish on the internet a three-year summary report (FY2000-02), but this was just a list of approved projects (see: <http://www.nps.gov/lwcf/>). The program plans to develop an annual report for calendar year 2003.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: NPS lacks salient, meaningful performance measures that capture the most important aspects of the program. NPS will need extensive coordination with State partners to develop adequate measures that support the goal in the new DOI Strategic Plan to "improve access to appropriate recreation opportunities on DOI managed or partnered lands and waters."

Evidence: No evidence provided to show that the program systematically collects information from States on program outcomes. NPS does track one measure (the number of acres made available for outdoor recreation through LWCF acquisition grants), but it still lacks adequate information on prior performance and future targets.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: See explanation for question 4.1.

Evidence: See evidence for question 4.1.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program has not yet developed efficiency measures or been able to demonstrate high levels of efficiency through other means. It has made some initial IT improvements, such as including forms on its website, but it has not provided evidence that management practices have resulted in efficiency gains over the past year.

Evidence: No evidence of meeting performance targets to reduce per unit costs or other steps that result in tangible productivity or efficiency gains. Although NPS did provide data on grant processing time, the trends do not indicate improved efficiencies. NPS also did not set targets or identify strategies for improving processing time.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	0%	44%	0%	

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program did not provide sufficient evidence to determine if (a) benchmarks exist to compare performance against other programs, or (b) no comparable programs exist.

Evidence: No evidence of benchmarks to compare performance to other programs. NPS did provide evidence for question 1.3 that shows the program purpose and design is not redundant or duplicative of other Federal programs. Yet, that is not the same as showing that the results of this program cannot be compared to other programs.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: No independent evaluations have been conducted since the 1980s, and no reviews are currently scheduled. As a result, DOI is strongly encouraged to conduct a review as soon as possible.

Evidence: GAO conducted a review of the program in 1981. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission in 1988 evaluated the national need for outdoor recreation, but it did not focus on the effectiveness of the program. The American Planning Association reviewed the SCORP planning process in 1989.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service

Measure: Measure under development

Additional Information: To be determined. NPS will work with States to identify suitable output measures.

Year

Target

Actual

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Number of acres made available for outdoor recreation through LWCF grants.

Additional Information: Each State needs to set its own target and report its performance in meeting that target.

Year

Target

Actual

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Measure under development

Additional Information: To be determined. NPS will work with States to identify suitable efficiency measures.

Year

Target

Actual

Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The mission of the Mineral Resources Program (MRP) is clear. MRP is the sole federal provider of scientific information, objective resources assessments, and unbiased research results on mineral potential, production, consumption and environmental effects.

Evidence: The USGS Organic Act (43 U.S.C. 31 et seq.) includes instructions that the USGS is to "classify the public lands and examine the geological structure, mineral resources, and products within and outside the national domain." (see attachment for additional legislative mandates).MRP 5 year plan

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The US is the world's largest user of mineral commodities, and in 2002 US manufacturers and other mineral users depended on other countries for 100% of 14 commodities and for more than 50% of 37 commodities. Making decisions about supply and development of mineral depends on having current and reliable information on mineral resources and implications of their development. MRP reports on mineral commodities to inform macroeconomic policy, and provides research and assessments to support management of minerals on federal lands. Regional, national, and global mineral assessments provide broader context for long-term land use and economic policy planning, rather than from one company's or one county's perspective.

Evidence: The 1996 National Research Council (NAS) review of the MRP 5 year plan identified (Mineral Resources and Society, p. 2, p. 16-22, p. 23). Three functions that are considered appropriate: supply unbiased information related to mineral resources, provide advice and analysis to other government agencies, and conduct basic research on mineral resources. NRC, Future Roles and Opportunities, p. 40

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The MRP is the only federal, state, local, or private entity whose purpose is to provide objective resource information concerning mineral commodities for the nation. The framework data and process understandings provided by MRP are used by land managers and industry to identify and address site-specific mineral resource and mineral environmental issues and challenges ranging from determining the feasibility of new mine development to remediation of long-abandoned mine sites.

Evidence: The 1996 NAS review of the MRP stated "...there do not appear to be other federal agencies that duplicate MRSP activities. On the contrary, with the demise of the US Bureau of Mines, the MRSP stands as the only federal program with clear responsibilities in hard mineral resources. MRP's activities do not duplicate those of State geological surveys.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: MRP is designed to conduct three functions necessary to carry out its mission: research, assessments, and minerals information. MRP employs an expert federal workforce with extensive experience in mineral deposits research, mineral resource assessment, geochemical and geophysical research, and information technologies, and leverages this expertise with others. World-class laboratories are operated at regional USGS centers where costs are shared with other programs, and the program has a small headquarters staff in Reston, VA, where interaction with other USGS programs and other federal agencies is facilitated.

Evidence: The MRP is designed around a 5 year plan which is reviewed periodically by the NAS, and implemented through the USGS annual science plan. The program was modified significantly in response to the 1996 review (see evidence for question 2.8 for responses to the review.) MRP scientists are distributed nationally, fostering local and regional expertise on mineral-related issues, as well as contact with academic institutions and partner agencies and companies. MRP continues to refine its program design by actions such as outsourcing routine work whenever possible.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: MRP targets beneficiaries for mineral commodities reports, and activities in support of federal land management. MRP supports DOI's resource use goal for non-energy minerals, providing decision-specific information on mineral availability and related environmental issues to Federal land managers, regulators, and other users worldwide. Information is also disseminated to all users at the same time. Recent advances in data-serving tools have increased availability of both data and reports. However, the difficulty of applying geospatial mineral information excludes decision makers with less technical sophistication.

Evidence: Minerals program 5 year plan and list of cooperators. Statistics concerning data downloads and letters of support from both state geological surveys and the private sector.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program has developed a long term measures that is better focused on outcomes. USGS should develop additional outcome measures. The current measures largely focus on outputs and process (citation of USGS documents for policy use). However, the goals in the current 5 year plan are not specific enough to evaluate performance and need to be refined.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for 2004 Outcome measures for MRP in this plan are as follows: 80% of U.S. with geochemical and lithologic data coverage, 80% customers satisfied with timeliness of data, 80% of customers for which minerals data meets their needs, and 100% of formal USGS publications and scientific products receiving appropriate peer review. "Science Strategy for the Geologic Division of the USGS, 2000-2010" includes the goal "Advance the understanding of the Nation's energy and mineral resources in a global geologic, economic, and environmental context." The five goals outlined in the MRP 5-year plan for 1999 to 2004 (see 1.1 and 2.2) are the basis for achievement of these outcome measures.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: It is difficult to determine whether targets in GRPA documents and 5 year plans are ambitious for the following reasons: Program goals and the narrative for 5 year plans are too broad to be considered measures, they do not include time frames or specific products. Annual project work plans contain more detail and time frames, but are not clearly linked to achieving goals in the 5 year plan. New performance measures were developed in the PART process, with more ambitious targets.

Evidence: The MRP 5-year plan lists five goals. Project work plans refer to 5 year plan goals; all projects have established time frames for completion in project work plans.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Annual performance measures are identified in GPRA and in the DOI Strategic Plan (draft). Each annual measure achieved provides evidence of progress towards long-term goals. Due to insufficient targets for long term goals, it is difficult to determine whether adequate progress was achieved.

Evidence: USGS GPRA Reports and DOI Strategic Plan (draft)

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The annual measures appear to be ambitious and have baselines. However, it is not clear how annual measures will contribute to increased efficiencies or long term goals. Baselines and targets for MRP projects are listed in Geology's Annual Science Plan, and annual project proposals and work plans.

Evidence: Baselines and targets include projections of planned enhancements to MRP's five major databases, projected delivery dates for scientific assessments and research products, dates and topics for stakeholder meetings, trainings, and workshops, and projected enhancements for decision-making support systems. MRP reviews projects annually, in collaboration with Team managers, to track progress of work and ensure that targets are ambitious, but reachable. Each target is associated with a specific project. Team managers conduct performance reviews with each scientist every six months to ensure appropriate progress towards products expected from funded research.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: CRADAs and MOUs supplied provide information about the cost, scope, and deliverables. The agreements are related to the goals stated in 5 year plans. But as the goals are broad it is difficult to determine impact of partnerships activities on MRP performance.

Evidence: In order to achieve specific annual or multi-year tasks, MRP establishes Cooperative Research and Development Agreements, project implementation plans associated with Memoranda of Understanding, and/or contracts with public or private sector organizations who have access to the required information or technology and who can perform the required research or analysis. Activities undertaken by them with MRP funds are limited to work that explicitly supports MRP project and program goals. Technical guidance and supervision, as appropriate, are provided as a part of partnership or contractual agreements. Examples of the official documents by which these agreements are made are attached. Each shows the relation between the outlined work and MRP's goals.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: USGS uses independent committees of the National Academy's National Research Council to conduct reviews of the MRP. In addition to this formal process, MRP managers utilize mid-term project reviews and periodic discussions with users, collaborators, and stakeholders as feedback on the direction and significance of MRP project work.

Evidence: NRC reviews are conducted on a 5-7 year cycle. The last was in 1996; the current review is scheduled to be completed in August 2003. Information on status of the current review is available on the NAS website at <http://www.nas.edu/>. Regular meetings with public- and private-sector customers (annual, quarterly, or as needed) are another source of information on relevance and significance of MRP work to those groups.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Program budgets are not clearly tied to long term performance goals. The items listed in the GPRA table are not clearly tied to descriptions of actual activities within the text of the budget justifications. Further outcome oriented and measurable long term performance measures did not exist, and accordingly could not be tied to the budget.

Evidence: Minerals Program 5 year plan, Project Work Plans, Congressional Justifications.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: MRP has taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies. The NRC review completed in 1996 included one recommendation specifically addressing strategic planning. MRP has developed new vision, mission, and goals. The 5 year plan strategic goals are still broad and not clearly linked to societal outcomes. Further, long term goals need to be outcome oriented and need specific time frames to provide context for assessing performance reported at the project level.

Evidence: The NRC recommendation said: "The MRSP and its Plan should place greater emphasis on improving the mechanisms and procedures for comprehensive planning, setting priorities, and evaluating and enhancing performance, particularly through external reviews or advisory panels." (Mineral Resources and Society, p. 55.) Continued refinement of the strategic planning processes are demonstrated in MRP's leadership in USGS-wide and Geology-specific strategic planning. The Full Report of MRP responses to NRC recommendations provides summary of MRP actions in response to NRC recommendations for strategic planning.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

- 2.RD1** **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%
- Explanation:** Many other organizations collect information on mineral resources but few make the information publicly accessible. Though a formal cost/benefit has not been performed for MRP, cost benefit studies of other programs with open access to information policies suggest making information publicly available increases benefits to society. 27 state geological surveys conduct mineral-resource related research or compile data on mineral production for their states. Of those who compile data, nine use USGS data for some or all of their reports. Only two state geological surveys report attempts to conduct mineral assessments for their states. Neither has published the results.
- Evidence:** Evolution of research in mineral-resource assessment provides an example of the results of continuing evaluation of the ways MRP provides information for the Nation. MRP management determined that a more efficient approach to mineral resource assessment was required in order to provide information required by Federal land management agencies. The 1996 NRC review agreed with this view. As documented in the report on mineral resource assessment supplied with question 3.1, MRP dramatically changed its approach from site-specific (e.g. small areas proposed for wilderness status) to regional, national, and global scales. This made possible the first ever National mineral resource assessment, and is the basis for work on the first ever global assessment. MRP participates in forums on minerals topics (e.g. Sustainable Minerals Roundtable (see attached), Acid Drainage Technology Interest Group) to identify partners with expertise that complements program goals, build partnerships based on shared strengths, and participate in joint planning toward group goals that complement MRP goals.
- 2.RD2** **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%
- Explanation:** MRP has a process for reviewing programs and priorities. One priority in the 5 year plan was to improve the content and delivery of MRP data sets. The priority is reflected in increased funding for data management and distribution.
- Evidence:** The following priorities are stated in the MRP 5 year plan, 1. major improvements to both the content and delivery of MRP's largest data sets and 2. research on the processes through which mineral deposits form and are destroyed. MRP planning process: MRP uses annual and long-term prioritization processes as described in 2.1 - 2.7 and Section 3. Funding is directed to achieve program priorities through long-term and annual planning, through annual project and task-level prioritization involving partners and customer input, and through annual and quarterly tracking and reporting on project and program level performance.
- 3.1** **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%
- Explanation:** DOI, USGS, and its Programs regularly collect performance information through customer and partner reviews and surveys. Feedback is incorporated into program plans and specific actions are taken in response. The DOI and Bureau Strategic Plans include partner and customer reviewed long term goals, annual performance measures, and GPRA measures. Progress on GPRA is verified quarterly and reported and updated annually.
- Evidence:** MRP documents: NAS reports related to MRP, report of FY03 listening session, sample MRP customer survey, documents demonstrating changes in mineral resource assessments. General: USGS Strategic Plan showing long term goals, measures, and annual GPRA targets (p 9-15). GPRA memo for FY02, GPRA reports for 03 and quarterly verification. USGS Planning Model showing performance requirements in 5-year plans (p.9) and performance information in BASIS+ system (p.12-13).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: USGS holds senior management and program partners accountable for performance through performance evaluation, management process controls, and performance guidance provided in agreements, contracts, and grants. Grant programs have specific performance guidance and include rigorous review panels and budgetary penalties for non performance. Cooperative agreements with states and universities include specific requirements, products, and time schedules with payment penalties for non performance. Contracts for services are competed and contain specific quality and performance requirements and time schedules for services.

Evidence: MRP's utilization of a contract for geochemical analyses by XRAL demonstrates through-going accountability. As is shown in evidence for 1.4, use of this contract has reduced MRP's cost per analysis by almost 50%. In addition, the contract (attached) specifies (in part IV, p. 21 et seq.) timeliness, reporting, and quality control/quality assurance requirements. The 30-day period for completion of analysis ensures that MRP can provide geochemical data and analyses in accordance with its established goals for project work. In another example, MRP's cooperative research and development agreement with DuPont. Documents: SES Performance Plan Guidance and Trujillo Memo, Bureau Program Planning Process responsibilities list. MRP-specific documents: XRAL contract, cooperative research and development agreements (specifically the CRADA with DuPont).

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The USGS has an established budget, allocation, and spending process that includes annual planning, quarterly and monthly reviews, and review of any funds allocation change over 25K. It has implemented management controls and measures to ensure dollars are allocated and obligated in a timely manner and spent for intended purposes. Budget planning to object class is done in the BASIS+ system, which ties budget to intended use. Projects and their budgets are reviewed monthly by line managers and annually by Programs. The Bureau conducts quarterly review of status of funds against performance measures.

Evidence: Documents: Diagram of USGS Budgeting and Finance. FY02 Geology Annual Science Plan showing project science and funding targets used for budgeting. FY02 Allocation Process Memo showing appropriation actions and allocation requirements. FY02 allocation tables made by Programs and administrative office giving allocations to cost centers, projects, and accounts. Summary of Program quarterly obligations for FY02 showing consistent spending of all appropriations for intended program. Final spending report for all Programs FY02. Instructional Memos APS-2003-11-13 showing the monthly management control requirements..

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Bureau is engaged in competitive sourcing for Visual Information Services, Building and Ground Maintenance, and Warehousing. Geology mission critical information systems have submitted Capitol Asset Plans (Exhibit 300) to DOI and are in the certification and accreditation process. In 2003, all Geology programs are developing Activity Based Costing for 2004 implementation. Since 1996, Geology Programs have been a leader in conducting competitive project proposal and review processes and project based costing using a prototype of the BASIS+system now in use across the Bureau.

Evidence: Since the beginning of the current five-year plan (FY 1999), MRP has used contractor-provided services to migrate its geochemistry, geophysics, and mineral deposits databases to SQL-based data structures in order to minimize the in-house expertise required to maintain those structures and to maximize the opportunity for data interoperability. Similarly, when cost comparisons demonstrated that routine geochemical analyses could be obtained on contract (rather than with a Federal workforce), MRP implemented the required contract, lowering the cost by almost 50% (see questions 1.4 and 3.2 for more information.) Documents: April 2002 Memo from USGS Director announcing competitive sourcing, June 2003 update on competitive sourcing.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: MRP actively collaborates with a significant number of agency, state, and local partners, industry, and academia towards the achievement of common or complimentary goals. Major partners are identified in the Geology Strat Plan and MRP 5-year plan and include but are not limited to DOI bureaus and other Federal land management agencies, NASA, EPA, DOD, and DOC as well as State Geological Surveys, state departments of natural resources, local resource and planning agencies, and academic, governmental, and industry consortia. USGS establishes roles and responsibilities with partners through cooperative agreements, Memoranda of Understanding, or Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADA).

Evidence: Upcoming project to assess mineral resources on Federal lands in central Colorado, partners will include USGS's National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program (particular skills in mapping at the scales required by Forest Service), Colorado Geological Survey (expertise in evaluating physical hazards at abandoned mine sites in Colorado), and Forest Service (expertise in planning requirements and information on land use and land status). Other MRP projects collaborate with USGS Programs (e.g., Volcano Hazards, Toxic Substances Hydrology) or with State geological surveys (e.g., Colorado in the recently completed Front Range Infrastructure Resources Project or 46 States in the collection and dissemination of minerals information.) In the case of Pennsylvania (attached), the State provides site-specific information.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The 2002 Audit findings of the Inspector General's Office conducted by KPMG contained a "no opinion" result and cited 8 reportable conditions in their report dated January 24, 2003. The 2002 Audit findings of the Inspector Generals Office conducted by KPMG contained a "no opinion" result and cited 8 reportable conditions in their report dated January 24, 2003. USGS submitted a Corrective Action Plan that has been accepted by the Inspector Generals office, In his cover memo, the Asst. Inspectors General for Audits stated: "Based on the response and corrective action plan, all the recommendations are considered resolved but not implemented." Monthly meetings and reports on progress are being provided to DOI and thus far, many tasks are completed and all others are in progress. In the USGS matrix organization, line management and administration is responsible for financial, facilities, and personnel management. USGS Program Coordinators are responsible for scientific planning and coordination, budget formulation, and establishing and reviewing performance. Due the extent of financial management problems cited in the audit and the inability of the auditor to render an opinion, it is difficult to separate the program from financial management problems.

Evidence: Documents: April 11 Auditors Report 2003, Corrective Action Plan, and cover memo from Asst. Inspector General for Audits Roger LaRoche.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The USGS is taking the necessary steps to resolve management deficiencies. The USGS has aggressively addressed IT control weaknesses. Management control performance measures have been incorporated into all SES Performance Evaluations. An expert team has been formed and operating for the last 6 months to address audit issues and ensure completion of the Audit Corrective Action Plan. Extensive training is underway to address reported conditions and strengthen management practices. Administrative Instructional Memoranda outline in detail all financial processes and requirements. All Geology Programs use an annual review process and the BASIS+ system to review all program work and correct deficiencies. This is described in detail in 3.4 and 3.RD1. The NRC and FACA advisory panels conduct periodic reviews that make recommendations regarding program management, performance, and scientific direction.

Evidence: In its 1996 review of MRP, the NRC provided four general and 16 specific recommendations, all of which required management action. MRP has responded to all of them by changing management practices, by moving away from an organizational culture dominated by self-direction and independent research, by instituting stricter controls on project planning, execution, and reporting, by developing more efficient approaches to performing mineral resource assessments, and by developing significant relationships with a wide variety of customers and collaborators. A full report of these actions is included with evidence in 2.8. Documents: Corrective Action Plan Progress Report for April 2003 submitted to the DOI and showing progress or completion of all actions. Memorandum from Hord Tipton providing improved results of March and April testing of DOI WAN's. Instructional Memoranda from 3.3.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

- 3.RD1 For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%
- Explanation:** Since 1996, Geology Programs have conducted division-wide competitive project proposal process using a prototype of the BASIS+ system now in use across the Bureau. Geology issues an annual call for project proposals called the Geology Annual Science Plan (formerly know as the Geology Prospectus) which contains scientific and funding guidance for all projects. The annual plan uses the Geology Science Strategy and Program five year plans for its organizing framework. Scientists are required to submit annual project proposals into the BASIS+ system for program review. Reviews are conducted by scientific peers and include external scientific or stakeholder review. Earmarked funds are not excluded from review.
- Evidence:** In response to the 1996 NRC review, MRP instituted a practice of convening project review panels of internal and external scientists. This practice is required in Obj. D of the MRP 5-year plan (see 1.1). Another approach to increasing external input into MRP is through conducting stakeholder workshops before a project begins. In FY 2003, MRP conducted two workshops of this type to determine are the highest priorities for new work in Alaska. Results of those workshops have shaped the request for new project that appears in the FY 2004 prospectus. Documents: Overview diagram of Geology Planning Process demonstrating management and review process. See 3.1 and 3.3 on planning and allocation processes.
- 4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%
- Explanation:** Every year, MRP completes project work that addresses long-term goals. Completions reported to the right are each evidence of progress toward one of the five goals laid out in the MRP 5-year plan. While progress was demonstrated, adequate progress could not be determined as long term goals were not clearly linked to specific products, timelines in 5 year plans, or budget justification materials.
- Evidence:** MRP 5 year Plan, Project work plan Completions, FY 2000-2002.
- 4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
- Explanation:** see also 2.4, 2.5. Baselines and targets for MRP projects are listed in annual science plans (the Geology Prospectus), annual project work plans and proposals, and in documentation of base and initiative budgets. A modest amount of the work is conducted by contractors or other cooperators in the accomplishments of these annual goals; the work of these partners is included within accomplishments identified in GPRA.
- Evidence:** Annual priorities are established within the context of long-term goals (e.g., MRP 5-Year plan, Geology Science Strategy, DOI Strategic Plan) and performance is achieved through management review, approval and funding of both internal USGS projects and external cooperative grants. Project funding for all projects, including support of cooperative agreements, is adjusted annually on the basis of performance, programmatic priorities, and resource availability. In the FY 2002 GPRA performance report, MRP met all targets. For FY 2003, MRP has met all targets identified for the first and second quarters.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: LARGE
EXTENT

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: MRP adopts new technologies that increase efficiencies. (See also section 3.4) In addition, program and project staff monitor the effectiveness of long-term efforts on a periodic basis, to ensure that the work remains appropriate and that the cost-benefits can be demonstrated. While savings have occurred, there is no regularly collected data which facilitate cost effectiveness determinations over years, or permit comparisons across programs.

Evidence: Examples (all from the last 3 years): stable isotope analysis has seen a 10-fold increase in productivity (= cost savings) due to development of automated sample handling equipment; gravity data acquisition has seen a factor of 2 decrease in expense due to the replacement of traditional surveying methods by global positioning satellite (GPS) techniques; magnetic survey processing and interpretation has seen a factor of 2-10 decrease in expense due to the use of GPS and the investment in new software; research trace element chemistry has seen a 10 fold increase in productivity (= cost savings) due to the replacement of single-element instruments (e.g., mass spectrometers) with multi-element, multi-tasking instruments (e.g. inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometers). See section 1.4 and 3.2 for information on outsourcing saved almost 50% on the cost of geochemical analyses.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: LARGE
EXTENT

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: MRP has two key groups of functions: research and assessment and minerals information. As described in question 1.3, there are no government or private programs with purpose and goals similar in breadth and depth to MRP. Comparisons of specific functions within MRP to other programs are somewhat instructive, although this comparison by components does not allow discussion of the benefits gained by having the two groups of functions together. In one such comparison, MRP compares favorably with DOE's Energy Information Agency (EIA). NRC reviews suggest that USGS compares favorably to other programs with similar goals.

Evidence: MRP compares its Minerals Information function with that conducted by DOE's Energy Information Agency (EIA). The functions are similar in that both produce independent information about non-renewable resources for policy and other uses. Both produce data on production and consumption domestically and worldwide. They are different in that MRP provides information on over 80 metallic and industrial mineral commodities, whereas EIA provides information on five energy sources (petroleum, natural gas, coal, nuclear, and renewables/alternates.) EIA's budget for FY 2003 is \$80 million and supports 374 people; the information function of MRP is budgeted at \$16.4 million and is conducted by 140 FTE. MRP compares favorably for response rate to surveys issues and the amount of data collected to support statistical reporting. NRC summary report (Mineral Resources and Society, 1996, p. 23-24)

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: LARGE
EXTENT

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Independent NRC/NAS review of the program found it to be effective and achieving results. Though the last NRC report noted that the program had strategic planning difficulties including too broad a vision, mission, and objectives. These factors are critical in determining effectiveness, if they are not clear it would be difficult to determine effectiveness.

Evidence: The NRC summary report (Mineral Resources and Society, 1996, p. 23-24) indicates that MRP made many scientific contributions, including "characterization of major deposits in the U.S. and overseas, and understanding of ore-forming processes"; "excellent descriptions of ore deposits that proved useful for environmental mitigation and remediation of abandoned mine lands as well as for mineral exploration"; and "mineral resource assessments and mineral-environmental assessments... [that] contributed to land use decisions by the USFS and the BLM". The report also stated that the program needed new, clearly articulated statements of vision, mission, and objectives.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey

Measure: % of targeted analyses/investigations delivered which are cited by identified partners within three years of delivery

Additional Information: Objective is to ensure that analyses and investigations delivered are actually used by their intended recipients within a short time of delivery, ensuring both relevance and timeliness.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2004	80%		
2005	80%		
2006	80%		

Measure: Number of completed systematic analyses and investigations delivered to customers

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002	4	4	
2003	4	4	
2004	5		
2005	3		

Measure: Number of decision-making support systems

Additional Information: MRDATA is a web-based, data delivery system providing basic GIS and analytical tools and data download functions for the geochemical, geophysical, mineral deposit, and lithologic data.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001		1	
2002		1	
2003	1	1	
2004	1		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey

Measure: Number of formal workshops or training provided to customers

Additional Information: Workshops are held a formal meetings, professional society meetings, and at the request of partners or customers.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001		4	
2002		8	
2003	8	8	
2004	4		

Measure: % of formal USGS publications and scientific products receiving appropriate peer review

Additional Information: The goal is for all USGS formal publications or reports to be published in trade journals

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002	100%	100%	
2003	100%	100%	
2004	100%		
2005	100%		

Measure: Average square miles (in millions) of the US with non-energy mineral information available to support management decisions

Additional Information: This measures the coverage of the US with basic information required to understand mineral resources.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003		2.37	
2004	2.54		
2005	2.76		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey

Measure: Number of long-term data collections maintained

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002	5	5	
2003	5	5	
2004	5		
2005	5		

Measure: Average cost of a systematic analysis or investigation

Additional Information: Average cost per analysis allows comparisons among different projects to determine how efficiencies can be achieved.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2003		\$4.125m	
2004	\$4.125m		
2005	\$4.125m		

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Department of the Interior through the Minerals Management Service's (MMS) Minerals Revenue Management (MRM) Program is responsible for managing the revenues generated from offshore and onshore Federal mineral leases and from producing Indian mineral leases. Responsibilities include mineral valuation, revenue collection and distribution, and compliance and reporting. The program is authorized to take federal royalties either in-value (RIV) or in-kind (RIK).

Evidence: 1) The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, the Indian leasing Acts of 1909 and 1938, the Outer Continental Shelf lands Act of 1953, and the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (FOGRMA). 2) MMS FY 2004 Budget Performance Chart, linking MRM goals to the DOI Draft Strategic Plan's Resource Use and Serving Communities Mission Components.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Federal Government is the largest single land owner and mineral leasing entity within the United States. Following the enactment of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (FOGRMA) the Secretary of the Interior created MMS, Secretarial Order 3087, designating MMS as the agency responsible for fulfilling the Secretary's obligations to ensure proper fiscal accountability and management of the mineral revenues (rents, royalties, and bonuses) from federal and Indian lands. MMS's current workload includes the collection and distribution of revenues from over 84,000 leases and oversight of industry's compliance with lease terms and 'statutes. This is done to ensure that public and Indian beneficiaries receive their rightful shares from the disposition of these public and Indian mineral revenue assets

Evidence: 1) The Federal Government has been collecting revenues from mineral production on Federal onshore lands since 1920, from American Indian lands since 1925, and from Federal offshore lands since 1953. 2) Total mineral revenue collections by the Federal Government from 1920-1981 were about \$20 billion; however, in the 20+ years since inception, MMS has collected over \$89 billion. 3) Average annual collections now total more than \$6 billion with approximately 63 percent going to the U.S. Treasury, 23 percent to special purpose funds, 11 percent to States, and 3 percent to American Indians. 4) Over \$1 billion in offshore mineral revenues is deposited annually into the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the National Historic Preservation Fund.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: See "Part Performance Measures" provided by MMS. MRM's annual measures -- most of which are incorporated as Intermediate Outcome measures in the DOI Plan -- provide ongoing indicators of progress toward achieving long-term MRM measures. MMS's increased focus on providing capability and incentives for companies to electronically report and pay have resulted in increased accuracy in company reporting (now above 95% -- but targeted to be at 97% by 2008). Increased reporting accuracy leads directly to increased timeliness in disbursing mineral revenues. The annual compliance strategies focus on properties representing the highest percentages of royalties, and is a direct indicator of MMS's progress in achieving its long-term MRM outcome of ensuring receipt of proper value. MMS has ambitious targets to increase each year the properties in its 3-year compliance cycle until it completes its compliance work within 3 years for properties representing '95 percent of all royalties. Within both FM and CAM, MMS monitors specific goals focused on Indian Trust responsibilities.

Evidence: 1) MMS has 5 annual measures that are primary indicators of progress in Financial Management, Compliance and Asset Management, and Indian Trust responsibilities. In addition to these program-wide goals, MRM monitors a variety of internal tactical goals that cascade from and link to the DOI, MMS, and MRM strategic goals. These tactical goals provide indicators to management on how well their office is contributing to overall MRM performance achievement. 2) In FY 2003, MRM offices began to maintain a variety of output measures, linked to costs, which will provide managers productivity information for decision making and resource allocation. 3) MMS Draft Operating Plan 2003-2008 Logic Model. 4) MMS Performance charts in FY 2004 Budget Justification. 5) Preliminary reports of MRM measures/costs from MMS Activity-Based Costing and Management (ABC/M) system. 6) Annual Performance Report tables; Performance Accountability Report tables

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Because MMS has reported and monitored performance data over several years, baselines and prior trend data is available for most MMS measures. Only a few measures lack baselines due to their focus on new MMS strategic directions or new calculation methodologies. In addition, MMS will be developing measures for its RIK program. MMS has set ambitious annual targets related to two core end-to-end business processes, ensuring that both FM and CAM measures integrate MMS's focus on Indian Trust.

Evidence: 1) During the reengineering effort, MMS challenged itself to cut the 6-year compliance cycle in half, while increasing royalty coverage to ensure MMS receives the correct value for all royalties. By FY 2001, MRM had demonstrated feasibility of the 3-year goal by completing compliance work for "Operational Model" properties representing 11% of the 1999 royalty universe. During FY 2002, MMS increased coverage within the 3-year cycle to 49% of the 2000 royalty universe, and is on track to complete at least 95% of that compliance work by the end of FY 2003. 2) During FY 2002, following implementation of the new MRM systems, MMS disbursed 80% of revenues timely; this was low due to the court-ordered Department-wide Internet system shutdown. However, thus far in FY 2003, MMS has significantly improved to 88% timely, with more aggressive targets in the future. Indian Trust goals are monitored in both FM and CAM's. 3) Sources: Reengineering & RIK Road Maps, Strategic Plan 2003-2008 Logic Model, performance charts in FY 2004 Budget.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: MRM coordinates closely with the State and Tribal audit groups to achieve compliance goals for targeted mineral properties within the 'states and reservations within 3 years of the date royalties are paid. Each State and Tribe commits to and works toward the '3-year goal by including targeted properties within their state and reservation on a work plan. MMS provides oversight to ensure States and Tribes successfully achieve their audit plans. Additionally, MMS coordinates closely with contractors in development and implementation of its reengineered systems. 'MMS's contract with Accenture to build-out RIK management systems was specifically designed to accomplish the goals, objectives, and action items of the RIK Road Map. The MMS/MRM Quality Steering Committee -- consisting of all of the top business managers in MRM -- provides oversight to ensure that MRM performance measures are on track, and that systems are aligned and fully supportive of the DOI, MMS, and MRM Strategic Goals.

Evidence: 1) MRM established quality partnering agreements with Accenture Partnership, with related service level agreements. Earned value metrics are being employed to monitor work progress, schedule and compliance and manage costs under the Accenture contract. 2) MRM Senior Managers frequently review IT project deliverable and system operations metrics, to ensure systems provide the support needed to achieve MRM strategic goals. 3) The Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (FOGRMA), Sections 202 and '205, authorized the Secretary to develop cooperative agreements with States and tribes to carry out certain inspection, auditing, investigation, and enforcement activities for leases in their jurisdiction. RSA expanded the functions States could perform; however, no state has requested expansion of functions beyond audits already performed by 10 states. States and Tribes develop annual audit plans, in coordination with MRM, and aligned with MRM strategic goals.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: MRM's activities result in a major source of revenue to the states, Tribes and Federal Government, so MRM is continuously under review by oversight agencies such as the Office of Inspector General (OIG) and the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO). KPMG, contracted to the OIG, performs annual reviews of MRM custodial accounts under the Chief Financial Officers Act. These external reviews augment an aggressive internal review function within MRM, focused on highest-risk areas. Also, MMS performs oversight of the State and Tribal Peer Review Process, their quality reviews of one another. The RIK pilot program has been and continues to be independently evaluated by OIG and GAO, and internally, to determine program effectiveness. These reviews are comprehensive and involve all aspects of the RIK activity. Additionally, MMS's independent policy office has conducted three RIK program assessments. Also, the RIK pilot program is currently being examined by a commercial energy commodity consultant to independently evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

Evidence: 1) MRM's Internal Control Evaluations annually include 8 Internal Quality Control Reviews (IQCR) to ensure compliance with Government Auditing Standards and 2 or more Alternative Management Control Reviews (AMCR) addressing management controls, records, and measures for MRM functional areas. 2) PMI issued reports in March 2001 and March 2002 on the Wyoming and Texas RIK Pilots. 3) The OIG issued a report on the RIK Program in August 2002, followed by the GAO report in January 2003. MRM has completed implementation of OIG recommendations, and implementation of GAO recommendations is well underway. 4) A competitive contract was awarded January 2003 to Lukens Energy Group to independently assess current RIK capabilities & performance and provide recommendations. 5) SOURCES: Annual Assurance Statement, Example IQCR/schedule, Example AMCR/schedule, PMI reports on Texas & Wyoming RIK pilots; GAO Report January 2003, August 2002 IG Report, Announcement of 'Solicitation resulting in competitive award to Lukens.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	80%	89%	61%	

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Budget initiatives are performance based. MMS formulation process involves forecasting future funding needs to maintain service and performance levels, projecting new mission requirements, and harvesting savings resulting from new efficiencies realized. New requests are prioritized by increased performance, enhanced service delivery, and opportunities for new efficiencies. Operations are routinely analyzed for areas where new efficiencies and cost savings can be or have been realized. Those savings either offset new costs internally or are offered as budget decreases to offset new initiatives. Budget execution accomplishes the integration with performance through an Activity Based Cost/Management tool implemented by MMS in FY '03. This tool will enable MMS, for each of its cost centers, to fully cost program accomplishments and better project future budget requirements. MRM, through ABC/M, and cost accounting prior to that, will be able to map these cost centers directly to the MMS and DOI strategic goals.

Evidence: 1) Preliminary ABC Data is available from MMS pilot year. The ABC model fully costs MRM end outputs and rolls-up to the draft DOI strategic plan. 2) Budget Justifications, Initial Budget Requests from the Divisions for FY 2003.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: MMS continuously works to improve strategic planning efforts. In 1993, RMP (now MRM) was selected as a Pilot program to implement the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). This was due in part to the fact that RMP had a history of strategic planning and performance measurement. In addition, the program offices developed tactical plans linking to the overall program plan. Over the years, MRM has improved strategic planning by involving mid-level managers in setting strategy and targets, increasing employee involvement and input, and aligning with MMS and DOI plans. Additionally, MMS Reengineering and RIK pilot initiatives involved radical shifts in direction. For these initiatives, MRM Managers set long-term "stretch" goals, designed to focus and align the organization toward the new direction. MMS Strategic Plan goals and targets have also shifted to align with these stretch goals. MMS continuously benchmarks and assesses the external environment, and managers discuss performance status regularly and revise strategic direction as necessary.

Evidence: 1) MMS has recently contracted with the Lukens Energy Group to develop a post-Road Map 5-year Strategic Business Plan that will facilitate accomplishment of long term RIK performance goals for the years 2004 and beyond. 2) OTHER SOURCES: 1994, 1996, 1998, 2000, and 2001 MRM Managers workshop agendas. Reengineering Road Map; RIK Road Map, MRM Arrow Chart, Budget and other documents that discuss/align with "stretch" goals. Statement of work for Luken's contract. October 2002 AD memo to the DOI Assistant Inspector General for Audits (RIK).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	80%	89%	61%	

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: MMS has measured and reported performance at least quarterly using a variety of reporting and collection tools since FY 1997. During prior years, MRM compiled and reported measurement data at least annually. MRM Managers regularly review quarterly data (on both externally reported and internally tracked measures) and redirect staff resources to address areas where increased progress is required -- either to achieve externally reported measures, or to address internal office targets. Performance measurement has been an integral part of program management. MRM is now utilizing the MMS-wide ABC/M system that integrates workload and process outputs with cost data. MMS also collects quarterly performance data from States and Tribes, and incorporates that data into MRM's reported progress toward the 3-year compliance goals. Additionally, MRM COTR's receive Metrics Reports tracking contractor progress and performance in meeting Service Level Agreements (SLAs) in the contracts, and identifying trends and problem areas to ensure proper dedication of system resources.

Evidence: 1) During the GPRA pilot years (1994-1997), MRM established an internal performance measurement team that reviewed all MRM performance measures, determine whether they were the right measures, recommended new measures to managers -- many of which were implemented, and developed a useful tool for regularly reporting performance data to managers. MRM benchmarked with other organizations and adopted the Kodak matrix approach for a few years, continuing to work with managers to refine reporting and enhance usefulness. 2) OTHER SOURCES: MRM measurement Matrix 1996-1998. DOI Reporting documentation for 1998 - current. Internal draft MRM tactical plans/measures. Sample 202/205 Reports. Accenture contract and RIK build out metric reports.

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: All of MMS's SES managers performance standards include responsibility toward annual 'strategic goals and other mission objectives, including the President's Management Agenda and the Secretary of the Interior's 4 C's. Performance responsibility cascades down to other MRM managers. The MRM Associate Director reviews quarterly performance data, and discussed concerns with the accountable managers. In addition, MRM managers are responsible for monitoring related costs. MMS's partners -- states and Tribes with whom MRM has cooperative agreements -- are held accountable for their costs and achievement of MRM's 3-year compliance goals for targeted properties under their responsibility. MMS ensures accountability by completing regular reviews of internal CAM offices and of State and Tribal audit offices. Frequent external reviews from OIG, GAO, and others provide increased assurance of accountability in achieving performance goals. The AD ensures that action plans are developed and implemented to correct weaknesses found during reviews.

Evidence: 1) A significant portion of MMS's reengineering systems contract was converted to fixed price, providing cost effectiveness. 2) During reengineering and RIK system implementation, MMS and the contractor held monthly contract status meetings and reports. 3) The MRM Quality Steering Committee meets at least quarterly. 4) In addition, MMS annually provides incentives to the mineral industry to report and pay timely and accurately through awards to top company performers. With the Mineral Revenues Stewardship Award, MMS elevates mineral companies awareness of how their proper reporting and payment practices contribute to MRM's success in achieving its mission. 5) SOURCES: Example SES Performance Standards. Example Work Plan w/ State and Tribe. March 2003 OIG Report - Audit of MMS Audit Offices. Action Plan/Status of implementing OIG's prior recommendations. Capital Asset Plans for RIK & Reengineering.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	80%	89%	61%	

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The MMS begins formulating funding requirements for the next fiscal year during the mid-year budget review of the current year. At that time anticipated expenditure levels are estimated and thereafter the current fiscal year is "closed out" as a staging for the subsequent fiscal year. MMS senior management develops initial detailed funding requirements for the full fiscal year in October. Final allocations are made shortly after passage of the budget, or in the case of extended continuing resolutions, tentative allocations are made as soon as practical. These allocations are officially reviewed and analyzed for mid year, third quarter and other periodic reviews by MMS's senior managers. Budget controls, including signature authority limitation, also ensure that funds are obligated timely and spent for the intended purpose. In recent years, MMS consistently has obligated over 98% of appropriated funds by the end of the fiscal year, carrying over any remaining funds for anticipated projects in the new fiscal year.

Evidence: 1) The MMS operating budget staff evaluate disbursements/obligations on a monthly basis, and adjust funding allocations quarterly to meet unanticipated circumstances. 2) Reprogramming rules established by the Appropriations Committee are strictly adhered to if funding needs to be adjusted from one activity to another. This ensures appropriate and proper approval of usage of funds prior to expenditure. 3) Since FY 2000, MRM has carried over appropriated fund balances of approximately \$1 million each year on total appropriations of between \$83 and \$86 million. 4) Sources: Initial budget requests from Divisions FY 2003. Carryover Balances for FY 2002 and 2003.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The MRM culture continually monitors efficiency and cost effectiveness. MMS recently implemented an ABC/M system to facilitate these efforts. MMS measures timeliness of financial disbursements and completed compliance and audit plans, performance goals and targets with actual MRM performance, and staffing allocations to achieve MRM's priority performance goals. Additionally, an MRM-wide reengineering effort reorganized the program in FY 2000 to implement improved business practices. MMS also focuses on efficient and cost-effective management of the mineral revenue asset. For example, the RIK pilot program performs assessments to ensure that value has been optimized. Most MRM IT functions are contracted out using Performance Based Contracts and Service Level Agreements to provide greater efficiencies, flexibility and cost savings. Additionally, MMS has eliminated duplication and reduced overhead costs by contracting out enterprise-wide IT functions. MMS has competed specific FTE percentages, and has targeted additional functions for study during FY 2004.

Evidence: 1) MMS promotes realization of optimal value through implementation of an asset management approach to administering the oil and gas mineral revenue stream. Capabilities to perform asset management were the primary focus of the Reengineering Initiative and RIK Road Map. 2) MRM contracted with Lukens Energy and implemented a Risk and Performance Management System (scheduled for September 2003). This will further leverage MMS's understanding of the production and marketing environment to make asset management decisions that optimize value through taking royalty-in-kind or in-value. 3) Through competitive sourcing initiatives, MMS direct converted 10 MRM FTE in FY 2002 for IT management efficiencies; in FY 2003, MMS used streamlined cost comparison for 28.5 MRM FTE, and work was retained in house, avoiding over \$3 million in cost over 5 years. 4) OTHER: Capital Asset Plans (Exhibit 300's); RIK Road Map; PMI reports on RIK pilots; Lukens SOW/RFP; Competitive Sourcing Plan/Report. Accenture Report on "As-Is Business Processes" January 2002. GAO Report 2003.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: MRM actively collaborates with a variety of programs and constituents. For example, the development of MRM's RIK capability is a collaborative effort with Wyoming through joint crude oil RIK sales pilot, with the Texas General Land Office in joint management of RIK gas sales pilot, and with BLM in the sale of natural gas from the Federal Helium Reserve. MRM also coordinates with the mineral industry in developing FM, CAM, and RIK processes. MMS regularly meet with State and Tribal partners to receive their input on audit policy, and to annually coordinate audit plans. Similarly, the Royalty Policy Committee (RPC) meets with representatives from the energy industry, Federal Government, States, and Indian Tribes recommends royalty management policy. MRM continuously works with MMS's Offshore Program, BIA, Office of the Special Trustee, and other programs on issues of mutual concern. MRM is also successfully collaborating with the DOE to respond to the November 2001 Presidential Directive to fill the remaining capacity of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) with RIK oil.

Evidence: 1) The MMS/MRM is a member of the Indian Mineral Steering Committee (IMSC), an oversight group for the Federal Indian Mineral Office (FIMO) in Farmington, New Mexico. This office is a collaborative effort between MMS, BIA, BLM and OTFM to provide one stop shopping for individual Navajo mineral owners in the San Juan Basin region. Much data/information is exchanged among MRM, BLM, BIA, and OST. 2) COPAS, a broad-based industry technical group has been consistently involved as MMS developed reengineering and RIK processes. 3) SOURCES: DOI Budget Justifications and Performance Information for Fiscal Year 2004 for the Minerals Management Service. MOU with Wyoming; MOU with Texas; MOU with BLM. Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act, as amended; RPC Charters; Annual Audit Coordination Agenda; STRAC & RPC Minutes; Division of Responsibility, OMM/MRM; Indian Mineral Steering Committee Minutes.

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: In 2003, Interior's OIG found that MMS's internal quality control of its audit function was insufficient to ensure that its audits follow Government Auditing Standards because it lacked accountability, does not cover all audit work, was incomplete, and some (12%) auditors did not meet their continuing education requirements. However, annual audits of MMS have consistently found the MRM custodial financial activity to be fairly presented and without material weaknesses. In November, 2001, MRM implemented a commercial off-the-shelf accounting system that is Joint Financial Managers Improvement Program (JFMIP)-compliant, further enhancing our financial controls.

Evidence: 1) March 2003 OIG audit of MMS's MRM program audit offices. 2) The Independent Auditors Report of the Annual Financial Statement have generally indicated that prior findings were fixed or that progress, in most cases substantial progress, has been made. Additional staffing/financial resources were redirected to ensure that the strong commitment to accurate accounting of the mineral revenue stream were not compromised by the court ordered Department-wide Internet shut-down of the newly developed and implemented system. SOURCES: Fiscal Years 2001 and 2002 Annual Financial Reports.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	80%	89%	61%	

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: MRM has a history of continuous review and improvement, utilizing a good mix of external oversight, internal review, and contracts for independent review. MRM proactively addresses deficiencies identified by external oversight groups and internal reviews. Also, MRM focuses to actively implement the President's Management Agenda, and has continued strong collaboration with constituents in support of the Secretary's 4 C's. Performance data demonstrates the significant progress MMS has achieved. Also, MRM has completed all actions in the Reengineering Road Map, and is near completion of the RIK Road Map -- a series of actions to implement management controls/systems applications to transition RIK from pilot to operations if approved. Recommendations from the August 2002 OIG report on RIK pilots have also been implemented. The MRM contract with Lukens Energy Group will result in the development of a 5-year Business Plan that includes specific management improvements and strategies that optimize their use, and implementation of the recommendations from recent GAO Reports.

Evidence: 1) During MRM's reengineering effort, MRM recognized that the compliance function was resource intensive, burdensome on industry, and did not fully address issues of non- or under-payment of royalties. MMS developed a Road Map to move to a more efficient compliance process. Financial management was improved by increase electronic reporting and increasing financial controls. The Change Readiness Assessment and Transition Plan addressed human capital transition to reengineered processes. The MRM contract with Lukens Energy Group includes development of a RIK Strategic Business Plan for 2004 and beyond, including human resource development, acquisition of intellectual capital; identification and application of best practices; and installation of software applications. 2) SOURCES: October 2002 AD memo to the DOI Assistant Inspector General for Audits (RIK); RIK Road Map 2001; Reengineering Road Map 1998; PMA implementation examples; 4 C's examples; Examples of corrected OIG or GAO noted deficiencies. Change Readiness Assessment.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The PART instructions require a "NO" rating if the program received a NO rating in Question 2.1.

Evidence:

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: See "PART Performance Measures" provided by MMS. For the measures used by the MRM program, the annual performance trends show that MRM historically meets or exceeds most of its annual goals -- a strong indicator of progress toward its long-term goals. In cases where MMS has not met the goal, managers have made decisions on redirecting staff resources to increase progress. As with the long-term goals, some of our MMS's FY 2002 progress was impacted by the court-ordered Department-wide Internet shutdown; however, the 2nd quarter FY 2003 reporting demonstrates significant progress toward achieving those annual targets. MMS's State and Tribal Partners progress is calculated in with MRM's progress in achieving the 3-year compliance goal, so MRM actively coordinates with States and Tribes to ensure their progress toward MRM goals.

Evidence: 1) MMS FY 2001-2002 Performance Results. 2) MRM 2003 GPRA Report. 3) Performance charts from the MMS FY 2004 Budget Justifications.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	80%	89%	61%	

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: MMS has no efficiency measures demonstrating improved cost effectiveness. However, MRM has a well established culture of pursuing new efficiencies and capturing cost savings through innovative thinking and organizational restructuring. In 1998, MRM conceptualized, designed and began the building phase of reengineered business practices. Achievement of these new processes required wholesale restructuring of the organization, development of new core business systems and retraining of human resources. MRM routinely evaluates the most efficient means for accomplishing mission requirements and assesses and adjusts workforce requirements to gain the greatest efficiencies. Savings from improvement initiatives have allowed MRM to continue covering uncontrollables and unfunded mandates related to cost of living increases and added building, IT and internet 'security costs while continuing to achieve high performance standards. In FY 1998, MRM piloted a cost-accounting system, a project that aided MMS in developing a bureau-wide ABC/M system.

Evidence: MRM Reengineering: MRM goals were to cut the compliance business cycle time in half, expedite the disbursement of funds and reduce our constituent's reporting and recordkeeping burden. Due to an extended internet shutdown during initial implementation, MMS is only now beginning to realize the benefits associated with the reengineering effort. Efficiently Accomplishing Mission Requirements: " Technology Investment Analysis of Electronic Commerce Services showing that MRM has been able to reduce it's contractual data entry costs from \$773,998 in FY 1999 to \$162,271 in FY 2003." Publishing statistical reports and training manuals on CD and Internet instead of paper." Expands Electronic Funds Transfer use to reduce check processing and courier services. Workforce Efficiencies: MRM Personnel Reduction Summary details that show that since FY 2000, MRM has reduced its staff levels by approximately 10% through attrition.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Comparisons have been sought over the years, however, MRM has not been able to identify a comparable organization in terms of purpose and goals. There are other programs that perform functions similar to some of MRM's specific functions, but there is no other program that performs at the scale and variety of MRM. Though MMS has identified no organizations that provide the comprehensive mineral revenues management services provided by MRM, MMS continues to incorporate "best practices" as it encounters them. For example, the RIK pilot program uses standard industry contracts and credit management terms to collect revenues and minimize Government risks. And the compliance process radically changed from the company focus to a property/producing area focus, aligning with industry business processes, and providing MRM capability to more efficiently determine whether the government is whole. MMS has also noted that its electronic commerce initiatives -- resulting in 98% of all royalties and production now reported and paid electronically -- are ahead of most organizations.

Evidence: Final State Benchmarking Study; Final Report on Benchmarking Work with Norway 1996; Benchmark Visit to Alberta, Canada Department of Energy 1997; Capital Asset Plan (Exhibit 300) for RIK; RIK Roadmap; Technology Investment Analysis for Electronic Commerce Services; Benefits of Property/Producing Area focus (company quote)

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	80%	89%	61%	

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?
Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: MRM proactively addresses and implements recommendations of oversight agencies including OIG and GAO. Many of the recommendations require multi-year initiatives to implement, and MRM provides regular status reports to the oversight agencies on its progress. Recommendations from MRM's internal reviews have not historically been as aggressively addressed; however, in recent years, MRM has developed and implemented procedures to correct this. MRM frequently seeks independent review of significant IT investments. In 1998, an independent validation of the MRM "Plan for Reengineering Business Processes and Support Systems for the 21st Century (March 1998)" endorsed reasonableness of the schedule, appropriateness of the requested budget, and acceptability of the planned contractual approach for its reengineered systems.

Evidence: 1) An outside contractor, PEC, performed an independent assessment of MRM existing technology and provided recommendations of alternatives for future technology solutions. As a result of reviews of the court appointed Special Master on MMS security, MMS has been allowed to reconnect to the Internet and additionally have been allowed to give access to State and Tribal sites via Citrix/NFUSE. Examples of improvements to MRM implementation of recommendations from Internal Reviews: Nearly all recommendations in the FY 2002 AMCR on "Physical Security Over Proprietary Data" have been implemented. 2) A recent IQCR of Offshore CAM's Tulsa Office has been closed, with all items on the action plan, completed and addressed. 3) SOURCES: Independent Review of RMP Business Process Reengineering Initiative (September 1998), an engineering review by PDS Advanced Technologies, Inc., of the MMS/RMP business process reengineering initiative and support systems for the 21st century.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service

Measure: Proper royalty value received from mineral lease operators on their initial royalty submission, reported as a percentage of the total submissions received.

Additional Information: A primary outcome of MRM is to ensure that ultimate beneficiaries of mineral revenues receive fair value. MRM measures this by comparing actual payments received voluntarily from companies to predicted value. MRM influences correct voluntary payments by providing training/consultation to select companies, as determined necessary through MRM's compliance verification and audit work.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001		98%	
2002		99%	
2003	98%		
2004	98%		
2005	98%		

Measure: Rate of timely disbursement of mineral revenues to recipients, reported in percent.

Additional Information: A primary MMS end outcome is timely disbursement of funds to recipients (States, American Indians, and the U.S. Treasury). MMS measures percent of mineral revenues disbursed to states by the end of the month following the month received (as required by regulation). Recipients use these revenues for schools, roads, other public works, etc.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2001		98%	
2002		80%	
2003	92%		
2004	94%		
2005	95%		

Measure: Increase rate of company accuracy in royalty reporting

Additional Information: Accurate reporting directly impacts MMS's ability to timely disburse mineral revenues. MRM influences company's accurate reporting by providing reporter training to payers and operators, and by requiring electronic reporting with built-in edits, and contracting for electronic commerce infrastructure/interface with companies.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001		96%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service

Measure: Increase rate of company accuracy in royalty reporting

Additional Information: Accurate reporting directly impacts MMS's ability to timely disburse mineral revenues. MRM influences company's accurate reporting by providing reporter training to payers and operators, and by requiring electronic reporting with built-in edits, and contracting for electronic commerce infrastructure/interface with companies.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002		86%	
2003	94%		
2004	94%		
2005	96%		

Measure: Increase percent of financial distribution details to BIA within 21 days of receipt

Additional Information: MMS immediately transfers Indian mineral revenues to OTFM interest-bearing accounts. However, BIA requires lease-level financial distribution details from MMS to distribute funds to Indian individual mineral owners. MMS is seeking to reduce the current 30-day target to 21 days. This is a new measure.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	90%		
2005	92%		

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Mixed Programs

Name of Program: National Fish Hatchery System

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	No	Currently, there is no clear and well-defined purpose or mission for the National Fish Hatchery System (NFHS) (see numerous reports cited in evidence section). GAO has reported that, in some instances, the many purposes of the NFHS are in conflict. Based on recent activities related to Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council led reviews of the NFHS, the FWS believes that the mission of the NFHS is "Working with partners to restore and maintain fish and other aquatic resources at self-sustaining levels and support Federal mitigation programs for the benefit of the American public." However, this mission statement has not been shared with and agreed to by the various partners and other interested parties including the Congress.	GAO report, National Fish Hatcheries: Authority Needed to Better Align Operations with Priorities, GAO/RCED-00-151, June 2000; GAO report, National Fish Hatcheries: Classification of the Distribution of Fish and Fish Eggs Needs Refinement, GAO/RCED-00-10, October 1999. Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council Report (SFBPC), A Partnership Agenda for Fisheries Conservation: Report of the Fisheries Program Strategic Plan Steering Committee to the SFBPC, January 2002. Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council Report (SFBPC), Saving A System in Peril: A special Report on the National Fish Hatchery System, September 2000.	15%	0.0
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The NFHS helps to conserve a growing number of aquatic species that are declining at alarming rates. One-third of the Nation's freshwater fish species are threatened or endangered, 72 percent of freshwater mussels are imperiled, and the number of threatened and endangered species has tripled in the last 20 years. Concurrently, demand for captive propagation as an important tool in recovery of these species has greatly increased. The NFHS also fulfills Federal responsibilities to provide fish to replace or maintain harvest levels lost as a result of these projects.	Nearly three quarters (56 plans, covering 72 species) of all ESA Recovery Plans for fish (76 plans, covering 96 species) include captive propagation technology or refugia as part of the recovery strategies to re-establish wild populations. ESPN/B.A.S.S letter to Secretary Norton.	15%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Since State, tribal, and private hatcheries primarily raise and stock fish for commercial and recreational fisheries, most improvements related to mitigation, species recovery, and achieving self-sustaining native population levels are due to NFHS activities.	Fish and Egg Distribution Reports; GAO audits 1999 and 2000; SFBPC Sept. 2000 Report, Saving a System in Peril, pg. 23; CRBF&W Program Report 2000-19, pg.5.	15%	0.2
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	The NFHS, as the only Federal fish hatchery program, does not duplicate other federal efforts to recover threatened and endangered species, restore self-sustaining native populations, and fulfill Indian trust and mitigation responsibilities. State, tribal, and private hatcheries carry out some restoration, recovery, and mitigation activities that complement, but do not duplicate, NFHS activities. These non-NFHS programs could carry out more of these activities if funding, state priorities, or legislative barriers were overcome.	Sept. 2001 Letter from U.S. Army to Region 2 on poor quality of privately stocked recreational fish compared to recreational fish provided by NFHS; Whirling Disease Research Update Report 2001, pg. 3; LSRCP Artificial Production Committee Position Paper; GAO 1999 audit, pg. 1; SFBPC 2002. Data identifying the restoration, recovery, and mitigation contributions of State, tribal, and private hatcheries is not available.	15%	0.2
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	The program is not optimally designed because the NFHS does not have the flexibility to open, close, change, move, and consolidate hatcheries to emphasize priorities. Additionally, NFHS activities are divided among many, sometimes conflicting, purposes such that the NFHS is unable to target funds effectively resulting in missed production goals and compromised fish quality, according to GAO. GAO and other reports (see evidence) have recommended seeking legislative changes to the design of the program such that the NFHS would have the flexibility to emphasize priorities and seek reimbursement for mitigation hatcheries.	GAO report, National Fish Hatcheries: Authority Needed to Better Align Operations with Priorities, June 2000; GAO report, National Fish Hatcheries: Classification of the Distribution of Fish and Fish Eggs Needs Refinement, October 1999. Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council Report, A Partnership Agenda for Fisheries Conservation: Report of the Fisheries Program Strategic Plan Steering Committee to the SFBPC, January 2002. Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council Report, Saving A System in Peril: A special Report on the National Fish Hatchery System, September 2000. FY 2000 House Appropriations Report. Recommendations from FWS Stakeholders Meetings, 1996-1997. Report of the National Fish Hatchery Review Panel, December, 1994.	15%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6 (RD 1) <i>Does the program effectively articulate potential public benefits?</i>	No	The NFHS is able to provide examples of specific accomplishments of the FTCs but no analysis or summary of analysis of the benefits of these actions as required in the PART Guidance (p. 9). FTC benefits accrue primarily to FWS aquatic resource programs, and to a lesser extent to States, Tribes, and private aquaculturists. FTC Directors meet with the Assistant Regional Directors for Fisheries annually for updates on needs and capabilities; formal meetings are held within Regions to transfer technologies and decide which aquatic resource projects to work on; publication of FTC results and capabilities to address aquatic resource issues are provided to managers and other interested parties.	Evidence supplied included Mora water improvement award; Technical Publications List of USFWS FTCs; FTC Directory.	13%	0.0
7 (RD 2) <i>If an industry-related problem, can the program explain how the market fails to motivate private investment?</i>	Yes	The NFHS currently administers multiple FDA Investigational New Animal Drug (INAD) exemptions as a "fee-for-service" program to Federal, State, Tribal, university and private facilities, to facilitate the use of non-approved drugs for aquatic animal diseases. Such drug use allows for the generation of corroborative data to support FDA drug approvals. Private pharmaceuticals have found that such aquatic animal drug research provides little profit and is cost-prohibitive. However, private pharmaceuticals are the only entities that can apply for drug approvals. Without FWS playing a key role in research coordination, such drugs would not be available to treat aquatic animal diseases.	Various articles identify the market failure including, Federal-State Aquaculture Drug Registration Partnership: A Success Story in the Making, Fisheries, Vol. 1, No. 5.	12%	0.12
Total Section Score				100%	57%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	<i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	Yes	NFHS has worked internally and with its partners, DOI and Service budget and planning offices, and OMB to develop new long-term goals to be included in the FY 2004 GPRA plans. They are consistent and linked to the new Department of the Interior Strategic Plan. They include intermediate outcome and output goals because of the difficulty in obtaining measurable outcome data.	New Long-term goals developed during PART process and finalization of DOI/FWS Strategic Plans. See section IV, question 1 for goals.	12%	0.1
2	<i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	NFHS has worked internally and with its partners, DOI and Service budget and planning offices, and OMB to develop new annual goals to be included in the FY 2004 GPRA plans. They are consistent and linked to the new Department of the Interior Strategic Plan.	New annual goals developed during PART process and finalization of DOI/FWS Strategic Plans. See section IV, question 2 for goals.	12%	0.1
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	Partnerships with states, universities, other federal agencies, and/or private firms are based on achieving program goals founded in sound science such as requirements in Fishery Management Plans and Recovery Plans.	National Whirling Disease Foundation; Whirling Disease Initiative Report to Congress; testimonials/ letters of support for program activities. Recovery Procedures Cooperative Agreement for FWS, CO, UT, and WY; US v MI Court Decree, and link to "A Lake Trout Rehabilitation Guide for Lake Huron".	12%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	The NFHS works with the BOR, Corps, and TVA to assist in mitigating adverse effects of federal water development projects; collaborates with other federal agencies (USGS, NMFS) on aquaculture practices; collaborates with the FWS Refuge program to restore native fish populations and provide fishing opportunities; collaborates with the FWS Endangered Species program to support recovery strategies in Recovery Plans; and collaborates with the FWS Fish and Wildlife Management Assistance Offices to fulfill approved fishery management plans and agreements. The NFHS also works closely with State and Tribal partners to fulfill approved fishery management plans and agreements.	Interagency agreement with BOR on Leavenworth and Coleman NFHs; US v. Oregon Interim Spring/Summer Management Agreement; Participation on the Joint Subcommittee on Aquaculture; ESA recovery plans; National Wild Fish Health Survey and Database; INADS; AADAP; SFBPC Sept. 2000 Report, Saving a System in Peril, pg. 23; From the Edge, Oct. 2000 Draft, pg. 47-48; Recovery Procedures Cooperative Agreement for FWS, CO, UT, and WY; April, 2000, N.J. Dept. of Environmental Protection Testimony concerning Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act; Conservation exchange between FWS and MT.	12%	0.1
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	No	The program does not have regularly scheduled objective, independent evaluations to examine how well the program is accomplishing its mission and meeting its long-term goals. Gaps in performance are generally addressed through regularly scheduled national program managers meetings and informally among program managers and FWS planning staff. Over the years, there have been numerous independent evaluations looking at both the purpose and strategic direction of the NFHS.	SFBPC reports, 2000 and 2001; GAO audits of October 1999 and June 2000; 1997 Evaluation of the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan; NWPPC program review; Artificial Production Review Economics Analysis.	12%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	No	Budgeting and performance planning are not yet integrated, i.e., annual budgeting for the program is not based the financial resources needed to achieve annual and long-term goals. The Service is, however, developing the budget-performance linkage in phases: (1) consolidating program activities into GPRA program activities; (2) showing the performance consequences of requested levels of incremental funding for each of the performance goals; and (3) linking budgetary resources to results for "base" operations. This final step will occur when the Service implements activity based costing linked with performance in FY 2004.	FONS; Accomplishments module; Three A's report; MMS data base; SAMMS.	12%	0.0
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The NFHS has undergone extensive internal and external reviews and a comprehensive strategic planning effort. Additionally, the NFHS has worked closely with OMB, DOI, and the Service's planning and budget offices during the PART process to develop specific, ambitious long-term and annual performance goals. An internal work group has been established to identify and accomplish long-term strategic performance measurements and reporting.	Sport Fish and Boating Partnership Council reports; OMB work groups; internal work groups; Draft Fisheries Strategic Plan; ESPN/B.A.S.S letter to Secretary Norton.	12%	0.1
8 (RD 1)	<i>Is evaluation of the program's continuing relevance to mission, fields of science, and other "customer" needs conducted on a regular basis?</i>	Yes	An Evaluation Program for FTC's was established in 1995 to determine continued relevance of the program with NFHS priorities and aquatic resource conservation goals of the FWS, and to ensure the quality, integration, and productivity of center activities. The evaluation team is led by the FWS's Research Coordinator and comprised of representatives of several program areas within the FWS as well as one or more representatives of aquatic research laboratories or partners outside of the FWS. Evaluation recommendations are used to improve FTC program performance and relevance.	FTC Program Guidance document; FTC Evaluation Reports (Bozeman FTC, Warm Springs FTC, Dexter FTC).	8%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (RD 2) <i>Has the program identified clear priorities?</i>	Yes	For the R&D part of the NFHS, the FTCs priorities have been developed. The FTC "Tech Team," comprised of the Asst. Regional Directors for Fisheries, established a list of priority work areas for FTCs in 1994. This list of priorities is revisited by the Tech Team annually to ensure continued relevance. The Fisheries Program has also established advisory groups in some Regions to prioritize technology development projects.	FTC Priority Work Areas; FTC Advisory Committee Project Request Form and Meeting Minutes. Example of regional advisory group: Region 4 FTC Advisory Committee conducts an annual call for projects that extends to all Service Programs. The multi-program advisory board reviews the projects based on Regional conservation needs recommends projects accordingly.	8%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	76%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting ERROR	Weighted Score 64%	
Total Section Score						
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	Information collected annually from the Regions is used in budget allocations, requests, justifications, and performance reporting. However, there is no baseline performance data set established (i.e. there is no idea of the total number of recovery plan or fishery management plan objectives) and the database will need to be adjusted to provide adequate results information.	FIS Accomplishments module; budget justifications; MMS; 5-year construction plan; MOA for LSRCP; Example of the use of performance data to improve NFHS performance: the NFHS adjusted and reduced its striped bass production as the population was restored, adjusted its lake trout stocking programs from Lake Superior to Lake Michigan and Lake Huron as the population was restored in Lake Superior, and adjusted from shore stocking to reef stocking in response to evaluations made by other programs.	10%	0.1
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	No	While SES level managers are now going to be held directly accountable for performance results through Performance Plans, field managers are not. Field managers are generally held accountable for appropriate levels of their performance relative to supporting Work Activity Guidance and/or Performance Plans but not specific actions in those plans or guidance. Some Cooperative Agreements contain specific performance measures in terms of numbers and purpose for cultured fish, costs, timetables, and agreement duration.	FIS Accomplishment, Fish Distribution, Egg Distribution, and Imperiled Species Modules; MOA between BPA and DOI for LSRCP, Nashua NFH Work Activity Guidance, Conservation Exchange of FWS and MT, Biological Assessment of Artificial Propagation.	10%	0.0
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	Review of the previous 3 years obligation reports show that funds have been managed within target levels.	FIS Accomplishment Report, End of Year obligations.	10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	No	While an efficiency measure was developed during these PART deliberations and will help to achieve efficiencies and effectiveness, there currently are no incentives and procedures to measure and achieve efficiencies. The FIS database will need to be modified to capture efficiencies. Efficiencies may come from FTCs which provide technical support to the NFHS which could lead to overall efficiencies.	Evidence supplied included Mora water improvement award; FTC Priorities, Meetings, and Examples; Diet Study at Ennis NFH; ozone treatment technology; however, these documents do not demonstrate there are any incentives or procedures in place to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness.	10%	0.0
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	No	Although the Department of the Interior complies with managerial cost accounting standards, it does not yet have a financial management system that fully allocates program costs and associates those cost with specific performance measures. This requirement might be met through Activity Based Costing (ABC), which DOI is adopting for each of its bureaus. While the FWS has a cost allocation methodology to ensure that general administrative costs are allocated in a consistent manner to all activities and all appropriations of the FWS, this still does not cover the full costs of the program. The FWS is scheduled to begin implementing ABC in FY 2004.	FWS Budget Justification, FY 2003.	10%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	No	While the FWS generally employs sound financial management practices to administer all of its programs, including the NFHS, a January 2002, independent auditor's report identified four material internal control weaknesses and one reportable condition. Of these, two apply to service-wide processes and systems that the NFHS uses. The first applicable weakness cited was untimely and inaccurate financial reporting. The second weakness was inadequate security and controls over financial Management Systems. The FWS financial management system has specific system controls in place to minimize the risk of erroneous payments. In addition, the Regional NFHS staff review payment transactions recorded in the financial system to ensure that they are in accordance with the program's goals and objectives. The auditors found no significant problems with improper, duplicate or erroneous payments.	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Shared Commitments to Conservation 2001 Accountability Report of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Independent Auditors' Report, KPMG, January 21, 2002; Financial Management System, FWS policy. Division of Finance - General Operations Budget Fiscal Year 2001 vs. Fiscal Year 2002.	10%	0.0
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	Internal review of the NFHS via the 3As analysis established a baseline for identifying management deficiencies. Twenty management controls for program direction, facility needs, and hatchery operations are in place to monitor program activities. FONS and MMS databases are used to identify and prioritize deficiencies in areas such as recovery, restoration, mitigation, and Tribal trust responsibilities.	3As analysis. Management Control list update of August 8, 2002; FONS; MMS; Alignment Report and reduction of Non-aligned programs. For example, the 3As analysis identified the need for more project evaluations on management and performance (e.g. stocking schedules). Based on this need, projects to address priority evaluation needs are now included in FONS.	10%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
8 (RD 1) <i>Does the program allocate funds through a competitive, merit-based process, or, if not, does it justify funding methods and document how quality is maintained?</i>	Yes	The Whirling Disease National Partnership is a consortium that emphasizes fish health, fishery productivity, fisheries ecology, and adaptive fishery management. The NFHS provides grant money to the Partnership that is matched by sponsoring agencies and private organization funding to pursue research and management activities consistent with the Partnership charter. FWS also participates in a steering committee to provide coordination, establish research priorities, supervise a peer review process for selecting projects to be funded, and publicize the research results.	Charter for the National Partnership for the Management of Wild and Native Coldwater Fishes.	8%	0.1
9 (RD 2) <i>Does competition encourage the participation of new/first-time performers through a fair and open application process?</i>	Yes	Grant funds distributed through a competitive process for Whirling Disease research appears to be biased towards a few institutions but not necessarily against new/first time applicants.	Whirling Disease Research Update for OMB, July 2001; Whirling Disease Research Status Report for OMB, Feb. 2000.	8%	0.1
10 (RD 3) <i>Does the program adequately define appropriate termination points and other decision points?</i>	No	In some aspects of the FTC work there are natural termination points such as with the cooperative INAD (investigational new animal drugs) program. This program works with pharmaceutical manufacturers to gain approval of aquaculture drugs. Once the research is completed and the approval process is final, the Service turns it over to the pharmaceuticals. Beyond completion dates there appears to be no mid-term or major program decision points such that termination could occur if performance is lacking or other conditions for termination are met.	Bonytail Identification and Genetic Monitoring Study Plan; Virgin River Resource Management and Recovery Program Proposed Scope of Work; Spending Plan for Candidate Species: Preservation of shortnose sturgeon sperm from distinct population segments.	7%	0.0
11 (RD 4) <i>If the program includes technology development or construction or operation of a facility, does the program clearly define deliverables and required capability/performance characteristics and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?</i>	Yes	Study plans that specify products, costs and schedules for FTC projects are developed as specifically as appropriate for the level of knowledge available, i.e., the more advanced the technology, the more specific the study plan can be.	Study Plan for Bozeman FTC project to enhance rearing or rainbow trout using synthetic structure for nutrient supplementation, etc.; Study Plan for Dexter NFH/FTC for Propagation of Rio Grande Silvery Minnow.	7%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Section Score				100%	53%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
-----------	------	-------------	---------------	-----------	----------------

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1	<i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	Small extent	New long-term goals have been identified for the NFHS by the PART team for FY 2004 but relevant data is unavailable to rate performance. Nevertheless, past NFHS performance contributed toward progress of achieving previous FWS GPRA long-term goals to recover listed species and restore depleted populations. However, the FWS was unable to provide accomplishment data relative to these goals and targets. Additionally, Annual Performance Plans indicate that progress toward accomplishment of the long term goal was delayed compared to the original plan. Targets below may change based on input from the field in the near future.	1999, 2000, & 2001 FWS Annual Performance Reports/2001, 2002, & 2003 FWS Annual Performance Plans; GAO report, National Fish Hatcheries: Authority Needed to Better Align Operations with Priorities (page 7); Strategic Plan for the Merrimac River; Work Activity Guidance for Nashua NFH; 2001 Accomplishment Module projects; FY 2000 Annual Reports (Nashua NFH, Laconia FRO, Maine Fisheries Program Coordinator); Imperiled species module roll-up.	20%	0.1
---	---	--------------	---	--	-----	-----

<p>Long-Term Goal I: Recover Listed Species -- % of NFHS priority recovery tasks implemented as prescribed in approved Recovery Plans. Target: 5 year projection - 48% (3% increase = 10 new objectives addressed) Actual Progress achieved toward N/A -- New Goal goal:</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal II: Restore Depleted Native Populations -- % of NFHS priority restoration tasks implemented as prescribed in approved Fishery Management Plans. Target: 5 year projection - 75% (based on one additional accomplishment) Actual Progress achieved toward N/A -- New Goal goal:</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal III: Recover Listed Species and Restore Depleted Native Populations -- % of survival targets, prescribed by approved management plans, met for hatchery stocks of imperiled species Target: 5 year projection - 86% (based on 0.2% increase per year) Actual Progress achieved toward N/A -- New Goal goal:</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal IV: Ensure Healthy Fish Populations -- % of DOI watershed units with wild fish health surveys current Target: 5 year projection - 21 (3% increase = 60 additional watershed units sampled) Actual Progress achieved toward N/A -- New Goal goal:</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal V: Mitigate for Federal Water Projects -- % of mitigation production targets met. Target: 5 year projection - 93% (stable pending cost reimbursement) Actual Progress achieved toward N/A -- New Goal goal:</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal VI: Efficient Production -- lbs/\$ of healthy rainbow trout as efficiency measure for recreation.</p>

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
			Target: 5 year projection - \$0.41 lb/\$1.00 Actual Progress achieved toward N/A -- New Goal goal:			

2	Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?	small extent	New annual goals have been identified for the NFHS by the PART team for FY 2004 but relevant data is unavailable to rate performance. Nevertheless, past NFHS performance contributed toward previous FWS GPRA goals to recover listed species and restore depleted populations. However, the FWS was unable to provide accomplishment data relative to these goals and targets. Additionally, Annual Performance Plans indicate that accomplishment of the annual goal were not met in the case of establishing a baseline and another was changed from the original plan. Targets below may change based on input from the field in the near future.	1999, 2000, & 2001 FWS Annual Performance Reports/2001, 2002, & 2003 FWS Annual Performance Plans; GAO report, National Fish Hatcheries: Authority Needed to Better Align Operations with Priorities (page 7); Strategic Plan for the Merrimac River; Work Activity Guidance for Nashua NFH; 2001 Accomplishment Module projects; FY 2000 Annual Reports (Nashua NFH, Laconia FRO, Maine Fisheries Program Coordinator); Imperiled species module roll-up.	20%	0.1
---	---	--------------	--	--	-----	-----

Key Goal I: Recover Listed Species -- % of NFHS priority recovery tasks implemented as prescribed in approved Recovery Plans. Performance Target: 45% Actual Performance: N/A -- New Goal						
Key Goal II: Restore Depleted Native Populations -- % of NFHS priority restoration tasks implemented as prescribed in approved Fishery Management Plans. Performance Target: 72% Actual Performance: N/A -- New Goal						
Key Goal III: Recover Listed Species and Restore Depleted Native Populations -- % of survival targets, prescribed by approved management plans, met for hatchery stocks of imperiled species Performance Target: 85% Actual Performance: N/A -- New Goal						
Key Goal IV: Ensure Healthy Fish Populations -- % of DOI watershed units with wild fish health surveys current Performance Target: 18% Actual Performance: N/A -- New Goal						
Key Goal V: Mitigate for Federal Water Projects -- % of mitigation production targets met. Performance Target: 93% Actual Performance: N/A -- New Goal						
Key Goal VI: Efficient Production -- lbs/\$ of healthy rainbow trout as efficiency measure for recreation. Performance Target: 0.37 lbs/\$1.00 Actual Performance: N/A -- New Goal						

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	small extent	The FTC's develop new technologies that are designed to improve efficiency throughout the NFHS but there is no data to substantiate efficiency gains. Examples of FTC activities include: Cryopreservation techniques developed at FTC's that are now being employed at NFH's to more efficiently manage broodstocks for restoration and recovery. Ozone water sterilization is being used to remove pathogens from the water early on, minimizing the need for expensive disease treatments later. Ultrasound techniques have enabled mass vaccinations.	Mora award; Diet study at Ennis; Other FTC technologies.	20%	0.1
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	large extent	An in-depth draft FWS rainbow trout cost comparison study indicates the NFHS is the most cost effective and efficient regional producer of rainbow trout, with few exceptions. Nevertheless, a recent NWPPC study of eight northwest hatcheries indicates a state hatchery is more cost effective in producing fall Chinook salmon compared to a NFHS hatchery. A 1997 national survey of representatives of ten government agencies, fishery management councils, and conservation organizations rated the FWS rated as the overall best Federal agency in achieving the fishery conservation goals of the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan.	FWS Preliminary Benefit-Cost Analysis for the Competitive Sourcing of Rainbow Trout and Competitive Sourcing Plan and Model; Northwest Power Planning Council, Artificial Production Review - Economic Analysis, Phase I, July 2002; 1997 Evaluation of the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan, April 1997.	20%	0.1
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	No	There have been no comprehensive independent evaluations looking at the effectiveness of the NFHS program. Numerous reports have looked at various aspects of the NFHS (e.g., GAO report "Classification of Distribution of Fish and Fish Eggs Needs Refinement"), however, there are no reports that capture the full range of a program's impact, effectiveness, financial management, and other measurements of performance.		20%	0.0
Total Section Score					100%	33%

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Overall purpose is to preserve historic properties nationwide. Achieving that purpose requires a complex inter-governmental partnership that recognizes and seeks to influence critical historic preservation decisions by local groups and private property owners through grants, incentives, national recognition, and other non-prescriptive means.

Evidence: The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 sets out the overall purpose and intergovernmental structure. Components of the overall effort are addressed through other acts, such as the Historic Sites Act, the NPS Organic Act, the Archeological Resources Protection Act, the American Battlefields Protection Act, and various tax code provisions.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Problem is to serve the public interest in preserving historic structures of national significance, while respecting the dominant principle of private property rights. Continued interest in historic preservation can be seen through the growing popularity of historic sites; the annual additions to State's historic site inventories and NPS's National Register of Historic Places (National Register); the increasing number of preservation projects funded through the "Save America's Treasures" (SAT) grants and other sources; the Administration's Preserve America initiative; the increase in Certified Local Governments (CLGs); and the growing private investment in tax-assisted historic rehabilitation projects.

Evidence: See the Historic Preservation Fund annual reports. First Lady Bush announced the Preserve America initiative on March 3, 2003. The National Register currently has 76,000 listings, compared to 71,000 in 1999. SAT grants elicited over 450 applications in 2003, up from 119 in 1999 when the program was established. Tribal assumption of SHPO duties on tribal land has grown from 12 initial tribes in 1996 to 37 in 2003. There are now 1,388 CLGs, up from 1,192 in 1999. Private investments in historic rehabilitation of commercial historic buildings encouraged through Federal preservation tax incentives has grown from \$2.3 billion in 1999 to \$3.2 billion in 2002 (over \$28 billion in historic preservation activity has been stimulated through tax incentives since 1976).

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program design depends on efforts from a wide range of governmental and private agencies, organizations, and individuals. These efforts are complementary, not duplicative. For example, Federal grants help support State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs) to implement duties under both Federal and State laws. In effect, State agencies perform activities under a Federal statute in return for partial Federal funding. CLGs contribute by managing design and land use in a manner not appropriate for Federal or State governments.

Evidence: There are no duplicative programs. However, one indication of complementary efforts is the amount of non-federal funds leveraged by the program in FY 2001: \$34m in HPF grants leveraged at least a matching amount of State funds; SAT grants leveraged at least \$30 million; the rehabilitation tax credits stimulated \$2.7 billion in private investment in historic preservation projects. Another example of complementary efforts is the coordination between SAT grants, tax credits, and listings on state and national inventories.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

1.4 **Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program design takes advantage of the various capabilities of the respective governmental and non-governmental partners. NPS carries out (or provides grants to SHPOs and THPOs to carry out) such governmental functions as promulgating regulations and standards, maintaining site inventories, approving National Register and National Historic Landmark (NHL) entries, and approving projects for compliance with Federal law. NPS also manages SAT grants. CLGs carry out zoning and project-specific reviews.

Evidence: The allocation of duties between Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments seems to be efficient, although there has been no cost-effectiveness study to confirm this. For example, SAT grants are targeted to avoid projects for which tax incentives or compliance regulations are the proper tool. SAT grants are competitively awarded to fill in gaps in historic preservation that are not adequately covered by Federal, State, or local programs. There are still opportunities to improve coordination between the current combination of mechanisms that make up this program.

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Funds are effectively targeted to support SHPOs and THPOs in implementing Federal statutes. NPS could promote effectiveness by providing incentives for SHPOs that perform well. Half of SAT grants are chosen through a rigorous competitive process, but the other half are determined through congressional earmarks, which may not go to the most meritorious projects.

Evidence: Competitive process ensures that SAT, tribal, and American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) project grants go to the most meritorious beneficiaries. State grants are distributed through a well-established formula process. Other Federal actions, such as accepting National Register and NHL nominations or approving projects for tax credits, follow well documented standards and guidelines. (See Secretary's Standards and Guidelines.)

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program has multiple long-term performance measures, all keyed to the outcome of more historic properties protected outside the National Park System. The measures address different types of protection in different degrees as a result of various actions by all levels of government and the private sector.

Evidence: The long-term performance measures are specifically set out in the GPRA goals that appear in the DOI and NPS strategic plans.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The long-term targets are all quantified. Targets are established by analyzing previous performance and funding data to determine what is achievable, assuming level funding in the future.

Evidence: See GPRA goals cited above. Even with level funding, the targets call for an ever-increasing number of historic properties to be protected through program activities.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program's annual performance measures are established, quantifiable GPRA goals. They measure the various means for achieving protection of historic properties and so are directly tied to achieving long-term targets.

Evidence: See GPRA annual performance measures for cultural resources outside the National Park System.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Baselines have been established for annual measures by using cumulative data from previous annual reports. Annual targets, like long-term targets, are established by analyzing previous performance and funding data to determine what is achievable, assuming level funding in the future.

Evidence: See cumulative data calculations and annual GPRA goals. Annual targets call for an ever-increasing number of historic properties to be protected through program activities.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: All state and tribal program grant recipients must prepare, carry out, and report on scopes-of-work based on duties set out in statute. All of these scopes-of-work include quantifiable measures of activities directly tied to the program's annual and long-term goals. Recipients of preservation project grants, as well as tax credit recipients, must carry out their projects in accordance with the Secretary's Standards.

Evidence: The commitment of partners is documented in grant agreements and final reports, covenants, easements, agreements by local governments to assume CLG status, agreements by tribes to assume THPO status under Section 101(d) of the NHPA, agreements by ABPP grant recipients for permanent protection of battlefields, and plans for SAT and other project-specific grants. Historically Black Colleges and Universities have not done as well in meeting program goals, as shown by the slow obligations of grant funds.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: There have not been regularly scheduled, objective, independent evaluations of how well the program is performing. DOI should conduct (or authorize an outside entity to conduct) an independent evaluation.

Evidence: Although there have been no independent evaluations, NPS activities are regularly subject to scrutiny from state and tribal partners, outside groups (such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation, or NTHP), and other clients.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	75%	89%	75%	

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Program budgeting is not clearly based on performance goals. Instead, budget requests are based more on incremental changes from previous appropriations.

Evidence: Recent NPS budget request justifications do include performance measures, but they do not indicate how funding and policy decisions affect performance or why the requested mix of performance and funding is appropriate.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS continues to work with SHPOs, THPOs, and CLGs to measure performance of day-to-day operations. NPS and DOI are looking for ways to better integrate budget and performance information, such as using the PART and other information to make FY05 budget recommendations. In response to question 2.6 of this PART, DOI should conduct (or authorize an outside entity to conduct) an independent evaluation to examine program effectiveness.

Evidence: NPS ensures that: (1) States have NPS-approved Comprehensive State Historic Plans (required by Section 101(b)(3) of the NHPA); (2) State Plans are updated with community involvement at least every 5 years; and (3) each annual grant application cross-references State Plan objectives and implements the Plan through grant-assisted activities (see Chapter 7 of the HPF Grants Manual; see Georgia State Plan for 2001-2006). The NPS strategic planning process has led to more refined performance measures each year.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program annually collects from States and Tribes performance data that are directly tied to the program's annual and long-term performance measures and targets. These data become the basis for determining future targets that are ambitious, but achievable. It also collects useful information on tax credits and ABPP. Better information is needed on the performance results of SAT grants.

Evidence: See sample End-of-Year reports. See also procedures for State Program Review. NPS used to conduct quadrennial, on-site reviews to confirm the accuracy of the annual data, but this process has been suspended for lack of funding. NPS will need to either reinstate these reviews or find other ways to verify the accuracy of the data.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	75%	89%	75%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS requires States and tribes to set their specific performance targets (e.g., number of properties inventoried) and then report each year on actual performance versus targets and explain any significant deviations. Tax credit approval, Section 106 reviews, National Register listings and other activities have specific standards and timeframes that must be met to be approved. SAT grants must meet strict standards, including matching funds. In all of these cases, past performance by grantees is taken into account when making awards.

Evidence: See sample grant agreement and end-of-year report. See implementing regulations for National Register process (36 CFR 60), Section 106 process (36 CFR 800), and Tax Credit program (36 CFR 67) for timeliness measures. See 36 CFR 61 and the Secretary's Standards for quality of preservation work to be performed.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS has a "use or lose" policy that ensures timely expenditure of grant funds for state and tribal programs. Project funding is obligated as soon as feasible following competitive selection. Operating funds for NPS program staff are one-year funds with no carry-over.

Evidence: See obligation rate data, grantee expenditure data, use or lose grant condition, funds recapture data, WASO expenditure records. The program receives very few grantee audit reports under the Single Audit Act, because the dollar amounts are so small.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program has not yet established efficiency targets for grantees, as there is no current basis for determining optimal per-unit costs for mandated NHPA activities. However, some efficiency is provided through a "delegated" decision-making process that empowers front-line managers (i.e., SHPOs and THPOs) to establish and address specific preservation priorities in a manner that is most cost-effective for them. The program is reviewing options to improve IT security and efficiency.

Evidence: See organizational structure for program implementation, with many activities delegated to SHPOs and THPOs. Review of IT operations are part of a DOI-wide effort. DOI should examine options for providing incentives for SHPOs and THPOs to increase cost effectiveness.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS collaborates closely with SHPOs, THPOs, CLGs and other groups in implementing NHPA activities. This is essential, given the decentralized structure required under NHPA. NPS also works closely with other groups, such as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, in implementing the Preserve America initiative. It coordinates with NEA, NEH, and IMLS in the review of SAT grant applications. The program regularly carries out cooperative projects with the National Conference of SHPOs and the NTHP.

Evidence: NPS performance measures, plans, grant announcements, and other documents are developed jointly by NPS and its partners. NPS reports are based on data collected by States and other partners. SAT grant application instructions show the level of multi-agency coordination in reviewing and approving those grants. NPS regularly provides training for Federal Preservation Officers in other agencies.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Management controls introduced in 1979 result in exceptionally high obligation and expenditure rates for HPF formula grants to States and tribes. Internal controls implemented by NPS for Historic Preservation grants minimize erroneous payments. Grantees must spend or obligate 75% of grant funds within the fiscal year of appropriation, and must spend all funds by the end of the following fiscal year. Competitively awarded project grants also have expenditure deadlines; recapture rates for unspent funds are low.

Evidence: No material weaknesses related to this program. NPS minimizes erroneous payments by requiring grantee Final Project & End-of-Year Reports to compare the NPS-approved budget with costs actually incurred. If grantee has erroneously billed, NPS requires repayment. SMARTLINK electronic payments both improve efficiency and avoid erroneous payments. Other controls include a "Use or Lose" policy (amounts over 25% of a State's grant that are carried over after the first year may be reapportioned to others) and a requirement to expend all funds by the end of the second year.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program has internal procedures for addressing program management deficiencies, such as when SHPOs do not obligate funds as planned or significantly fall short of annual performance targets. NPS is using SMARTLINK and other IT improvements to improve efficiency.

Evidence: See sample End-of-Year reports. See also procedures for State Program Review. To avoid backsliding on management efficiencies, NPS needs to either reinstate its on-site reviews to confirm the accuracy of annual data provided by SHPOs and THPOs, or find another way to verify the accuracy of the data.

3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program has reporting procedures for grantees to provide precise information on expenditures, FTEs, and products for each of the NHPA activities. The program has a strong relationship with its grantees and a high level of understanding of what they do, but it no longer has a regular process for reviewing the accuracy of data provided by SHPOs and THPOs.

Evidence: See sample End-of-Year reports. See also procedures for State Program Review. To avoid backsliding on management efficiencies, NPS needs to either reinstate its on-site reviews to confirm the accuracy of annual data provided by SHPOs and THPOs, or find another way to verify the accuracy of the data.

3.BF2 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program collects meaningful annual performance data from grantees. The information is compiled, aggregated, and published in an easy-to-read annual report. Information on the performance of each grantee is maintained and available to anyone in easily accessible form, but it is not published as part of the brief annual report.

Evidence: See Annual Reports and more detailed compilations.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 35%

Explanation: Long-term goals reflect an ever-increasing number of historic properties that are protected by some means. The program is on track to meet each of those goals.

Evidence: See GPRA results data.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 35%

Explanation: Because annual goals are based on past performance and assumptions of level funding, abnormally high past performance (leading to unreasonably high expectations), or funding reductions can on occasion cause failure to meet an annual target. However, most annual targets are achieved, and use of a 3-year average mitigates unusual swings in performance.

Evidence: See GPRA Annual Reports.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 15%

Explanation: Although the program lacks per-unit-cost" efficiency measures, it has been able increase the number of properties protected with level or slightly declining funds. Better efficiency measures would likely show that this decentralized process is relatively efficient in implementing a variety of preservation tools.

Evidence: NPS has rough estimates of the cost of giving an historic property a new designation or other level of protection. This measures is still a work in progress and needs to be used in making program decisions.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: There are no other programs with the purpose of promoting historic preservation of private properties. Others may preserve their own historic properties, but no one else functions as coach, cheerleader, and referee.

Evidence: For the purposes of this PART, the SHPOs and THPOs that receive grants through this program are considered part of this program. These organizations are the only ones outside of NPS that have a similar responsibility for promoting historic preservation of private properties.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NO Question Weight: 15%

Explanation: There have not been regularly scheduled, objective, independent evaluations of how well the program is performing. DOI should conduct (or authorize an outside entity to conduct) an independent evaluation.

Evidence: None

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service

Measure: Historic properties newly designated as National Historic Landmarks.
Additional Information: 2,227 NHLs in FY 1999.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2000	25	33	
2001	25	31	
2002	33	0	
2003	25		
2004	10		
2005	10		
2006	10		
2007	10		
2008	10		

Measure: National Historic Landmarks in good condition.
Additional Information: Overall number of NHLs expected to increase slightly each year with new designations.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2000	90%	95%	
2001	90%	90%	
2002	90%	95%	
2003	90%		
2004	90%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: National Park Service

Measure: National Historic Landmarks in good condition.

Additional Information: Overall number of NHLs expected to increase slightly each year with new designations.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2005	90%		
2006	90%		
2007	90%		
2008	90%		

Measure: Number of historic properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Additional Information: 70,019 listings in FY 1999.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2000	1,300	1,402	
2001	1,200	1,434	
2002	1,400	1,454	
2003	1,300		
2004	1,200		
2005	1,150		
2006	1,100		
2007	1,050		
2008	1,000		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: National Park Service

Measure: Percent of historic properties (i.e., potentially eligible for the National Register) that are currently protected by historic preservation programs.

Additional Information: Targets based on FY02 baseline of 3.0% (59,800 of 1,986,400). Percent may decline as the overall inventory of eligible properties grows faster than the number of listings and other protection.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2000	2.8%	3.0%	
2001	2.7%	3.0%	
2002	2.8%	3.0%	
2003	2.9%		
2004	2.8%		
2005	2.8%		
2006	2.7%		
2007	2.7%		
2008	2.7%		

Measure: Number of historic properties inventoried, evaluated, or officially designated by States, Tribes, and local partners per year.

Additional Information: Includes 59 States and territories, 35 Tribal Preservation Offices, and 1,350 Certified Local Governments.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2000	162,400	163,900	
2001	185,400	260,600	
2002	291,200	216,800	
2003	212,800		
2004	215,700		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: National Park Service

Measure: Number of historic properties inventoried, evaluated, or officially designated by States, Tribes, and local partners per year.

Additional Information: Includes 59 States and territories, 35 Tribal Preservation Offices, and 1,350 Certified Local Governments.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2005	218,600		
2006	218,700		
2007	218,800		
2008	218,900		

Measure: Cost of giving an historic property a new designation or other level of protection.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)
2000		\$15,800	
2001		\$13,200	
2002		\$16,500	
2003	\$16,500		
2004	\$16,000		

**OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)
Research & Development Programs**

Name of Program: National Mapping

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	yes	The purpose of National Mapping or "The <i>National Map</i> ", the USGS' mapping program, is to assure public access to consistent, high quality, geospatial data and information to help inform decision making by natural resource managers, the public and others. The <i>National Map</i> enhances the Nation's ability to access, integrate and apply geospatial data. The mission of the USGS mapping program began to evolve in the early to mid 1990's from a primary producer of map data to one of coordination and ensuring access to data. This transformation is reflected in the consistent mission statements in the referenced documents.	(a) National Mapping Division Strategic Plan 1997; mission statement of Overleaf and Figure 1 "A New Direction for the National Mapping Program", page 12; (b) Future Roles and Opportunities (NRC - pg6; pg 78 Sidebar 4.3) (c) Draft DOI Strategic Plan (July 30, 2002) Mission Component 4 (Serving Communities) Outcome Goal 2.	20%	0.2
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	yes	The Nation has a critical need for high quality geospatial data that is integrated and easily accessible to meet a variety of decision-making needs. While there are many sources of geospatial data, it is dispersed, often not publicly available, and not in a form that can be integrated with other data for analysis. The National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) serves as the Nation's strategy for comprehensive geospatial information. The <i>National Map</i> supports the NSDI. Partnerships with State and local government help provide the <i>National Map</i> with higher resolution, more current data, while helping to provide a consistent basis for the geospatial requirements of federal programs at the local level.	(a) NMD Strategic Plan, 1997, pg 1 (b) Future Role and Opportunities (NRC) page 66 (c) Geographic Information for the 21st Century (NAPA) 1998; pg 36, pg 44: "The bottom line is that the federal government is currently involved in many high-profile and important public purposes and missions that rely heavily on geographic information (GI).....Widespread public availability of related GI assists in the effective and efficient accomplishment of these missions." pg 53, pg 54;	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	yes	The NRC has stated that the databases and mapping coordination provided by the USGS "are essential to federal government", and that "the USGS is ideally situated to identify, develop, and implement an optimal multidatabase architecture." In 2001, the NSGIC stated that its "member states have the ability and willingness to leverage funding and political support in their state legislatures for engendering and furthering the partnerships with the U.S. Geological Survey, and . . . recognizes that USGS Civil mapping programs in the United States provide a foundation for geographic information infrastructure, and . . . the USGS National Map Initiative addresses this function in a comprehensive manner."	<p>(a) National Research Council (NRC), 1997, The Future of Spatial Data and Society, pg 5 references OMB Bulletin 93-14, which estimated the FY 1994 federal spatial data activities at \$4.4 billion. An equal or greater amount is spent by State and local governments and the private sector. Using these estimates, the USGS National Map program appropriation is between 1% and 3% of the of the total spending on spatial data activities in the U.S. For this small investment the public receives what has been characterized by the NRC as "an essential" resource.</p> <p>(b) National Research Council, 2001, Future Roles and Opportunities for the U.S. Geological Survey, pg 62-63, 77, 80.</p> <p>(c) National States Geographic Information Council resolution, September 11, 2001</p>	14%	0.1
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	yes	The USGS has the unique role of setting standards for specific layers of geospatial data (orthoimagery, elevation, hydrography) and promoting the use of these NSDI standards among all our partners. Therefore the USGS must serve a national coordinating role for the collection of geospatial data that no other federal mapping agency can provide. While many organizations may produce maps for their own purposes, the USGS will promote a nationally consistent and complete geographic framework that can be applied to the full range of needs for geospatial analysis for the entire Nation.	<p>The uniqueness of the USGS role has been independently documented in numerous forums. Of particular pertinence is the quotation from the NAPA report below.</p> <p>(a) Geographic Information for the 21st Century (NAPA) 1998; pg 143; pg149: "USGS's program...responds to the imperative for a common national database that would be met only spottily if left to a private-sector focused on 'marketable' production."</p> <p>(b) Future Roles and Opportunities for the USGS, NRC 2001, pg139</p> <p>(c) Land Remote Sensing Act 1992 (d) National Map Report, Issues and Actions, USGS.</p>	13%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	no	The USGS mapping program is in transition. It is recognized within the program that the program design must be strengthened to meet this new challenge. Implementation of some changes has already begun, and 5-year implementation plans are currently under review. It will be essential for USGS to move from producing the specialized products of its mapping centers and research activities to improving interaction with state and local government activities and use of cooperative agreements and grants for creative partnerships, needed to support development of the of the <i>National Map</i> for the NSDI.	(a) <i>The National Map</i> Report - Organizational Issues and Strategies, pg 16 & 17 (b) Geographic Information for the 21st Century (NAPA) 1998, pg 110 (c) Geographic Information for the 21st Century (NAPA) 1998, pg 110 (d) National Spatial Data Infrastructure, Partnership Program, (NRC) 2001 (e) Research Opportunities in Geography at the USGS, (2002 prepublication) NRC.	13%	0.0
6 (RD 1)	<i>Does the program effectively articulate potential public benefits?</i>	yes	The benefits of nationally consistent map data are extensively documented over time. More specifically, <i>The National Map</i> , a supporting component of the Geospatial One-Stop, will save time and money by reducing redundant data collection, allowing easy access to data through the use of interoperable standards, so that many different types of data can be integrated and analyzed. Types of benefits resulting from applications are far-reaching, from better preparation and response to fires and other disasters, to tracking of diseases. Studies have shown that investments in mapping resources are a significant economic multiplier affecting many sectors.	(a) Geographic Information for the 21st Century (NAPA) 1998, pg 36: "Governments are inherently geographic – being territorial jurisdictions with responsibilities for programs that benefit the peoples, lands, economies, and other enterprises within their borders – and they are highly dependent on geographic information (GI) and major sources of it." (b) National Mapping Division Strategic Plan, pg 1; pg 7&8 (c) <i>The National Map</i> Report, 2001, pg 1 (d) The OpenGIS Consortium website (e) Illinois State Geological Survey (ISGS) Special Report 3, Economic Benefits of Detailed Geologic Mapping to Kentucky. 1999	13%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
7 (RD 2) <i>If an industry-related problem, can the program explain how the market fails to motivate private investment?</i>	yes	While the market can and does provide large amounts of geospatial data, the market does not provide coordination to reduce redundancy of collection, ensure accessibility to the public, or guarantee long-term preservation of data. The private sector is the source for collection of most geospatial data. Industry consortia such as the Open GIS Consortium are becoming more active in promtimng standards and interoperability. However, there are some types of data and some locations for data (e.g., some remote areas of the country), that are not profitable for private sector data collectors. In those cases, the USGS acts as the data provider of last resort. Nearly 45 percent of the total mapping program is contracted out to the private sector.	(a) The National Map Report, pg 7: "A 1997 National Research Council report concluded that: 'Spatial data have helped form a foundation for commercial enterprises, such as delivery services, and have also led to enhanced market analyses. At the same time, the use of spatial data has reduced costs and increased efficiencies in a wide variety of areas where it is necessary to manage large networks of geographically dispersed facilities." (b) Geographic Information for the 21st Century (NAPA) 1998, pg 149: "USGS's program which responds to the imperative for a common national database that would be net only spottily if left to a private-sector focused on "marketable" production" - also, pg 154:	13%	0.1

Total Section Score	100%	87%
----------------------------	-------------	------------

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)					
--	--	--	--	--	--

1	<i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	yes	The long-term goals for the mapping program, shown in Section IV, Question 1, encompass the entire scientific and program management cycle for <i>The National Map</i> : improving the value of geospatial data by building <i>The National Map</i> distributed databases through partnerships with State and local government; ensuring national consistency and integration of geospatial data by leading implementation of NSDI standards; expanding understanding of the Earth's processes using remotely sensed data; informing decision making by applying high quality science to understand, model, and predict the rates, causes, and consequences of land surface change;	(a) <i>The National Map</i> Report (pg 1) Time frames are pg 20. (b) CTM, LRS, and GAM 5-yr plans for long-range goals - SEE DOCUMENTATION OF IV 1 & 2	11%	0.1
---	--	-----	---	--	-----	-----

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
2	<i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	Each component of the program appears to contribute important goals to the overall mission. Key Goals for each program are listed in Section IV. Goals for 2002 were not all quantitative or provided clear decision points, and links to long term goals were not clear. Goals developed for 2003 have addressed this concern.	(a) Cooperative Topographic Mapping Directions for FY03, 06/06/2002 (b) GAM Annual Program Guidance (c) LRS Annual Program Guidance See section IV for FY03 annual performance measures.	11%	0.1
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	yes	The two main types of contractors for the mapping program are the EDC contract and the Cartographic Services Contract. The contracts are designed to support the goals of the mapping program. In addition, Interagency Agreements (IA) with federal partners and Innovative Partnerships (IP) with State and local partners to collect data for <i>The National Map</i> require the partner to adhere to the applicable NSDI (or national map standards when NSDI standards are not yet available). It is part of the normal USGS and FGDC processes to vet new standards with partners to gain consensus.	(a) EROS Data Center Statement of Work (b) Cartographic Services Contract Statement of Work (c) US Forest Service Interagency Agreement for Production and Maintenance of Primary Services Quadrangle Maps "...maps produced under this IA shall meet . . . standards . . . jointly prepared . . ." (d) Various Innovative Partnership agreements	11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	yes	Cooperation and collaboration occurs regularly within the USGS mapping program. For all of the partnership programs, partners contribute funding or in-kind resources. A few examples include: the DOI high priority mapping program (in FY 1999, \$11 million in USGS funds accomplished overlapping needs of DOI bureaus that would have cost \$72 million if handled separately); the Forest Service Single-Edition Program (the Forest Service collects data to USGS specifications, using no USGS funds); the GeoMac program (a fire mapping website); the National Digital Orthophoto Program, or NDOP, (USGS contributes approximately ten percent of the program costs); the USGS collaborations with local and State governments for <i>National Map</i> pilot projects (partners may provide the Internet services, data collection, data integration, data maintenance or other in-kind services); and many others. USGS currently can not tie how partnership activities contribute to specific annual and long term goals.	(a) DOI High Priority Program Web Pages - Forest Service Single-Edition program statistics - USGS-NASA for Satellite Data Archive - USGS-NOAA Land Cover Characterization - National Digital Elevation Program (NDEP) - National Digital Orthophotography Program (NDOP) - USGS/NASA/NIMA Satellite Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) - Licensing of U.S. Commercial Satellite Companies - NIMA-NASA-USGS Verification and validation of commercial and civil satellite data - Committee of Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS) international collaborations - Landsat Ground Stations Operations Working Group - international cooperation - IGDC Remote Sensing Working Group	11%	0.1
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	No	USGS has regular reviews by the NRC. There was a NAPA study from four years ago, but it addressed mapping across federal, state, and local government. The NRC reviews are not in-depth enough to supply information that can fill gaps in performance and evaluate effectiveness. In the case of the NAPA review and possibly other, they are not done on a regular basis to provide necessary time series information. USGS policy review in 1996 can not be considered part of evaluations on a regular basis.	(a) National Research Council reports since 1995 dealing with the National Mapping Program (b) National Research Council current studies (c) Geographic Information for the 21st Century (NAPA) 1998 (d) USGS Review Policy, December 1996	11%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	yes	The mapping program proposed a new budget and management structure for FY 2003 in order to align the budget with the mapping program's goals. The 5-year plans for the mapping program sub activities articulate goals that can be accomplished at current funding levels for future years. Specific annual goals have been developed for program areas that are linked to the budget and should reflect changes in funding. But it is difficult to determine impacts of funding changes on achieving long-term goals.	(a) FY 2003 Greenbook (b) 5-year plans (c)see section IV annual and long term goals	11%	0.1
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	yes	To improve planning integration across the organization, the USGS developed and implemented a 5-year program planning process that will specify processes, timetables, and responsibilities to ensure that long-term plans for individual programs are rigorously linked with strategic goals of the organization, the annual science guidance, and program implementation and performance measurement. The process must ensure development of annual goals that are quantitative and clearly linked to long term outcomes.	(a) The USGS Planning process documentation (linked to the USGS Strategic Plan)* (b) <i>The National Map</i> Report (c) Geography Discipline 5-Year Plans *The table of contents from the Program Planning Model illustrates linkage from strategic direction to statement of annual priorities, and to implementation:	11%	0.1
8 (RD 1)	<i>Is evaluation of the program's continuing relevance to mission, fields of science, and other "customer" needs conducted on a regular basis?</i>	yes	In addition to the periodic National Research Council studies that frequently deal with the relevance of the program's mission to current customer needs, the USGS conducts customer surveys and "listening sessions" that constantly monitor the relevance of the program. One type of "listening system" is focused on State mapping partners. The results of these evaluations are incorporated into the strategic planning and the 5 year planning process. For the "listening sessions", the USGS provides feedback to the respondents on actions taken.	(a) National Research Council reports since 1995 dealing with the National Mapping Program (b) National Research Council current studies (c) Geographic Information for the 21st Century (NAPA) 1998 (d) USGS Mapping Program Customer Satisfaction/Outcome Surveys (e) USGS Listening Sessions (f) Annual USGS State Mapping Workshop	11%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
9 (RD 2) <i>Has the program identified clear priorities?</i>	yes	<p>Top priority for Cooperative Topographic Mapping is establishing partnerships. Where State and local communities already collect data, the USGS can help move the partners toward standard NSDI practices that will ensure high quality and allow data to be integrated nationally.</p> <p>For Land Remote Sensing, the top priority is to ensure that an archive of remotely sensed data is available as a resource for natural resource managers.</p> <p>Top priority for Geographic Analysis and Monitoring is periodic publication of a report on the Status and Trends of the Nation's Land Surface to help understand changes in land use, the causes, and how people and resources are affected.</p>	<p>(a) <i>The National Map</i> Report (b) 5-year plans (and 5-year Program Planning Model, including Annual Guidance document issued by the Director, USGS) (c) NRC Reports, particularly the Research Priorities</p>	11%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	89%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes, No, N/A)						
1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	yes	<p>The USGS tracks performance for various types of activities. For example, under the Cartographic Services Contract, as paper maps or digital databases of elevation data are updated, records are kept of quality and timeliness of output. These are tracked by contractor to provide a record of their effectiveness and efficiency to help understand which contractors are best for which types of work as other contracts are required. These are continuously updated. Map production is also tracked and reported quarterly.</p> <p>Customer surveys are also a very important measure of performance of the mapping program. Results of those surveys directly influence the direction and management of the program.</p>	<p>(a) NSGIC "Undaunted Courage" resolutions and letter to the USGS Director, Chip Groat.</p> <p>In November 2000, the National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC), sent the Director of the USGS a resolution asking that the USGS realign its mapping program to generate its traditional products from digital framework data and to take on the role of integrator of the NSDI framework data themes. That idea is the cornerstone of <i>The National Map</i> Report that the USGS Geography Discipline issued in November 2001, realigning the National Mapping Program. In a subsequent resolution, based on review of preliminary drafts of <i>The National Map</i> Report, NSGIC noted that "The USGS National Map Initiative addresses this function [role of framework integrator] in a comprehensive manner."</p> <p>(b) Customer surveys (c) <i>The National Map</i> Report - Issues and Actions (d) Customer Satisfaction Surveys (e) Customer Listening Sessions (f) Internal program reviews</p>	9%	0.1
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, sub grantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	yes	<p>The FY03 planning process is documented and makes the Regional Geographers and Program Coordinators responsible for final decisions of specific annual objectives. The SES Performance contracts hold them responsible for execution of the plan. The EROS Data Center contract and Cartographic Services Contract have the requisite performance and incentive clauses.</p>	<p>(a) SES Performance Contracts are used to hold program managers personally accountable for achievement of program results.</p> <p>(b) Contract Plan from EDC and performance reports</p> <p>(c) The FY03 Program Planning procedures for Mapping</p> <p>(d) Cartographic Services Contract</p> <p>(e) Survey Planning Model</p> <p>(f) Quarterly reports</p> <p>(g) Regular program reviews</p>	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	no	For every contract awarded, a trained, Departmentally certified Contracting Officer's Representative is responsible for overseeing and certifying that contract funds are spent for the intended purposes. They also verify that deliverables are received on time and that payments are processed in accordance with the Prompt Payment Act. However, a recent audit which resulted in a disclaimer opinion, identified problems in USGS accounting systems and prompt payment. See the explanation for question 6 for a description of the problem and question 7 for specific action that is being taken to address this problem. Further, Mapping's Funds Management System lacks automatic interface with FFS, this raises question of whether data submitted to FFS is correct and timely.	a) <i>2002 KPMG Independent Audit of USGS, USGS FY 2001 Audit Lessons Learned</i> . The weaknesses were cited USGS wide and there were 2 Mapping program specific problems. USGS is still undergoing a re-audit of FY 2001, before they can begin the FY 2002 audit. Further, obligation of funds by object classification at a level below the bureau level has not been presented to determine whether funds were obligated for intended purpose.	9%	0.0
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	no	It has not been demonstrated how USGS regularly applies incentives and procedures for management changes. DOI approved IT capital asset plans were not submitted (for FY 2003) with the annual budget. USGS did not that measures of efficiency or effectiveness are used for some of the activities under the old structure, such as unit costs of maps (e.g., standard setting, coordination). Internal activities are often funded on the basis of competing proposals to achieve specific program goals. This includes competition between centers and competition between researchers. Also, the new program management software system, BASIS+, is designed to help achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness. The printing and warehouse functions within the mapping program are undergoing review under OMB Circular A-76.	(a) CTM prospectus process for FY 03 (competition)	9%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	no	Present cost accounting systems of the Department comply with FASAB #4 - Managerial Cost Accounting. Full costs are reported at the segment level from the Departmental perspective and also from the bureau perspective. This includes full cost reporting by Department strategic goals in the Department's Annual Accountability Report and by bureau mission goals in bureau-level annual financial statements. Cost accounting at lower levels, as requested by individual PART reviews, does not currently accumulate full costs as defined in the PART instructions and OMB Circular A-11; for example, the full employer share of the annual accruing cost of retiree pension and health benefits is not included.	(a) FASAB #4	9%	0.0
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	no	There are currently unresolved material weaknesses, which have resulted in delay in release of the FY 2001 financial audit. The independent auditors found general control weaknesses in information technology (IT) security and internal control weaknesses in establishing and controlling reimbursable agreements. In addition, the auditors also found difficulties accounting for transactions created by two Geography systems and accounting for inventory, property, and delinquent accounts receivable.	(a) USGS, July 26, 2002 memo to Assistant Inspector General for Audits; (b) <i>Independent Auditor's Report</i> FY 2001, on the Interior Fiscal Year 2001 Annual Departmental Report on Accountability, pp.12,19, 20.	9%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	yes	The USGS is taking the necessary steps to resolve material weaknesses. The USGS has aggressively addressed the IT control weaknesses and made numerous improvements in this arena. The USGS converted to a new inventory system in FY 2002 that will greatly improve controls and accounting for our maps and map products. A comprehensive, independent internal control and accounting standards review of this and another mapping program system will be conducted shortly. The USGS is also attempting a better explanation of our inventory procedures for the auditors. The USGS' CFO has formally addressed senior management on several occasions on the importance of internal controls and other fiscal management issues. In addition, an extensive training campaign is underway to address the issues associated with reimbursable agreements, property, and delinquent accounts receivable.	(a) USGS, July 26, 2002 memo to Assistant Inspector General for Audits (b) Corrected SF 133 for the 3rd quarter of FY 2002 - The DOI FFS system has a deficiency that results in incorrect recoveries being documented on SF 133 documents. DOI has a plan to correct the problem. Until then, the USGS will manually work around the FFS system deficiency to properly report recoveries on the quarterly SF 133s.	9%	0.1
8 (RD 1) <i>Does the program allocate funds through a competitive, merit-based process, or, if not, does it justify funding methods and document how quality is maintained?</i>	yes	Research funds are allocated using a Prospectus process that has been in place for four years. Peer review of prospectus-funded research projects follows the National Science Foundation model. Proposals are reviewed and ranked by a panel of experts from within and outside the USGS using seven criteria, such as need for the research, innovation, clarity, and likelihood of success. The ranked list is used by the Selection Committee (the Chief Scientist for Geography and the three program managers) to determine which projects will be funded. Research proposal work plans are evaluated on three criteria: clarity of tasks; reasonableness and justification of budget; and identification of milestones, deliverables, products, and/or outcomes. Funds may be used to support the USGS and government scientists, university scientists, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows.	In FY 2003 Budget Request Documentation, research funds for FY 2002 of \$23.595 million were split among OMB research categories as follows: \$150,000 to R&D Performed by Colleges and Universities, \$19.895 million to Inherently Unique Research, and \$3.7 million to Merit-Reviewed Research with Limited Competitive Selection.(a) Award process for CTM's Nation Map project (b) Geography prospectus process	9%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
9 (RD 2) <i>Does competition encourage the participation of new/first-time performers through a fair and open application process?</i>	yes	<p>The largest research related contract in the mapping program is for operation of the EROS Data Center (EDC). The contract is awarded to one company and lasts for five years. The contract includes a range of scientific support functions and remote sensing applications. Typically, the contract turns over at the end of the contract cycle. That contract is currently up for bid and the incumbent is not among the finalists.</p> <p>For external research activities, competition is open to new and existing researchers. Cooperative Research and Development Activities (CRADAs) are also awarded on a competitive basis.</p>	<p>(a) CTM National Map prospectus process (b) Geography prospectus process (c) EDC contract</p> <p>Of eight CRADAs initiated during the period FY 1999 2002, seven are with first-time cooperators.</p>	9%	0.1
10 (RD 3) <i>Does the program adequately define appropriate termination points and other decision points?</i>	no	<p>USGS currently does adequately define termination points, but is developing The Enterprise Architecture and Business Planning processes for <i>The National Map</i> are driving the program to begin to develop decision points as part of the planning process. Projects will be reviewed each year for alignment with annual guidance and strategic direction and defunded when appropriate.</p>	<p>The <i>National Map</i> program element (CTM,LRS, GAM) 5-year planning documents and Budget justification materials have not identified termination or decision points. Efforts have been made to develop decision points for FY 2003.</p>	9%	0.0
11 (RD 4) <i>If the program includes technology development or construction or operation of a facility, does the program clearly define deliverables and required capability/performance characteristics and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?</i>	yes	<p>Operation of the Eros Data Center facility has clearly defined deliverables and performance characteristics listed in the statement of work. These are reviewed and updated for each contract cycle (5 years). Technology development for <i>The National Map</i> is carried out largely through Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs) which clearly identify performance characteristics and the responsibilities of each party. CRADAs are limited to three years, but are typically reviewed on an annual basis. CRADAs do not involve the exchange of funds.</p>	<p>(a) Eros Data Center Statement of Work (b) Cooperative Research and Development Agreements</p>	9%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	55%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)					

1	<i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	small extent	USGS has had vague long term goals that were difficult to measure progress. USGS has achieved some progress in attaining annual goals in 2002 but it is difficult to determine whether this is adequate progress. Sufficient targets or baselines did not exist to determine whether adequate progress was made toward a long term goal. 5- Year plans cited had vague goals that do not include quantifiable targets. Improved long-term goals are below.	(a) Draft CTM 5-Year Plan (b) Draft LRS 5-Year Plan (c) Draft GAM 5-Year Plan (d) USGS Budget Justification FY03 (e) Unmet goals are documented in <i>The National Map</i> Report, Nov. 2001, Appendix 1, page 29.	20%	0.1
---	---	--------------	--	--	-----	-----

Long-Term Goal I:	Improve the value of the geospatial data available to the natural resource decision makers and the public by building <i>The National Map</i> distributed databases through partnerships with State and local government that collect and maintain higher resolution, more current data.
Target:	By FY 2012, establish partnerships for data sharing or operation of <i>The National Map</i> for 80% of the area of the Nation that assures the data are current within 6 months in urban areas and 3 years in rural areas.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Partnerships were initiated in FY 2002 for a small number of pilot areas to test different partnership scenarios for <i>The National Map</i> . Long-term statewide partnerships now exist for Delaware and Texas. In addition, other partnerships for smaller geographic areas were established.
Long-Term Goal II:	Ensure availability of nationally consistent and integrated geospatial data by leading development and promoting the use of international, national, and FGDC NSDI standards among <i>The National Map</i> partners.
Target:	By FY 2012, provide seamless, integrated, nationally consistent data for 8 basic themes of geographic information.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	The program has developed a 5-year plan to address the long term goal above. Seamless, nationally consistent datasets are maintained and made available to the public for 5 of the 8 data layers (orthoimagery, elevation, hydrography, land cover, and names), but they are independently maintained and not yet integrated. The datasets are not yet integrated with more recent or higher resolution data from State and local governments. Integration of the existing national data sets was studied and prototypes developed.
Long-Term Goal III:	Expand the understanding of the Earth's processes by maintaining and providing access to a long-term archive of imagery of the Earth's surface, and other regional and global remotely sensed data as part of <i>The National Map</i> distributed databases.
Target:	Assure preservation of both older data and newly collected data and enhance access to remotely sensed assets.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	The program has collected and archived globally consistent Landsat satellite coverage since 1972 and has maintained a 99.998% data capture success rate for Landsat 7.
Long-Term Goal IV:	Inform decision making by natural resource managers, the public and others by applying high quality science to understand, model, and predict the rates, causes, and consequences of land surface change (e.g., changes to land cover, urbanization, deforestation) over time by integrating <i>The National Map</i> distributed database with other data.
Target:	Describe the status and trends of the Nation's land surface every 5 years
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Determined the contemporary rates and trends of land surface change for 15 of 84 national ecoregions. Initiated ten integrated science studies across the country. The program has developed a 5-year science plan to address specific scientific questions for the Status and Trends report.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
2	Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?	large extent	Past goals tended to be based on activities from the historic mission, such as updating map sheets. But USGS regularly met GPRA goals. Those goals are not being used now. The new goals are improved from the past, they are quantitative or identify decision points. USGS should continue look at whether the efficiency measure, annual goal IV, is the best efficiency measure or consider others such as cost per user (total cost/#of users).	(a) Annual Guidance of all three Geography components (b) USGS FY 2001 GPRA Quarterly Performance by Budget Activity (worksheet) (c)user cost efficiency measure- <i>Public Private Partnerships for Data Sharing</i> , RAND, 2000 p33.	20%	0.1

Key Goal I:	Test partnership strategies and confirm the concepts developed in <i>The National Map</i> Report through the implementation of pilot projects. Relates to the long-term goal for partnerships (Goal I).
Performance Target:	Complete 9 pilot projects, covering 1% of the Nation, which test all of the major concepts of <i>The National Map</i> .
Actual Performance:	Completed 8 pilot projects, covering 0.8% of the Nation. (The ninth pilot was terminated when it was determined that it was an ineffective partnership arrangement.) Analyses of results of the pilots are underway and will be used to develop a national partnership strategy for operating <i>The National Map</i> distributed databases.
FY 2003 Performance Target:	Initiate 10 new implementation projects using strategies developed from FY 2002 pilots and make 15% of the Nation's land area available through <i>The National Map</i> by the end of FY 2003. Currentness and maintenance of the data must be negotiated with each partner using the long-term goals as the objective. For currentness, the goal is for information to be updated within 6 months for urban areas and 3 years for rural areas; however, this will depend on the needs and resources of the partners.
Key Goal II:	Test potential techniques needed to fill gaps in data integration technical capabilities and standards to accomplish long term data integration goals (Goal II).
Performance Target:	Test freely available, industry-developed integration techniques and USGS developed techniques for integrating data from different, distributed databases. The National Map partners will each host data on their own databases. Integration technology is required in order to view the components of The National Map seamlessly.
Actual Performance:	Tested industry-developed technique for integration, evaluated effectiveness and identified additional capabilities needed to support The National Map. Developed working prototype of USGS integration model. These tests were done using USGS data holdings. These techniques will be further tested in the future using partner's data to determine the best standard to use in implementation of The National Map.
FY 2003 Performance Target:	By the end of FY 2003, develop a draft standard approach for integration of data from distributed databases. The standard must be vetted with partners to ensure that it is acceptable to them, so that they will implement it. In addition, industry will be relied upon to produce commercial off-the-shelf software that supports (implements) the standard, so the standard must be vetted with industry as well to ensure that products that use the standard are marketable.
Key Goal III:	Manage the Landsat 7 satellite mission operations to acquire, interpret, and disseminate data from archive for natural resources and hazards applications. Relates to long term imagery archive goal (Goal III).
Performance Target:	Achieve uninterrupted (100%) Landsat 7 data record and draft a plan for a future Landsat Data Continuity Mission (LDCM)
Actual Performance:	Continuity of mission was achieved. A continuous record of Landsat 7 data (100%) has been recorded over the last 15 months (since the launch of Landsat 7 the overall scene capture rate has been 99.998%).
FY 2003 Performance Target:	Achieve uninterrupted Landsat 7 data record. Continue planning for Landsat Data Continuity Mission (LDCM) and work with NASA to prepare for the deorbit of Landsat 7 as it begins to fail.

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
<p>Key Goal IV:</p> <p>Performance Target:</p> <p>Actual Performance:</p>		<p>Improve the efficiency of Landsat data processing. Relates to long-term goal related to archive of imagery (Goal III).</p> <p>Reengineer data processing to reduce personnel, simplify processing steps, and reduce lag time from data acquisition to "ready for distribution" by one half.</p> <p>Fully automated, hands-off operation achieved, lag time reduced from 12 hrs to 4 hours. Resulted in savings of \$100,000 per year in personnel costs and \$144,000 per year in hardware maintenance costs.</p>			
<p>FY 2003 Performance Target:</p>		<p>Reduce distribution costs per Landsat scene by implementing Landsat multi-scene package capability. This will allow customers to purchase groups of scenes at lower costs per scene than if they purchased scenes individually. For example, the Level 1 systematic product, the most popular Landsat product, is currently sold at a cost of \$600 per scene. The packaged cost will be \$600 for the first scene and \$250 each for additional scenes up to a total of 3, or \$1100 for 3 scenes. Other products will also be available in multi-scene packages.</p>			
<p>Key Goal V:</p> <p>Performance Target:</p> <p>Actual Performance:</p> <p>FY 2003 Performance Target:</p>		<p>FY 2001, plan and initiate the studies for the first Status and Trends Report of the Nation's Land Surface and develop applications that will help natural resource managers and others improve decision making. Relates to the long-term goal for understanding land surface change (Goal IV).</p> <p>Identify the specific studies needed to complete the first status and trends report.</p> <p>Identified 40 studies needed to fill gaps and initiated the studies. These studies will help complete the 84 ecoregions identified in the long-term goal.</p> <p>Initiate 10 new studies and continue 40 more started in previous years, designed to contribute to the Status and Trends report. 75% of these studies will produce peer-reviewed results in FY 2003. The rest will complete peer review later.</p>			

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weight	Weighted Score
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	small extent	This program is currently examining ways to achieve program efficiencies and improve program effectiveness. Anecdotal evidence exists to show that the pilots undertaken in FY 2002 have provided significant new benefits for those partners. Many states are now soliciting the USGS for similar implementations for FY 2003.	USGS cited savings in the Land Remote Sensing element which is mentioned in key goal IV above. An improved measure will be developed for FY 2003.	20%	0.1
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	small extent	There is not specific performance information. The Ordnance Survey, a UK mapping agency expends almost twice as much as USGS annually, employs half again as many people to map a country the size of Oregon. Their primary map products are equivalent to those produced by the USGS (1:25,000 scale). A Rand report on data sharing use case examples and cites the EROS data center as a good example of a data clearinghouse. The study does not provide objective performance information but suggest that there are comparable data sharing programs.	(a) NAPA, Executive summary, xxvii (b) Final Report, Ordnance Survey, The Economic Contribution of Ordnance Survey, Great Britain, 1999 (c) Public Private Data Partnerships, Rand 2001	20%	0.1
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	small extent	USGS is effective at creating and managing spatial data but needs to demonstrate leadership in geographic information science, particularly research in geographic information systems and the analysis of the data the Survey provides to others.	(a) National Academy of Public Administration (b) NRC - Future Roles and Opportunities for the USGS, pg 151 (c) USGS Mapping Division Customer Satisfaction/Outcome Surveys 4Q2001 (d) Research opportunities in Geography at the U.S. Geological Survey, (2002 prepublication) NRC, pp.11-118.	20%	0.1
6 (RD 1)	<i>If the program includes construction of a facility, were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?</i>	N/A	The mapping program has not constructed a facility for over twenty years.		0%	
Total Section Score					100%	40%

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

- 1.1 Is the program purpose clear?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
Explanation: Purpose is to provide safe and sustainable facilities for park visitors and staff, as part of the dual NPS mission of serving visitors and protecting park resources.
Evidence: Since 1916, NPS has managed facilities to "provide for the enjoyment" of visitors in national parks and to protect resources "unimpaired for . . . future generations."
- 1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
Explanation: Need is to manage and maintain the national park facilities that serve 300 million visitors annually.
Evidence: NPS has inventoried 40,000 assets and 12,000 miles of roads. It is now assessing the priority of these assets for the park mission.
- 1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
Explanation: These programs maintain the facility infrastructure within national parks. Increasing or decreasing funding for these programs has a direct impact on the condition of that infrastructure. No other Federal or non-Federal funding sources are available for this purpose.
Evidence: All funding for park facilities comes from NPS maintenance (\$379m in FY04), construction (\$327m), recreation fees for maintenance (\$75m), and FHWA's Federal Lands Highway Program (\$300m).
- 1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
Explanation: These capital asset programs are free from major design flaws. They are the only programs that address the Federal responsibility of federally owned facilities within national parks.
Evidence: NPS has clear responsibility for managing park assets. NPS and FWHA have an effective working relationship on park roads, which are solely a Federal responsibility. (Roads that serve other Federal lands are often a State responsibility.)
- 1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
Explanation: The programs are generally designed well, with most construction work performed through contracts. NPS is working to become more efficient in conducting maintenance operations.
Evidence: NPS contracts out most construction, design, and road repair work. Only a small amount of NPS maintenance is done through contracts, but DOI and NPS are initiating competitive sourcing efforts.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS can now measure its performance in maintaining regular assets by using a Facility Condition Index (FCI). It can also measure an asset's importance to the park mission by using an Asset Priority Index (API). By combining these two, NPS can target funding to improve the condition of priority assets.

Evidence: See initial FCI and API estimates. NPS now has baselines and targets in place, with annual condition assessments done for 96% of regular assets. It still needs to complete comprehensive assessments for over 80% of assets, but make more progress on concessions facilities.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Same as 2.1

Evidence: Same as 2.1

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS has a multi-year plan to complete condition assessments, implement a Facility Maintenance Software System (FMSS), and verify FCI and API measures. As NPS proceeds in completing these near-term output goals, it will shift toward meeting outcome goals based on FCI and related measures.

Evidence: See annual goals under the measures tab. Now that NPS has identified key milestones for establishing FCI and API performance measures for regular assets, it will need to establish similar milestones for concessions.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Same as 2.3

Evidence: Same as 2.3

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS leadership has placed great emphasis on getting park managers to assess facility conditions and prepare FCI performance measures. Park managers, in turn, work with contractors and other partners to ensure they support these goals. NPS generally does well in building consensus and support, but it will have to use more performance-based contracts for construction contractors, concessioners, and facility operators.

Evidence: See NPS Director and Deputy Director memos to parks on condition assessments. See also examples of communications with partners. NPS provided examples of construction contracts with performance specifications, but few of these incorporated performance-based incentives. It will also need to incorporate more performance-based incentives into concessions contracts. FHWA, the key partner for park roads, effectively uses a performance measure (Pavement Condition Rating, or PCR) to identify priorities for park road repairs.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS uses a Development Advisory Board (DAB) for independent review of individual construction projects. (DAB reviewed 174 projects in 2002.) Larger projects are also reviewed through DOI's Capital Planning and Information Control (CPIC) process. Booz Allen Hamilton (BAH) and PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC) have been contracted to verify and validate condition assessments for NPS-operated and concessions-operated facilities, respectively.

Evidence: See DOI's CPIC guidance and NPS's DAB guidelines. See BAH and PWC contracts. Although these project-by-project reviews are helpful, NPS would benefit from an independent review of the facility management program overall. One part of this program -- construction management -- was reviewed by the National Academy of Public Administration in 1998 and 2002. The 2002 review indicated that NPS has made significant progress in addressing concerns raised in the 1998 report.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS has not yet shown how budget requests link to particular performance targets. Nor has it documented how different funding levels would achieve different results. NPS may be able to do so next year, however, if it can continue to make progress in establishing performance measures, implementing FMSS, and introducing Activity-Based Costing (ABC).

Evidence: NPS provided some evidence of life-cycle cost estimating for individual assets, but it has not yet shown that it can estimate changes in outputs (i.e., facility conditions) based on changes in inputs (i.e., funding). This will require not just estimating future costs, but tracking actual expenditures in maintaining and constructing assets.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS has made across-the-board improvements in facility management, including better construction project management, service-wide condition assessments, implementation of a new maintenance management system, and establishment of FCI performance measures.

Evidence: See information on condition assessments, FMSS, FCI, API, DAB and CPIC reviews, and construction management reforms. See also draft Director's Order #80 on asset management program and 1998 NAPA report.

2.CA1 Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS regularly conducts value analysis and value engineering to identify potential cost savings. It also uses capital asset plans for major projects, although it is struggling to use earned value management properly. NPS has created a new facility planning model to prepare size and space standards for major facilities, as recommended by the 1998 NAPA report.

Evidence: See DOI's CPIC guidance and NPS's DAB guidelines. See BAH and PWC contracts. See value analysis and value-engineering reports. See Capital Asset Plans presented to DAB and CPIC. See presentations on Facility Planning Model.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS is close. It has built a foundation to collect high-quality performance data, but it cannot yet document how it regularly uses such data to adjust program priorities, allocate resources, or take other management actions. NPS has also made progress on capital asset plans, but it needs to show more clearly that the plans properly track earned value. NPS could reach a Yes answer next year if progress continues.

Evidence: NPS is close to obtaining credible and timely performance data from FMSS, but has not yet documented that the system can generate the information needed to manage the program. NPS will also need to describe how it uses performance measures, with examples of recent management actions based on performance data. One example could be incorporating FCI measures into the NPS process for identifying construction project priorities.

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS has begun to hold individual park managers accountable for facility conditions, but more work is needed. NPS leadership has allocated certain maintenance funds to parks on the basis of their progress in completion of condition assessments. Park superintendents performance evaluations are based on program performance, although these could be tied more closely to specific FCI targets. DAB reviews hold superintendents accountable for specific construction projects. Construction contractors have to meet minimum performance thresholds, although NPS needs to make greater use of performance incentives.

Evidence: See 3/4/03 memo from NPS Deputy Director on allocating FY03 maintenance funds. See background information on DAB reviews. See examples of superintendent performance reviews and concession contracts with performance thresholds.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS has made progress in increasing its annual obligations for construction, but it continues to carry over large unobligated balances. NPS also has large unobligated balances in recreation fee receipts, although this has stabilized as the program has matured. NPS should prepare year-end spending reports that compare planned and actual expenditures by construction project or program element. NPS also needs better ways to report on recreation fee expenditures.

Evidence: Unobligated balances for NPS construction have grown from \$277m at the end of FY00 to \$378m after FY01 and \$395m after FY02. This is despite NPS efforts to increase obligations from \$297m in FY01 to \$370m in FY02. Higher obligations in FY03 should start to bring down the carryover balances. NPS still carries over too much in recreation fee receipts; it carried over nearly \$300m from FY02, which is double the amount of annual collections.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS has focused on completing condition assessments and establishing output measures using FCI, but now it must look for ways to measure efficiency improvements. Ongoing competitive sourcing efforts should help NPS identify the most efficient operation, whether in-house or by contractor. DOI should help NPS by reinvigorating its Facility Metrics Working Group.

Evidence: NPS has begun to identify efficiency measures, but it has not yet begun to track them. For maintenance, this may depend upon full implementation of FMSS. For construction, it will require better tracking of actual costs against estimated costs. Competitive sourcing should start to show results by next year.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS collaborates closely with DOT's Federal Highway Administration in the management of park roads. The two agencies jointly develop performance goals, planning documents, and resource allocation decisions.

Evidence: See NPS budget justifications, planning documents, and maintenance guidelines. Although NPS works well with FHWA, it could work more closely with other DOI bureaus. DOI could help by reinvigorating its Planning, Design, Construction and Maintenance Council.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS traditionally has weak financial management practices. It is one of the key players in two DOI-wide material weaknesses: inadequate department-wide maintenance management capability, and inadequate controls over property, plant, and equipment.

Evidence: See DOI's FY02 Annual Report on Performance and Accountability.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS has made across-the-board improvements in facility management, including better construction project management, service-wide condition assessments, implementation of a new maintenance management system, and establishment of FCI performance measures.

Evidence: See information on condition assessments, FMSS, FCI, API, DAB and CPIC reviews, and construction management reforms. See also draft Director's Order #80 on asset management program and 1998 NAPA report.

3.CA1 Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS has used its DAB process as an Investment Review Board under CPIC. This has forced project sponsors to specify up-front their objectives and milestones, and has given NPS leadership a way to monitor performance in meeting those goals. DOI oversees this with its own CPIC process. NPS uses value analysis and value engineering to avoid costs and improve performance.

Evidence: See information on DAB reviews. Out of 174 projects reviewed in 2002, 10 were rejected, 37 required responses or changes, and 26 were approved with conditions. NPS reports that its value analysis helped avoid \$24m in costs in FY02, while in other cases it kept projects within planned budgets.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

- 4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 16%
- Explanation: NPS will soon be able to demonstrate progress in achieving long-term goals, but first it must establish baseline conditions and targets. NPS gets some credit, however, for working with FHWA to make progress in meeting long-term goals for park roads.
- Evidence: NPS has just established long-term performance goals for regular assets, so next year it should be able to demonstrate progress in achieving those goals. NPS gets some credit for meeting goals for park roads, based on FHWA's Pavement Condition Rating.
- 4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%
- Explanation: NPS met its annual goals for completing condition assessments, implementing FMSS, and establishing FCI and API measures. All but four parks have completed their condition assessments by the end of FY03, and all but one will be done by the end of FY04.
- Evidence: See measures tab for annual targets and results. NPS still needs to document progress for concessions and other "non-regular" assets, such as archeological ruins.
- 4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 16%
- Explanation: NPS is just now turning to efficiency measures, so it cannot yet demonstrate improved efficiency. NPS is conducting a couple of A-76 competitions in maintenance functions, which should produce results next year.
- Evidence: No evidence provided to show improved efficiency. DOI should help NPS by reinvigorating its Facility Metrics Working Group to identify suitable benchmarks in other agencies and in the private sector.
- 4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 16%
- Explanation: NPS has gone from a laggard to a leader in facility management. In the mid 1990s, it was regularly criticized for cost overruns and no priority-setting process; now it has good cost controls and a five-year list of priorities. Only a few agencies have better FCI performance measures. NPS has been acknowledged as a leader in value analysis.
- Evidence: The 2002 NAPA report concluded that the NPS construction program has addressed most of the concerns raised in the 1998 NAPA report. NPS generally recognized by colleagues as a leader in value analysis. Other bureaus are now turning to NPS for help in implementing a facility management system.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The 2002 NAPA report indicated that the construction program has addressed most of the concerns raised in the 1998 NAPA report. In April 2002, GAO reported that NPS was making progress in developing a new asset management process, but its success could not yet be demonstrated. GAO testified in July 2003 that NPS continues to make progress. DOI has started a CPIC process to complement NPS's DAB process for approving and monitoring individual projects.

Evidence: See 2002 NAPA report. See 2002 GAO report. See July 2003 GAO testimony. See DOI's CPIC guidance and NPS's DAB guidelines.

4.CA1 Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: NPS has done well over the past year in meeting its annual goals for completing condition assessments, implementing FMSS, and establishing FCI measures. NPS has also submitted to Congress its five-year construction priority list. In contrast to the 1990s, when a number of NPS projects had cost overruns, most NPS projects have met cost, schedule and performance goals. The main slippage has been in cases (such as Yosemite, Everglades, and Olympic) where legal challenges or other external constraints have slowed the process.

Evidence: See information on condition assessments, FMSS, FCI, API, DAB and CPIC reviews, and construction management reforms. See also five-year construction priority list and 2002 NAPA report. NPS still needs some way to systematically demonstrate program accomplishments, such as through an annual report that compares targets and results for FCI measures, capital asset plans, unobligated balances, and efficiency measures.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service

Measure: Condition of all NPS regular assets as measured by a Facility Condition Index (score of 0.14 or lower is acceptable)
Additional Information: Facility Condition Index (FCI) of 0.14 or lower means that this group of assets is in acceptable condition on average.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2003		0.25	
2004	0.23		
2005	0.21		
2006	0.2		
2009	0.14		

Measure: Condition of all NPS buildings as measured by a Facility Condition Index (score of 0.10 or lower is acceptable)
Additional Information: Facility Condition Index (FCI) of 0.10 or lower means that this group of assets is in acceptable condition on average.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2003		0.16	
2004	0.15		
2005	0.14		
2006	0.13		
2007	0.12		
2008	0.11		
2009	0.1		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: National Park Service

Measure: Condition of priority NPS buildings as measured by a Facility Condition Index (score of 0.05 or lower means portfolio is in good condition on average)

Additional Information: Facility Condition Index (FCI) of 0.05 or lower means that this group of 200 assets is in good condition on average.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2003		0.13	
2004	0.12		
2005	0.08		
2006	0.05		
2007	0.05		
2008	0.04		
2009	0.04		

Measure: Percent of assets with completed annual condition assessments

Additional Information: NPS inventory has 40,341 assets (as of 09/17/03) that need condition assessments.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	96%	96%	
2004	100%		

Measure: Percent of assets with comprehensive condition assessments (96% of initial assessments are already done)

Additional Information: NPS inventory has 40,341 assets (as of 09/17/03) that need condition assessments.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	16%	16%	
2004	40%		
2005	70%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service

Measure: Percent of assets with comprehensive condition assessments (96% of initial assessments are already done)

Additional Information: NPS inventory has 40,341 assets (as of 09/17/03) that need condition assessments.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2006	100%		

Measure: Percent of assets that are fully documented in the Facility Maintenance Software System (FMSS)

Additional Information: Fully documented assets (out of 40,341 as of 9/17/03) means: (1) all required data fields are populated; (2) all available specification templates are populated; and (3) representative work types are utilized for planning and reporting of work.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	50%		
2005	70%		
2006	100%		

Measure: Percent of assets with approved schedules for preventive maintenance and component renewal.

Additional Information: NPS inventory has 40,341 assets (as of 09/17/03) that need approved schedules for preventive maintenance activities.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	0%		
2004	0%		
2005	50%		
2006	100%		

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

- 1.1 Is the program purpose clear?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
 Explanation: Purpose is to protect natural resources in national parks "unimpaired for . . . future generations." These resources are the main reason national parks were created.
 Evidence: NPS Organic Act of 1916.
- 1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
 Explanation: Need is to establish a science-based framework for measuring the condition of park resources and taking steps where possible to restore park ecosystems to an unimpaired condition.
 Evidence: National Research Council's Science in the National Parks (1992, 1993). GAO 1997 report (T-RCED-97-76). Richard Sellars Preserving Nature in the National Parks (1997). NPS Action Plan for Preserving Natural Resources (1999).
- 1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
 Explanation: No other program has responsibility for protecting natural resources in national parks. Increasing or decreasing funding for these programs has a direct impact on the condition of park natural resources or NPS ability to monitor those conditions. Program balances NPS knowledge of park resources with non-NPS scientific and subject-matter expertise.
 Evidence: National Research Council's Science in the National Parks (1992, 1993). GAO 1997 report (T-RCED-97-76). Richard Sellars Preserving Nature in the National Parks (1997). NPS Action Plan for Preserving Natural Resources (1999). Interagency Agreement with USGS to provide Park Oriented Biological Support (POBS). Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Units Network Annual Report 2002 (10/02). Funding for the Natural Resource Challenge Fiscal Year 2002 (Draft 5/03).
- 1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%
 Explanation: Program design is free of major flaws. It is designed to balance NPS knowledge of park resources with non-NPS scientific and subject-matter expertise. The Natural Resource Challenge was initiated to improve natural resource preservation through research support and management to establish condition baselines, monitor changes, detect unnatural influences, and develop and implement appropriate management actions and programs. The Challenge has made NPS natural resource stewardship more effective and efficient overall.
 Evidence: NPS Action Plan for Preserving Natural Resources (1999). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (1/03). Funding for the Natural Resource Challenge FY 2002 (Draft 2003). FY 2000 House Interior Appropriations report language.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Program is generally designed well, using a broad-based, multi-disciplinary approach, with a wide range of NPS and non-NPS researchers, resource professionals and park managers. The Challenge has allowed the natural resource program to address deficiencies in baseline natural resource inventories and monitoring, and to pursue innovative approaches to national park needs (e.g., Exotic Plant Management Teams, Vital Signs Monitoring Networks).

Evidence: FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Biological Resource Management Division Annual Report FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Exotic Plant Management Team Annual Report - FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Water Resource Division FY 2002 Annual Report (Draft 2003), FY 2002 Geologic Resource Division Annual Report (Draft 2003). Air Quality in the National Parks, Second edition (2002). NPS FY 2004 Budget Request (pp. ONPS-9 - ONPS-17).

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS has had various output measures to track natural resource stewardship. Until the Natural Resource Challenge, however, it lacked a framework for measuring the desired outcome of natural resources protected unimpaired for future generations. The Challenge is now building off of NPS's first set of performance measures to establish baseline inventories, implement effective monitoring strategies, and make initial improvements to national park natural resource conditions. It will eventually identify vital signs that better measure the outcomes of natural resource stewardship.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for FYs 2003-08 (draft 2003). NPS strategic goals (with actuals and targets) for natural resources FYs 1999-2005 (2003). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Vital Signs Monitoring Network - Status and Timeline (Draft 2003). Exotic Plant Management Team Annual Report - FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Biological Resource Management Division Annual Report FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Water Resource Division FY 2002 Annual Report (Draft 2003), FY 2002 Geologic Resource Division Annual Report (Draft 05/03). Air Quality Actions Implementing NRC Funding (2003). Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Units Network Annual Report 2002 (2002).

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Same as 2.1

Evidence: Same as 2.1

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Natural Resource Challenge has established ambitious annual baselines and timeframes to complete natural resource inventories and implement complex monitoring strategies. Annual milestones are laid out for acquiring specific inventory data sets, restoring disturbed lands, controlling exotic species, improving populations of T&E species, monitoring air and water quality, improving the condition of fragile geologic resources, and identifying vital signs to measure overall ecosystem health.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for FYs 2003-08 (draft 2003). NPS strategic goals (with actuals and targets) for natural resources FYs 1999-2005 (2003). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Vital Signs Monitoring Network - Status and Timeline (Draft 2003). Exotic Plant Management Team Annual Report - FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Biological Resource Management Division Annual Report FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Water Resource Division FY 2002 Annual Report (Draft 2003), FY 2002 Geologic Resource Division Annual Report (Draft 05/03). Air Quality Actions Implementing NRC Funding (2003). Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Units Network Annual Report 2002 (2002).

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Same as 2.3

Evidence: Same as 2.3

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS has many partners within the Natural Resource Challenge that have shown commitment toward long-term resource stewardship goals. NPS uses a network of Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Units (CESUs) to partner with USGS, EPA, and other bureaus, as well as state, local, and non-profit entities. All have been committed to using national parks as reference points for broader environmental measures.

Evidence: See MOUs with USGS, EPA, USFS, BLM, BOR, NRCS, USFWS, DOD, DOE, NASA, universities and researchers, particularly through the Learning Centers and CESUs. Partners and contractors must agree to certain performance standards before agreements are executed. See Funding for the Natural Resource Challenge FY 2002 (Draft 2003), and Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Units Annual Report 2002 (2002).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	88%	100%	68%	

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The National Research Council (NRC) reports in 1992 and 1993, and Richard Sellars pivotal book, Preserving Nature and the National Parks (1997), identified long-standing shortcomings in NPS natural resource stewardship. These provided an impetus to begin the Natural Resource Challenge as an attempt to address the need for better outcome measures and science-based resource stewardship. Although NPS conducts narrow, area-specific reviews, there has not been a recent independent evaluation of either the Natural Resource Challenge or NPS natural resource stewardship overall. NPS should pursue more systematic and integrated reviews that use expertise tailored to the disciplines being evaluated. The NPS Advisory Board has begun a review of the Challenge, but DOI is encouraged to initiate or support a more independent review by the IG, NRC, or other appropriate body.

Evidence: NRC's Science in the National Parks (1992, 1993). GAO 1997 report (T-RCED-97-76). Richard Sellars Preserving Nature in the National Parks (1997). National Academy of Sciences Ecological Dynamics on Yellowstone's Northern Range (2003). NPS Advisory Board Report on the Natural Resource Challenge (draft report in progress). See also NPS Peer Review Guidelines (Draft 2003) and NPS natural resource program evaluation strategy (Draft 2003).

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: For natural resource programs, NPS can link specific budget requests to various output performance targets. During the FY 2004 budget process, NPS was able to show changes in various output targets in response to changes in estimated funding. NPS still has more work to do to report all the costs needed to achieve specific outcome performance targets.

Evidence: NPS 2004 Budget Request (pp. ONPS-29 - ONPS-31). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (1/03). Funding for the Natural Resource Challenge FY 2002 (Draft 2003).

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The entire Natural Resource Challenge is, in effect, a long-term plan to address the most significant deficiencies in strategic planning for natural resource stewardship -- that is, the need for comprehensive outcome measures to track ecosystem health in national parks. The Challenge lays out a series of logical steps to address long-term deficiencies in understanding, monitoring, and managing natural resources in national parks. Each successive NPS strategic plan has contained better measures for natural resource stewardship. The next NPS operational plan and DOI strategic plan will integrate pre-Challenge output goals with the outcome measures under development.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for FYs 2003-08 (draft 2003). NPS strategic goals (with actuals and targets) for natural resources FYs 1999-2005 (2003). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Vital Signs Monitoring Network - Status and Timeline (Draft 2003). Exotic Plant Management Team Annual Report - FY 2002 (Draft 2003). NPS Action Plan for Preserving Natural Resources (1999). Funding the Natural Resource Challenge FY 2002 (Draft 2003). NRC's Science in the National Parks (1992, 1993). Richard Sellars Preserving Nature in the National Parks (1997).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: The program regularly tracks progress in completing inventory data sets and monitoring plans, individual resource management projects, threatened and endangered species status, disturbed land restoration, invasive species control efforts, and a large number of individual projects in parks. In addition, each network, subprogram, or individual project must document its performance annually.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for FYs 2003-08 (draft 2003). NPS strategic goals (with actuals and targets) for natural resources FYs 1999-2005 (2003). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Vital Signs Monitoring Network - Status and Timeline (Draft 2003). Exotic Plant Management Team Annual Report - FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Funding the Natural Resource Challenge FY 2002 (Draft 2003).

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: Park managers are held accountable for performance through a number of means. Before funds are released, they must identify planned cost, schedule and performance results in Detailed Implementation Plans (DIPs). Each program has quality control standards for an initial phase of an activity (such as establishing monitoring networks) that a manager must meet before funding is released for subsequent stages. Performance is monitored throughout the year, both through the Performance Management Database System (PMDS) and annual reports. Program field staff are also accountable for performance specified in annual work plans. Individual projects are not funded until a DIP is approved and performance must be relatively consistent with the DIP schedule. For non-NPS program partners (e.g., other bureaus, contractors or cooperators), accountability is based on performance costs, schedules and results specified in contract or agreement instruments executed with the partner.

Evidence: See examples of project-specific Detailed Implementation Plans (DIPs). See also examples of contracts and interagency agreements. Other evidence includes Inventory and Monitoring product specifications and a CESU master agreement. See also NPS guidance requiring an annual accomplishment report before funding is released for multi-year projects. This program has been willing to reprogram funds to other high-priority needs if an activity or project is not likely to achieve the intended results or unreasonably deviates from approved schedules. For example, soil maps to be done in partnership with USDA's NRCS have fallen behind schedule, so NPS is exploring alternatives, including contracting out this activity.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: One-year funds have been obligated annually. In addition, the program has required annual accomplishment reports to provide confidence that funds are expended for their intended purposes.

Evidence: See examples of annual accomplishment reports, including the FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003), the Biological Resource Management Division Annual Report FY 2002 (Draft 2003), and the Water Resource Division FY 2002 Annual Report (Draft 2003).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	88%	100%	68%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: NPS contracts out much of the research and data collection to universities, other bureaus, and private organizations. Inventories (e.g., bird species) for multiple parks are routinely consolidated into a single contract or agreement. NPS uses CESUs, with low fixed overhead rates, to secure university-based scientific expertise. NPS will also deploy in FY 2004 a new IT system, the Resource Activity Management System (RAMS), that is designed to capture park natural resource management actions, regardless of funding source, and compare planned and actual cost information to improve understanding of costs per unit and competitive-sourcing efficiencies.

Evidence: See information on CESUs, which negotiate in advance overhead rates of 15%, compared to regular university rates of 25-65%. CESUs also allow NPS to obtain low-cost technical support through student interns and Student Conservation Association resource assistants. The Alien Plant Control and Monitoring (APCAM) IT database captures information on costs to treat exotic plants by the Exotic Plant Management Teams (EPMTs).

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: The program is designed to collaborate and coordinate with other programs with professional expertise and institutional knowledge in natural resources. The program optimizes available non-NPS scientific and subject-matter expertise in other Federal, state, local and private entities through interagency partnerships, CESU networks with academic institutions, and cooperative agreements with non-profit institutions. Although NPS has sole responsibility for monitoring and managing natural resources in national parks, it must coordinate with others in the development of scientific protocols, the mapping of vegetation, and overall research on natural resource conditions.

Evidence: See the NPS Action Plan for Preserving Natural Resources (1999) for a description of the coordination with a wide range of external programs. These include the USGS and universities, which have the lead in designing protocols and conducting biological research, and the CESUs, which provide new opportunities for obtaining scientific expertise across departmental, bureau and academic institutional lines. See also: Interagency Agreement with USGS to provide Park Oriented Biological Support (POBS); MOAs and other agreements with other bureaus/departments; and CESU Network Annual Report 2002 (10/02). The program also collaborates with other NPS programs through a series of Technical Advisory Groups, including the Contaminants TAG (CTAG), Fire TAG (FTAG), Monitoring TAG (MTAG), and Restoration TAG (RTAG).

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: The program is free of material internal control weaknesses. NPS overall still has financial management weaknesses, but they do not have a direct relation to the program. In fact, the program is developing capabilities (e.g., RAMS) to compensate for NPS-wide weaknesses.

Evidence: See DOI's FY02 Annual Report on Performance and Accountability. See also information on the pilot park deployment in FY 2004 of a new NPS information system, RAMS, designed to capture park natural resource management actions, regardless of funding source, and compare planned and actual cost information to improve understanding of costs per unit and competitive-sourcing efficiencies.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: The Natural Resource Challenge is, in effect, a comprehensive collection of steps aimed at addressing a long-term deficiency in understanding and tracking natural resource conditions in parks.

Evidence: NPS Action Plan for Preserving Natural Resources (1999). Funding the Natural Resource Challenge Fiscal Year 2002 (Draft 5/03). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (1/03).

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?

Answer: LARGE
EXTENT

Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: NPS has demonstrated good progress in establishing and achieving long-term output goals and tracking results. This includes both the pre-Challenge goals (such as acres of disturbed land restored) and the Challenge goals (such as number of data sets completed). A full yes, however, would require that DOI finalize its Strategic Plan and NPS establish long-term outcome goals that use vital signs to measure park lands with ecosystems in good or fair condition. Suitable performance goals are under development for the next 5-year period, but await completion of the DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for FYs 2003-08 (draft 2003). NPS strategic goals (with actuals and targets) for natural resources FYs 1999-2005 (2003). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Vital Signs Monitoring Network - Status and Timeline (Draft 2003).

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: NPS has consistently demonstrated good progress in achieving its annual goals. The Natural Resource Challenge established ambitious goal baselines and targets for natural resource inventories, and the development and implementation of often complex monitoring strategies for national park natural resources. Performance against those goals, much of it continued funding-increase dependent, has been consistent and easily interpreted.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for FYs 2003-08 (draft 2003). NPS strategic goals (with actuals and targets) for natural resources FYs 1999-2005 (2003). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Vital Signs Monitoring Network - Status and Timeline (Draft 2003).

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: LARGE
EXTENT

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: NPS has done a good job finding creative solutions (e.g., CESUs, integrating monitoring program designs, and military engineering resources) to procure efficient research and resource management services from academia, other bureaus (i.e., USGS), and other partners. The NPS is also pursuing non-traditional solutions such as a Native Plant Corps under development with an NGO partner that will further increase its exotic plant control capabilities. It continues to improve tracking of costs per unit for activities, such as exotic plant treatment by EPMTs. It still needs to do more to track costs per unit for other activities, but planned improvements and the anticipated RAMS IT system should help in this regard.

Evidence: See CESU agreements and brief on Native Plant Corps. See also information on USGS/NPS water quality partnership and RAMS pilot. NPS estimates that EPMT costs averaged \$451 per acre in 2002. EPMT tamarisk cut stump control costs were significantly lower than other agencies (\$394 vs. \$3,000 per acre), even with the added environmental requirements of operating within national parks. For urban parks, EPMT costs were cheaper than contractors (\$298 vs. \$2,000 per acre). EPMT effectiveness is shown by the interest of other organizations in adopting this practice. Other efficiency improvements include cost-sharing I&M data preparation, integrating design and planning of monitoring programs (i.e., vital signs and water quality), coordinating work with partners (e.g., aerial photography and LIDAR data), partnering with National Guard and Army Reserve military engineering resources for restoration work in parks, and consolidating natural resource inventories for multiple parks into a single contract or agreement.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service

Measure: Acres of disturbed park lands treated per year. (A slightly revised measure will be used after 2004.)

Additional Information: Number of acres that have been treated each year, out of 222,300 acres of disturbed park land identified in 2001.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	6,798	5,768	
2002	1,824	2,696	
2003	2,964		
2004	3,028		

Measure: Acres of disturbed park lands prepared for natural restoration per year (Proposed Measure)

Additional Information: Number of acres that have been prepared for natural restoration each year, out of 235,000 acres of disturbed park land identified in 2003.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	11,500		
2004	4,700		

Measure: Percent of parks that have identified their vital signs for natural resource monitoring

Additional Information: 270 national parks with significant natural resources are required to identify the vital signs they will use to monitor the condition of park ecosystems. (Targets based on networks funded at FY04 levels.)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2001	13%	13%	
2002	17%	17%	
2003	40%		
2004	56%		
2005	80%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service

Measure: Percent of parks that have identified their vital signs for natural resource monitoring

Additional Information: 270 national parks with significant natural resources are required to identify the vital signs they will use to monitor the condition of park ecosystems. (Targets based on networks funded at FY04 levels.)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2006	80%		

Measure: Percent of parks with unimpaired water quality.

Additional Information: 288 parks are required to have criteria for impaired water quality.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2001	56%	56%	
2002	64%	64%	
2003	65%		
2004	65%		
2005	66%		

Measure: Percent of completed data sets of natural resource inventories.

Additional Information: In 1999, NPS identified 2,767 data sets that are needed to inventory the natural resources in parks.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	30.4%	30.7%	
2002	44.4%	52.1%	
2003	59.3%		
2004	74.5%		
2005	87.2%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: National Park Service

Measure: Average cost of treating an acre of park land disturbed with exotic plants.

Additional Information: Average cost per acre fluctuates, depending on the types of plants treated in a given year. Costs range from \$70/acre for herbaceous trees in Florida to \$950/acre for tamarisk.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)
2001	\$400	\$312	
2002	\$400	\$451	
2003	\$400		
2004	\$400		

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	50%	71%	20%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 established that the "mission of the [National Wildlife Refuge] System is to administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management, and where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans." The Act states that "it is the policy of the United States that -- each refuge shall be managed to fulfill the mission of the System, as well as the specific purposes for which that refuge was established [and that]... compatible wildlife-dependent recreation is a legitimate and appropriate general public use of the System, directly related to the mission of the System ..." The 1997 Act defines wildlife-dependent recreational uses as "a use of a refuge involving hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, or environmental education and interpretation" and a "compatible use" as "a wildlife-dependent recreational use or any other use of a refuge that, in the sound professional judgment of the Director, will not materially interfere with or detract from the fulfillment of the mission of the System or the purposes of thereof." Further, the 1997 Act provides that "in administering the System, the Secretary shall . . . ensure that the biological integrity, diversity, and environmental health of the System are maintained." Numerous other laws directly impact the operation of the National Wildlife Refuge System (NWRS). The Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS or the Service) is responsible for administering and managing the NWRS.

Evidence: Mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System; National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997; National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Act; National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer and Community Partnership Act of 1998; Legislation Dealing with Management of the National Wildlife Refuge System; Refuge Recreation Act, Primary Statutory Compliance Issues Affecting Management of the National Wildlife Refuge System: Service Manual Chapters on Refuge Planning (602FW1 - Refuge Planning Overview, 602FW3 - Comprehensive Conservation Planning Process, 602FW4 - List of Potential Step-Down Management Plans); Draft Service Manual-Policy on the NWRS Mission and Goals, and Refuge Purposes

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The NWRS helps to conserve a growing number of aquatic and terrestrial species that are declining at alarming rates. Approximately one-third of the Nation's mammal and bird species are declining or presumed extinct. Forty percent of our reptiles and 80 percent of our amphibians are in decline. Loss or degradation of habitat is a leading cause of the decline in Federal trust species populations (i.e., migratory birds, interjurisdictional fish, threatened and endangered species). For example, nationwide, 53 percent of all wetlands have been lost, 90 percent of native prairie is gone, 70 percent of riparian habitat has been lost, and 3.6 million miles of streams have been degraded. The 542 refuges and 37 wetland management districts in the NWRS protect 260 endangered species, and safeguard breeding and resting habitats for millions of migratory birds. Wildlife managers on refuges have helped restore once depleted populations of whooping cranes, elk, wild turkeys, crocodiles, wood ducks, antelope, Aleutian Canada geese, key deer and other species. As the world's human population continues to grow and attendant stresses on the environment continue to cause the decline of wildlife and associated environmental attributes, the NWRS will increase rather than decline in value.

Evidence: Fulfilling the Promise-Visions for Wildlife, Habitat, People, and Leadership; Annual Report of Lands Under Control of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Fish & Wildlife News - Special Edition on National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial; Wetlands and the National Wildlife Refuge System Protecting and Restoring Wetlands; U.S. Wetlands of International Importance - Under the Ramsar Convention; Status and Trends of Wetlands in the Conterminous United States 1986 to 1997; Endangered Species Bulletin Jan/Feb 2003; Shorebird Migrations - Fundamentals for Land Managers in the United States

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	50%	71%	20%	

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Refuge System occupies a unique niche in the management of public natural resources. The Refuge System is the only federal land base devoted specifically to the conservation and management of fish, wildlife, and plants. Other federal land management agencies have land and species conservation programs, however, their missions are different. For example, the National Park Service's mission is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife within. The Bureau of Land Management is charged with sustaining health, diversity, and productivity on the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations. The Forest Service's mission emphasizes land management in a sustainable manner to meet the diverse needs of people. While complementary to the NWRS, none of these other federal land management agencies has a mission that places wildlife first. State conservation land systems also often play a complementary role to the NWRS but their purpose is more geographically restrictive and in some cases do not share the "wildlife first" mission of the NWRS.

Evidence: America's National Wildlife Refuge System, Celebrating a Century of Conservation; A Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and the Environment - 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy - Implementation Plan May 2002; Fulfilling the Promise-Visions for Wildlife, Habitat, People, and Leadership.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 changed News from a collection of sites with varying practices guided by local goals to a unified System. The past six years have been virtually free of any serious GAO corrective actions, Congressional Oversight Hearings and multi-refuge litigation. The Inspector General's (IG) request for more Maintenance program documentation and one law suit (regarding hunting-related NEPA decisions) have been the only opposition to System's operations and maintenance decisions since the Act. Also, NWRS is efficiently leveraging public funds: Partners/Service spending ratio is 2.5 to 1; 20% of all staff work done is by unpaid volunteers; more than 230 community-based organizations exist to support goals of the NWRS. One possible design flaw is that individual refuge purposes take precedence over the mission of the refuge system over all.

Evidence: Biological Needs Assessment; Refuge Law Enforcement Reform - Interim Strategies March 27, 2003; FWS Deployment Modeling Work Group April 30, 2003; Strategic Growth (Draft Memorandum: Review of Draft Interim Guidance on Strategic Growth of the NWRS, Agenda for May 29 and 30, 2003 stakeholders meeting "The Next 100 Years of Conservation-Charting the Future Growth of the NWRS").

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The NWRS effectively targets funding to directly address the program's purpose of conserving wildlife by restoring habitat, carrying out specific management actions to improve populations, and by educating people about the various fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats throughout the nation.

Evidence: RONS and RCAR Measures and Definitions - April 2003; FY 02 Refuge Comprehensive Accomplishment Report (includes Volunteer summary); Maintenance Management System Handbook; FY 2004 Budget Justification - Refuge Operations and Maintenance, Five Year Maintenance and Capital Improvement Plan, March 2003; Handbook - Writing Refuge Management Goals and Objectives, March 2003.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The NWRS has taken a number of strategic planning steps including producing the "Fulfilling the Promise" document which presents a vision for the NWRS and a number of recommendations to help accomplish the vision. The recommendations, however, are not specific enough to be considered as long-term goals for the PART. In the Fall 2001, the Department of the Interior began developing a Department-wide Strategic Plan. In April 2003, the Refuge Program developed new draft long-term and annual output performance goals as part of a DOI directive to construct a FWS Operational Plan to support the DOI Strategic Plan. During the PART assessment these goals were further refined and outcome based long-term and annual goals were developed for the program.

Evidence: Fulfilling the Promise, 1999; FWS FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan/FY 2001 Annual Performance Report; Draft Strategic Plan - National Wildlife Refuge System - April 24, 2003

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Baselines and ambitious targets have not yet been developed for the long-term outcome goals developed during the PART assessment.

Evidence:

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The specific and measurable annual goals have been developed recently through the FWS efforts to devise measures for their Operational Plan to step up to the Department's Strategic Plan as well as through the PART process. Many of these measures are output oriented.

Evidence:

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Baselines and ambitious targets have not yet been developed for many of the annual measures. The initial first year effort for some of the new goals will be to establish baselines and then set FY 2008 long-term targets and FY 2005 annual performance targets.

Evidence: RONS and RCAR Measures and Definitions - April 2003; FY 02 Refuge Comprehensive Accomplishment Report (includes Volunteer summary); FY 02 Public Education and Recreation Totals; Refuge Operating Needs System data entry screen, Maintenance Management System data entry screen, Real Property data entry screen

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	50%	71%	20%	

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Common goals and measures are developed for many partnership activities. Examples include a Memorandum of Agreement with the Park Service and USGS on restoration of the Everglades, and work with the National Invasive Species Council to develop a cross-cut budget initiative to control adverse impacts of invasive species on natural resources. Additionally, the NWRS has extensive support through a large network of volunteers and Friends Groups that all commit and work towards accomplishing the goals of the NWRS. Nearly 20% of the hours worked on NWRS field stations is done by volunteers who work directly on priority natural and cultural resource management activities and visitor service programs consistent with goals of the NWRS. The Cooperative Alliance for Refuge Enhancement, CARE, a coalition of major national conservation organizations has provided strong support for helping to ensure the NWRS is able to accomplish its goals by pushing for increased Refuge Operations and Maintenance funding.

Evidence: FY 2004 Interagency Invasive Species Performance Budget; Everglades Restoration MOA; National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer and Community Partnership Enhancement Act of 1998; Refuge Support Group (Friends) Directory; Fiscal Year 2001 Volunteer Report Feb 10, 03; Challenge Cost Sharing; Refuges and Climate Change, Cooperative Grant program with National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (National Wildlife Refuge Support Groups Program[Friends], Take Pride Centennial Refuge Legacy, and The Nature of Learning); Cooperative Alliance for Refuge Enhancement - Shortchanging America's Wildlife, A Report on the National Wildlife Refuge System Funding Crisis.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: A number of evaluations of select parts of the NWRS have been conducted over the past five years, however, they do not, independently or taken together, meet the requirements of the question that the program have regularly scheduled objective, independent evaluations that examine how well the program is accomplishing its mission and meeting its long term goals.

Evidence: Protecting the National Wildlife Refuge System - Law Enforcement Requirements For the 21st Century; Recommendation to the Secretary for Implementing Law Enforcement Reforms; Deferred Maintenance, US Fish and Wildlife Service - Audit Report 00-I-226 - March 2000; GAO Audit RCED-00-52, Feb 2000, FWS Agency Needs to Inform Congress of Future Costs Associated with Land Acquisitions; Science-Based Stewardship: Recommendations for Implementing the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act -- Oct. 1998.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Budget requests identify increases on a project by project basis for the most part and deferred maintenance funds are prioritized and planned for in a 5-year plan that is submitted annually. However, the linkage to achieving performance targets is not always clear, particularly where outcome based long-term goals are absent. Recent efforts to link performance and budget in budget justifications are improvements and reflect a transition towards integrating performance-planning and budget-planning such that annual and long-term performance goals drive budget requests.

Evidence: Operational Priorities - Prioritization Process for the Refuge Operating Needs System [RONS]; FY 2004 Budget Justification - Refuge Operations and Maintenance.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	50%	71%	20%	

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The NWRS began efforts to address strategic planning deficiencies with a System-wide conference in October of 1998. This conference led to a report (Fulfilling the Promise) that looked at where the System has been, reviewed its current situation, and stated a vision for the future. Numerous vision statements and 42 recommendations for improving the NWRS were included in the report. More recently, as part of the FWS effort to develop a new operational plan to step down a draft Department of the Interior strategic plan, the NWRS met over two days to develop output goals. The NWRS will continue to refine the goals to develop long-term outcome goals, further refine efficiency measures, and baselines and targets for both long-term and annual goals. In response to GAO and IG reports of deficiencies, the FWS has developed a five year maintenance and capital improvement plan, implemented MAXIMO, and developed a process for assessing the conditions of refuge facilities.

Evidence: Draft Strategic Plan - National Wildlife Refuge System April 24, 2003; Deferred Maintenance, US Fish and Wildlife Service - Audit Report 00-I-226 - March 2000; Visitor Satisfaction Survey: Data Analysis and Report; Service Asset and Maintenance Management System memorandum and pilot test report, Feb 19,2003; Memorandum-Completing the Real Property Inventory and Validating Data Entries April 3, 03; Memorandum - Draft Strategic Plan April 24, 03.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: Performance information is collected from a variety of sources. Information collected through condition assessments provides a baseline for facility maintenance needs. The Refuge Management Information System is used to document current status, adjust program priorities, and allocate resources. Information collected annually in the Refuge Comprehensive Accomplishment Report provides a baseline of activities being carried out within the Refuge System. Activities are quantified for both our own staff as well as the large volunteer contingent that contributes to effectiveness of refuges. Annual budget increases for Refuge Operations are drawn from the Refuge Operating Needs System which provides an annual listing of priority needs that are identified by field station managers each year. These projects include performance measures and projects are prioritized based on most urgent contribution of the project to the Refuge System mission. Each year funding increases requested in the Budget Justification are selected and listed by project after an analysis was made to determine the highest-priorityneeds of the System.

Evidence: Annual Report on Performance and Accountability FY 2002; Refuge Management Information System (RMIS) modules: FY 02 Refuge Comprehensive Accomplishment Report (includes Volunteer summary), FY 02 Public Education and Recreation Totals, Refuge Operating Needs System, Maintenance Management System, Real Property Inventory database

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	50%	71%	20%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: While SES level managers have GPRA annual goals incorporated into their annual plans, Refuge supervisors and Refuge managers do not yet have performance standards incorporated into their performance plans linking that individual's performance to the achievement of program goals. It is important, however, to note that Regional Directors have line authority over the Refuge Managers who routinely work with the public and trust resources. Regional Directors can not succeed in their performance unless their subordinates produce the products required by the Regional Director's standards. Regional Directors ratings are linked to GPRA annual goal and other performance management contract achievements (such as the Realty contracts).

Evidence: Refuge Operating Needs System Accomplishment Reports for budget increases in FY 2002; FY 2002 report of accomplishments for deferred maintenance projects; sample Employee Performance Plan and Results Report

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: Although the allowed time span for expenditure of Refuge appropriated funds is 2 years, the expenditure rate is consistently 95%-99% at the close of the first year in which the funds are available. An obligation rate of 95% in the expenditure of maintenance funds are due to the need for permits, design and large-purchase procurement procedures. The program's funding expenditure has received independent audit review and financial transactions met standards. The FY 2002 financial audit was qualified due to insufficient documentation of values of real property assets. Corrective action is currently underway.

Evidence: Initial Budget Allocations - Fiscal Year 2002 (BAS Report 2002-1) Dec 19, 01; Refuge Operating Needs System Accomplishment Reports for budget increases in FY 2002; FY 2002 report of accomplishments for deferred maintenance projects; Expenditure rates for Refuge Operations and Maintenance Accounts FY 2000, 2001, 2002; Completing Real Property Inventory and Validating Entries

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: The NWRS has a wetlands efficiency measure developed as part of the Administration's common measures activity. Efficiencies are sought through competitive sourcing reviews such as that of the GS-326 Series (secretarial services) and through consolidation of purchase power and standardization of equipment specifications, such as the consolidated IT contracts. The management structure is delayed, each Regional Refuge Supervisor having an average of 20 staffed stations to supervise. Field stations follow national and regional policies but operate quite independently on daily activities. The NWRS also has achieved efficiencies through "complexing" (or combining the administration of many refuges into one central refuge office) and by selectively not staffing refuge units (refuges and wetland management districts) based on biological and other considerations.

Evidence: National Park Service Interagency Acquisition Agreement for uniform program; Reimbursable support agreement for Department-wide purchase of MAXIMO software to support maintenance program; SOW Competitive Sourcing Review 326 Job Series; IT Enterprise Licensing Agreement

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	50%	71%	20%	

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: The Refuge System works effectively with a wide variety of programs within the Fish and Wildlife Service and with state, federal, and private partners. Examples of these programs include working with the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) Joint Ventures, assessing and cleaning up contaminants problems affecting refuges, undertaking a variety of Fisheries projects and by using Refuge heavy equipment to support achievement of the goals in the Partners for Wildlife program.

Evidence: Conserving America's Fisheries; The Service Protects and Restores Wetlands; Biological Report 89 - Ecology and Conservation of the Endangered Least Bell's Vireo; Endangered Species Bulletin; Endangered Species Table; Celebrating a Century of Conservation - Regional Refuge Events Involve, Commemorate, Inspire; FY 2003 Refuge Cleanup Proposals; Fisheries/Refuges Cooperation; Habitat Based Conservation Goals Proposal; Integrating HCPs with National Wildlife Refuges; Cooperative Strategic Conservation Planning Proposal

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: FY 2002 financial statements identified a number of material weaknesses including one specifically related to the NWRS. The weakness was related to the processes, controls, and financial reporting related to buildings, structures and construction work in process. In response, the FWS is initiating appropriate corrective actions in FY 2003 to correct this and other cited deficiencies. Additionally, a Department-wide Federal Managers Financial Integrity material weakness of inadequate Departmentwide maintenance management capability directly relates to the NWRS.

Evidence: Independent Auditor's Report on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 2002 and 2001; Independent Auditor's Report on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 2001 and 2000; Independent Auditor's Report on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 2000; Fiscal Year 2003 General Annual Guidelines for the Management Control Program; Completing Real Property Inventory and Validating Entries; U.S. Department of the Interior Annual Report on Performance and Accountability, FY 2002.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: Management challenges are given serious attention as evidenced by recent efforts to analyze and implement recommendations identified in the Fulfilling the Promise document. Numerous action teams have been assigned and the Promises Implementation team consisting of NWRS leadership and regional field representatives meets twice annually to manage progress against these goals which include a full range of management programs to include addressing shortages in biological programs, refine refuge law enforcement programs, implement Comprehensive Conservation Plans for field units, be more strategic in growth of the Refuge System, provide for quality wildlife dependent recreation and education programs, and provide for strong leadership and organizational management. Many changes have occurred in the maintenance program to refine and improve management of equipment and facility resources; a new condition assessment process has been initiated and a five year budgeting process is now in place. Also, a new commercial maintenance management software is being implemented throughout the country to systematically track and manage a comprehensive maintenance program. Also, a number of GAO and IG audit reports provide recommendations that are being applied to improve management activities.

Evidence: Fulfilling the Promise Briefing Statements; Final Report-Pilot Test Results and Recommendations for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Asset and Maintenance Management System, 2/19/03; Protecting the National Wildlife Refuge System - Law Enforcement Requirements For the 21st Century and Recommendation to the Secretary for Implementing Law Enforcement Reforms; Comprehensive Conservation Planning (CCP) (Draft Strategic Needs Assessment for CCPs, CCP Accomplishments, and CCP status April-June 2003); Strategic Growth (Draft Memorandum: Review of Draft Interim Guidance on Strategic Growth of the NWRS, Agenda for May 29 and 30, 2003 stakeholders meeting "The Next 100 Years of Conservation-Charting the Future Growth of the NWRS"); Semi-Annual Audit Follow-up Progress Report

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	50%	71%	20%	

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: **SMALL EXTENT** Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: New long-term goals for the NWRS were identified by the PART team and will implemented in FY 2005, therefore, there is no data to measure performance. Past NWRS performance toward progress in achieving previous FWS GPRA long-term goals is available and demonstrates achievement of some long-term goals. The projected cumulative amount (through 2003) of acres enhanced by controlling aquatic and terrestrial invasive species on NWRS land is 1.1 million acres. This exceeds the previous 2005 target of 850,000 acres. The old long-term target for annually managing/enhancing NWRS lands is 3.2 million acres. Through 2003, the Refuge Program has managed/enhanced 3.3 million annually. The previous long-term 2005 target for restoring NWRS wetlands is 850,000 acres; the actual restored acres is projected to be 850,000 acres. The goals for the number of interpretive, educational, and recreational visits as well as the number of volunteer hours, however, may not be met. While these old goals were adequate at the time of their creation to guide the NWRS, they are not outcome oriented or in some other way were not the best measures to track performance of the NWRS, and, therefore, new goals were crafted. The initial first year effort for some of the new goals will be to establish baselines and then set FY 2008 long-term targets and FY 2005 annual performance targets.

Evidence: Annual Report on Performance and Accountability FY 2002; FY 2000 Annual Performance Plan - Performance Measure Commitment; FY 2001 Annual Performance Plan - Performance Measure Commitment; FY 2002 Annual Performance Plan - Performance Measure Commitment; FWS FY 2003 Budget Justification.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: **SMALL EXTENT** Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: New annual goals were identified for the NWRS by the PART team and will be implemented in FY 2005, therefore, there is no data to measure performance. Past NWRS performance toward achieving previous FWS GPRA long-term goals is available and demonstrates achievement of some of the annual goals. In FY 2002, the NWRS met or exceeded three of their old goals (number of acres enhanced by controlling invasive species; number of acres managed/enhanced; and number of new friends groups) but did not meet three other goals (number of acres restored; number of interpretive, educational, and recreational visits; number of volunteer hours). New goals were needed to align with new long-term outcome goals. The initial first year effort for some of the new goals will be to establish baselines and then set FY 2005 performance targets.

Evidence: Annual Report on Performance and Accountability FY 2002; FY 2000 Annual Performance Plan - Performance Measure Commitment; FY 2001 Annual Performance Plan - Performance Measure Commitment; FY 2002 Annual Performance Plan - Performance Measure Commitment; FWS FY 2003 Budget Justification.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: **NO** Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: While accomplishment reporting indicates some goals are being met and others are not, there is no evidence that management practices have resulted in efficiency gains over the past year.

Evidence: Refuge Operating Needs System Accomplishment Reports for budget increases in FY 2002; FY 2002 report of accomplishments for deferred maintenance projects; FY 02 Refuge Comprehensive Accomplishment Report (includes Volunteer summary)

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	50%	71%	20%	

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: SMALL EXTENT

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: While the program is not duplicative of other programs, some of the activities conducted on refuges are also conducted by other programs such as restoring wetlands. Data collected for the wetlands common measures exercise indicates that the NWRS compares somewhat favorably to other FWS programs that rehabilitate and restore wetlands (this comparison excludes land acquisition for purposes of this PART). The Refuge Comprehensive Accomplishment Report indicates that in FY 2001 and 2002, the NWRS spent \$17,559,000 to restore 92,804 acres of wetlands. This calculates to an average cost of \$189 per acre or 5,291 acres restored per million dollars invested. A second area in which the Refuge System demonstrates effective accomplishment of goals is in the production of waterfowl. Data collected by the FWS show that the Refuge system has a disproportionately positive impact on waterfowl. Although waterfowl production areas, easements, and the National Wildlife Refuge system account for less than 2 percent of the landscape in the prairie pothole region, they are responsible for producing nearly 23 percent of this area's waterfowl.

Evidence: Wetlands Common Measures data

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Some reviews of this type have occurred; however, they tend not to be comprehensive in nature. In general an outside group reviews certain segments of the program and points out deficiencies which the NWRS then reacts to and attempts to correct where appropriate.

Evidence: Science-Based Stewardship: Recommendations for Implementing the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act; Cooperative Alliance for Refuge Enhancement - Shortchanging America's Wildlife, A Report on the National Wildlife Refuge System Funding Crisis.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service

Measure: Number of NWRS acres affected by aquatic and terrestrial invasive species controlled.

Additional Information: This is the number of acres annually treated for invasive species.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	170,000	187,000	
2002	187,000	217,945	
2003	217,945		
2004	341,945		

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Research & Development Programs

Name of Program: Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Studies

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	MMS's mission statement is "To manage the mineral resources on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) in an environmentally sound and safe manner ..." Resources include oil, gas, and other marine minerals. Currently, only oil, natural gas, and limited amounts of sand and gravel are extracted from the OCS. The Environmental Studies Program (ESP) provides the necessary environmental information for MMS decision makers and states, and local governments to ensure that offshore activities are conducted in an environmentally safe manner.	The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA) established policy for the management of the OCS natural gas and oil-leasing program and for the protection of marine and coastal environments: 1) establish information needed for assessment and management of environmental impacts; 2) predict impacts on the marine biota; and 3) monitor human, marine, and coastal environments to identify significant changes.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	MMS oversees energy and mineral extraction from the OCS. The ESP supports the MMS OCS leasing program by providing environmental information that is used by decision makers to develop Interior's 5-year OCS leasing program and other OCS activities without harming the environment. In the context of the DOI Strategic Plan (draft) for supporting a society <i>capable of responsibly meeting its resource needs to sustain a dynamic economy</i> , the ESP directly supports the Departments Goal of managing resources to enhance public benefit, promote responsible use, and ensure optimal value. Furthermore, the ESP supports the President's Energy Policy which directs the Secretary of the Interior to continue OCS oil and gas leasing and approval of exploration and development plans on predictable schedules.	The production of oil and gas on the OCS accounts for over 25 percent of both the Nation's annual oil and natural gas production. In addition, MMS estimates that in FY2003 they will collect nearly \$4 billion in OCS revenues from leasing activities. The ESP's annually revised Studies Development Plan "publicly" outlines issues for proposed research for the next FY in its "Identification of Information Needs" section and strategically lays out potential future issues for FY+ 2 years and further out. The ESP focuses on the collection of information and conduct of research to address information needs of other Interior OCS oil and gas and marine minerals programs. The program activities and schedules (e.g. leasing schedule, development plans) are reviewed annually to establish the specific information needs that can be addressed through the ESP.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	The environmental studies program is unique because it is focused on oil, gas and marine mineral extraction on the OCS. MMS alone has the mandate to develop environmental assessment information in support of offshore oil and gas leasing and development activities. The OCSLA directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct the OCS offshore oil and gas program, and this responsibility has been delegated to the MMS. Furthermore, the President's Energy Policy directs the Secretary of the Interior to continue OCS oil and gas leasing and approval of exploration and development plans on predictable schedules. Other Federal regulatory agencies review and comment on MMS's environmental study findings. In addition, other Federal agencies study and monitor marine and coastal environments but have different missions. The ESP coordinates extensively with other Federal research programs to minimize duplication of effort and to maximize opportunities for collaboration and cost sharing.	The MMS conducts regular public meetings and workshops to: 1) identify current and future program issues -- emerging concerns, issues, and directions; and 2) identify the means with which to acquire the information and/or resolve the issues. Information needs or issues which cannot be resolved through other means (such as information from other sources/programs) are then developed as topics for research. To avoid the potential of performing redundant research, the ESP coordinates extensively with both stakeholders and researchers. Such coordination, for example, led to the MMS study "Research on Sperm Whales and their Responses to Seismic Exploration in the Gulf of Mexico". The study is being conducted cooperatively with several academic institutions, government agencies, and industry and is leading to the resolution of multiple aspects of an issue with numerous facets and with significant cost leveraging.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Over 90 percent of the research is conducted externally through competitive contracts, cooperative agreements and interagency agreements. The ESP coordinates extensively with other Federal research programs, states, and industry to: 1) minimize duplication of effort: 2) maximize opportunities for collaboration and cost sharing, and 3) to prioritize research efforts.	The scope of the interest or "problem" could be defined in the context of revenues received and energy produced from offshore oil and gas activities. Environmental research represents a relatively small but highly cost effective investment. MMS created an independent Minerals Advisory Board which provides a formal mechanism for consultation with affected states and other interested parties on all aspects of leasing, exploration, development, and protection of offshore resources. As part of this Board, the OCS Scientific Committee advises MMS on the feasibility, appropriateness, and scientific value of the ESP; reviews the information produced by the ESP and may recommend changes in scope, direction or emphasis; and reflects, through its membership, a balance of scientific and technical disciplines considered important to the management of the ESP.	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 (RD 1) <i>Does the program effectively articulate potential public benefits?</i>	Yes	The ESP supports MMS's offshore oil, gas, and marine minerals program which provides multiple benefits to the public and does so in a safe and environmentally sound manner. It directly supports DOI draft Goal 2.1 <i>Manage Resources to enhance Public Benefit, Promote Responsible Use, and Ensure Optimal Value</i> . The ESP is one means by which the MMS demonstrates its commitment to environmental protection through the use of the highest quality science for decision making.	OCS program benefits are articulated in the 5 Year EIS, including its research. It is communicated through multiple meetings with stakeholders (e.g. Information Transfer Meetings, workshops, and web information). Publicly distributed documents such as the budget and GPRA publications articulate that activities on the OCS significantly contribute to our national energy supply. OCS activities provide more than 25% of the natural gas and oil produced in the United States and accounting for approximately \$4 billion in revenue annually. MMS recently released a study on the 2000 assessment of conventionally recoverable hydrocarbon resources, reserves, production and geologic data. This study forecasts that over half of the oil and natural gas total endowment of the Gulf of Mexico, for example, remains to be discovered, The OCS has also provided 13.1 million cubic yards of sand for beach renourishment to the States of Florida, Maryland, Virginia and South Carolina. These statistics were recently provided in public testimony to the U.S. Commission on Ocean F	20%	0.2
6 (RD 2) <i>If an industry-related problem, can the program explain how the market fails to motivate private investment?</i>	N/A	Although the oil, gas and marine minerals extraction industries use the OCS, and must meet environmental laws and regulation on their individual operations, the MMS is the steward of the Federal OCS lands. Before the extraction industries can use the OCS, the Federal government must determine if the extraction of oil, gas, and other marine minerals can be conducted in a manner that protects humane, marine, and coastal environments.		0%	
Total Section Score				100%	100%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)						
1	<i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	Yes	Long term goals for the ESP are consistent with the OCSLA and the DOI Strategic Plan (draft). This long-term performance goal supports Goal 4.2 of the DOI Strategic Plan (Draft): advance knowledge through scientific Leadership and inform decisions through the application of science. To meaningfully implement Interior's goal, the ESP focuses on the needs of the overall OCS Program, by gathering information from all OCS regions concerning industry trends, leasing and development schedules and plans, environmental issues, and environmental information needs on a 5-year horizon.	The Five Year ESP Strategic Plan (1998-2002) and the annually revised Studies Development Plans The latest version documents the information needs to be addressed by the MMS ESP through 2005. Also, Goal 4.2 of the DOI Strategic Plan (Draft) articulates 3 Strategies, all of which are supported by the ESP: <i>expand the scientific knowledge base, enhance the quality and objectivity of DOI science, and lead and facilitate exchange and use of knowledge.</i>	11%	0.1
2	<i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	The ESP National Studies List is developed annually based on long-term goals articulated in OCSLA and other program documents such as the annually, revised Studies Development Plan. ESP uses the list to prioritize study efforts. The MMS is drafting goals to support the DOI Strategic Plan (draft), measures for improving assessment and information for decision making .	The National Studies List represents the short-term goals of the ESP. The DOI Strategic Plan (draft) establishes the measure for the use of ESP research in decision documents (Strategy 4.2.a).	11%	0.1
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	Partners (contractors) receive financial support for the sole purpose of carrying out MMS mission related research. Some partners (e.g. Coastal Marine Institutes and others involved in cooperative agreements associated with the ESP) may engage with MMS and revise their research plans to support MMS goals in an effort for both parties to effectively address mutual information needs.	The ESP does not enter into contracts, agreements, etc. unless they are supportive of annual (NSL) and long-term goals .	11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	There are no other federal, state or private sector organizations that have the same goals as articulated by OCSLA . However, the ESP takes advantage of mutual research interests and coordinates around those interests resulting in cost-sharing and leveraging of scarce financial resources.	Interagency Agreements, Memoranda of Understanding, Cooperative Agreements, etc. For example, <u>noise in the sea</u> is a complicated issue with various facets for multiple stakeholders. To avoid performing redundant research, the MMS ESP coordinated extensively with stakeholders and researchers leading to the study "Research on Sperm Whales and their Responses to Seismic Exploration in the Gulf of Mexico". The study is being conducted cooperatively with several academic institutions, government agencies, and industry at considerable cost-savings (leveraging).	11%	0.1
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	Yes	Periodically, MMS requests program/discipline reviews from the NRC/NAS. Annually the program is reviewed by the Scientific Committee of the MMS Advisory Board, individual program disciplines are reviewed/advised by Scientific Committee Subcommittees, and individual projects are reviewed by contractually mandated Scientific/Quality Reviewed Boards. Furthermore, OMM Strategic Plan (draft) articulates a strategy to enhance the quality and objectivity of DOI science.	NRC/NAS reports (1990, 1992, 1993), annual Scientific Committee letters to the MMS Director and Subcommittee Charters; and individual studies contract reviews by Scientific/Quality Review Boards; internal program reviews including two Alternative Management Control Reviews (AMCR) (1993, 1999) of the Environmental Studies Program which specifically focused on program effectiveness and studies management processes and procedures. The AMCR's included recommendations for program improvements particularly in the area of communicating with internal customers and several steps have been taken to address this issue.	11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	Yes	The program is research, and as such, cannot precisely measure the effect of small funding increases or decreases on overall program performance. However, annual budgets are based on assessments of needs developed through the annual public review Studies Development Plan and National Studies List processes. Funding affects the ability to conduct scheduled research necessary for informed decision making. Delays (financial, policy, or legislative) in leasing or development milestones could negatively impact future energy production and revenue to the Treasury.	Historically the ESP budget declined as increased numbers of OCS areas were dropped from leasing consideration. However, funding increases have been made to support deepwater research in support of OCS development in the deepwater Gulf of Mexico. ESP funding has fluctuated and this can be associated with many factors including number of acres offered for leasing, advancement of leasing in frontier areas, and identification of new program demands such as beach renourishment (sand and gravel).	11%	0.1
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	Regular discussions with internal and external program stakeholders are carried out to ensure that the process effectively considers all relevant research issues. Annually, the ESP develops its Studies Development Plan putting out for discussion with these stakeholders proposed research for the next FY and topics for research being discussed for the years to come.	Discussions with stakeholders held in conjunction with the development of the annual Studies Development Plan, Information Transfer Meetings, Workshops, meetings with both the Policy and Scientific Committees of the OCS Advisory Board and their various chartered Subcommittees, and making such materials and discussions available via the internet.	11%	0.1
8 (RD 1)	<i>Is evaluation of the program's continuing relevance to mission, fields of science, and other "customer" needs conducted on a regular basis?</i>	Yes	Accomplished through the <u>annual</u> Studies Development Plan Process and annual development of the National Studies List. Specifically to develop research to advance knowledge through scientific leadership and inform decisions through the application of science necessary to safeguard property and financial assets and improve quality of life for communities and trust beneficiaries (draft DOI Strategic Plan Goal 4).	Annual Scientific Review Committee meeting and HQ Memorandum (with guidance) to the OCS Regions to initiate annual Studies Development Plan process and subsequent correspondence between HQ and the Regions. The process emphasizes Strategy 3 of the DOI Strategic Plan (draft) Goal 4: Serving Communities: <i>Lead and Facilitate Exchange and Use of Knowledge</i> .	11%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (RD 2) <i>Has the program identified clear priorities?</i>	Yes	<p>Research priorities are established through the annual Studies Development Plan (SDP) process and the annual development of the National Studies List (NSL); the SDP is the stakeholder input document and the NSL is the MMS senior management approval document. The process is accomplished through intensive discussions with the Scientific Committee of the MMS Advisory Board and its Subcommittees with additional input from other internal and external stakeholders. While the Program has an annual set of established "milestones", it also has the flexibility to address and respond "tactically" in the event of unanticipated information needs.</p>	<p>The annual Studies Development Plans, and the final annual National Studies List; and the publicly available annual Program Prospectus. An example of a more "tactical" issue was the accelerated industry activity in the deep and "ultra-deep" water of the Gulf of Mexico. To develop the appropriate research, the ESP coordinated the necessary input from both internal and external stakeholders through a public workshop, with peer-view provided by a Deepwater Subcommittee chartered by the OCS Scientific Committee. More recently, with the public concern of mercury in the marine environment, the Scientific Committee chartered a Mercury Subcommittee to examine the issue and to provide MMS advice on any necessary new research.</p>	12%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	100%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes, No, N/A)						
1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	No	Overall, the ESP does collect timely and credible performance information, but it does not have a basic automated system to summarize project manager and research contractor performance that could be used by upper management, on a daily bases, to identify program problems before they become critical. On a project by project basis, information from contractors used to authorize the disbursement of funds. Individual projects frequently have Scientific/Quality Review Board reviews throughout the course of the research - projects can, and are, modified as appropriate.	Program summary information is developed manually causing a time lag. However, monthly/quarterly reports from contractors and final deliverables and reports from Scientific/Quality Review Boards are prepared and reviewed by management and corrective action is taken if necessary.	19%	0.0
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, sub grantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	An integral part of project management is financial and technical oversight to assure performance consistent with stated cost, schedule, and objectives.	Evaluation criteria for contract awards includes consideration of past performance.	9%	0.1
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	The ESP has consistently obligated funds in a timely manner with the exception of FY 2001. The procurement award process was disrupted by the events of September 11th and no-year funds were carried over into FY 2002. Program funds are obligated only for projects that have been approved by MMS's Associate Director of Offshore Minerals Management on the annual National Studies List.	MMS Annual Financial Reports.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	While the ESP uses a competitive procurement process for most of its contracted research, it strives to bring in new researchers. This is accomplished by frequent public meetings and workshops to inform potential researchers and to increase their familiar	Along with the MMS as a whole, the ESP is exploring components for competitive sourcing and is participating in the Bureau's e-Gov and Activity Based Costing development and implementation programs. These efforts support the electronic government initiative in the Secretary's plan for citizen centered government to use information technology to provide the public information uniquely available in the Department.	9%	0.1
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	No	Although DOI complies with managerial cost accounting standards, it does not yet have a financial management system that fully allocates program costs and associates those costs with specific performance measures. This requirement might be met through Activity Based Costing (ABC), which DOI is adopting for each of its bureaus.		9%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	<p>ESP has been reviewed and had been found to free of material internal control weaknesses. Although MMS has been cited for inadequate security and controls over information technology systems. This relates to ongoing Indian trust fund litigation. Procedures are in place to ensure that payments are made properly for the intended purpose. The Financial Management Branch Quality Assurance Program requires that a review be performed each month of all invoices paid in an amount equal to or greater than \$250,000. The program also requires that a random sample of the remaining invoices paid during the month be performed. The purpose of the MMS quality assurance review is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure that invoices entered into the MMS Advanced Budget/Accounting Control and Information System (ABACIS), meet the criteria of 5 CFR Part 1315; <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure that Federal resources are used consistent with agency mission; <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure that the invoices recorded by MMS are both, accurate and timely; <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure that interest was paid if an invoice was paid late; and <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure the imaged document matches the original document. 	<p>The Minerals Management Service Financial Management Branch has written procedures that require persons responsible for scheduling payments of commercial invoices to verify the company name, address, and DUNS number prior to scheduling any invoice for payment. Once these items have been verified, the invoice is scheduled for payment. Prior to the schedule being transmitted to Treasury authorizing the disbursement of funds, the MMS Certifying Officer again reviews all invoices and payments to ensure accuracy. In addition to the above reviews, MMS has an established Quality Assurance Review Program that encompasses commercial payments.</p>	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	MMS uses Alternative Management Control Review (AMCR) on a recurring basis to evaluate program management activities. For example, the need to improve communication of program goals and objectives, scope and strategy to a diverse customer base within MMS was identified in the 1993 AMCR. Since that time the ESP has aggressively sought customer input from the many offices who are responsible for various facets of the offshore oil and gas and marine minerals program. Through its internet web pages the program office now communicates program information including goals, objectives, scope and strategy - not only to its internal customer base, but to the general public.	One deficiency identified through the AMCR's was the accessibility of Environmental Studies Program information. Over the last few years the ESP has launched web-based information for all active projects and has identified a goal of updating the web-information for all ongoing projects on a quarterly basis. In addition, the ESP has established a web-based repository for all reports so this information is freely available to the general public.	9%	0.1
8 (RD 1)	<i>Does the program allocate funds through a competitive, merit-based process, or, if not, does it justify funding methods and document how quality is maintained?</i>	Yes	Over 95 percent of the ESP research is conducted through a merit based award process and more than 90 percent is awarded through competitive contracts and cooperative agreements. The ESP utilizes a mix of funding to maximize achievement of program objectives through the use of competitive awards, cooperative agreements, interagency agreements and joint industry projects. Quality of research is maintained through establishment of Scientific/Quality Review Boards and encouragement of contractors to publish in the peer-reviewed literature.	All proposals considered for funding are subjected to merit review by MMS scientists, and sometimes scientists from other federal agencies and/or co-sponsoring industry partner.	9%	0.1

9 (RD 2)	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (RD 2)	<i>Does competition encourage the participation of new/first-time performers through a fair and open application process?</i>	Yes	While the ESP uses a competitive procurement process for most of its contracted research, it strives to bring in new researchers. This is accomplished by frequent public meetings and workshops to inform potential researchers and to increase their familiarity with ESP goals, objectives, and procedures.	Many ESP awards are conducted via an open, advertised competitive process encouraging creativity. In recent years the ESP, in conjunction with the MMS Procurement Office, has conducted pre-RFP meetings to ensure that all potential researchers understand the specific issues to be addressed in an upcoming procurement. MMS also reviews planned acquisitions to determine whether any are suitable for set-aside for small and disadvantaged businesses to encourage participation of new businesses in the ESP. Finally, the ESP encourages senior researchers to use and mentor the next generation of scientists. For example during the first six years of the MMS/State of Louisiana Coastal Marine Institute cooperative agreement to jointly address information needs of the MMS and the State, 14 postdoctoral associates, 26 doctoral candidates, 22 master's candidates, and 38 undergraduate students were involved with, and supported by, 50 MMS/State of Louisiana research projects.	9%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
10 (RD 3) <i>Does the program adequately define appropriate termination points and other decision points?</i>	Yes	The ESP is predicated on the continuation of the offshore oil and gas and marine minerals programs. Individual ESP projects have set schedules and budgets with defined final deliverables specified in award documents. These schedules are established to ensure that the information is available for specific decision-making endpoints.	Delivery schedules are specified in individual contracts. The delivery of scientific information is critical to the mission of the ESP as it supports both the draft Department's Goal of <i>managing resources to enhance public benefit, promote responsible use, and ensure optimal value</i> . This timeliness is critical in light of the President's Energy Plan which includes the continuation of "...OCS oil and gas leasing and approval of exploration and development plans on <u>predictable schedules</u> ."	9%	0.1
11 (RD 4) <i>If the program includes technology development or construction or operation of a facility, does the program clearly define deliverables and required capability/performance characteristics and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?</i>	N/A			0%	
Total Section Score				100%	72%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
-----------	------	-------------	---------------	-----------	----------------

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1	<i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	Large Extent	Multiple program reviews have given the ESP high marks while offering constructive criticism. The goals of the ESP, as established by the OCSLA, are in direct support of the MMS in its role as manager of the Nation's OCS energy and nonenergy mineral resources. MMS's long-term strategy seeks to: assess the availability of OCS energy and nonenergy resources; determine, in consultation with affected parties, if the resources can be developed in an environmentally sound manner; and regulate all operations activities when leasing occurs to ensure safety and environmental protection. The rating reflects the lack of adequate quantification of measures. However, it is recognized that establishing practical and meaningful performance measures for research is inherently difficult.	Independent evaluations by the NRC/NAS and internal evaluations such as the PMAT and the AMCR provide the benchmarks by which the program has been assessing its progress in achieving its goals. The goals of the ESP were established by the OCSLA and include: 1) to establish the information needed for assessment and management of environmental impacts from OCS activities; 2) to predict impacts on the marine biota which may result from chronic, low level pollution or large spills associated with OCS production from drilling fluids and cuttings discharges, pipeline emplacements, or onshore facilities; and 3) to monitor human marine and coastal environments to provide time series and data trend information. Also, findings of adequacy of information available for resource management decisions demonstrates progress in achieving long term goals.	25%	0.2
---	---	--------------	---	---	-----	-----

<p>Long-Term Goal I: To establish the information needed for assessment and management of environmental impacts from OCS activities.</p> <p>Target: To provide the information needed to completed Agency NEPA documents, support agency and departmental decisions regarding the OCS program, and to address specific issues/questions as they develop during the course of the OCS program.</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal: Multiple studies completed in all OCS Regions addressing those information needs identified by program stakeholders during the ESP planning process.</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal II: To predict impacts on the marine biota which may result from chronic, low level pollution or large spills associated with OCS production from drilling fluids and cuttings discharges, pipeline emplacements, or onshore facilities.</p> <p>Target: To increase available information, and the availability of the information, on biological resources and fates and effects of impact producing agents.</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal: ESP Information System, web site, posters, reports available to the public, public meetings & conferences, continual encouragement of researchers to publish in the peer reviewed literature.</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal III: To monitor human marine and coastal environments to provide time series and data trend information.</p> <p>Target: To identify significant changes in the quality and productivity of these environments and to identify the causes of these changes.</p>

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
--	-----------	------	-------------	---------------	-----------	----------------

	Actual Progress achieved toward	MMS leads in developing state-of-the-art monitoring protocols and techniques as demonstrated by the highly successful Flower Gardens goal: National Marine Sanctuary, Chemosynthetic Communities, Pacific Region's Marine Intertidal Team, and the Alaska Beaufort Sea Bowhead Whale monitoring programs.				
2	Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?	Large Extensi	Performance goals are achieved through assessment and prioritization of information needs, execution of procurement award process (initiation of new research), and technical oversight of ongoing research. <i>The resulting research is specifically intended to advance knowledge through scientific leadership and inform decisions through the application of science necessary to safeguard property and financial assets and improve quality of life for communities and trust beneficiaries (DOI Strategic Plan Goal 4). The rating reflects the lack of adequate quantification of measures. However, it is recognized that establishing practical and meaningful performance measures for research is inherently difficult.</i>	Annual establishment of research priorities through the Studies Development Plan (SDP) process; development of the National Studies List for Senior MMS Management review and approval; and finally, the awarding/initiation of new research (primarily through an open competitive procurement process).	25%	0.2

Key Goal I: Perform annual assessment of information needs with stakeholders leading to the development and finalization of the NSL	
Performance Target: Hold annual discourse with stakeholders of the OCS oil and gas and marine minerals programs regarding the most pressing information needs.	
Actual Performance: Discussions are completed and final approval of the National Studies List by the Associate Director OMM reflects stakeholder needs and priorities.	
Key Goal II: Complete detailed project designs and procurement award activities	
Performance Target: Timely design of individual research projects reflecting the needs and priorities of the approved National Studies List and their award through the Procurement Process.	
Actual Performance: Successful award of projects reflecting the information needs of the approved National Studies List.	
Key Goal III: Maintain the technical and financial oversight of ongoing research efforts and ensure dissemination of results from completed efforts.	
Performance Target: Proper contract financial and technical oversight ensuring that contract performance is consistent with stated cost, schedule, and objectives of award. Disseminate all final deliverables received.	
Actual Performance: Timely and accurate receipt of project information such as monthly and quarterly reports in order to disburse obligated funds. Where necessary, modifying contracts as appropriate.	

Complete detailed project designs and procurement award activities

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Large Extent	This is not easily demonstrated in the context of conducting research. However, the ESP disseminates information on its research program including proposed research areas. In some cases, entities conducting related research will propose to partner with MMS to share resources thereby reducing costs to both. Also, MMS thoroughly reviews existing research from all sources to identify information gaps, to avoid duplication of effort. The rating reflects the lack of adequate quantification of measures. However, it is recognized that establishing practical and meaningful performance measures for research is inherently difficult.	Increasing our use of the internet to disseminate information on the ESP, public meeting, Science Committee, etc.	25%	0.2
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	N/A	The environmental studies program is unique because it is focused on oil, gas and marine mineral extraction on the OCS. MMS alone has the mandate to develop environmental assessment information in support of offshore oil and gas leasing and development activities. The OCSLA directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct the OCS offshore oil and gas program, and this responsibility has been delegated to the MMS. Furthermore, the President's Energy Policy directs the Secretary of the Interior to continue OCS oil and gas leasing and approval of exploration and development plans on predictable schedules. Other Federal regulatory agencies review and comment on MMS's environmental study findings. In addition, other Federal agencies study and monitor marine and coastal environments but have different missions. The ESP coordinates extensively with other Federal research programs to minimize duplication of effort and to maximize opportunities for collaboration and cost sharing. The rating reflects the lack of adequate quantification of measures. However, it is recognized that establishing practical and meaningful measures for research is inherently difficult.		0%	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Yes	The GAO review of the ESP (1988) found that customers were satisfied with the usefulness, timeliness, and quality of the program studies. In 1986 the MMS requested that the NAS undertake a review of the ESP which lasted six years, cost approximately \$1 million and produced six reports on various technical disciplines, information adequacy for certain OCS areas, and ESP program management. The NAS (1993) review included the following conclusions/recommendations: (1) The ESP has provided important and useful information to inform decisions about the OCS and has contributed significantly to the accumulation of knowledge about the continental shelf; (2) MMS should strengthen the role and place more importance on advice from the Scientific Committee; (3) MMS should increase emphasis of post-lease studies and consider increasing the priority for studies in the Gulf of Mexico; (4) MMS is commended for increasing academic involvement in the ESP, and is commended for its cooperative programs with other federal agencies.	GAO review (1988), NAS/NRC reviews (1990, 1992, 1993), letter to the MMS Director from the OCS Scientific Committee of the MMS Advisory Board on the excellent progress concerning ESP activities in initiating deepwater studies; findings of two Alternative Management Control Reviews (1993, 1999). Evaluations by the Scientific Committee (1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002) indicate commendations for information technology initiatives and continued support for ESP efforts which synthesize existing information. The full Scientific Committee endorsed the MMS Deepwater Studies Plan (1998-99) and endorsed the continued development of new starts for the 1999-2000 plan providing additional endorsement of the ESP. The Scientific Committee conducted a review of MMS responsiveness to the NAS recommendations at its 1995 meeting and passed a resolution indicating satisfaction with MMS progress towards addressing those recommendations.	25%	0.3
6 (RD 1)	<i>If the program includes construction of a facility, were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?</i>	N/A			0%	
Total Section Score					100%	75%

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: **PARTNERS FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE**

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	The Partners program purpose is to provide technical and financial assistance to private landowners who voluntarily wish to restore fish and wildlife habitat on their lands. Fish and wildlife habitat restoration projects are limited to habitat for Federal trust species by law. There is no specific legislative declared purpose for the Partners Program (the program is authorized under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956); however, the program's purpose, as described in Partners' program policies, has consensus among interested parties. The program purpose is not to acquire interests in the land but to facilitate private land treatments that have a durable impact on Federal trust fish and wildlife species.	Legislation: Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 gives the Service general authority to conduct fish and wildlife projects, FWS Policy: Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (interim operating draft since 1997) (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, 504 FW 10) . Federal Trust Species: A wide range of federal legislation and executive orders provide the Service with principal trust responsibility to protect and conserve migratory birds, threatened and endangered species, certain marine mammals, and inter-jurisdictional fisheries (see authorizing statutes pages 26-34 of FY2003 budget justification). Solicitor's Opinion on Private Lands: May 29, 1996 Memo from Director to Directorate transmitting to the field the Solicitor's Opinion on authorities permitting FWS to obligate public funds for private land habitat restoration projects.	20%	0.2
2 <i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Loss or degradation of habitat is a leading cause of declining Federal trust species populations (i.e., migratory birds, inter-jurisdictional fish, threatened and endangered species). For example, nationwide 53% of all wetlands have been lost, 90% of native prairie is gone, 70% of riparian (streamside) habitat has been lost, and 3.6 million miles of streams have been degraded. Additionally, there are water quality and supply problems, invasive species, habitat fragmentation, and declining watershed health which all lead to declining population health due to limited available habitat. With over 70 percent of our Nation's land in private ownership, most of the Federal trust species the FWS is charged with conserving for future generations live on or use private lands. Fortunately, many private landowners are interested in providing fish and wildlife habitat on their own lands. The Partners Program provides one-on-one technical assistance and financial assistance (cost-sharing) to private landowners who undertake habitat restoration projects on their land.	Scientific Documentation of Degraded Habitats: e.g., Status and Trends of Wetlands in the Conterminous US 1986-1997. United States Shorebird Conservation Plan 2001. Status of the States: Innovative State Strategies for Biodiversity Conservation 2001. Our Natural Legacy Delaware's Biodiversity Conservation Partnership 2001, Stream Steward Restoration Guide, U.S. FWS Waterfowl Population Status 2002, The State of Our Environment Commonwealth of Massachusetts 2000, Kentucky Alive Report of the Kentucky Biodiversity Task Force 1995, The Landscape Project NJ Endangered and nongame Species Program, The North American Bird Conservation Initiative in the United States: A Vision of American Bird Conservation 2000. WAITING LIST: Over 2000 landowners on the waiting list each year show public interest in the program.	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3 <i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The Partners program plays a significant part in efforts to restore habitat on private lands that are used by federal trust species. This significant impact is a direct reflection of the programs ability to successfully leverage program funds with private land owners' financial and in-kind contributions. By meeting and exceeding Partners goal of leveraging of Federal dollars one-to-one with private landowner contributions, the Partners program has a significant impact on habitat restoration on private lands. Without the Partners Program, private landowners would not have access to state-of-the-art restoration expertise and custom-made restoration plans and they would not have the financial means to restore habitat. The thousands of individual on-the-ground restoration projects contribute significantly to the achievement of the project's output goals as well as long-term outcome related habitat restoration goals.	Leveraging: The program is designed to focus funds and resources on habitat restoration on private lands; the program works with landowners and other contributing partners to leverage funds and resources. Program has maximum flexibility to cost-share with multiple parties on any project. FWS Policy: Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program, Fish and Wildlife Service Manual (Chapter 640 FW 1) establishes goal of at least 50 percent cost-share and in-kind services. No funds are released to the landowner until the project is certified complete and correct. FY 2001 Partners Accomplishment Report: 1:1 cost-share goal achieved (value of \$25 million in partner funds and in-kind contributions); 3,036 landowner agreements entered into during year; 48,800 wetland acres restored/enhanced; 335,000 uplands restored/enhanced; 1,022 miles of riparian and instream habitat restored/enhanced.	20%	0.2
4 <i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	No	There are a handful of programs within the Federal government that help private landowners restore and conserve habitat on their lands including the FWS Coastal Program, USDA Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program (WHIP), and the USDA Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP). The Partners program avoids duplication of effort by prohibiting the expenditure of restoration funds on Federal and State lands, prohibits replacing USDA funds with FWS restoration funds on joint projects, and doesn't do compensatory mitigation. None of the other similar programs have been able to successfully recreate the high level of technical expertise, program flexibility, or the very critical one-on-one relationship with the private landowner associated with the Partners program. The WHIP program is the most similar with a goal of "providing cost-sharing assistance to landowners developing habitat for upland wildlife, wetland wildlife, threatened and endangered species, fish and other types of wildlife." Landowners seek out the Partners Program because of the program's expertise in fish and wildlife habitat restoration, minimal response time, track record of successful projects, and personal commitment of the program reps. Unlike most State-sponsored programs, the Partners Program does not require public access to restored sites.	Other Conservation Programs: Currently WHIP offers some of these services but the program applicant must be knowledgeable about restoration techniques in order to prepare the application and there are limits on partnerships. WRP 10-year agreements offer some of these services but only for wetlands and only if your land has an agricultural history. Related Program Appropriations for FY 2002: Partners=\$37M (\$26M excluding earmarks), WHIP=\$15M, Coastal program=\$11M. Other relevant programs include WRP and CRP. State Summaries: Each State describes their unique methods of working with landowners to restore habitat. Testimonials: Private landowners have written letters and emails to the Service indicating that they preferred working with the Partners Program rather than the USDA programs. Waiting List: Accomplishment reports identify unmet need (i.e., waiting list).	20%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 <i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The current flexible, cost-shared program design has proved to be a logical method for encouraging habitat restoration and conservation on private lands while ensuring accountability and performance. When the program was first created in the 1980s many states wanted the program to be designed as a grant program to the states. After more than 15 years, however, the cost-share design has proved to be logical and successful. Great care is taken to design restoration on working lands. Decades of biological expertise and track record of restoration enables the program to tailor restoration to the site, the landowner's needs, and the ecological community.	FWS Policy: Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (interim operating draft since 1997) (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, 504 FW 10). Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program, Program Activities: State Summaries identifying the tailoring of projects. Monitoring report for Wisconsin: Survey of program participants in Wisconsin indicated that 89% of the landowners intended to maintain the restored habitat after the agreement period expired.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score				100%	80%

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	Yes	The Program's goal is to facilitate the restoration of habitat on private lands in a sufficient quantity, quality and location to ensure that Federal trust species continue to exist for future generations. To achieve this outcome, the program has set 5-year output goals, and annual output goals described in terms of acres and miles of priority habitats to be restored through voluntary agreements. The 5-year goals appear to be overly ambitious as currently stated in FWS Strategic Plans. The program contributes substantially to DOI Outcome Goal 1.2 - Sustained biological communities on DOI managed and influenced lands and waters. As part of the Environment/Wetlands Common Measures activity, an efficiency-based goal may be developed. Output goals are used in part because of the difficulty in obtaining measurable outcome data.	Strategic Plans: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Strategic Plan 9/30/1997 - 9/30/2002. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Strategic Plan FY2000-FY2005. Annual Plans: FY02 Annual Performance Plan & FY00 Annual Performance Report, FY03 Annual Performance Plan & FY01 Annual Performance Report. PFW State Sheets: show accomplishments by State and long-term goals by State. GPRA Regional Targets: breakout of performance targets and accomplishments for FY01 & FY00. See section IV, question 1 for goals.	20%	0.2
2 <i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	The Program has annual performance measures stated in terms of acres and miles of restored wetlands, uplands, riparian, and in-stream habitat achieved through voluntary agreements. Annual targets are set each year based on previous year accomplishments. The program contributes substantially to DOI Outcome Goal 1.2 - Sustained biological communities on DOI managed and influenced lands and waters. As part of the Environment/Wetlands Common Measures activity, an efficiency-based goal may be developed.	Strategic Plans: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Strategic Plan 9/30/1997 - 9/30/2002. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Strategic Plan FY2000-FY2005. Annual Plans: FY02 Annual Performance Plan & FY00 Annual Performance Report, FY03 Annual Performance Plan & FY01 Annual Performance Report. PFW State Sheets: show accomplishments by State and long-term goals by State. GPRA Regional Targets: breakout of performance targets and accomplishments for FY01 & FY00. See section IV, question 2 for goals.	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3 <i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	Landowners and NGO's that contribute to the projects support the long-term and annual goals of the program. All contributors (financial or technical assistance) are required to sign an agreement that specifically identifies by project the number of acres of miles, location, habitat type to be restored, timetable, and duration of agreement. NGO's have expressed their support for the goals by contributing to the projects and sending letters of support. Policy requires Landowner Agreements to include accountability information such as acres to be restored, funds committed, timetable for completion. Partners Policy requires all projects to be certified complete by the Partners biologist prior to the dispersal of any cost-share. Obligating documents refer to specific projects. Accomplishment reports are based on actual acres restored by a project not the anticipated acreage. Partners Policy requires monitoring periodically during the agreement period. The Habitat Information Tracking System (HabITS) includes obligating dates and project completion dates.	FWS Policy: Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (interim operating draft since 1997) (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, 504 FW 10). Testimonials from landowners and other partnering organizations. Landowner Agreements. Cooperative Agreements. Memoranda of Understanding.	20%	0.2
4 <i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	The Partners Program began in 1987 and has worked with 27,000 landowners and 100's of other contributing partners. One of our biggest partners is USDA which has numerous conservation programs. The Partners Program, through guidance, limits redundancy and strives for complementary activities when operating in the same watershed or site. At the state level, the program enters into arrangements whereby the Service, an NGO, and NRCS jointly hire an individual to deliver all three programs; that individual is able to use the most applicable program to the issue at hand.	MOU with NRCS for WRP delivery. FWS Policy: Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (interim operating draft since 1997) (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, 504 FW 10) describes in detail how Partners coordinates with NRCS and FSA to implement the conservation provisions of the Farm Bill. Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 PL 107-171 enacted May 13, 2002, also known as the "Farm Bill": WRP legislation and regulations identifies FWS role. New York Reimbursable Agreement between FWS and NRCS for WRP. Agreement between Wisconsin Waterfowl Assoc & NRCS & FWS for WRP. Testimonials from non-government organizations show support and coordination. State sheets showing partners.	8%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 <i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	No	The program does not have regularly scheduled objective, independent evaluations to examine how well the program is accomplishing its mission and meeting its long-term goals. Gaps in performance are generally addressed informally among program managers and FWS planning staff. However, this process doesn't appear to capture larger strategic planning issues that regular evaluations may have identified such as the program's overly ambitious 5 yr goal. The Partners program recently volunteered to undergo an in-depth program review of management and administration through the FWS's Management Control Review process during 2002. In 1997, the IG reviewed the Partners Program and found that it was accomplishing its goals. Recommendations for improving management and administration of the program have been written into policy or guidance and adopted.	Management Control Review. IG Audit 1997. Chemung County Soil and Water Conservation District Legislative Briefing (Program Report Cards), Wisconsin-Assessment of landowner Participation and Habitat Accomplishments, One Acre at a Time Video of landowner testimonials.	13%	0.0
6 <i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	No	While the implications on program performance can be determined based on various funding levels, budgeting and performance planning are not integrated. Annual budgeting for the program is not based on a determination of the level of financial resources needed to obtain annual and long-term goals. Since the program knows the costs of restoring habitats in different parts of the country, it can predict acreage accomplishments by habitat type based on available funding. Program budget requests to the FWS generally reflect an effort to achieve program output goals over an extended timeframe but not the current five year long-term goal.	FWS Policy: Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, & 504 FW 10) (interim operating draft since 1997) specifies that funding will be used only for restoration on private lands. Allocation formulas for funding increases. Annual FWS Budget Justification.	8%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	No	While the Service has informal procedures for adjusting targets for the long-term goals in its current strategic plan, the current long-term goal has not been adjusted to realistic program expectations. The initial long-term goal targets were set by Service management teams, who were program experts in the particular goal area. At the end of each reporting year, the Planning and Evaluation Staff reviews the final year data and compares it to the long-term goal targets to determine if the targets are attainable. Recommendations for adjusting the long-term targets are discussed with the appropriate program manager, who reviews the suggestion with senior management who has responsibility for the goal. However, during the PART process it became obvious that this process was not working as expected as it was acknowledged that the current LT goal target is overly ambitious, unlikely to be attained, and not consistent with the Program's expectations. Recent actions will likely help to address this deficiency (e.g. incorporating performance goals/measures into SES managers performance plans). Also, the Partners Program is currently undergoing an indepth review of program management and administration via the Service's Management Control Review process.	The Program exercises close coordination with the FWS Planning Office and provides or confirms planning activities and annual accomplishment targets. The Program conducts Regional and Field Office reviews of the program on a regular basis. The Program is currently undergoing a Management Control Review. The FWS conducts stakeholder meetings and sends out questionnaires to stakeholders every 3 years to identify stakeholder priorities and concerns and to incorporate them into strategic planning.	13%	0.0

Total Section Score	100%	68%
----------------------------	-------------	------------

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)					
Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	Annual accomplishment reports quantitatively and qualitatively describe program accomplishments by region. Tables and narrative explanations explain the benefits and significance of the projects. All accomplishment reports identify partners and their contributions and performance. The performance reports are used by the Program to adjust priorities and activities in a watershed. Once a habitat goal is met in one watershed, the Program moves on to another watershed. Landowner agreements are very specific with respect to performance. The program uses the information to adaptively manage the program by adjusting priorities based on accomplishment of goals in a watershed. For example, the Program has shifted invasive species funds from Alaska (which doesn't have many opportunities) to another Region with better opportunities and replaced Alaska's funds with fish habitat funds (for which they do have opportunities).	Annual Partners Program Accomplishment Reports. Habitat Information Tracking System (a web-based data system that allows field personnel to enter project data into the national database any time). Landowner Agreements. Allocation formulas.	14%	0.1
2 <i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	No	While SES level managers and landowners are held directly accountable for performance results, field managers are not. Recently, the FWS included GPRA performance goals/measures in the performance plans of all SES managers. This provides a layer of accountability for setting and accomplishing long-term and annual performance goals. Field managers, however, are simply charged in their official Performance Plans to administer the Partners Program to optimize accomplishments and cost efficiencies. While these field managers must submit accomplishment reports there are no criteria or processes to ensure cost, schedule, or performance results are accomplished. Landowner & cooperative agreements contain specific performance measures (acres and miles of habitat to be restored), costs, timetables, and agreement duration. Landowners are not issued the cost-share until the project is certified complete by the Partners biologist. Landowners who remove the restoration before the end of the agreement period are required to refund the cost-share to the government.	Landowner Agreements, Cooperative Agreements, SES Managers Performance Plan; Program Manager Performance Plans	14%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3 <i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	For FY 2001, the Partners program unobligated balance at the end of the year was roughly 3%. FWS allocates funds to the 7 Regions within 30 days of the Interior appropriations bill being signed. The Regions allocate these funds to the Field Offices within 30 days of receiving them (60 days from the Interior appropriations bill being signed). The Partners policy states that at least 70% of the habitat restoration funds must be used for on the ground habitat restoration work and no more than 30% for overhead and support. Regional Partners Coordinators review financial system statements and accomplishment reports to ensure that funds are being used by the field appropriately. Cost-sharing funds are released to the cooperator as soon as the project is certified complete and according to standards and specifications.	Appropriated funds status reports show Partners (1121) funds are obligated in a timely manner, Management Control Review evaluated Regional fund allocations and expenditures. Financial reports indicate low unobligated balances. Financial reports and accomplishment reports help verify funds are spent on intended purposes.	14%	0.1
4 <i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	The program has de-layered the management structure and has enabled field offices to make on-the-spot decisions on funding. The program has a cost-share goal of 50% nationwide. The program requires annual reports on accomplishments and leveraging. Program is designed to partner with almost anybody or any organization in an effort to reduce program costs and focus skills and resources on community selected projects. Program flexibility allows field offices to use the most effective methods for accomplishing restoration (e.g., in-kind services). New common measures efficiency goal may assist program in improving efficiencies and cost effectiveness.	FWS Policy: Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (interim operating draft since 1997) (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, 504 FW 10). Common Measures Efficiency Goal.	14%	0.1
5 <i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	No	Although the Department of the Interior complies with managerial cost accounting standards, it does not yet have a financial management system that fully allocates program costs and associates those cost with specific performance measures. This requirement might be met through Activity Based Costing (ABC), which DOI is adopting for each of its bureaus. While the FWS has a cost allocation methodology to ensure that general administrative costs are allocated in a consistent manner to all activities and all appropriations of the FWS, this still does not cover the full costs of the program. The FWS is scheduled to begin implementing ABC in FY 2004.	FWS Budget Justification, FY 2003.	14%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6 <i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	No	While the FWS generally employs sound financial management practices to administer all of its programs, including the Partners Program, a January 2002, independent auditor's report identified four material internal control weaknesses and one reportable condition. Of these, two apply to service-wide processes and systems that the Partners program uses. The first applicable weakness cited was untimely and inaccurate financial reporting. The second weakness was inadequate security and controls over financial Management Systems. The FWS financial management system has specific system controls in place to minimize the risk of erroneous payments. In addition, the Regional Partners Coordinators review payment transactions recorded in the financial system to ensure that they are in accordance with the program's goals and objectives. The auditors found no significant problems with improper, duplicate or erroneous payments.	Audit Report: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Shared Commitments to Conservation 2001 Accountability Report of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Independent Auditors' Report, KPMG, January 21, 2002; FWS Policy: Financial Management System, FWS policy. Division of Finance - General Operations Budget Fiscal Year 2001 vs. Fiscal Year 2002.	14%	0.0
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The Partners Program has taken action to correct management deficiencies identified in the 1997 IG report. Additionally, Partners Program managers requested the program undergo an in-depth program management and administration review by the FWS's Service's Management Control Review process to help identify additional deficiencies.	2002 Management Control Review is underway. FWS Policy: Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (interim operating draft since 1997) (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, 504 FW 10). IG Audit 1997. FWS memo addressing IG Audit. For example, FWS provided Regional and Field staff with guidance that (1) ensured that cooperative agreements are prepared and signed for all program projects, (2) ensured that project files contain adequate documentation to fully support project expenditures, and (3) clarified the types of costs that are considered when calculating cost-share.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	57%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	small extent	Based on trend analysis of historic and current Partners' program targets and results, the Partners program will not achieve its long term goals. While annual goal are routinely exceeded, even these actual accomplishment levels would fail to achieve the long term goal targets. Data for common measures exercise is being collected and may lead to an efficiency goal.	FY02 Annual Performance Plan, FY03 Annual Performance Plan, FY00 Annual Performance Report, FY01 Annual Performance Report, PFW State Sheets showing accomplishments by State, Regional breakout of targets and accomplishments FY01 & FY00.	20%	0.1

Long-Term Goal I: Improve fish and wildlife populations by restoring wetlands, uplands, and riparian and stream habitat.
Target: FY01-FY05 targets = restore 330,000 acres of wetlands, 900,000 acres of uplands, and 4,900 miles of riparian and stream habitat.

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Accomplishments through FY2002 = 103,309 acres of wetlands, 441,782 acres of uplands, 1,414 miles of riparian and stream restored.				
Long-Term Goal II:	Improve fish and wildlife populations through efficiencies as evidenced by acres of wetlands established, re-established, rehabilitated, enhanced, or protected/maintained per \$1 million in total costs.				
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Target: Targets currently being determined as part of the common measures exercise.				
2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?	large extent	The Program exceeded its annual targets in FY 2001 but only met two of its three targets in FY 2002. In FY 2001, the Program greatly exceeded its target for upland restoration because of unprecedented partnerships in Regions 2 and 6 and a great demand for better range management. Based on trend analysis of targets and recent program results, the annual targets are not being set high enough to achieve the long term goals. Annual goals are set annually and not based on a strategic plan to achieve long-term goals.	FY02 Annual Performance Plan, FY03 Annual Performance Plan, FY00 Annual Performance Report, FY01 Annual Performance Report, PFW State Sheets showing accomplishments by State, Regional breakout of targets and accomplishments FY01 & FY00.	20%	0.1
Key Goal I: Improve fish and wildlife populations by restoring wetlands, uplands, and riparian and stream habitat.					
Performance Target: FY01 targets = 39,700 acres of wetlands, 65,979 acres of uplands, 324 miles of riparian and stream restored.					
Actual Performance: FY01 accomplishments = 45,787 ac wetland, 283,606 ac upland, 888 miles of riparian and stream.					
Key Goal II: Acres of wetlands established, re-established, rehabilitated, enhanced, or protected/maintained per \$1 million in total costs.					
Performance Target: Targets currently being determined as part of the common measures exercise.					
Actual Performance:					
Key Goal III:					
Performance Target:					
Actual Performance:					

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3 <i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	large extent	Annual accomplishments have continued to increase because of a concerted effort by the program to increase the number and scope of the partnerships and to better leverage funds and resources. The program is flexible enough to incorporate new techniques and materials to lower costs. Program leverages funds and uses in-house expertise to deliver on-the-ground projects. The Program is flexible enough to skip over project sites that are unsuitable for restoration. Decision-making at the field level, with respect to project selection and design, enables the program to make the best possible fit of resource management and restoration techniques for the specific site. Partners Program representatives receive training to maintain skills and understanding of state-of-the-art restoration techniques. Periodically the program coordinators meet to exchange success and failure case studies to pass on lessons learned to other coordinators. New common measures efficiency goal may help manage for more efficiencies. The "Large Extent" is provided rather than a "Yes" because of lack of evidence of leve cost efficiencies.	Performance: FY02 Annual Performance Plan, FY03 Annual Performance Plan, FY00 Annual Performance Report, FY01 Annual Performance Report. PFW State Sheets showing accomplishments by State, Regional breakout of targets and accomplishments FY01 & FY00. Monitoring: biological results based on monitoring reports. Testimonials from landowners working in more than one Federal conservation program. Wisconsin-Assessment of landowner Participation and Habitat Accomplishments. Habitat Information Tracking System. Documents showing Washington Office expenditures covering training of Field personnel for stream restoration techniques.	20%	0.1
4 <i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	large extent	FWS provided data as part of the wetlands common measures exercise, however, no other agency in the exercise provided data so we cannot say how the Partners program compares to others performing similar wetlands activities. There is not a comprehensive evaluation or documentation comparing similar habitat restoration programs, such as USDA programs such as Wildlife Habitat Improvement Program or Wetlands Reserve Program, however, the FWS has testimonials that indicate users believe the Partners program is better than similar USDA programs.	Performance: FY02 Annual Performance Plan, FY03 Annual Performance Plan, FY00 Annual Performance Report, FY01 Annual Performance Report. PFW State Sheets showing accomplishments by State, Regional breakout of targets and accomplishments FY01 & FY00. Monitoring: biological results based on monitoring reports. Testimonials from landowners working in more than one Federal conservation program. Wisconsin-Assessment of landowner Participation and Habitat Accomplishments, One Acre at a Time Video of landowner testimonials. Monitoring reports. Testimonials from non-government organizations.	20%	0.1
5 <i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Yes	In 1997, the IG reviewed the Partners Program and found that it was accomplishing its goals. Recommendations for improving management and administration of the program have been written into policy or guidance and adopted. Through the Service's Management Control Review process the Partners Program is currently undergoing an in-depth review of program management and administration.	Management Control Review, IG Audit 1997, OMB review 2001, Chemung County soil and Water Conservation district Legislative Briefing (Program Report Cards), Wisconsin-Assessment of landowner Participation and Habitat Accomplishments, One Acre at a Time Video of landowner testimonials. Monitoring reports. Testimonials from non-government organizations.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score				100%	67%

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The purpose of Reclamation's Hydropower Program is to generate and provide low-cost, reliable power and ancillary services for the citizens of the 17 Western States in Reclamation's service area: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Evidence: The primary authorizing legislation is the Reclamation Act of 1902. Subsequent authorizations (The Town Sites and Power Development Acts of 1906, The Federal Water Power Act of 1920, the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and individual project authorizations) have continued to authorize power development on Reclamation Projects.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program addresses a major portion of the need for power generation in the Western U.S. The program is an integral part of the interconnected electric system, the grid of power generating and transmission facilities that generate and move power around the country. Reclamation was instrumental in supporting the system during the recent California power crisis.

Evidence: Reclamation provides power for about 2.5 million megawatt-hours of project use and 40 million megawatt-hours to other power customers annually. Reclamation also provides system support services such as load-following, voltage regulation, spinning reserve, standby reserve, and black start capability.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Congress authorized Reclamation to reclaim arid and semi-arid western lands, with hydropower generation as a byproduct of its other facilities. At that time (early 1900s), there was no competition from the private sector in western hydropower production. Although other public and private entities generate hydropower, Reclamation's role is unique in that it was one of the leaders in developing western hydropower capacity, thereby establishing its facilities as central to western hydropower generation. The inclusion of power in project purposes allowed for development of water projects by repaying part of project costs and also by directly supporting irrigation by paying part of the costs allocated to irrigation.

Evidence: Reclamation provides about 10 percent of electrical capacity and 23 percent of hydropower capacity in the western U.S., and plays a crucial role in the stability and flexibility of the West's electrical grid. Power produced at Reclamation's 58 hydropower facilities is also used for pumping water on Reclamation's projects (Reclamation-Wide Power Performance for Fiscal Year 2001; Bureau of Reclamation Power Resources Office, Business Plan, January 2002). Reclamation's powerplants annually generate over 42 billion KWh of hydroelectric energy, enough to meet the annual residential needs of 14 million people (Reclamation's Power Program, agency flier).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Reclamation's hydropower program was not designed as an integrated unit, although many of its components are operated in close coordination with each other. While it was not designed in an integrated fashion, it does not have any significant problems that inhibit effective operations and functions.

Evidence: There have been no significant findings or recommendations identified by any groups including the IG or OMB suggesting that the program has problems. Program personnel meet regularly with power customers to assure that potential problem areas are addressed in a timely manner. In addition, the program meets regularly with Federal Power Marketing Agencies (PMAs), other Federal power producers, and other regulatory agencies to assure continued compliance with existing system regulations, requirements, and needs.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program effectively meets the needs of beneficiaries, which include project users and also power customers that benefit from the surplus power.

Evidence: Reclamation project beneficiaries directly benefit from the power that is generated to meet project needs. Surplus power is marketed by the PMAs. PMA marketing is directed at public non-profit entities (such as public utilities) to ensure widespread beneficial use. PMAs and Reclamation track the amount of power delivered to customers to confirm that delivery obligations are met. Revenues pay for the portion of power repayment allocated to power which helped the initial project by directly paying for a portion of project capital costs. In addition surplus power is sold to benefit water districts, municipalities, and other not-for-profit groups, with a portion of these costs used to repay some irrigation costs that are beyond the irrigators ability to pay. The power is also used to support the Western electrical system on a daily and emergency basis. Reclamation works closely with the PMAs to coordinate and manage the multipurpose project operations to enable effective marketing, generation, and delivery of electric power.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The long term goal for the hydropower program is to operate and maintain the multi-purpose hydro system to provide reliable and efficient power to project users and preference customers through the PMAs. The program has recently developed new long term goals that address the ability of the powerplants to meet energy demands during peak demand periods, and to improve the overall condition and long-term viability of power facilities.

Evidence: The two new 10 year goals align with Reclamation's and the Department's strategic goals. The first goal is designed to increase unit availability during summer peak demand times when the interconnected electrical system demands are highest. This also increases the value of the various ancillary generation products and also increases the system's ability to avoid and/or recover from system emergencies. The second goal addresses long term powerplant condition by decreasing the amount of major generating components rated in poor condition. At present there are over 500 components in use that are beyond their expected useful lives with an additional 200 components reaching that point in the next ten years. In recent years the rate of upgraded or replaced components has been only 20-25 per year. An increase in this rate will likely be required to decrease the number of poor components being added to the list. See the revised Power Program Business Plan.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program goals are ambitious in that they seek to increase the unit availability to very high levels when compared to typical industry availability. In addition, the long term goal is to decrease the number of power generating components rated in poor condition, even as more of these components meet their design life. This will require making the large capital expenditures in support of an aggressive maintenance and replacement plan.

Evidence: The program goal to increase peak demand period availability increases availability during peak periods from the present 92 percent to 94 percent. This is very significant since average unit availability in the hydroelectric industry is around 88 percent. There is significant risk that this goal could be missed if a couple of large units were taken out of service for any reason. As an example, a worker leaving a wrench inside a unit after a repair caused damage resulting in the loss of 600 megawatts of capacity for over one year. The other goal of decreasing the amount of generating components that are in poor condition is also ambitious because funding depends on convincing customers that these expenditures are necessary.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program is changing its long-term goals to better document improvements in program performance. Existing annual goals and procedures can show progress toward reaching the new long-term goals. These existing annual goals will be supplemented with new annual goals.

Evidence: The present forced outage goal fits very well into achieving the new long-term goals of increasing peak demand period availability and also is a good indicator of facility condition. The present cost per megawatt goal also fits into the goal of improving facility conditions while keeping costs competitive, and will put a premium on prioritization of program expenditures. New annual goals are also being added to measure annual progress toward meeting the long-term goals of increasing unit availability during peak demand periods and also measuring improvement in facility condition.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The previous goals, although ambitious in their own right did not demonstrate that the program was making long-term improvements. The new annual goals will demonstrate program improvement. Baselines have been established for unit availability, facility condition, and annual costs.

Evidence: The goals are found in the Power Resources Program Business Plan for 2003. Each of these goals includes some key initiatives on which progress is tracked annually. They are also reflected in Reclamation's Strategic Plan and GPRA Plan. Some of the GPRA goals are to maximize power generation and efficiency by maintaining power production costs at a level comparable to the most efficient and lowest cost sector of the hydropower industry and forced outage below the industry average. In anticipation of an open market in ancillary services Reclamation has formed a hydropower optimization team that is starting to look at the hydropower optimization issue.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Regional Power offices all participate in extensive planning meetings with the Power Marketing Agencies (PMAs) and power customers. The two PMAs in the Western U.S., Bonneville and Western, set production and maintenance goals for the year in concert with Reclamation and have ongoing meetings and discussions to set goals all the way down to as little as an hourly time goal.

Evidence: Bonneville and Reclamation agree on performance goals and incentives for Reclamation power production and outages and a capital expenditure plan. These are tracked closely and reported monthly. During the recent California power crisis Glen Canyon and Hoover powerplants were called upon to produce emergency peak hourly power to meet system emergencies that were above the planned generation schedules.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Reclamation works with the outside consultant firm of Hadden-Jackson which is known as the main player in doing hydropower assessments. This firm has an extensive database of costs and facilities of private and public hydropower plants, and conducts annual in-depth surveys and evaluations on members to determine best practices for various aspects of hydropower operations and conducts annual workshops with participants to identify weaknesses and offer suggestions for improvements.

Evidence: Reclamation has worked with Haddon-Jackson, an independent consultant generally regarded as the leader in benchmarking hydroelectric plants in North America, since 1996 and has evaluated operations at Reclamation facilities which represent almost 90 percent of Reclamation's capacity. Last year Reclamation's Parker and Davis powerplants were evaluated as the best performers in terms of performing operations and maintenance at the lowest costs of all plants in the Haddon-Jackson study. Power reviews of operations and maintenance at individual plants are conducted regularly by teams from outside the plant.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The expenditures are fully tracked by the power customers and they participate in decision making for these expenditures. By looking at long term trends it is possible to show that when facilities are neglected for lack of funding the reliability of the units is noticeably reduced.

Evidence: Budgets are reviewed and negotiated with PMAs and power customers to determine spending priorities. The forced outage rate for Reclamation's generating facilities was at much higher levels in the early 90s when funding for maintenance was not sufficient. The PMAs also negotiate on capital expenditures at individual plants and develop capital expenditure plans, which the PMAs then track.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program has changed its long-term goals to more effectively demonstrate that the program is continuing to improve. The program undertook an extensive reinvention effort in past years and worked with Reclamation stakeholders to identify how the Program could improve itself and identified areas of improvement and also identified what later became strategic goals. Also, the Reclamation Power Resources Office annually updates and publishes its strategic business plan where upcoming issues and solutions are identified.

Evidence: The Power Business Plan is updated annually in consultation with the Regional offices and other stakeholders. The new long term performance measures which will increase powerplant performance are being added. The Power Management Laboratory received the Golden Hammer Award for its work on the National Performance Review Power Management Laboratory. Reclamation meets monthly and annually with power customers to discuss upcoming problems such as major replacements and operating plans.

2.CA1 **Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program has a process that analyzes the costs and benefits of maintenance and repairs versus the risk of failure and the impact to operational costs. Major replacements and maintenance are scheduled with customer coordination to keep the price of energy stable. Although the program has not undergone an overall cost-benefit analysis, such an undertaking would not contribute much if anything to program operations, since the focus of operations is at the level of individual facilities, not the overall program.

Evidence: The program produces annual reviews that detail each facility's performance and costs. The program also has the power industry's foremost specialist, Haddon-Jackson, conduct annual audits on powerplant performance, which measure and quantify how Reclamation plants compare to other plants within the industry and identify possible program shortcomings. Reclamation also works closely with the power marketing agencies to meet scheduled power delivery requirements and works closely with power customers to evaluate plans for operations and maintenance improvements. Reclamation is involved with Hydro Quebec and the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers on developing a comprehensive risk analysis methodology to prioritize capital expenditures. This work forms the basis of Reclamation's new long-term goals.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program closely tracks performance information, which is closely scrutinized by program partners, and used to both plan future work and to assess past performance. Data is collected on power generation, outages, and individual maintenance for all its generation units. The program collects all production cost data and collates that data into an annual performance report.

Evidence: Reclamation publishes its annual "Databook" with individual and Reclamation-wide powerplant costs and reliability with industry wide comparisons. Reclamation has recently established new baselines for its two new long-term performance measures based on five years of data for peak availability. The baseline data has recently been established for measuring progress on the new long term goals.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program and its managers continue to be under close scrutiny from power customers who monitor and participate in major operating and spending decisions. In addition, program managers now have the program goals written into their performance standards.

Evidence: Program goals are written into each Regional Director's and project manager's performance standards. Power customers continuously monitor project performance through meetings and monthly and annual performance reports. Capital and operating and maintenance expenses are also negotiated as to timing and need. Bonneville Power Administration has set performance goals for Reclamation powerplants which have a direct linkage to employee results. There is a cash incentive program whereby PMAs may make an additional cash payment to Reclamation for meeting certain targets.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Most of Reclamation's funds are obligated and spent on schedule and very little funding carries over from one year to the next.

Evidence: Obligation rates for Reclamation have consistently been in the 95-97% range, and this is also true for the Hydropower Program.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: An annual report is produced showing performance for each powerplant for which Reclamation has operation and maintenance responsibilities.

Evidence: The annual "Databook" report is produced showing performance for each powerplant for which Reclamation have operation and maintenance responsibilities. The performance of each powerplant is compared internally and externally with plants of similar size. Of the 25 hydroelectric powerplants over 500 megawatts in capacity, Reclamation plants ranked 1,2, 3, and 10 in lowest cost/megawatt of capacity in FY 2002.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program works very closely with its power customers and especially the power marketing agencies to ensure that costs and expenditures remain as low as possible and that powerplant performance meet contracts and power system requirements.

Evidence: The program has many different Reclamation groups that meet regularly with the power marketing agencies and power customers. Some of these groups, especially those related to meeting power delivery schedules are in daily and even hourly contact to meet changing power system conditions. The program also meets with and participates within diverse industry groups such as the North American Energy Reliability Council (NERC), to establish and monitor standards that assure system reliability. In addition Reclamation meets regularly with the Corps of Engineers and Hydro Quebec, an industry partner and worldwide leader in the hydropower industry.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: All power costs are tracked in the Federal Financial system and reported annually. These costs are entered in accordance with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) accounts.

Evidence: Outside consultants evaluate and compare Reclamation operations procedures and costs with other private and public power producers. In addition, the costs of the program are reviewed during the rate setting process, which is in turn reviewed by FERC. Power customers and the PMAs continuously participate with Reclamation in the decisions related to major expenditures for operations and maintenance and capital expenditures. Reclamation has also established a working group with the Corps, Hydro Quebec, and the PMAs to coordinate facility condition assessments.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Reclamation has developed a comprehensive review program (the Power Review of Operation and Maintenance (PROM) program), which does annual and in-depth plant reviews on a regular basis. These in-depth and annual reviews reset the way operations are done and identifies maintenance priorities.

Evidence: A detailed assessment tool has been implemented which categorizes deficiencies in terms of priority of urgency and has a tracking mechanism to ensure that recommendations are implemented.

3.CA1 Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: As a provider of deliverables, Reclamation regularly meets with customers to define the amounts and timing of power production including other electrical products that support the interconnected electric grid. As a purchaser of equipment Reclamation has very tightly defined standards for performance. Reclamation has projections of long-term costs including replacement of aging equipment. These replacements are scheduled with customer coordination to keep the price of energy stable.

Evidence: As an example of Reclamation as a power provider, the Mid-Pacific Region is part of a standing technical group with Western and power customers that meets monthly to discuss maintenance schedules and has oversight responsibilities to access the "Rapid Return to Service" fund for addressing unanticipated problems. For equipment purchases Reclamation has guarantees of performance and testing to verify that contract specifications are met. Reclamation publishes its annual "Databook" with individual and Reclamation-wide powerplant costs. These costs are compared with industry-wide production costs to determine where Reclamation costs are compared to similar sized plants. In addition, Reclamation works with Hadden-Jackson to confirm that its costs are within industry norms and to point out where Reclamation could make improvements.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The long-term goals were changed this year to reflect the changes required to achieve a yes on question 2.1. Therefore there is no identifiable progress on the goal. Some of the existing annual measures can be used to indicate progress toward achieving the goal concerning long-term facility condition, but these measures have not yet been reformulated to track progress on the specific aspects of facility conditions that the new long-term measure considers, namely reducing the amount of generating components rated poor. However, the new measures are a strong step in the right direction, and hopefully annual measures will show progress toward this goal in the near future.

Evidence: The program has various betterment programs underway at several powerplants and can be expected to improve future performance and condition assessment ratings. Assessment ratings of Reclamation facilities are a regular part of the existing maintenance program. However, the new long-term measures will focus on an aspect of long-term maintenance that was not previously targeted, namely reducing the amount of generating components rated poor. Bonneville and Reclamation have a working team which plans and implements activities to better optimize power production at Reclamation facilities.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The program has met its existing annual goals and will be adding new annual performance goals. The previous goals of keeping the forced outage better than the industry average will be kept. The goal of keeping the cost per megawatt in the lowest quartile will be modified to fit with the new goal of keeping costs competitive.

Evidence: The program has consistently met or exceeded its annual goals of being a low cost provider of power and also keeping forced outages below the industry average, see annual GPRA reports. New annual goals are being added this year to complement the new long-term goals of increasing daily peak power availability and improving the overall condition of Reclamation power facilities.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The program has consistently been within budget and has been very good at meeting contract goals and responding to support the interconnected system during system emergencies, and also helping the system to quickly recover from failure.

Evidence: Reclamation has consistently met its performance goals, see annual GPRA reports. Reclamation has consistently exceeded these goals since they were first instituted. The program has experienced a significant trend in reducing forced outages. In addition, there has been a significant increase in management attention to costs now that the costs are monitored and published.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: Reclamation hydroelectric power costs are consistently among the lowest in the U.S. Reclamation compares favorably with other Federal programs, such as the hydropower program of the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers. It is not clear how Reclamation's hydropower program fares in a comparison of long-term goals, although the establishment of new long-term goals is a strong step in the right direction. The hydropower programs of both Reclamation and the Corps both face the challenge of how to set long-term goals for programs that are mature and have met the long-term goals as the programs were originally envisioned.

Evidence: Reclamation has consistently had a forced outage rate lower than the industry average of 2.5 percent. Costs/megawatt of capacity has been in the lowest cost quartile since the measure was instituted in 1998.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The PMAs, independent contractors, and customers report on Reclamation performance and compare it with other public and private power producers. Reclamation facilities generally fare well in these comparisons.

Evidence: Contractor reports from Hadden-Jackson have outlined where plants ranks in terms of performance and made recommendations for adopting best practices.

4.CA1 Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The program is generally successful at achieving its program goals within budgeted costs and established schedules. One reason for this is the intense scrutiny Reclamation Operations and Maintenance activities receive from outside entities. Regional offices work with the PMAs and other power customers to establish projected outlays for operations, maintenance, and capital expenses. The costs associated with these outlays are closely tracked on an annual and long-term basis. The general goal is to meet established production goals and keeps costs within budget.

Evidence: Reclamation has consistently met its target goals since they were instituted in 1998. Reclamation annually reports on cost and outage performance of each powerplant and benchmarks it against plants of similar size. In addition, regular customer meetings establish goals for performance. As an example, the Pacific Northwest Region works closely with the Bonneville Power Administration to establish annual goals and incentives for performance which includes power production and costs. These goals are tracked closely and a report is published monthly.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Measure: Percentage of time Reclamation hydroelectric generating units are available to the interconnected Western electrical system during daily peak summer demand periods. Long term goal is to increase from the present baseline average of 92 percent to 94 percent over the next 10 years.

Additional Information: The peak period is defined as Monday thru Friday between 7AM to 7 PM during the months of June through September. The availability will be calculated using a 5-year rolling average beginning with years 1998 through 2002.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2002	92	92	
2003	92.2	91	
2004	92.4		
2005	92.6		
2006	92.8		

Measure: Improve the overall condition and long-term reliability of Reclamation powerplants by reducing the total amount of generating capacity that has a major generator/turbine related component rated in poor condition from the present 46 percent to 40 percent over the next ten years.

Additional Information: The major components include the unit penstock, control gate, exciter, generator, turbine runner, breaker, and transformer.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2002	46	46	
2003	45.8	45.4	
2004	45.4		
2005	44.8		
2006	44.2		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Measure: Maintain a forced outage rate on hydropower units that is lower than the industry average for similar units. In FY 2003 attain a 3 percent or lower rate for Reclamation hydropower units.

Additional Information: This goal is designed to keep Reclamation better than the industry average. The goal changes based on the latest industry average which is now down to 2.5.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	<3.0	1.62	
2002	<3.0	1.03	
2003	<3.0	1.5	
2004	<2.5		
2005	<2.5		

Measure: Reclamation power production costs will be kept in the cheapest quartile of the industry for comparable hydroelectric plants (above 75%).

Additional Information: This measure will track the cost efficiency of Reclamation hydropower generation. The 1st percentile would be the most expensive hydropower generation, while the 100% percentile would be the most cost efficient, or cheapest.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)
2001	75	86	
2002	75	84	
2003	75	77	
2004	75		
2005	75		

Measure: Perform annual condition assessments at all power facilities.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	100	100	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Measure: Perform annual condition assessments at all power facilities.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	100		
2005	100		
2006	100		

Measure: Perform comprehensive review assessments of every hydropower plant once every six years.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2003	new process		
2004	28		
2005	7		
2006	13		
2007	12		

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: BLM is responsible for providing opportunities for outdoor recreation to the American public as part of its multiple use mandate under FLPMA. All of BLM's recreation activities support the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) strategic plan goal of providing opportunities for environmentally responsible recreation. BLM has prepared several recreation strategies to provide additional clarification for balancing recreation with other uses of the public lands as well as balancing between different types of outdoor recreation.

Evidence: BLM's authorizing statute, the Federal Land Management Policy Act of 1976 (FLPMA), clearly sets out recreation as one of BLM's multiple use goals. BLM recreation strategic planning documents including Recreation 2000, the Recreation 2000 Update, and BLM's Priorities for Recreation and Visitor Services (BLM Work Plan Fiscal Years 2003-2007) provide specific direction and purpose for managing recreation on the public lands.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The need for a variety of open space and outdoor recreation opportunities is well recognized by Congress and the American public, and the types and locations of recreation BLM provides would not otherwise be addressed by the market. BLM is the steward for managing the landscape character of over 262 million acres of land, many of which provide outstanding recreation opportunities in a variety of landscape settings. BLM public lands attract over 55 million visitors annually. These visitors are drawn to what has been characterized as the remnants of the American Frontier. In many areas, BLM lands provide the best, and sometimes the only, venue for self-directed, dispersed recreation.

Evidence: Annual visitation statistics and national recreation surveys. BLM's collaborative land use planning process uses extensive public input to identify issues requiring resolution in land use plans. These plans provide much of the specific direction in managing recreation and visual resources on specific parcels of public lands.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: BLM exclusively manages 262 million acres of public lands, many of which are highly valued for recreation. BLM is the only agency responsible for providing recreation access to these lands. Many of these lands provide unique and special landscapes not found elsewhere in the United States. BLM provides different recreation opportunities than those provided by the other major federal land management agencies (National Park Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, USDA Forest Service, Army Corps of Engineers, etc.) focusing on dispersed recreation, which tends to be resource-based and, therefore, less facility-dependent. Since the BLM mission differs from other agencies, BLM is able to accommodate recreation activities not permitted elsewhere.

Evidence: FLPMA Section 102 (10). BLM's National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands. (Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 require BLM to designate lands for appropriate types of Off-Highway Vehicle use.) Interagency partnerships among BLM, National Park Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and USDA Forest Service such as the Leave No Trace program to implement educational efforts and promote responsible use of public lands.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

1.4 **Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: BLM faces a continuing balancing act in meeting public demand for recreation while providing for other uses of the public lands, such as energy and mineral production, grazing, etc. However, from planning through implementation, the recreation program has been designed to address and respond to this issue. While the lack of more uniform user fee practices could be considered a design flaw, BLM is, in many cases, challenged in its ability to charge recreation users for costs directly associated with providing recreation opportunities. BLM does charge fees in its more popular recreation areas, but for many dispersed recreation areas, the cost of collection is prohibitively high.

Evidence: FLPMA Section 102 (10).BLM's National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands.BLM recreation strategic planning documents (Recreation 2000, Priorities for Recreation and Visitor Services - 2003-2007 Work Plan).

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Through public participation in the land use planning process, BLM, in large part, responds to specific public demands for recreation opportunities. This process also recognizes specific local needs and tailors programs to meet these needs.BLM recreation programs emphasize resource-dependent recreation opportunities" such as driving for pleasure, hiking, boating, trail riding, education and interpretive activities, and OHV use. While most BLM recreation use is dispersed, BLM also provides specific access through developed recreation sites and trails, visitor centers and facilities. BLM manages this use using a variety of tools such as the issuance of Recreation Use and Special Recreation Permits.There may be limited situations where resources are not effectively targeted due to program design issues. For example, because recreation fees are only collected in certain areas, some users are arguably paying less than they should be relative to other users and/or the impacts of their activities on natural resources on BLM lands.

Evidence: BLM internal guidance requires that recreation fees be re-invested at the site of collection to ensure that those paying the fees receive the benefits from improved facilities and services at the site where the fee was paid.Educational and interpretive activities have resulted in improved public awareness concerning resource values and appropriate recreation behavior.BLM's National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands shows that BLM is placing increased management emphasis and funding on dealing with the rapid growth in OHV recreation. These efforts include route designations, signing and fencing, and educational activities including the Tread Lightly program.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 15%

Explanation: Under the existing BLM Strategic plan, the GPRA Program Activity Goal: Provide Opportunities for Environmentally Responsible Recreation has four long-term and annual performance goals: - Percent of physical facilities in Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) in good or fair condition;- Percent of physical facilities in SRMAs that are universally accessible;- Percent of recreation users satisfied with the quality of their recreation experience; and- Percent of recreation users satisfied with the BLM's interpretation and environmental education in SRMAs.While improvements could be made to these goals, the goals generally focus on desired program outcomes. BLM should continue to work with OMB to improve and/or expand upon these goals. Specifically, the program would benefit from the use of an efficiency measure, such as the cost per visitor.

Evidence: BLM Annual Performance Plan, 2003 and Annual Performance Report, 2001.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

- 2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%
- Explanation: Baselines have been established for all the annual performance measures in the recreation program, but the accuracy of the data is unclear as is the ambitiousness of the agency's targets.
- Evidence: BLM Annual Performance Plan, 2003 and Annual Performance Report, 2001.Budget Justification and Performance Information, 2004.
- 2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 15%
- Explanation: Currently, the BLM uses 4 annual performance measures for recreation. These may be modified somewhat upon adoption of a new Department Strategic Plan.
- Evidence: Annual Performance Measures for the Recreation Management program are shown in the 2004 Budget Justifications.
- 2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%
- Explanation: Baselines have been established for all the annual performance measures in the Recreation program, but again data accuracy is an issue and the targets may not be ambitious.
- Evidence: BLM Annual Performance Plan, 2003 and Annual Performance Report, 2001.Budget Justification and Performance Information, 2004.
- 2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%
- Explanation: BLM has specifically structured its partnership arrangements to ensure that high priority recreation work is being accomplished. BLM would be unable to meet it targets without the help of partners and volunteers. Reported accomplishments include partner contributions.
- Evidence: BLM enters into partnerships with other federal, state, and local agencies and private partners to leverage resources and avoid duplicative efforts. About 2/3 of all BLM's partnerships are in the recreation program with over 500 partnerships nationwide. One example is the interagency partnership among BLM, NPS, FWS, and USDA Forest Service to work with the Leave No Trace Center to implement educational efforts to promote responsible use of the public lands. Case studies of Partnerships in BLM, July 2002.
- 2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 15%
- Explanation: BLM conducts a variety of annual and periodic evaluations to ensure program effectiveness and improvements, but these evaluations do not appear to meet the independence and scope criteria.
- Evidence: Periodic audits of commercial operations authorized under Special Recreation Permit authority. Recreational Fee Demonstration audits.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight: 15%

Explanation: Program requests have traditionally been based on broad assertions of need, rather than being tied to specific performance goals and related data.

Evidence: BLM Congressional Budget Justification, 2004.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: BLM has for a number of years placed strong emphasis on developing plans and strategies for addressing recreation issues to ensure that high priority work is being accomplished that will meet both present and future needs.

Evidence: BLM recreation strategies include Recreation 2000 and BLM's FY 2003-2007 Workplan. These documents provide specific direction and purpose for managing recreation on the public lands. BLM's National Off-Highway Vehicle Strategy also recognizes the unique challenges in managing this particular type of recreation use.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Each BLM field office regularly reports accomplishments into the Management Information System (MIS). State Offices and the Washington Office review these accomplishments against targets at several points in the year. Budget allocation adjustments and corrective actions are taken after these reviews are completed. BLM uses customer surveys to obtain user feedback on BLM performance. These surveys include the on-site surveys at developed recreation sites that provide input into the two customer satisfaction performance measures and the periodic survey administered to commercial Special Recreation Permit holders.

Evidence: 2003 Midyear Review and subsequent adjustments. Annual recreation program cost analysis conducted pursuant to Instruction Memorandum No. 2003-122. Annual report of contributed volunteer hours. Annual visitor surveys. Annual reporting of contributed funds leveraged through the Challenge Cost Share Program.

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: BLM evaluates the work performance of all employees annually. Senior level managers performance is reviewed quarterly. Where appropriate, field manager evaluations include key recreation management goals. Many elements within an employee's annual evaluation are tied to agency output measures. BLM tracks performance on 4 specific objectives related to recreation. Each objective has an assigned senior manager with lead responsibility for tracking/reporting completion or implementation progress, as well as the current status of each objective. There is also an established target date for completion or implementation. The Director's Tracking System presents the Director with the ability to track key recreation measures. The Director can see in real time what has been reported compared to targets for key output measures such as the numbers of recreation permits issued. The report also shows costs by program element.

Evidence: BLM's Employee Performance Plan and Results Reports. BLM's Management by Objectives System. Director's Tracking System.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 17%

Explanation: The BLM has established a guideline for its offices to allow no more than two percent carryover with no overspending for the fiscal year. In the recreation management programs, one percent of available funding was unspent at the end of 2001 and 2002. The major exception to these fiscal constraints is that Bureau policy allows for recreation fees collected and deposited to be retained until sufficient funding has accumulated and is available for use on significant projects to correct deferred maintenance deficiencies. Internal reviews are also used to ensure that funds are spent for the intended purpose.

Evidence: MIS report on Year End Carryover, 2000-2002 (MIS reports, which are linked to the agency's financial system, indicate that overall BLM spent 99% of appropriated recreation management funds, although a few offices deviated by more than the target of 2% carryover.) Annual Recreation Fee Demonstration Program Report to Congress. Annual recreation program cost analysis.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: The BLM uses its MIS to track the performance and unit costs for all programs. An annual performance analysis is conducted to compare offices in achieving reduced unit costs and maximum output. The BLM is cooperating with DOI to provide a standard source for recreation information under the Recreation One-Stop initiative linked to the federal E-Government effort. Facility accessibility data are being developed using the Accessibility Data Management System in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation.

Evidence: Annual recreation program cost analysis. Recreation.gov and the National Recreation Reservation System are the first website-based products in the federal E-Government effort. The BLM continues to operate the Recreation MIS as the central repository for recreation-related information. This system is being linked to the Collections and Billing System and other automated systems as a means to avoid redundant data entry. Accessibility Data Management System inventory annual results.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: BLM coordinates with other federal agencies and offices (NPS, FWS, USDA Forest Service, Army Corps, etc.) to achieve efficiency and coordination in the recreation program, including, where possible, joint recreation program management. Program coordinates internally with the National Landscape Conservation System Office and other resource groups to assure consistency in application of policy and management actions across all BLM lands.

Evidence: Interagency Fee Council participation to implement the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program. United States Bureau of Reclamation coordination concerning facility accessibility. Participation with the National Association for Interpretation to provide interpretive training. Participation in various programs including the Leave No Trace and Tread Lightly land use stewardship program. Joint BLM-USFS Service First operations.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The BLM has received seven consecutive unqualified audit opinions, of which the recreation program was an integral component. Key to its success has been the availability of timely and accurate financial information made available to all employees through its MIS. The BLM has also met or exceeded its goals under the Prompt Payment Act and goals to reduce or eliminate erroneous payments.

Evidence: Independent audit evaluations and unqualified audit opinions.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: BLM has developed strategies to address a number of deficiencies, including the recent development of plans for improving OHV management, though much work remains in actual implementation. BLM has also used the Rec Fee Demo authority to improve priority recreation facilities. Nevertheless, BLM could potentially improve its ability to maintain more recreation sites and provide better visitor services through a more systematic evaluation of user fee practices and improved cost recovery.

Evidence: National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands and National Mountain Bicycling Strategic Action Plan. Annual Recreational Fee Demonstration Program Report to Congress. ADMS facility inventory and implementation plans to make access improvements. GAO Report (02-10), November 2001: Recreation Fees - Management Improvements Can Help the Demonstration Program Enhance Visitor Services.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 30%

Explanation: Data on long-term performance goals is spotty, but does not indicate progress is being made in meeting key goals such as visitor satisfaction. This is a result, in part, of BLM's lack of good information on the baseline status for some measures. In other cases, such as visitor satisfaction, the baseline seems to have shifted based on changing methodologies for collecting performance information. In one instance, visitor satisfaction information was not collected at all due to problems in implementing the survey instrument. One of the keys to improving long-term performance information is to ensure consistency in performance data collection over time.

Evidence: See measures worksheet.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Annual goals for facility conditions have been met regularly, although targets may not represent stretch goals. Visitor satisfaction goal was met in 2000, but not in 2001. The same baseline problems exist for BLM's short-term and long-term goals.

Evidence: See measures worksheet.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Sufficient evidence has not been presented to indicate actual improvements in efficiency or cost effectiveness. However, BLM's Management Information System allows for depicting the cost per unit of output, thus allowing comparison from one year to the next. BLM indicates that states are sharing best management practices from one state to another, thereby allowing for improved efficiencies.

Evidence: Annual recreation program cost analysis. This analysis served as the basis for a report to management concerning planned versus actual accomplishments and the average unit cost per office. BLM reports that field offices are using these data to adjust operations and improve efficiency. Accountability is also being improved as offices strive to correct past reporting errors. The analysis indicated that variation among states is being reduced by more accurate and consistent reporting and by efforts to streamline standardized processes. Recreational Fee Demonstration Program Site Evaluation.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: LARGE
EXTENT

Question Weight: 30%

Explanation: Visitor satisfaction scores are reasonably comparable to those of other recreation agencies such as NPS and the Forest Service. BLM must also deal with a higher degree of unique challenges (e.g., dispersed recreation, OHV use) and does so within a smaller budget relative to some other programs.

Evidence: Cost per visitor data. Comparison of visitor satisfaction rates.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: LARGE
EXTENT

Question Weight: 5%

Explanation: Few current independent evaluations exist. Those that do exist have not identified major problems with BLM's Recreation program, but have identified some areas in need of improvement.

Evidence: GAO Report (02-10), November 2001: Recreation Fees - Management Improvements Can Help the Demonstration Program Enhance Visitor Services.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management

Measure: Percent of recreation users satisfied with the quality of their recreation experience.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the satisfaction of users with their experience

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2000	94%	94%	
2001	94%	90%	
2002	92%		
2003	92%		
2004	94%		

Measure: Percent of physical facilities in Special Recreation Management Areas (SMRAs) that are universally accessible.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the % of accessible facilities in SMRAs

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	10%	3%	
2002	5%	5.1%	
2003	7%		
2004	9%		

Measure: Percent of physical facilities in Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) in good or fair condition.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the condition of physical facilities in SMRAs either in good or fair condition.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2000	81%	84%	
2001	81%	84%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management

Measure: Percent of physical facilities in Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) in good or fair condition.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the condition of physical facilities in SMRAs either in good or fair condition.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002	81%	87%	
2003	82%		
2004	84%		

Measure: Percent of recreation users satisfied with the BLM's interpretation and environmental education in SRMAs

Additional Information: This measure track the satisfaction of users in the interpretation and environmental education programs in SRMAs

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2000	84%	76%	
2001	76%	66%	
2002	70%	No Data	

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Through legislation enacted in 1977, the Office of Surface Mining (OSM) was charged to establish a nationwide program to protect society from the adverse effects of surface coal mining, strike a balance between protection and the Nation's need for coal as an essential source of energy, and to assist coal mining states and Indian Tribes, through grants, to develop, administer and enforce SMCRA programs. Currently, twenty-four States (92% of the 26 States with active coal mining) have chosen to take primacy, i.e., responsibility for regulating surface coal mining and reclamation operations within their borders. No Indian Tribes have yet assumed primacy.

Evidence: The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA). Specifically, Sections 102, 705 and 710(i).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Prior to 1977 there was no nationwide program regulating surface coal mining activities. In 1972, there was a large surface coal mining disaster on the Buffalo Creek, West Virginia. Failure of a coal company sludge pond led to a flood which killed 125 people and left about 4,000 people homeless. Passage of SMCRA in 1977 has not eliminated the risk of surface mine failures but it has significantly reduced it. During active mining, there is always risk for safety and environmental hazards both on and off the permitted mine site. There are also complex technical challenges. The State regulatory programs, incorporating SMCRA requirements cover every aspect of coal mining operations. OSM provides oversight and technical assistance to its state partners to reduce the adverse impacts of coal mining on society and the environment.

Evidence: 1) The Buffalo Creek Disaster by Gerald M. Stern. 2) In SMCRA, section 101 (c), (e), (f), and (g). 3) Legislative history of SMCRA: Senate Report No. 95-128, May 10, 1977, pages 49-53. 4) Legislative history of SMCRA: House Report No. 95-218, April 22, 1977, pages 57-60.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: SMCRA is the only Federal statute specifically directed toward regulation of the environmental impacts of coal mining. Its coal regulatory program is based on a cooperative partnership between States and OSM. SMCRA established that States should be the primary regulatory authority because of the physical diversity of lands. OSM's role is to approve State regulatory programs and amendments, monitor and oversee program implementation, and provide technical and other assistance to the States. EPA and Army Corps of Engineers regulatory programs also regulate coal mining activities, but their programs work to control water pollution and disturbances to surface waters; they do not consider non-water problems, such as blasting, subsidence, and land reclamation after mining. Another Federal agency that regulates mining is the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA). MSHA governs miner safety, but not the safety and health of other coalfield citizens nor protection of the environment. While other agencies touch on aspects of mining, OSM's program covers the complete mining cycle.

Evidence: 1) SMCRA, sections 501, 502, 503, 517, 521 and 705. 2) Examples of State-OSM performance agreements (Alabama FY 2003 and West Virginia FY 2002 and 2003) to demonstrate the respective roles of OSM and the State. 3) West Virginia DEP Office of Mining and Reclamation Permitting Handbook

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: There are no apparent "major" flaws in the program design or suggested alternative designs that would substantially increase the program's effectiveness or efficiency. The structure of State primacy with Federal oversight to maintain national standards, is working. The program continues to deal with significant issues, such as mountaintop mining and operator bonding, which sometimes involve litigation. In addition, the Federal grants require a 100 percent match from the receiving state. The major constraint on the program is funding -- if States do not receive the Federal grant or the State match funding they need, OSM's ability to meet the goals of SMCRA may be lessened.

Evidence: 1) The most recent audit was DOI IG Survey Report, No. 97-1-56, State Reclamation and Regulatory Grant Programs, 1996. 2) Management Control Reviews conducted on the State Oversight Program (1998) and Grants Program (1997). 3) Annual Independent Auditors Reports for OSM (Contracted by DOI Inspector General Office to KPMG, LLP, an independent certified public accounting firm). 4) DOI IG Evaluation of State Operated Coal Regulatory Programs - work began on June 17, 2003.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The State regulatory program is designed to balance citizen safety and environmental protection with coal production in a time of continued reliance on coal as a major source of energy to the Nation. As Congress intended, OSM's programmatic efforts and grant funding are primarily directed at the States because they are the primary regulatory authorities in most cases. In addition, having a national program ensures that competition in interstate commerce does not undermine OSM's and states ability to maintain adequate standards on coal mining within their borders. OSM resources and grant awards are allocated on the basis of need, and the extent, type and scope of mining operations in each State. OSM's Annual Report lists the distribution of regulatory grant funds among program States.

Evidence: FY 2001 OSM Annual and Accountability Report, page 22, Table 11.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: See PART Performance Measures provided by OSM. These measures are "outputs." They do not cover the full scope of the program; they do not reflect the total purpose of the program in a meaningful way, and include no efficiency measure. Although there are two specific long-term output goals that are useful in assessing the program progress in a limited way, there is no outcome goal assessing how well individual states are reviewing permit applications and if state approvals comply with SMCRA requirements, the main reason for the SMCRA legislation. OSM and the regulated states will be reviewing these measures during June 2003.

Evidence: 1) OSM Strategic Plan FY 2000-2005. 2) FY 2003 Performance Plan and FY 2001 Annual Performance Report. 3) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004. 4) Reg. 8-OSM Directive on Oversight of State Regulatory Programs 5) Meeting Scheduled for June 23, 2003 with the regulated states to begin revising the performance measures.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The PART instructions require a "NO" rating if the program received a NO rating in Question 2.1.

Evidence:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	78%	100%	54%	

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: See PART Performance Measures" provided by OSM. There are three annual performance measures. The annual goal measurements provide data on the protection of the environment during mining, impacts of surface mining on citizens, and the status of reclamation of mined lands.

Evidence: 1) FY 2003 Performance Plan and FY 2001 Annual Performance Report. 2) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: OSM has established baselines and targets for the measures it has developed. For example, to measure off-site permit compliance, OSM uses an off-site measure. The measure looks at off site impact to water quality, blasting, etc. The target is that 94% of coal mine sites will be free of off-site impacts per year. The baseline is calculated by dividing the number of inspectable units by the number of off-site impacts occurring. The target is ambitious considering the nature of mining and that it would be impossible to achieve 100%.

Evidence: OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The States are an integral part of achieving the goals for the Surface Mining Program. In an effort to track the progress toward meeting OSM's annual and long-term goals, OSM receives data annually from its State and Indian Tribe partners. In June, OSM and 11 state partners will meet to develop common performance measures for the program.

Evidence: FY 2003 Performance Agreement for Alabama and West Virginia and FY 2002 Performance Agreement for West Virginia.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The OSM program evaluation system is an ongoing process of assessing program accomplishments and communicating those assessments to management. Information obtained through oversight and annual evaluation reports made pursuant to SMCRA requirements contribute to developing an accurate picture of progress in accomplishing OSM's mission. The Program evaluation system includes Management Control Reviews, Alternative Management Control Reviews (conducted in compliance with the Inspector General Act), audits done under the auspices of the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act, and annual state program evaluations.

Evidence: 1) DOI IG Survey Report: State Reclamation and Regulatory Grant Programs-Report No. 97-I-56, October 1996. 2) DOI IG Evaluation of State Operated Coal Regulatory Programs - work began on June 17, 2003. 3) Annual Independent Auditors Reports for OSM (Contracted by DOI Inspector General Office to KPMG, LLP, an independent certified public accounting firm). 4) Single Audit Reports on States performed by State Auditors and/or contracted to Independent Auditors (32 performed in the last 5 years). Listing provided. Alabama and West Virginia included as examples.5) State Oversight Reports completed each year by OSM in conjunction with its State Partners each year. 6) Management Control Reviews conducted on the State Oversight Program (1998) and Grants Program (1998 and 2000).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	78%	100%	54%	

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: OSM's 2003 and 2004 budget requests included the integration of planning and performance. OSM can demonstrate the probable effects on individual state regulatory programs with various levels of funding.

Evidence: 1) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2003 and 2004.2) OSM study of 2001 regulatory grant funding (1999).3) OSM study of regulatory grant funding (2003 Draft).

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: OSM has identified deficiencies in its program performance measurement, and is in the process of exploring the re-design of its strategic goals and measures in cooperation with its state and Tribal partners.

Evidence: OSM initiated meetings with its state and Tribal partners in late FY 2003.

2.RG1 Are all regulations issued by the program/agency necessary to meet the stated goals of the program, and do all regulations clearly indicate how the rules contribute to achievement of the goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Regulations implementing this program generally address one of five major program components required by SMCRA: designation of areas as unsuitable for mining; performance standards; permitting requirements and procedures; performance bond; and inspection and enforcement requirements. Federal final rule preambles cite the authorizing SMCRA section or other authorizing event, e.g., court decision. The first Federal final rules were published March 13, 1979, and addressed all SMCRA regulatory requirements. Changes to these Federal rules occur as a result of passage of law that directly or indirectly affects SMCRA requirements, court decisions affecting the interpretation of SMCRA requirements or the changing nature of technology. Approved primacy State regulatory programs must be no less stringent than SMCRA and no less effective than the Federal implementing regulations. OSM reviews any changes to the Federal rules to determine whether a State must amend its program to be in accordance with SMCRA and consistent with the Federal regulations.

Evidence: 1) SMCRA 2) Rule preambles.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: States regularly report on the status of their programs through the grant reporting process, and OSM conducts annual evaluations of each State program. OSM's primary role with respect to State programs is to monitor the State program to ensure that it maintains the capability to fulfill its responsibilities under SMCRA. To further the reporting of end results and on-the-ground success, the oversight strategy was redesigned in 1995-1996 to evaluate and report State-specific and national findings for off-site impacts and reclamation success. OSM is in the process of exploring the re-design of its strategic goals and measures in cooperation with its state and Tribal partners. Meetings are scheduled for later in this fiscal year.

Evidence: 1) 1997 Hammer Award for Reinventing Oversight.2) Oversight guidance (OSM Directive REG-8, Oversight of State Regulatory Programs.3) State Oversight Reports (Alabama and West Virginia for FY 2002.4) State/Federal performance agreements (Alabama and West Virginia for FY 2003; West Virginia FY 2002.5) Book on the implementation of four environmental programs (surface mining, radon, drinking water and asbestos), by Denise Scheberle, Professor, Public and Environmental Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay.

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: OSM and States determine performance goals in annual performance agreements. OSM field managers and their staff plan and conduct oversight activities, including inspections, independent reviews and technical analyses, and prepare related documents and reports, including an annual evaluation report for each State. The OSM oversight reports focus on whether the public protection requirements and environmental protection standards of SMCRA are being met, with primary focus on end results and on-the-ground success in meeting SMCRA's environmental protection goals. Timetables and schedules are part of the oversight process, e.g., annual submission of program data by States.

Evidence: 1) Performance Agreement for Alabama and West Virginia for FY 2003; West Virginia for FY 2002.2) Oversight guidance, OSM Directive REG-8, Oversight of State Regulatory Programs.3) Annual OSM oversight reports (Alabama and West Virginia - (FY 2003).4) Amendment submission timetable in accordance with 30 CFR 732.17.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: Deobligations as a result of grantees not expending all awarded funding during the fiscal year are low. OSM reviewed regulatory grant funding in 1999; the report stated that the unexpended grant balances declined from 6.9% in FY 1994 to 2.2% in FY 1997. A review of subsequent deobligation history is currently underway. In addition, OSM monitors state-match contributions to ensure that states are also obligating state funding at the same rate as the Federal grant.

Evidence: 1) OSM's 1999 review of 2001 regulatory grant funding. 2) Annual budget submissions.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: The State Regulatory program is non-competitive; the use of incentives is not applicable. However, most States have sophisticated, well-established systems to measure and achieve efficiencies. Annually, States submit a wide variety of program performance data, e.g., program staffing, number of site inspections conducted, number of enforcement actions issued. Comparative program performance data for States can be reviewed through their year-to-year data submissions. OSM continues to use and implement IT improvements and use of E-gov, where possible. Progress includes: 1) electronic permitting initiative to encourage and assist States with developing and implementing electronic permitting; 2) Technical Innovation and Professional Services (TIPS), an analytical tool to assist the States with hydrologic assessments, quantifying potential effects of coal mining, etc. OSM is continuing to implement activity-based costing, which will enable it to fully cost its program accomplishments.

Evidence: 1) Brochure, 2003 Excellence in Surface Coal Mining Reclamation Awards, Call for Nominations includes rating criteria and point system for evaluation of entries. 2) OSM Annual and Financial Accountability Report for FY 2001. 3) Electronic permitting initiative: Enhanced Computer Software Applications for Mining and Reclamation, paper prepared by William L. Joseph, June 2000 Page 25-26, FY 2001 Annual and Financial Accountability Report (OSM Annual Report). Information Collection Package: 'Supporting Statement for Reporting and Recordkeeping for 30 CFR Part 779, question 3. Alabama currently receiving approximately 50% of its permits electronically. Record of Telephone Conversation, Jean O'Dell, OSM-Birmingham Field Office and Dr. Randy Johnson, Director of the Alabama Surface Mining Commission, June 9, 2003. West Virginia currently is beta-testing an electronic permitting submission system. Permit application forms are available for downloading from the State's website.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: OSM, State regulatory programs, and other Federal and State programs do collaborate and coordinate effectively to avoid duplication and seek solutions to common problems. With programs like the Coal Symposium, OSM held its largest event ever with government, industry, citizen and environmental groups to foster a mutual understanding of current government programs affecting the coal industry. OSM and the States routinely conduct forums and workshops on a number of technical and programmatic issues. OSM also meets several times a year with the Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC) and the Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB), organizations that represent more than 20 of the State regulatory authorities. Recently, OSM co-sponsored a benchmarking session with the IMCC on a critically important permitting issue. Proceedings Notes on CD from technical forums are made available on the OSM website, in hard copy, and on CD.

Evidence: 1) "Feds Who Get It, Governing Magazine, November 1999, byline: Jonathan Walters 2) Proceedings Notes on CD.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: OSM's Division of Financial Management has received clean audit reports for the last 12 years. OSM was the only bureau in DOI to receive a clean opinion in all three areas: financial statements, reports on internal controls and compliance with laws and regulations. Detection of erroneous payments is part of OSM's program management function carried out by grants specialists through on-site reviews with the States. For OSM program activities, OSM uses activity based costing. This assists management in identifying costs for each defined activity. Codes and outputs are under review for FY 2003 data.

Evidence: 1) FY 2001 Annual and Financial Accountability Report 2) Drawdown review on West Virginia and Alabama.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	78%	100%	54%	

- 3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%
- Explanation: Currently, neither the General Accounting Office (GAO) nor Interior's Office of Inspector General has identified any major performance or management challenges that limit OSM's effectiveness in carrying-out its mission. OSM is In compliance with the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA).
- Evidence: Independent Auditors Report on the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement's Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 2002 and 2001 (No. 2003-I-0022).
-
- 3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%
- Explanation: The Annual Performance Agreement for each grantee is the basis for oversight. The Agreement includes on-site reviews, review of expenditures, and program and performance review. One to two reviews per grantee are conducted annually, focusing on internal controls and management of the program.
- Evidence: 1) Grant Performance Reports, Alabama FY 2002 and West Virginia FY 2001 cooperative agreements.2) FY 2003 Annual Performance Agreements for Alabama and West Virginia. FY 2002 Annual Performance Agreement for West Virginia.
-
- 3.BF2 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%
- Explanation: OSM collects, compiles and disseminates grantee performance information through the OSM Annual Report (this report is distributed in hard copy and is available on OSM's website) and the grantee programmatic report.
- Evidence: 1) OSM's FY 2001 Annual and Financial Accountability Report .2) FY 2003 Annual Performance Agreements for Alabama and West Virginia. FY 2002 Annual Performance Agreement for West Virginia.
-
- 3.RG1 Did the program seek and take into account the views of all affected parties (e.g., consumers; large and small businesses; State, local and tribal governments; beneficiaries; and the general public) when developing significant regulations?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%
- Explanation: OSM is required to do so in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act. When as a result of changes in law, court decisions or other precipitating events the Federal SMCRA regulations must be revised, such revisions are finalized through publication in the Federal Register (FR). Every final rule published in the FR contains a section regarding how OSM obtained and considered public input on the final rule. In addition to publication in the FR, public hearings are held if requested, and OSM maintains a distribution list of individuals, groups, etc. who have requested that they be forwarded a copy of any final rule or final rules pertaining to specific subjects. OSM also often conducts outreach when proposing significant revisions to the Federal regulations. In the final rule, OSM explains its consideration of alternatives and the disposition of all comments received. State program and amendments approvals follow FR procedures and States regulations must also comply with State rule publication process, similar to the FR process.
- Evidence: 1) Proposed and final rule preambles [VER and 522(e)]. 2) documentation of outreach [stream buffer outreach plan]. 3) public hearings [FR notices for VER and 522(e)].

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	78%	100%	54%	

3.RG2 Did the program prepare adequate regulatory impact analyses if required by Executive Order 12866, regulatory flexibility analyses if required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and SBREFA, and cost-benefit analyses if required under the Unfunded Mandates R Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: OSM's rules comply with Executive Order 12866.

Evidence: 1) Rule preambles [VER and 522(e)] and 2) Supporting documentation [for VER and 522(e): EIS, Economic Analysis.

3.RG3 Does the program systematically review its current regulations to ensure consistency among all regulations in accomplishing program goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: OSM reviews Federal regulations for consistency with the entire Federal program throughout the regulatory revision process leading to publication of the final rule. Part of this review involves consideration of the effect of changes approved in the final Federal final rule upon State regulatory programs. If the Federal change will require amendment of the State regulatory program(s), OSM notifies the State(s). In addition, OSM reviews all its regulations every 3 years as it re-examines the information collection burden posed by individual Federal requirements. Finally, OSM has reviewed its regulations (on the average of) every 5 years to determine and remove regulations that are no longer necessary.

Evidence: 1) Record of Compliance (contains an economic analysis) [VER and 522(e)]. 2) Information Collection Package (30 CFR Part 779) Supplementary statement dated March 25, 2003. 3) Regulatory Review of Rules, March 23, 2000.

3.RG4 Are the regulations designed to achieve program goals, to the extent practicable, by maximizing the net benefits of its regulatory activity? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: The regulations are designed to provide the minimum threshold of requirements with which compliance is necessary. While each coal-producing State has been encouraged to accept primacy so it may incorporate and address circumstances unique to that State (e.g., climate, vegetation) in its regulation of surface coal mining operations within its borders, OSM's responsibility under SMCRA is national in scope. OSM guards against uneven regulation of surface coal mining operations by ensuring that regulation - whether done by the individual States or by OSM as regulatory authority or in providing States with any needed assistance - meets the national requirements threshold minimum, while maintaining a level playing field that enables industry to meet the need for mining the Nation's most abundant and essential source of energy. In addition to ensuring a level playing field, the Federal regulations must not impose an undue burden upon the regulated entity.

Evidence: 1) Paper on Enhanced Computer Software Applications for Mining and Reclamation 2) Information Collection, Supporting Statement, Question 3 (For 30 CFR Part 779)

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The PART instructions require a "NO" rating if the program received a NO rating in Question 2.1..

Evidence:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: **LARGE EXTENT** Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: IG audits have been initiated, but only one completed, and States and Tribes provide their assesments of the program at various meetings and conferences throughout the year. OSM has not been audited by an independed entity. However, it has been reviewed by two outside entities. The first is through a book being written on the implementation of four environmental programs (surface mining, radon, drinking water and asbestos), University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. A second was through the article Feds Who Get It, Governing Magazine, November 1999. OSM has also been reviewed by the IG once. State Reclamation and Regulatory Grant Programs-Report No. 97-I-56, October 1996. The IG was unable to determine whether Surface Mining Grant programs were administered efficiently and effectively due to an OSM reorganization that occurred. The IG recommended improving controls over the monitoring of regulatory grant funds and timely closure of grant agreements. OSM implemented the recommended solution.

Evidence: 1) DOI IG Survey Report: State Reclamation and Regulatory Grant Programs-Report No. 97-I-56, October 1996. 2) Book on the implementation of four environmental programs (surface mining, radon, drinking water and asbestos), by Denise Scheberle, Professor, Public and Environmental Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. (Work in progress, as described in a March 26, 2003 email.) 3) Feds Who Get It, Governing Magazine, November 1999, byline: Jonathan Walters

4.RG1 Were programmatic goals (and benefits) achieved at the least incremental societal cost and did the program maximize net benefits? Answer: **LARGE EXTENT** Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: As shown in the agency annual report(s), OSM and its partners, the State regulatory authorities, continue to make progress in encouraging the surface coal mining industry to avoid and reduce the incidence of off-site impacts and to reclaim affected land. Through the Federal requirements, OSM ensures the existence of a minimum national program to protect society from the adverse effects of surface coal mining operations, while assuring that the coal supply essential to the Nation's energy requirements continues. For instance, OSM's December 17, 1999, interpretive rule concerning subsidence due to underground coal mining balances the interests of surface owners and industry; maintains stability in SMCRA implementation; promotes safety; acknowledges existing property rights; and creates no regulatory gaps. (64 FR 70847-70847)

Evidence: 1) Annual Agency Report (FY 2001).2) OSM Individual State Oversight Reports (Alabama and West Virginia for FY 2001).3) Final Rule: 522(e): 64 FR 70838, 12/17/1999.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining

Measure: Outcome measures under development

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------------------

Measure: Increase the number of acres released from Phase III performance bonds

Additional Information: These are the number of acres that have been fully reclaimed from current mining operations, meet the performance standards, and released as useful and productive restored land. This performance measure is the acreage of land that is released every year by active coal mine operators (and is dependent on the operator filing application for release). This is done through a series of bond releases. The bonds are required to assure that funds are available for reclamation in case the operator fails to reclaim the mined land.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	400,000		

Measure: Maintain the percentage of sites free of off-site impacts

Additional Information: Protecting the environment, people and property is measured by the number of times incidents occur outside the boundaries of the permitted areas being mined. These are known as off-site impacts and ideally the goal is to not have any incidents occur. It is inevitable that some impacts will occur- 100% compliance is not realistic. The impacts are damaging effects that would occur as a result of blasting, land stability, hydrology, encroachment, etc., that would affect people, land, water, or structures outside the permitted area of mining operations.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	94%		

Measure: Number of acres released from phase III performance bonds

Additional Information: These are the number of acres that have been fully reclaimed from current mining operations, meet the performance standards, and released as useful and productive restored land. This performance measure is the acreage of land that is released every year by active coal mine operators (and is dependent on the operator filing application for release). This is done through a series of bond releases. The bonds are required to assure that funds are available for reclamation in case the operator fails to reclaim the mined land.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2000	75,000	63,071	
2001	75,000	81,853	
2002	75,000	73,407	
2003	70,000		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Office of Surface Mining

Measure: Number of acres released from phase III performance bonds

Additional Information: These are the number of acres that have been fully reclaimed from current mining operations, meet the performance standards, and released as useful and productive restored land. This performance measure is the acreage of land that is released every year by active coal mine operators (and is dependent on the operator filing application for release). This is done through a series of bond releases. The bonds are required to assure that funds are available for reclamation in case the operator fails to reclaim the mined land.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	70,000		

Measure: Percentage of coalmining sites that are free of off-site impacts, such as damage caused by blasting, landslides, water quality effects on streams, etc.

Additional Information: Protecting the environment, people and property is measured by the number of times incidents occur outside the boundaries of the permitted areas being mined. These are known as off-site impacts and ideally the goal is to not have any incidents occur. It is inevitable that some impacts will occur. 100% compliance is not realistic. The impacts are damaging effects that would occur as a result of blasting, land stability, hydrology, encroachment, etc., that would affect people, land, water, or structures outside the permitted area of mining operations.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2000	94%	94%	
2001	94%	94%	
2002	94%	93%	
2003	94%		
2004	94%		

Measure: Measure Under Development

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)
-------------	---------------	---------------	--

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Capital Assets & Service Acquisition Programs

Name of Program: **RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECTS**

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	No	The program purpose is not clear because each individual project was authorized with its own goals, which may differ from those of other projects. Reclamation does not have a rural water program per se. The projects are not organized in any coherent plan to unite these projects toward a common goal. Although Reclamation does not have a rural water program, one of Reclamation's purposes is to deliver water in an environmentally responsible and cost-efficient manner. Congress has directed Reclamation to fund 11 rural water projects with differing requirements and cost sharing arrangements with the general purpose of providing potable water to communities, tribes, and areas of need. Reclamation serves as the oversight agency in each of these projects and approaches them in a similar manner: to provide the technical and administrative oversight needed to complete the planning, design, and construction of its projects.	In each rural water project in which it serves as the oversight agency, Reclamation enters into cooperative agreements with the project sponsors to provide funds for planning, designing, constructing, operating, maintaining, and replacing their respective systems. The cooperative agreements and Indian Self-determination Act (Public Law. 93-638) agreements with the project sponsors specify the responsibilities for Reclamation and the project sponsors.	20%	0.0
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Congress has chosen Reclamation to fill a void for projects which are larger and more complex than other rural water projects, and which do not meet the criteria of other rural water programs. Reclamation's involvement in rural water stems from its reputation as one of the few Federal agencies that has large project management skills as well as the capability to carry a large project to completion.	Congress is seeking to take advantage of Reclamation's 100 years of experience and expertise in providing administrative oversight over the design of most of the major water development and delivery systems in the West. The 11 rural water projects that Congress authorized for Reclamation involvement typically include more than one local entity, cover a large regional area serving multiple local utilities, cost from \$100-400 million or more, and take 5 to 10 years to build.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Congress has chosen Reclamation to fill a void for projects that are larger and more complex than other rural water projects. These projects will provide an adequate supply of safe water to geographically dispersed communities and tribes.	Reclamation invests more Federal dollars in rural water projects of greater magnitude than any other Federal agency. Of the 11 rural water projects in which Reclamation is involved, 7 have combined estimated construction costs totaling \$2 billion. The Federal contribution for each Indian component of a project is 100% and as much as 85% for non-Indian projects. For example, the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply Project has a total estimated cost of \$400 million and ultimately will serve 50,000 people, including 40,000 Indians on 3 reservations. By comparison, programs of the Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Rural Utilities Service (RUS), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of Health and Human Services' Indian Health Service (IHS) serve smaller systems and have overall much lower costs.	20%	0.2
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	Congress has chosen Reclamation to fill a void for projects which are larger and more complex than other rural water projects, and which do not meet the criteria of other rural water programs. Reclamation's involvement stems from its reputation as one of the few Federal agencies that has large project management skills as well as the capability to carry a large project to completion.	Each of the 11 rural water projects that Congress authorized for Reclamation involvement serves a specific purpose and population. These projects are generally larger and more complex than rural water projects undertaken by other agencies. For example, the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply Project has a total estimated cost of \$400 million and includes a water treatment plant, 4500 miles of pipeline, 60 booster pump stations, and 35 water storage reservoirs, and will serve 50,000 people, including 40,000 Indians on 3 reservations. By comparison, RUS, which assists rural communities to develop drinking water supplies and solid waste disposal, funds small projects limited to systems serving fewer than 10,000 persons. The RUS program is primarily a loan and grant program for individual systems with little technical assistance provided by RUS itself. Rural water programs at EPA and at IHS are typically quite small compared to the dollars spent and the number of people served by Reclamation projects.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	Reclamation's involvement in rural water is not optimally designed to take advantage of Reclamation's experience and expertise. Congress has directed Reclamation to fund individual projects with specific requirements and cost sharing arrangements which differ from traditional Reclamation projects, often without involving the Bureau in the design and planning phase of a project.	Reclamation's role in rural water has been dictated by Congress and project sponsors who are frustrated by current Reclamation law and policy, which requires project-specific authority for feasibility studies and construction, and full repayment of municipal water project construction costs with interest. As a result, project sponsors often pre-judge the analyses of alternatives and dictate the desired outcome. The resulting studies seldom undergo Reclamation and Administration review, and are not prepared in accordance with current Federal planning and engineering standards. As such, these studies provide a poor basis for the project planning, design and construction. Also, the Federal cost-share for current projects has been enacted without regard to the project sponsors' repayment capabilities. Further, the trend toward Reclamation covering all tribal operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of project infrastructure in perpetuity will have increasingly significant budget impacts well into the future.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					100%	60%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)						
1	<i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	No	Reclamation does not have a rural water program, and does not have long-term goals adequate for managing its rural water projects in a comprehensive fashion. Although Reclamation has long-term performance goals to deliver water in an environmentally responsible and cost-efficient manner, they are not satisfactory for long-term management of a program whose goals and project purpose are unclear. Congress has directed Reclamation to fund 11 rural water projects designed with specific and different requirements and capabilities. Reclamation serves as the oversight agency in each of these projects and approaches them in a similar manner: to provide the technical and administrative oversight needed to complete the planning, design, and construction of its projects.	Congress has authorized 11 rural water projects for Reclamation involvement. Reclamation enters into cooperative agreements with the project sponsors to provide funds for planning, designing, constructing, operating, maintaining, and replacing their respective systems. The cooperative agreements and Public Law 93-638 agreements with the project sponsors specify the responsibilities for Reclamation and the project sponsors to furnish timely and reliable project performance information. Reclamation's oversight includes reviewing and approving reports, construction plans, specifications, work schedules, fund requests, and change orders. Project sponsors provide detailed schedules in support of fund requests to allow for effective tracking of expenses and budgets.	13%	0.0
2	<i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	Annual goals are established and performance measured based on construction contracts completed by the project sponsors under cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the project sponsors. These annual goals help guide program management, even though long-term goals for the program are inadequate.	The project sponsors develop the project work plan and schedule and are responsible for accomplishing the activities with the given amount of funding for that year. The construction contracts generally are fixed-price contracts with a specific completion date and specified performance requirements. Reclamation monitors the sponsors' progress in construction within the parameters of the cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the sponsors. Reclamation's approval of funding requests depends on the project sponsors' accounting of costs and project performance. Annual performance goals are: (1) Execution of all necessary cooperative agreements and obligation of appropriated funds; (2) Number score of satisfaction for rural water customers served by Reclamation; and (3) Percent of acre-feet delivered on time as defined in contracts.	13%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	No	All partners do not support program planning efforts. Reclamation's rural water program came into existence due to the successful efforts of project sponsors to circumvent Administration oversight of project development. Current Reclamation law and policy requiring project-specific authority for feasibility studies and construction, and full repayment of municipal and industrial water project construction costs with interest does not appear to be compatible with or responsive to the needs and expectations of rural water users. The water users circumvented these guidelines when they developed their projects. Additionally, there is no rural water program per se, and each project sponsor has its own agenda for long-term goals.	The Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and the Water Conservation and Utilization Act of 1939 require 100% repayment, with interest, of construction costs allocated to municipal water supply. The 1939 Act also requires that each proposed project be studied for feasibility as directed by Congress and then subsequently be authorized by a separate act of Congress. These and other Reclamation law provisions have led project sponsors to formulate projects and negotiate project financing terms with Congress in one step. The projects are justified through studies which are not prepared in accordance with current Federal planning and engineering standards and that do not consider ability-to-pay. The resulting authorizations provide as little as 15% cost-share for non-Indian project components, and no cost-share for tribes.	13%	0.0
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	No	The four agencies that have rural water programs (BOR, USDA, HUD, and EPA) do not effectively coordinate with one another.	USDA, HUD, and EPA signed a Joint Memorandum of Understanding to foster cooperation among rural water and wastewater programs at the Federal, State, and local level, which in turn will encourage more efficient use of funds and reduce administrative inefficiencies. Due to Reclamation lacking a formal authorized program, the other rural water agencies refused Reclamation's request to participate.	13%	0.0
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	Yes	The Department of the Interior's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and independent auditors review each project for appropriateness of costs charged. Project accountability and controls are included in the annual statement of accountability audit which is performed by an independent auditor.	Independent evaluations are performed on an as-needed basis. The OIG audited the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply Project and produced reports on the 4 project components in May-June 1999. Reclamation routinely performs Value Engineering studies to identify cost-saving measures related to project design. For example, Reclamation and the Lewis and Clark project performed a Value Engineering study and identified more than \$10 million in savings.	13%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	Yes	As the project oversight agency, Reclamation develops master plans for each project that allows Reclamation to assess the collective impacts of changes in annual funding, policy or legislation. Annual goals for this program reflect impacts to performance due to changes in funding, policy, and legislation.	Master plans often indicate situations where funding shortfalls will have long-term repercussions. For example, there currently is an amendment pending before Congress to increase the construction ceiling and extend the authorized construction period for the Mni Wiconi Project. The amendment is needed due to increased construction costs prompted in part by successive years of annual appropriations which were less than anticipated in the project master plan.	13%	0.1
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	Reclamation is working a proposal through the Department of the Interior intended to address concerns regarding project design, planning, and authorization.	The Reclamation proposal would address current and future needs for domestic and municipal water supplies in rural areas of the West. The program would provide the ability to conduct appraisal and feasibility level studies for proposed rural water supply systems, the development of common/suitable criteria and designs to guide the implementation of resulting projects, a mechanism for recommending the resulting proposals to Congress for construction authorization, funding strategies for construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement, and coordination between the many Federal, State, and other entities involved in rural water supply systems.	13%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	<i>Are acquisition program plans adjusted in response to performance data and changing conditions?</i>	Yes	Project sponsors adjust their goals for contracting for components of the project on a contract-by-contract basis based on the results of its competitive bidding process.	Project sponsors award construction contracts based on competitive bidding that provides for obtaining the required projects at the lowest price. As bids come in on the contract, project sponsors must adjust the Master Plan accordingly -- up or down. Reclamation will not approve contract awards unless project sponsors can demonstrate that letting the contract will not over-obligate funds which have been identified in the project master plan for a given year.	13%	0.1
9 (Cap 2.)	<i>Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule and performance goals?</i>	N/A	Project sponsors work with Congress to authorize projects without going through the normal Administration process of considering project alternatives. Alternatives to projects are normally considered as part of the authorization process, but once authorized it is not feasible to regularly reconsider alternatives. Reclamation routinely balances long-term funding requirements for all authorized projects against the potential for cost savings through accelerating completion of portions of construction for select projects.	As projects near completion of construction, Reclamation has increased funding allocations for those projects before starting construction on newly authorized projects. For example, the Mid Dakota project is 58% complete and has received about a 50% increase in funding in recent years.	0%	
Total Section Score					100%	63%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score	
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	Reclamation serves as the oversight agency. Reclamation monitors the construction activities of the project sponsors on a regular basis as established in each project's cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the project sponsor. Operation and maintenance of the system is the responsibility of the non-Indian project sponsors and is not monitored. Operation and maintenance of the Indian systems is the responsibility of the Tribe and also is not monitored.	The cooperative agreements with the project sponsors and Public Law. 93-638 specify the responsibilities for Reclamation and the project sponsors to furnish timely and reliable project performance information. This occurs during the funding process with monthly payment requests being reviewed by Reclamation along with the construction progress of the project. Reclamation also has periodic progress meetings with the project sponsors. The project sponsors provide inspection reports and progress reports at specific intervals as specified in the cooperative agreement. Reclamation conducts site visits to monitor performance.	9%	0.1
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	Federal managers' performance evaluations generally include a rating based on the management and control of projects under their purview. Project funding is based, in part, on the project sponsors' progress in completing individual project components of the overall project.	The project sponsors develop the project work plan and schedule, and are responsible for accomplishing the activities with the given amount of funding for that year. The construction contracts generally are fixed-price contracts with a specific completion date and specified performance requirements. Reclamation monitors the sponsors' progress in construction within the parameters of the cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the sponsors. Reclamation's approval of funding requests depends on the project sponsors' accountability of the costs and project performance. Reclamation also monitors and audits the project sponsors' administration and overhead expenses.	9%	0.1
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	Funding is dedicated to specific contract accomplishments achieved by the project sponsors. Annual funding for Reclamation's rural water projects is obligated through multi-year cooperative agreements and Indian Self-determination Act (Public Law. 93-638) agreements that specify what the funds will be used for by the project sponsors as they construct their projects.	To date, annual funding coming to Reclamation for the authorized rural water projects has not exceeded the construction capability of the project sponsors, therefore all funding has been expended in a timely manner. Expenditure of funds on individual projects on an annual basis depends on the ability of the project sponsors to plan, design, and award contracts. Overall, this process has occurred without major delays.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	Projects are reviewed and monitored to ensure cost efficient practices are employed by the project sponsors. Exceptional cases recognize statutory requirements for Indian Self-determination Act (Public Law. 93-638) agreements which Reclamation cannot control. This Act gives priority to tribal contractors to work on projects for tribal purposes.	Project sponsors award construction contracts based on competitive bidding, which provides for obtaining the required projects at the lowest price. Reclamation and the project sponsors regularly conduct Value Engineering studies on the projects and parts thereof to develop more cost effective construction of the systems.	9%	0.1
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	No	Present cost accounting systems of the Department comply with Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board #4 - Managerial Cost Accounting. Full costs are reported at the segment level from the Departmental perspective and also from the bureau perspective. This includes full cost reporting by Department strategic goals in the Department's Annual Accountability Report and by bureau mission goals in bureau-level annual financial statements. Cost accounting at lower levels, as requested by individual PART reviews, does not currently accumulate full costs as defined in the PART instructions and OMB Circular A-11; for example, "the full employer share of the annual accruing cost of retiree pension and health benefits is not included."		9%	0.0
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	Construction oversight and contracts management practices by Reclamation are in place and effective based on audit findings.	An audit conducted during May-June 1999 on the Mni Wiconi Project by the Inspector General found no material weaknesses in Reclamation's oversight capacity that directly related to the audit. The OIG recommended that the project sponsors undertake several actions in order to ensure that costs incurred by them were expended in accordance with Federal law, regulations, and funding agreements. Reclamation concurred or proposed acceptable alternative solutions in all of the recommendations. Reclamation also develops annual assurance statements on management controls and complies with all Department requirements on financial accountability.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	Reclamation is working a proposal through the Department intended to address concerns regarding project design, planning, and authorization.	The Reclamation proposal would address current and future needs for domestic and municipal water supplies in rural areas of the West. The program would provide the ability to conduct appraisal and feasibility level studies for proposed rural water supply systems, the development of common/suitable criteria and designs to guide the implementation of resulting projects, a mechanism for recommending the resulting proposals to Congress for construction authorization, funding strategies for construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement, and coordination between the many Federal, State, and other entities involved in rural water supply systems.	9%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	<i>Does the program define the required quality, capability, and performance objectives of deliverables?</i>	Yes	Reclamation provides quality control and oversight for all design and construction activities for its rural water projects in accordance with Federal law, regulations, and funding agreements.	The WEB, Mid Dakota, and Mni Wiconi projects are delivering water to project beneficiaries in compliance with Safe Drinking Water Act standards and consistent with industry standards. Other rural water projects are not as far along in the planning/construction stage (three are still studies), but each will be monitored according to project-specific construction and water delivery schedules.	9%	0.1
9 (Cap 2.)	<i>Has the program established appropriate, credible, cost and schedule goals?</i>	Yes	Reclamation dedicates funding to specific contract accomplishments achieved by the project sponsors. Multi-year cooperative agreements and Indian Self-determination Act (Pub. L. 93-638) agreements specify how the project sponsors will obligate annual funds as they construct their projects.	To date, annual funding coming to Reclamation for the authorized rural water projects has not exceeded the construction capability of the project sponsors, therefore all funding has been expended in the timely manner. Expenditure of funds on individual projects on an annual basis depends on the ability of the project sponsors to plan, design, and award contracts in a timely manner. Overall, this process has occurred without major delays.	9%	0.1
10 (Cap 3.)	<i>Has the program conducted a recent, credible, cost-benefit analysis that shows a net benefit?</i>	No	Congress has directed Reclamation to fund 11 individual projects with specific requirements and cost sharing arrangements which differ from traditional Reclamation projects often without involving the Bureau in the design and planning phase of a project. As a result, Reclamation cannot revisit the cost-benefit analysis after project authorization.	Reclamation's role in rural water has been dictated by Congress and by project sponsors who are unhappy with current Reclamation law and policy requiring project specific authority for feasibility studies and construction, and full repayment of municipal water project construction costs with interest. As a result, project sponsors facing Safe Drinking Water standard violations often pre-judge the analyses of alternatives and dictate the desired outcome to meet those standards. The resulting studies seldom have been developed with Reclamation's input, are not prepared in accordance with current Federal planning and engineering standards, and do not consider the project sponsors' repayment capabilities.	9%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
11 (Cap 4.) <i>Does the program have a comprehensive strategy for risk management that appropriately shares risk between the government and contractor?</i>	Yes	Reclamation enters into cooperative agreements with the project sponsors to provide funds for planning, designing, constructing, operating, maintaining, and replacing their respective systems. The cooperative agreements and Public Law. 93-638 agreements with the project sponsors clearly specify the responsibilities for Reclamation and the project sponsors, and allocate risk accordingly.	The project sponsors develop the project work plan and schedule and are responsible for accomplishing the activities with the given amount of funding for that year. The construction contracts generally are fixed-price contracts with a specific completion date and specified performance requirements. Reclamation monitors the sponsors' progress in construction within the parameters of the cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the sponsors. Reclamation's approval of funding requests depends on the project sponsors' accountability of the costs and project performance.	9%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	82%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1	<i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	No	The program does not have adequate long-term performance measures, therefore it has no basis for evaluating long-term progress. In particular, those measures it has lack clear timeframes. However, project data indicates that Reclamation is achieving results in delivering water in an environmentally responsible and cost-efficient manner.	Several projects are providing an adequate supply of safe water to the target population. The WEB Project is 100% complete. The Mid-Dakota Project is 58% complete. The Mni Wiconi Project is 43% complete. The Garrison Project is 61% complete. Other rural water projects are not as far along in the planning/construction stage (three are still studies), but each will be monitored according to project-specific construction and water delivery schedules.	17%	0.0
---	---	----	--	---	-----	-----

Long-Term Goal I: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Percent of targeted population served with reliable, safe drinking water. To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process. To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Long-Term Goal II: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Percent of contracted water orders delivered. To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process. To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Long-Term Goal III: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Cost per acre-foot of water delivered. To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process. To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	<i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Large Extent	Annual goals are established and performance measured based on construction contracts completed by the project sponsors under cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the project sponsors.	The project sponsors develop the project work plan and schedule and are responsible for accomplishing the activities with the given amount of funding for that year. The construction contracts generally are fixed-price contracts with a specific completion date and specified performance requirements. Reclamation monitors the sponsors' progress in construction within the parameters of the cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the sponsors. Reclamation's approval of funding requests depends on the project sponsors' accountability of the costs and project performance. Of the three performance measures listed below, Interior is developing Key Goals 2 and 3 as part of its new Strategic Plan. However, Key Goal 1 is not currently part of this process.	17%	0.1

Key Goal I:	Execution of all necessary cooperative agreements and obligation of appropriated funds.
Performance Target:	Annual obligations meet contractual requirements in each Fiscal Year.
Actual Performance:	
Key Goal II:	Number score of satisfaction for rural water customers served by Reclamation.
Performance Target:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Actual Performance:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Key Goal III:	Percent of acre-feet delivered on time as defined in contracts.
Performance Target:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Actual Performance:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.

3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Small Extent	Construction schedules are modified where efficiencies and cost benefits can be derived by the modifications. Not all possible savings can be recognized due to shortfalls in funding.	In a May 1999 Audit Report, the OIG found that if the West River/Lyman Jones Rural Water System (part of Mni Wiconi) completed their portion as currently designed, their portion of the project would be \$6.6 million less than the indexed costs projected by Reclamation.	17%	0.1
---	--	--------------	--	---	-----	-----

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Small Extent	Although project construction has proceeded as scheduled based on dollars appropriated, the magnitude of Reclamation's projects make comparisons with other programs with significantly smaller projects difficult. Reclamation's rural water projects were part of the common measures exercise for rural water projects. Based on the outcome of this exercise, Reclamation's rural water projects do not compare very favorably. However, Reclamation's project exist because they failed to meet the criteria of other rural water programs. Their poor performance seems to be from the nature of the projects that Congress authorizes, and not due to poor project management.	At first glance, Reclamation's rural water program does not compare favorably to the other programs compared in the common measures exercise. As part of the Rural Water Project Common Measures exercise, OMB compared the rural water programs of BOR, EPA's Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, RUS, and IHS, using two measures: Water Connections per \$ million, and Population Served per \$ million. Reclamation's project did not compare favorably for either of these metrics (21 connections per \$ million for BOR vs. 212 (IHS), 649 (RUS), and 764 (EPA). For Population Served per \$ Million the story was similar: 363 for BOR vs. 933 (IHS), 1779 (RUS), and 1655 (EPA). BOR's projects are generally larger and more complex than other rural water projects. RUS' program funds relatively small projects limited to systems serving less than 10,000 persons, with an average project cost for 87 projects in 38 states of about \$1.8 million. Rural water programs at EPA and at IHS are typically quite small compared to the dollars spent and the number of people served by Reclamation pr	17%	0.1
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Small Extent	Based on the independent evaluations performed, Reclamation is working with its project sponsors to improve project effectiveness. The Mni Wiconi Project is 43% complete and currently providing some project water to project beneficiaries in a relatively effective manner according to OIG auditors.	An audit conducted during May-June 1999 on the Mni Wiconi Project by the Inspector General found no material weaknesses in Reclamation's oversight capacity that directly related to the audit. The OIG recommended that the project sponsors undertake several actions in order to ensure that costs incurred by them were expended in accordance with Federal law, regulations, and funding agreements. Reclamation concurred or proposed acceptable alternative solutions in all of the recommendations. Reclamation also develops annual assurance statements on management controls and complies with all Department requirements on financial accountability.	17%	0.1
6 (Cap 1.)	<i>Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?</i>	Large Extent	Reclamation is achieving results in delivering water in an environmentally responsible and cost-efficient manner.	Several projects are providing an adequate supply of safe water to the target population. The WEB Project is 100% complete. The Mid-Dakota Project is 58% complete. The Mni Wiconi Project is 43% complete. The Garrison Project is 61% complete. Each are currently providing some project water to project beneficiaries.	17%	0.1
Total Section Score					100%	39%

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Reclamation's (BOR's) research program has a clear mission statement: facilitating the development and use of new scientific and technological solutions that contribute significantly to a safe, affordable, sustainable, and ample water and power supply. The purpose of the desalination research established by Congress is to develop more cost-effective, technologically efficient, and implementable means to desalinate water.

Evidence: Tab 1.1-1: Web page postings of Science & Technology (S&T) Program Goal Statement show a clear, focused program mission stated in two separate places at www.usbr.gov/research. 1.1-2: Program PowerPoint slide that shows program mission goal that has been presented at recent National Water Resources Association (NWRA), Western Coalition of Arid States (WESCAS), and other conferences. 1.1-3: Replies from NWRA members showing strong support for S&T Program Goal. 1.1-4: P.L. 104-298 (Water Desalination Act of 1996) states the purpose of the legislation. 1.1-5: The home page of Reclamation's Desal website shows the purpose of the program on the first page. The website is located at www.usbr.gov/water/desal.html. The Reclamation Act of 1902, and Public Law 92-149 provides authority for research focused on BOR mission needs.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Growing shortages of water and escalating water conflicts pose many challenges for Reclamation water managers and water users. Research is customized to find innovative solutions focused on BOR core end outcomes of water and power deliveries and on the specific needs of our stakeholders (i.e., Reclamation resource managers and the external water managers and water users served by Reclamation project waters). The program is designed to ensure research is targeted to those problems, interests, and needs. The program has a multi-objective steering team that includes internal and external stakeholders, and serves to steer, validate, and prioritize program needs and direction. The desalination research also serves national water supply needs.

Evidence: Water supplies in the U.S. are becoming progressively more scarce. 1.2-1: US Census and USGeological Survey (USGS) data show the Western US has an exploding population base, and a fixed amount of fresh water. 1.2-2: WATER2025 initiative describes this problem. 1.2-3: BOR's prime focus is in West. 1.2-4: Program addresses unique problems and solutions, pg. 1. 1.2-5: National Research Council (NRC) (2001) reports water problems & research needs. 1.2-6: The S&T Roadmap guides research proposals and program decisions to focus on four main research areas. 1.2-7: Nested in the 4 research focus areas are 20 mission-specific R&D output areas, each with specific goals and objectives. 1.2-8: Sect. I.F, I.G, and VI of the proposal form shows that research is focused on problems specific to BOR challenges, needs, and responsibilities. 1.2-9: Letter from WESCAS. 1.2-10: Desalination R&D brochure; 1.2-11, Desalination and Water Purification Technology Roadmap, pp 8-28; 1.2-12: the Multi-State Salinity Coalition article; 1.2-13 & 14, two articles; and 1.2-15: Golden Workshop Report.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: No other Research & Development (R&D) programs are dedicated to developing solutions for Reclamation water managers/users and their water needs. The program was designed to focus on these needs (see response to Question 1.2 and 4.4). It uses multiple mechanisms to avoid duplication and catalyze collaboration and coordination with others involved in water resources research. Subsidized agricultural water market prices do not provide sufficient private sector incentive for the R&D necessary. Private sector investments in desal. focus on incremental change of specific products; profit margins are too thin to support the high risk and long development times for basic desal. research. The mission of desalination cost reduction is unique, but other agencies work with the same technologies as they relate to their military mission requirements of reliability and portability. To avoid redundant research and facilitate information sharing, the program manages an interagency consortium on desalination and has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with other research funding non-profits.

Evidence: 1.3-1: A federal research coordinating committee ensures no duplication of research activities and encourage collaboration. 1.3-2: Established a multi-agency and stakeholder steering team that helps avoid duplication, encourage collaboration, and identifies R&D entities having ability to compliment or support BOR efforts. 1.3-3: Notes summarize the unique niches served by BOR R&D as applied and focused on solutions to BOR problems, while the USGS focus is on more basic R&D plus water data collection and dissemination. 1.3-4: Collaboration planning document. 1.3-5: Section V of proposal form and proposal ranking factors avoids duplication by encouraging coordination with partners having similar objectives through resource leveraging. 1.3-6: A memo addressing collaboration with USGS and the National Institutes for Water Resources (NIWR). 1.2-8, Section I.G of proposal form and ranking factors avoids duplicative efforts. 1.3-7: Consortium minutes. 1.3-8: MOU for Research Task Force. 1.3-9: BOR desalination research plan. 1.3-10 Excerpts from proposals about the absence of possible funding from other sources.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program is efficient and produces considerable results with a very small budget. Management is 4% of program budget. Program established a competitive environment and funds intramural & extramural research in a timely manner. It has established means to spread awareness and application of results and has external peer review mechanisms. Effective business practice improvements focus efforts on current and future BOR water management needs and goals, promote resource leveraging, avoid duplication, and evaluate costs and benefits. One area for improvement is the lack of overarching cooperative agreement/grant authority for R&D. Such authority would facilitate easier, stronger collaborative efforts with researchers at other institutions; and further increase competition for research funding. Other agencies such as Corps of Engineers (COE), USGS, National Park Service (NPS), and Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) have such authorities. Another area for improvement is where power marketing agencies benefit from BOR R&D that lead to cheaper power, but do not fund BOR R&D.

Evidence: 1.4-1: New competitive call for proposals. 1.4-2: External award for Exceptional Process Improvement. 1.4-3: Western Coalition of Arid States letter shows stakeholder value/low cost. 1.4-4: 4% program management/admin costs based on actual expenditures. 1.4-5&6: Proposal form/guidelines ensure focus on needs & resource leveraging. New on-line system for efficient program workflow & progress reporting. 1.4-7: Proposals awarded with greatest potential; best benefits; high leveraging. 1.4-8: Reward innovative, high quality R&D at reasonable cost, penalize duplication of capabilities. 1.4-9: Independent steering team identifies R&D priorities. 1.4-10: Project partner list. 1.4-11: External reviewers ensure effectiveness. Ex: removal of a flaw: initially offered \$25k coop. agreements for extramural desal. projects but efforts were too small to be effective, ensure completion, and the project admin. was a large percentage of costs. Increasing fed. share to \$100k ensured useful R&D accomplished. See also 1.2-11 Desal Research Roadmap, pp 38-45. 1.4.12 Extramural desal. proposal process.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program targets Reclamation resource managers and the external water managers and water users served by Reclamation project waters. Since 2001, the S&T Program has been restructured to ensure maximum focus on program stakeholders and their priority needs, to involve them throughout the R&D process, and provide new R&D results. The program has also established program goals that measure performance in terms of the core values of stakeholders and their expected outcomes of water, power, and avoided costs. Internal & external stakeholders have stated support for program goals and practices. Since 1989, Reclamation has held desal workshops with stakeholders and conducted studies to identify needs and promising technologies. Reclamation used the information obtained from these activities to guide the program. Beneficiaries are targeted through the research solicitation process, which is competitive, merit-reviewed and cost-shared.

Evidence: 1.5-1: Steering team guides program direction & priorities. 1.5-2: Outreach workshop for stretching ag. water supplies & invasive species workshops demonstrate outreach & involvement of stakeholders.(also posted on BuRec website). 1.1-3 NWRA members show strong support for S&T Program Goal. 1.2-9: Letter from WESCAS states support for program. Both Steering & BOR Leadership Teams show strong support for program practices & management(see 2.6). 1.4-11: Stakeholders influence direction of efforts through relevancy review. 1.4-7, Relevancy proposal ranking criteria rewards proposals with greatest potential for high use of R&D outputs. Ranking process rewards proposals that work with stakeholders throughout the research process. 1.2-8, Sections I.F, I.G, & VI of the program proposal form shows that research is focused on problems specific to BOR. 1.2-6 & 1.2-7, S&T Program Roadmap, effectively targets proposals to support BOR's core mission. 1.5-3, Desalting Needs References, shows how needs and beneficiaries are identified. 1.5-4, -5, -6 and -7, the current Broad Agency Announcements, describe how research projects are selected.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program has 3 long-term outcome goals and measures : 1) Quantity of water liberated, 2) Kilowatts (kW) of power generated, and 3) avoided operational costs. The program contributes to safe, affordable, sustainable, and ample water and power supplies by developing and implementing solutions that liberate water for increased use, or more dependable beneficial use, for BOR stakeholders; solutions that contribute to increased power generation, and/or that reduce or minimize operational costs so program stakeholders can use their financial resources more effectively. All outcome goals try to achieve at least a 10:1 economic return of the federal S&T Program investment and include extramural desalination research contributions. Program efficiency measures are in terms of outputs that contribute to outcomes and pursue a 34% improved efficiency over 6 years. The desal. program has 3 additional long-term performance measures under review by the NRC: 1) Reduce the cost of desal. & water treatment; 2) Reduce environmental impact of facility operations; and 3) Increase technology transfer and awareness.

Evidence: 2.1-1: Explains long-term outcome goals and measures; long-term goal reporting period is 6 years. 2.1-2, Section 1.1, the outcome goals of water liberated, power generated, and operational costs avoided support the program's goal and purpose. 2.1-3: Table demonstrates alignment of the 3 program outcome goals to Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) goals. 2.1-4, Section III.A explains the long-term efficiency measures in terms of two key outputs: (1) Resource leveraging measures the value others place on S&T efforts and also directs more resources and coordination toward issues shared by partners; (2) Production and dissemination of S&T Bulletins that target program beneficiaries and peers with relevant findings. 2.1-5: Slides explaining output efficiency measures have been presented at NWRA, WESCAS, Performance Institute, Department of the Interior (DOI), et al. 2.1-6: S&T Bulletin template and production flowchart. Objectives in the Broad Area Announcement (BAA) (Section A.2.2) can be found in Tabs 1.5-4 to 1.5-7. Tab 1.2-10, Table 1, page 11, has desal long-term performance measures.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Long-term goals have a 6-year timeframe. Outcomes target a minimum 10:1 economic return on the S&T investment in terms of outcomes that result from deployment of R&D outputs. Long-term output goals catalyze progress toward outcome goals. Output-based goals pursue greater levels (minimum 34% increase over 6 years) of (1) resource leveraging and (2) S&T Bulletins for more effective and timely transfer of new tools and knowledge to the end-user of the research outputs. Targets are ambitious considering the relatively small size of the program, diversity of R&D needs, and the fact that new research outputs must be put into use in order to achieve outcome goals. Desalination research targets described are ambitious. The desalination research roadmap has developed specific long-term (2020) targets that are very ambitious and are currently under review by the NRC. The approved desal roadmap targets will then become additional program targets.

Evidence: 2.2-1: Section II.A and III.B of S&T Program Goal document shows the specific, quantified program outcome targets and output targets over a 6-year reporting period (FY2005-10). 2.2-2: For the relatively small size of the program, achieving a 10:1 return on the R&D investment in terms of stakeholder outcome benefits achieved is considered ambitious. Likewise, a 34% increase over 6-years in the production efficiency of key program outputs is also considered ambitious. 2.2-3: Section II.E shows the established implementation schedule for program goals, baselines, and performance measures. Baselines for output measures are based on incremental annual improvements over the previous year. The FY2004 accomplishment will serve as the initial baseline for the FY2005-FY2010 reporting period. Establishing baselines for outcome measures are also scheduled by the end of FY2004. Tab 1.2-12, Table 1, p 11, specific needs-driven desal technology based targets and critical objectives were developed (i.e., long-term performance measures).

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Annual performance measures are tied directly to annual budget proposals. To achieve the 34% long-term increase in the leveraging and knowledge transfer output goals requires a 5% annual increase in each measure. Output goal measures are normalized with respect to S&T Program investments to create an efficiency ratio that measures production vs. costs. Desalination research projects, partnerships, publications and presentations are required to address the measures stated in Question 2.1. The program management plan that stems from the desalination research roadmap will have annual performance measures based on critical research areas.

Evidence: 2.3-1: Section II.A and III.B of S&T Program Goal document shows the specific, quantified program annual outcome targets and output targets. 2.3-2: Section III.A of the S&T Program Goal document explains the program annual efficiency measures in terms of two key outputs 1) Resource leveraging that measures the value others place in program efforts and also directs more resources and coordination toward common issues shared by partners and 2) Production and dissemination of S&T Bulletins that target program beneficiaries and peers about relevant findings that can facilitate use of new solutions. 2.5-7 shows the evaluation form used. The stakeholder-driven desal research roadmap contains critical objectives based on needs, and matches technologies to address those needs. 2.3-3 shows an example of current efforts on development of one aspect (concentrate management) of the desalination research roadmap.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Annual outcomes target a minimum 10:1 economic return on the annual research investment in terms of outcomes that result from deployment of R&D outputs. Annual output-based efficiency goals pursue greater levels (minimum 5% increase over previous year) of (1) resource leveraging and (2) timely transfer of new tools and knowledge to the end-user of the research outputs. Targets are ambitious considering the relatively small size of the program and the fact that new research outputs must be put into use in order to achieve outcome goals. Now that goals are established, baseline data will be collected in 2004.

Evidence: 2.4-1: Section II.A and III.B of S&T Program Goal document shows specific, quantified annual outcome and output targets. 2.4-2: Both annual outcome and output targets are established to show continued improvement and progress toward meeting long-term targets so that timely corrective actions can be taken toward achieving the long-term goals. 2.4-3: Section II.E of the S&T Program Goal document shows the established implementation schedule for program goals, baselines, and performance measures. Baselines for output measures are based on incremental annual improvements over the previous year. The FY2004 accomplishment will serve as the initial baseline. Establishing baselines for outcome measures is also scheduled by the end of FY2004. 2.4-4: Since program goal development activities did not begin until FY2002, determining if the annual and long-term targets are achievable is based on an analysis of recent case histories. Case histories, in Section II.D of the S&T Program Goal document, indicate targets are achievable and serve as a baseline indicator.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Recipients of funding must demonstrate how their efforts will contribute to research mission, goals, and performance measures. Proposal ranking and funding decisions consider alignment, potential contribution to goals, and past success in meeting goals. Accepted proposals become performance contracts. Failure to perform in accordance with contract jeopardizes continued and future funding. Technical Service Center (TSC) management has committed to supporting program goals and measures. Cooperative extramural research agreements contains the BAA as well as the proposal as part of the "contractual document", thus incorporating program goals. External cooperative partners are informed that collaborative efforts contribute toward BOR mission and research goals and that success and continued funding depends on results toward these goals. Recipients of Cooperative Agreements work on the projects specified in their proposals and federal project managers monitor work to ensure it stays directed to the long-term goals of the program and the specific project goals.

Evidence: 2.5-1: Proposal, sections I.F & V, require demonstration of contributions to goals. 2.5-2: Presentation used with potential partners/contractors shows goals and passion we expect from program partners. 2.5-3: Program stipulates that proposers commit to work toward and report on progress toward goals. 2.5-4: Annual project progress report and guidelines. Progress report is generated for each proposal by an on-line system. All "contractors" must report on their project progress as well as their progress toward their committed contributions toward program goals. Annual resubmittal for project review of progress is required for continued funding and to ensure continued relevance. 2.5-5: TSC, the primary contractor for intramural R&D, has provided a signed agreement to commit to and work toward the S&T Program goals. 2.5-6: Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) form informs cooperating partners that collaborative efforts will contribute toward BOR mission. 2.5-7& 8 Pre- and full-proposal evaluation forms contain program objectives, page 4. See also 1.5-6, pgs 33 - 38

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development

Competitive Grant

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Program steering team (external & internal program customers, stakeholders, peers) meets annually to provide strategic guidance, non-biased program evaluation, review & prioritize needs, assess progress, & review R&D projects. Periodic briefings on program practices & goals are provided to BOR's leadership & stakeholders with feedback requested. Annual, independent, technical & relevancy review of all new proposals and multi-year projects ensures high quality, a focus on BOR priorities, and progress. Annual reviews of multi-year projects ensures continued relevance & progress. Non-biased peer review groups used for certain cross-cutting R&D areas such as water operations and hydrologic process modeling. Independent peer reviews of the desalination R&D activities were done in 1993, 1995, 1998, & 1999. Presentations are made to critical audiences to get feedback. The 1998 peer review by NWRI was the most significant & forms the basis for the development of the desalination research roadmap, proposed facilitation role for the DOI and legislative concepts.

Evidence: Steering team roster (see 1.3-2). 2.6-1: 2001 S&T steering team summary of issues & program responses. 2.6-2: 2001 S&T steering team reviews proposed program practice improvements shows support for practices. 2.6-3: 2002 S&T steering team evaluations & recommendations for improvements show strong support for new practices, focus, & accomplishments. 2.6-4: 2003 evaluations from steering team & BOR leadership show strong support for program management. 2.6-5: Existing & planned independent panels provide technical and user relevancy review of specific R&D areas. Each proposal is reviewed for mission relevancy and annual progress by independent BOR customers and program management (see 1.4-7 & 2.5-4). 2.6-6, 1998 NWRI desal R&D peer review contract; 2.6-7, NWRI peer document; 2.6-8, Changes planned or implemented in response to 1998 review. 2.6-9, Response from a committee member; 2.6-10; a less formal review in 1999. 1.2-11: Desal roadmap addresses program improvements & involved independent experts, and has NRC review underway. 1.3-9 shows planned improvements for desal R&D.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Budget requests are directly linked to program goals & show impact of funding levels on goals, although this level of detail is not always clear in OMB & Congressional requests. Annual output goal measures are based on production efficiency relative to program funding. Linking priorities to funding allocations identifies program impacts. Budget requests and cost reports include complete program costs and all direct and indirect costs are tracked and reported on each R&D project. BOR will start Activity Based Costing (ABC) in FY04 that will the numerous activities that support BOR GPRA goals. Desal budget requests are based on moving technologies from the proof-of-concept stage to piloting and demonstration. A promising new technology or process proven in a 1-year research/laboratory study (\$100k maximum) in most cases would be funded at the pilot stage (\$270k maximum) for 2 additional years. Funding to date has not allowed 2-year demo projects (\$1M maximum). The desal roadmap & related management plan will better match budget requests to annual & long-term performance goals.

Evidence: 2.7-1: S&T Program Goal document includes a breakdown of program goals and budgets according to each of the four program focus areas. The goals, associated performance measures, and budgets are linked so that impacts and achievements with different funding levels can be clearly demonstrated. 2.7.2: The program steering team priorities with overlay of budget scenarios was used to show program impacts during BOR's FY05 budget formulation process. 2.7.3. Full Costing: Comments from the DOI response to 9/2002 GAO audit shows that the BOR cost accounting system is detailed and comprehensive and provides the full costs (direct and indirect) of its programs and activities and that full costs are reported in financial statements and budget reports. The program budget allocation pie chart shows the total costs of the program. Indirect costs are included in each category shown (1.4-4). The pie chart is used during annual budget formulation processes. 1.5.6&7 describe funding levels and task descriptions. 1.2-11, pg 29, Fig 10, desal roadmap has a very broad discussion of budget needs.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The Director of Research and S&T Program Coordinator were new to their positions in FY2000. At that time, program practices and capabilities were assessed through interviews with numerous researchers, BOR managers, and water users. While areas of research were relatively productive, the program management lacked essential elements. As a result, significant new program practices implemented during FY01-FY03 included clear definition of program mission, development of a S&T Program roadmap that puts a sharp focus on BOR stakeholder needs, based competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) & research selection on merit and relevancy, establishing program goals and measures, expanding steering team to include external stakeholders and other agencies, and having the steering team set priorities. The program uses the steering team & periodic briefings with program end-users to provide ongoing input on strategic planning improvements. Many of the corrective steps recommended in the 1998 peer review of desalination research have been taken or are in the process of being implemented.

Evidence: Assesment by new management in FY 2000 found some research areas to be productive but program lacked many essential elements including: priorities, assurance of relevancy, program goals and measures, accountability, clear focus on BOR customers, objective proposal peer review, broad competition for funds. Significant new program practices implemented during FY01-FY-03 to correct these deficiencies are explained in sections 1 & 2 along with associated evidence. Long-term reauthorization of extramural desalination research and steady levels of budget requests will facilitate development and implementation of a management plan that is being created from the desalination research roadmap framework. Evidence contained in the responses to Section 1.1.-1.5 and Section 2.1- 2.4 are relevant for this response, especially sections 1.4 and 2.1-2.4

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

2.CA1 **Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: BOR currently has no authority to construct and operate research facilities. Congress directed that a new research facility be planned for desalination. As such, no programmatic alternative analysis was performed. To plan this facility, an Executive Committee of local stakeholders and technical experts was formed to conduct a systematic study of the potential roles for a Tularosa Basin desalination research facility. The study's draft Report to Congress (2.CA1-1) and Environmental Assessment contain recommendations based on alternatives analysis for the facility mission, location, conceptual design, site layout, anticipated costs, organizational structure, and accelerated design/construction process. The program is employing a performance-based design-build contract to reduce costs and eliminate unnecessary contracting delays.

Evidence: The Executive Committee met monthly from January 2002 through August 2002 in Las Cruces, NM and Alamogordo, NM to gather data, analyze alternatives, and select viable options for the development of the Tularosa Basin National Desalination Research Facility. 2.CA1-2, Minutes of Meetings. Site investigations and public meetings were also a part of the process to ensure the best possible product. In addition, BOR held two meetings of Denver technical divisions in April 2003 to validate the Executive Committee's recommendation for a performance-based design-build contract. They concluded that the private sector, performance-based contract was the best alternative for executing the construction of the facility when compared to in-house design-bid-build efforts by BOR or Sandia National Labs.

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program generates significant research, and leverages significant funds for its size. Alternative R&D projects are identified through a BOR-wide call. Program reviews all proposals to see if BOR is best positioned to conduct/lead the research. Reclamation also evaluated the business practices and efforts of others such as NIWR, California Bay-Delta Program (CALFED), National Science Foundation (NSF), and Department of Energy (DOE) to develop and customize their practices to serve BOR-specific needs. Adopted best practices from NIWR and DOE. Other agencies performing desal. research have different goals and focus on mission needs (e.g., for the military, field reliability and portability are key factors in research rather than commercialization, cost reduction, and concentrate disposal). Reclamation periodically meets with other government agencies, the military and professional research organizations to compare efforts and leverage resources. Within the research roadmap framework, a proposed course of action was developed that currently optimizes benefits within the water community.

Evidence: BOR evaluated R&D business practices of other agencies through: talking to the President of NIWR & the Corps R&D Director; touring the on-line CALFED proposal/review process; reviewing published literature on DOE; and talking with participants in these and other programs via the Water Resources Research Coordinating Committee (WRRCC). Annual RFP and proposal rating forms show the assessment and comparison of benefits, value, and other factors when selecting proposed efforts. The benefit to BOR's mission, costs, potential for broad application and use, and if BOR is best positioned to conduct or lead the proposed research are factors with the greatest weight. 1.3-7: At consortium meetings BOR compares programs with other federal agencies. 2.RD.1-1: Regular meetings with the reuse/desal research task force enables comparison of benefits/allocation of resources among participants. 1.2-11: the desal roadmap, pg 45, provides a mechanism for future comparison of efforts. 2.RD1-2. pg 2, contains a discussion of the NRC review. BOR's competitive process to compare proposals & select the most beneficial for stakeholders appears at 1.4.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

2.RD2 Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: S&T Program steering team reviews/adjusts priorities on annual basis. Funding targets for the four program R&D focus areas in the call for proposals and in the annual budget submitted to Congress are framed around these priorities. Program uses these priorities down to each of the 20 individual research output areas to guide proposal funding decisions. Proposal ratings, administration priorities and line item flexibility also influence funding decisions. Annual budget requests are directly linked to annual & long-term program goals/measures, and clearly show impact of funding levels on goals. Linking steering team priorities to funding allocations also identifies program impacts associated with funding and policy decisions. The prioritization (evaluation) process for desal is described in the answer to question 3.CO1.

Evidence: 2.RD2-1: Steering team prioritizes 20 R&D output areas on the S&T Program roadmap. The roadmap defines each output area. FY2003 funding allocations to each priority area show that priorities are being used and correlate reasonably well with priorities. Correlation anomalies with the priorities are the result of administration priorities and line item flexibility limitations that exists under the FY2003 program line item structure. 2.RD2-2: Survey of BOR managers on the primary causes of water conflict. This information will be factored into program priority updates; it is fairly consistent with steering team priorities. 2.RD2-3: RFP shows funding targets based on steering team priorities. Priorities are in all desal BAAs (1.5-4 thru 7, section A.2.2). Desalination research roadmap priorities 1.2-11: the desal roadmap, pg 45, provides a mechanism for future comparison of efforts. 2.RD1-2. pg 2, contains a discussion of the NRC review. Our competitive process to compare proposals & select the most beneficial for our stakeholders appears at 1.4

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Timely and credible performance data is collected via annual & long-term program goal performance reporting including an on-line system that allows realtime reporting. On-line outcome goal reporting capability is being developed. Progress report is accessible to the R&D contractor & program management so that progress can be reviewed to ensure credibility. Multi-year projects resubmit & annually update progress. Progress report requires 3rd party contact info to verify progress and demonstrated performance is an essential factor for funding. Progress report & program performance measures help identify best practices, provide insights on problems, and help identify corrective actions to take. The program steering team provides annual evaluation and input for program improvements. The Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) approves payment based upon actual accomplishment of deliverables. Extramural desal has proposed an annual peer review process of project accomplishment in relation to the program's goals and would help identify management deficiencies.

Evidence: Progress report template and progress reporting guidelines are documented under evidence section 2.5-4. Existing progress report template and progress reporting guidelines demonstrate system established to collect regular, timely, credible performance information. Steering team evaluations also provide annual program performance input which is used to manage the program and improve its performance (see sections 4.5 and 2.8). 3.1-1 shows an example of the COTR responsibilities to ensure credible and timely performance of extramural researchers. All extramural research projects require quarterly reports, a visit by the COTR, formal presentation, and final report. The proposed peer review process is described in Tab 1.3-9, pg 4.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The annual performance plans for the Director of Research and the S&T Program Coordinator incorporate program performance elements. Some managers in BOR's Technical Service Center (the primary S&T Program contractor) do not require performance related to research accomplishments; each desalination task area is assigned to a staff member who reports to the Group Manager and their performance as leaders and monitors is part of their interim and annual performance reviews. 3.2-3 Assignments are shown in the minutes of the DWPR meeting. Agency GPRA goals do not contain explicit performance related to incorporating new technologies and solutions into resource management practices. For extramural research, staff sit on the advisory boards of the program partners to guide the programs of these organizations. All partners and contractors are held accountable for their performance.

Evidence: 3.2-1: Annual performance plans for the Director of Research and the S&T Program Coordinator include achieving specific program results. Reviews have been stellar. 3.2-2: Primary program contractor is BOR's TSC whose performance plans include requirements to manage program accomplishments and provide quality service to clients. All program R&D projects are required to annually submit a relevant progress report that demonstrates adequate progress toward program goals and key project tasks in order to be considered for continued funding (see section 2.5-4). Tab 1.5-5 section F.3.2 lists past performance as an award factor and section F.1.1 (b) evaluates the managerial capabilities of the proposer. Assignments of Task Leaders and individual project monitors are shown in the minutes of the DWPR meeting in Tab 3.2-3. Performance standards hold staff accountable (example at 3.2-4).

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Since 2001 BOR makes funding decisions and awards project funds by 10/01, contingent on appropriations action. Program annually obligates 100% of enacted budget. Proposals require a detailed task-based funding schedule. The progress report requires task-by-task tracking of progress. We use the Federal Finance Accounting system to track expenditures against each project monthly and more frequently when necessary. Tracking includes auditing categories of expenditures to ensure consistency with project intent and working with research contractor to correct inappropriate charges. As soon as the appropriation is received, a cost centered budget is developed for specific projects and is formally reviewed for accomplishment three times a year. Adjustments, generally modest, are made as the year proceeds and more accurate cost figures become available. As work is invoiced, the COTR matches accomplishments before recommending payment. At the end of the fiscal year, finances are monitored daily.

Evidence: 3.3-1: Funding approval notices show timely awards at start of FY. 3.3-2: Memo from TSC, primary contractor of program R&D, stating that awards have been consistently made at the beginning of the FY. 3.3-3: End-of-year carryover & accomplishment summary report for FY98-02 show good accomplishment & fund management with minimal carry over. 3.3-4: Sect. II & III of the program proposal form and Progress Report Sect. X.C and X.E show the required task-based cost and schedule plan. 3.3-5: Monthly and year-end spending reports at program and individual project level are used to track expenditures. 3.3-6: Federal Finance System report showing the detail of expenditure categories. 3.3-7: The desal budget plan for FY02 was spent for intended purposes: 57% for cooperative agreements, 32% for partnerships, 3% on technology transfer and 7.4% on program administration. 3.3-8 includes two examples (after 9 and 12 months) of monthly financial sheets showing expenditures by project. The final sheet indicates an unspent balance of \$100 for FY02.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development

Competitive Grant

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Program output measures reflect production/unit cost. Program admin is 4% of funding for research overall, and 7.4% for desal. Significant business process re-engineering has occurred over last two years including a competitive RFP process. Most intramural research is done by staff in the TSC which is subject to A-76 competitive sourcing requirements. IT improvements have been implemented with further modules underway to accomplish the program and streamline efforts. Automated, web-based system is speeding proposal submittal, peer review, and award processes and includes progress reporting and performance measure reporting for program goals (outcome goal reporting under devel). It enables others see what products are expected each year, attracts partners (which increases program cost effectiveness), & facilitates sharing of findings. Extramural desal research provides funds based on merit-reviewed, cost shared, and competitive cooperative agreements. Cooperative agreements permit revision as efficiencies are discovered. All proposals are reviewed for appropriateness of cost.

Evidence: BOR has de-layered management structure since 1994. Under A-76 competitive sourcing, TSC will convert 63 positions by 9/2003. BOR will convert additional 550 positions by FY06. Annual & long term program efficiency measures (2.1-4, 2.1-5, 2.2-3) are in terms of production/unit cost. Efficiency measures focus on key program outputs: 1) resource leveraging & 2) sharing information. 1.4-4: program cost categories w/ management/admin at 4%. 1.4 documents program business practice improvements implemented over past couple years. 3.4-1: Flow chart shows our online proposal process. System uses web-enabled data base for easy, efficient, effective entry, review, tracking progress, & dissemination of information. 2.1-6: On-line S&T Bulletin draft template & production flowchart. Template & process to be finalized by the end of FY03 & implemented as an on-line web-enabled data base. Award of program R&D projects at the start of the past prior 3 fiscal years (3.3-1 & 3.3-2). 3.4-2 Cost reasonableness is an evaluation factor on desal evaluation form and on S&T Program eval form(see 1.4-8).

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Meaningful and relevant coordination and collaboration is a fundamental tenet of the program with numerous mechanisms in place to encourage and accomplish effective collaboration. Program management coordinates desalination efforts within the federal community, professional research organizations, the military, and various water authorities through several distinct mechanisms. Researchers also coordinate and collaborate with their counterparts at other federal agencies and research institutions. Researchers have both formal and informal relationships and communications with researchers in related fields. Reclamation coordinates desalination efforts within the Federal community, professional research organizations, the military and various water authorities through the Interagency Consortium.

Evidence: River modellers coordinate via the Interagency Hydrologic Modeling Committee; USGS, Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and COE collaborate on Riverware development; BOR coordinates with the Department of Agriculture (USDA), COE, and several universities on invasive species R&D, and with the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) on power efficiency and related issues. 3.5-1: WRRCC ensures no duplication of water resources research. 3.5-2: Steering team helps collaboration and avoids duplication, with collaboration via the Desal Consortium and the Recycling/ Reuse Task Force. Ex: 2.3-3, Leveraged funding by three of the five members of the Reuse Task Force. 3.5-3 By partnering with the Navy, identified research opportunities 3.5-4, Awwa Research Foundation (AWWARF)/BOR Workshop led to joint funding of 2 projects. 3.5-5, Work with the Middle East Desalination Research Center via State Dept support. 3.5-6: List of partner entities for FY2003 S&T projects. 3.5-7: Use Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs) to collaborate with other organizations.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Budget Analyst uses the Federal Finance Accounting system to track expenditures against each project on a monthly basis, and more frequently when necessary. Tracking includes auditing categories of expenditures to ensure consistency with project intent and working with research contractor to correct inappropriate charges. Recent General Accounting Office (GAO) audit to evaluate cost accounting and cost recovery practices for Reclamation's Bureauwide programs found no anomalies with the S&T Program and that activities funded were consistent with Reclamation's authorities for research. Every extramural research agreement has a financial plan and schedule supervised by the COTR and the Contracting Officer. The COTR certifies that the information is accurate and timely. The Acquisitions and Assistance Management Services Department assures that the financial systems meet statutory requirements. Cooperative agreements are periodically audited including a recent one by the Inspector General's office. The TSC has a budget group that monitors spending and overspending.

Evidence: Strong program financial management practices are fully documented in Section 3.3. 3.6-1: GAO audit report number GAO-02-973 found no anomalies with the S&T Program and that activities funded were consistent with Reclamation's authorities for research. 3.6-2 Forms showing staff hours, lab rates, and equipment costs by task are required in all research cooperative agreements. Cooperative agreements are periodically audited, including a recent one by the Inspector General's office. The Technical Services Center has a budget group that monitors spending. The Science and Technology Office has a Budget Analyst who monitors expenditures through the Federal Financial System.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Because of feedback and suggestions from steering team, BOR's leadership team & others, and because the NRC's 2001 report also identified water resource R&D coordination among federal agencies as a concern, program expanded the steering team membership to include stakeholders, USGS, ERS, & ARS and established the Federal Water Resources Research Coordinating Committee to better coordinate and catalyze federal water resources research collaboration across the federal government. We have developed plans and actions to enhance collaboration and coordination with USGS & NIWR, integrated coordination and collaboration incentives and guidance within the proposal process. BOR leadership also identified better outreach to end-users as an improvement need, resulting in monthly activity reports, the newly-established S&T bulletin concept, and research exchange workshops. To respond to Presidential Management Initiatives, developed program goals and performance measures & implemented web-enabled efficiencies to better manage program workflow.

Evidence: Program coordination improvements are fully documented in Section 1.3, 1.5, and 3.5. Program goals and performance measures are fully documented in Sections 2.1 to 2.4. S&T Program steering team evaluations & responses to other program management concerns are contained in section 2.6 explanation and evidence. Web-enabled IT efficiencies are fully documented in section 3.4-1.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development

Competitive Grant

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

3.CA1 **Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Not applicable as facility construction is not yet fully authorized. However, construction of the Tularosa Basin National Research Facility will be managed by clearly defined deliverables, performance characteristics and carefully planned cost and schedule goals identified in the Draft Report to Congress: Tularosa Basin National Desalination Research Facility Study (Draft Report) of September 2002. See Tab 2.CA1.1

Evidence: 2.CA1-1: The Draft Report documents that the mission of the facility is to conduct R & D activities in desalination of brackish ground water, concentrate disposal issues, and renewable energy/ desalination hybrids. The facility is also to function as an information center for the public. The draft report to congress contains a mission statement (pg. 1), operational guidelines (pg. 30), conceptual design (pp. 11-14), facility layout (pp. 15-28), organizational structure (pp. 30-32), cost breakdown (pp. 29, 33), and streamlined performance-based design-build process (pg. 34). 2.CA1-2, Minutes of Meetings, provides an elaboration of these elements. The program was further refined through organizational meetings to plan the scope of work, cost and schedule for a performance-based design-build contract to be issued July 15, 2003. The defined deliverables are specified through floor plans, architectural views and site layouts. BOR established a 24-month schedule for completing the project, which will reduce costs and project duration. 3.CA1-1: shows a draft statement of objectives.

3.CO1 **Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Not directly applicable as this program uses Cooperative Agreements instead of grants. The agreement cycle begins with a widely distributed announcement and request for preproposals. All preproposals are assessed based on merit of concept and appropriateness to our published program goals. The proposals are evaluated by at least three individuals, including some individuals outside Reclamation.

Evidence: Examples of publicity for the competition are shown in 3.CO1-1 to -3 and 2.RD1-2. The procurement is widely advertised on Reclamation's Water Treatment website, through Government procurement sites, and by our newsletter that receives wide circulation in the water community. About 40% of preproposers are requested to submit a full proposal. 2.5-8: The proposal rating sheet, which uses ten factors shows the importance of factors in rating. About 40% of proposals are funded. Recipients of awards between FY98 and FY02 are listed in Tab 3CO1-4. In FY99, 8 of the 12 recipients were new, excluding two 2-year pilot projects. No awards made in FY00. In FY01, 5 of the 8 recipients were new. In FY02, 9 of the 10 recipients were new. The pilot scale projects under Task H are for two years. These are listed separately so there appear to be more repeat awards than there actually are. There is a unique case where a recipient was funded three cycles in a row. This was a technically difficult membrane development.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

3.CO2 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Not directly applicable because extramural research is handled through cooperative agreements in lieu of grants to ensure that BOR has sufficient oversight and influence over program data quality. The proposed work is required to be broken down into tasks and costs for labor, materials and supplies are provided for each task in the proposed budget and monitored closely. Each program is monitored by a GCAOTR (Grants and Cooperative Agreements Officer's Technical Representative) who is required to understand the content and track the progress of the program.

Evidence: One or two GCAOTRs, people familiar with the technology under study, are assigned to oversee each award. As an aid to oversight, each GCAOTR is provided with the Technical and Financial Proposals, and with a sheet, shown in 3.1-1, showing contacts and a schedule for contacts. Early in the award period, the GCAOTR visits the study site. The Principal Investigator (PI) is required to submit quarterly progress reports. Telephone contact is maintained at least once a quarter. The GCAOTR is typically able to make meaningful contributions to the research program. Each invoice is reviewed for approval by the GCAOTR with program costs being checked against the detailed budget in the Financial Proposal. On completion of the program, the PI submits a final report and makes an oral presentation to researchers in Denver. The draft final report is reviewed and comments are submitted for incorporation in the published version. 3.CO2-1 shows an example of the comments provided by the GCAOTR. Three times a year, the GCAOTRs and the Group Manager meet to discuss program progress. See minutes of meeting, 3.2-3.

3.CO3 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Not strictly applicable as extramural research is handled by cooperative agreements. New awards are summarized in the Water from Water newsletter, 3CO3-1, and the Bureau of Reclamation website.

Evidence: The results from each research project are published in a formal final report. These reports are available in hard copy from Reclamation and are delivered to those who request them. The reports can also be downloaded from Reclamation's Water Treatment website. These reports are also contained in a set of CDs that are being issued as part of the history of desalination and water treatment research. Note that the pilot plant projects produce a final report only at the end of the 2-year period, the first year generally being devoted to construction of the pilot plant rather than generation of data. The publication library from this program now contains almost one hundred technical reports. The list of reports is shown as Tab 4.1-6. A sample report, one of the shorter ones, appears as 3CO3-2. In addition BOR encourages presentation at technical conferences and in refereed journals.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

3.RD1 For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The program uses an annual, BOR-wide, competitive call for proposals implemented in 2002 for all intramural R&D. Each proposal is evaluated for mission relevancy & technical merit. Relevancy review is conducted by BOR cadre of subject matter resource managers across BOR (external to program). Technical review is conducted by at least 3 technical experts. One from BOR's TSC & two external to TSC and ideally external to BOR (sometimes there is not expertise outside of BOR). Funded proposals are selected from those having both high technical and relevancy scores and which are aligned with steering team/Administration priorities. Proposal and selection process meets Circular A-11 definition for merit reviewed research with competitive selection using external (peer) evaluations. Approx 10% of awarded funds are sub-contracted to external entities for specific tasks through subsequent contracts and cooperative agreements. The proposal & selection process for extramural desalination R&D meets Circular A-11 definition for merit-reviewed research w/competitive selection & external (peer)evaluation(see 2.5-8).

Evidence: 3.RD1-1: Web page outlines the S&T Program competitive, merit-based process(also documented in Section 1.4). Peer review occurs on all intra&extramural research. Historically nearly all desal funds written in by Congress in highly variable amounts; however, in FY04 the Admin. requested \$4.7M for desal R&D spread across several line items. In addition Congress earmarks in 02 & 03 about \$2M/year for funding extramural weather modification research under BOR's drought authorities. Research Office manages weather mod research activities under drought authorities for BOR's Office of Policy & Program Services. On average, 86% of FY02 & 03 intramural research was competed (remaining funds were used for tech transfer, outreach, special studies, e-gov IT improvement, & program management). In FY02, 57% of all desal funds received were subject to competition. Remaining funds went to tech transfer & program admin; and at Congress direction: partnerships, clearinghouse develop/management, desal roadmap, Tularosa Basin studies. External NRC,NWRI desal assessments documented elsewhere.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Relevant, long-term outcome and output goals and measures are clearly established (see Questions 2.1 and 2.2). Functional schedule for establishing meaningful baseline and performance measure tracking are in-place and scheduled to be completed by the end of FY2004. The long-term goal performance reporting period is FY2005 FY2010. As such, complete and accurate performance tracking consistent with the program goal objectives and framework are not available at this time. However, performance evidence to date suggests the program is on track, achieving stakeholder value and expectations, and making progress toward successful long-term goal accomplishments. A long-term performance goal in the authorizing legislation for desal required a report to Congress recommending demonstration plants. This report was provided in May 2001. Although these goals are new, the program also made significant progress toward achieving its prior long-term goals, which were revised and collapsed into the new goals.

Evidence: A variety of documents show the progress made toward both old and new program goals. These include: 4.1-1, Case history analysis in Section III.D of the S&T Program Goal Document; 4.1-2, Summary of various success stories indicating program achievements; 4.1-3, Letters from stakeholders recognizing value of the program; 4.1-4: Summary of collaborating/partner entities for FY2003 projects as evidence of achievements; 4.1-5, Summary of current Agreements as evidence that achievements are being made toward goals. High ratings and statements of support in Question 2.6 show satisfaction with achievements. The desal program has funded 84 cost-shared projects with 50% of the funding going to at least 27 universities. 4.1-6 is a list of reports distributed by the program. During this period, desalination costs are reported to have dropped 50%, part of which can be attributed to work in this program. 4.1-7, slide 12, shows the decreased costs of desal. A measure of the program's success is the growing interest in membrane bioreactors, recommended in the report to Congress, 4.1-8.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: **SMALL EXTENT** Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Annual outcome & output goals and measures are clearly established (see Questions 2.3 and 2.4). A schedule for establishing meaningful baseline by the end of FY2004 is in place. The first formal goal reporting year is FY2005, so complete performance tracking is not available now. However, evidence suggests the program is now on track, achieving stakeholder value, and making progress toward successfully accomplishing annual performance measures. The annual performance goals for the desal program are to fund projects within the priorities for that year and hold the contractors and partners accountable on individual projects. The desal roadmap and the management plan will set measurable annual performance goals. Initial program output goals for each S&T program R&D output area were established, linked to our S&T Roadmap, and posted on our website in FY2002. FY03 program R&D awards were targeted at the goals and program priorities.

Evidence: Annual goals and performance measures are strategically linked to the long-term goals to provide meaningful and relevant data about progress toward the long-term goals. Consequently, the evidence in Question 4.1 is also the evidence for Question 4.2. See evidence in section 1.2-7 for the output goals developed and posted on our website in FY2002 for each of the R&D output areas on our S&T Program roadmap. Structured goal measure tracking not implemented in past but is scheduled for FY2004 (see 2.2-3). However, program accomplishments consistent with goal objectives are documented in section 4.1 and are also posted on our website.

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: **YES** Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Measures of output goals are normalized with respect to S&T investment to create a ratio of production to costs (see Sections 2.1-4, 2.1-5, and 2.3-2). Outcome goal measures are based on achieving a high return on the S&T investment. These measures will provide consistent, meaningful indicators of efficiency and cost effectiveness from FY2005 to 2010. Although formal progress against these measures is not scheduled to be reported yet, the program has shown improvement since 2001. The change in the desal program, recommended in the 1998 peer review, to develop a research roadmap is producing significant efficiencies. The roadmap facilitates setting priorities based upon expert advice and helping to realize efficiencies by combining similar testing for differing needs. The roadmap is also outlining areas of collaboration to provide the greatest payoff. Where others have pursued research separately, the roadmap provides a guide for collaboration. Our goal is to have the best and brightest engaged in the highest priority research.

Evidence: 4.3-1 is a Denver News article: 2003 Award for Exceptional Productivity or Process Improvement given to program. 4.3-2 is a DOI People, Land & Water news article on program tech transfer effectiveness. 4.3-3 is a letter from the WESCAS showing recognition of high level of progress with relatively small budget. Evaluations shown in Questions 2.6-3 & 2.6-4 recognize recent program improvements. Other program improvements addressing coordination & collaboration to increase efficiency and effectiveness of R&D investments are documented in section 1.3. Recent program business practice improvements to improve intramural R&D effectiveness & efficiency are documented in Question 1.4. Recent program IT improvements to increase efficiency appear in 3.4-1. Progress toward A-76 competitive sourcing implementation is included in Question 3.4. Progress toward program efficiency is documented in Questions 4.1 and 4.2. 4.3-4 contains an analysis of how a currently funded research project could reduce the cost of desalination through reduced operating expenses & increased investor confidence.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Capital Assets and Service Acquisitio

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: No other R&D programs are focused & dedicated to developing solutions for BOR water managers and water users and their unique western water needs. There are similar or complimentary R&D activities performed by USGS, COE, &USDA. Although there are some similarities with these organizations, BOR's mission and R&D needs are different. For example, COE is a flood control/navigation agency and BOR is a water supply agency. Also USGS primarily concentrates on basic research and problem definition while BOR concentrates on applied R&D and solutions to problems. BOR compared their program practices with NIWR which focuses on applied R&D by academia for state water managers, and found their practices to be compatible with NIWR practices. BOR also compared their program practices with COE and with organizations that concentrate on basic water resources research and found their own program practices are strong in comparison. Stakeholder feedback also indicates the program compares very favorably with other programs that conduct water resources R&D that compliments BOR efforts and focus.

Evidence: Program comparisons and results are further explained and documented in Question 2.RD1. BOR actions to better understand, coordinate and integrate with other complimentary water resources research programs are explained and documented in Question 1.3. The size of BOR's R&D is significantly smaller than the other federal R&D programs with activities related to water and agriculture (COE,USGS, USDA),has comparable to stronger processes, and has productivity. Power marketing agencies fund no R&D on power efficiency and reliability.

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Comments from the program steering team (consisting of external stakeholders, academia, USGS Regional Directors, USDA, NIWR, and BOR customers (region and area offices)) indicate strong support for program management, practices, and results. External evaluations indicate the program has been moderately effective in the past, and in recent years has drastically improved; new performance measures should better track effectiveness. The program is also being reviewed as part of a National Research Council (NRC) review of federal water resources research to address Congressional response to the 2001 NRC report Envisioning a Water Resources Research Agenda for the 21st Century. The NRC is currently reviewing the desalination research roadmap as the basis for future investments in the program and will determine if it is an effective way to address the nation's water needs. The program has never requested an evaluation that focused only on its effectiveness, although as a part of a nomination for a prestigious water prize, the program was used as a justification of the nomination.

Evidence: The independence and diversity of the steering team is documented in the steering team roster (see 1.3-2). Program evaluations and results are documented in Question 2.6. Other documentation of program impact and value is contained in evidence 4.1-1 and 4.1-2, and Question 4.3. The initial comments, due in late June, from the National Research Council's review of the desalination research roadmap, will indicate the effectiveness of this approach. Tab 4.5-1 is a letter of nomination that cites the accomplishments of the desalination program.

4.CA1 **Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Not applicable. No construction is occurring as the program's only capital project, the Tularosa Basin Deslination Research Facility, is not authorized.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Measure: Quantity of water liberated (expressed in acre-feet). The net present value of the water liberated will be 10 times greater than the initial R&D investment.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used and produce a 10:1 return on the annual R&D investment. Targets set based on estimated R&D investment with water liberation as the primary outcome. Targets will be adjusted based on actual annual program appropriations.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	baseline		
2005	41,500		
2006	41,500		
2007	41,500		
2008	41,500		

Measure: Increase technology transfer to end-users by increasing the cumulative production rate of S&T Bulletins per program dollar by 34% over a 6-year period.

Additional Information: Tracks production of relevant R&D findings & their dissemination to end-users as an efficiency ratio of electronic S&T Bulletins produced per program dollar. The measure pursues a cumulative overall program efficiency increase over a 6-year period.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2010	34% over FY04		

Measure: Cumulative quantity of water liberated (expressed in acre-feet). The net present value of the water liberated will be 10 times greater than the initial R&D investment, over a 6-year period.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used & produce a 10:1 cumulative return (accumulation of annual stream of benefits) on the R&D investment based on six years of record. Targets set based on estimated R&D investment with water liberation as the primary outcome.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010	871,500		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Measure: Produce a 10:1 return on Reclamation's R&D investment in terms of the economic present value of operational costs avoided as a result of deploying program R&D outputs.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used & produce a 10:1 return on the annual R&D investment. Targets set based on estimated R&D investment with cost saving as the primary R&D outcome. Targets will be adjusted based on actual annual program appropriations.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	baseline		
2005	406,000		
2006	406,000		
2007	406,000		
2008	406,000		

Measure: Produce a 10:1 cumulative rate of return on Reclamation's R&D investment over a 6-year period in terms of the economic present value of operational costs avoided as a result of deploying program R&D outputs.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used & produce a 10:1 cumulative return (accumulation of annual stream of benefits) on the R&D investment based on six years of record. Targets set based on estimated R&D investment with cost savings as the primary R&D outcome.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010	\$8.5 million		

Measure: Produce a 10:1 return on Reclamation's R&D investment in terms of the economic present value of increased power generation efficiency or reliability as a result of deploying program R&D outputs.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used & produce a 10:1 return on the annual R&D investment. Targets set based on estimated R&D investment with power generation as the primary R&D outcome. Targets will be adjusted based on actual annual program appropriations.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	Baseline		
2005	12.5 million KWH		
2006	12.5 million KWH		
2007	12.5 million KWH		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Measure: Produce a 10:1 return on Reclamation's R&D investment in terms of the economic present value of increased power generation efficiency or reliability as a result of deploying program R&D outputs.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used & produce a 10:1 return on the annual R&D investment. Targets set based on estimated R&D investment with power generation as the primary R&D outcome. Targets will be adjusted based on actual annual program appropriations.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2008	12.5 million KWH		

Measure: Produce a 10:1 cumulative rate of return on Reclamation's R&D investment over a 6-year period in terms of the economic present value of increased power generation efficiency or reliability as a result of deploying program R&D outputs.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used & produce a 10:1 cumulative return (accumulation of annual stream of benefits) of the R&D investment based on six years of record. Targets will be adjusted based on actual program appropriations.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010	262.5 million KWH		

Measure: Increase R&D collaboration by increasing the amount of resource leveraging per program dollar by 5% each year.

Additional Information: The goal is intended to catalyze the production of R&D outputs. This measure tracks resource leveraging as an efficiency ratio of resources leveraging achieved per program dollar. The measure pursues a 5% efficiency increase over each prior year.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	baseline		
2005	5% over FY04		
2006	5% over FY05		
2007	5% over FY06		
2008	5% over FY07		

Measure: Increase R&D collaboration by increasing the cumulative resource leveraging per program dollar by 34% over a 6-year period.

Additional Information: This measure tracks resources leveraging as an efficiency ratio of resource leveraging achieved per program dollar. The measure pursues a cumulative overall program efficiency increase over a 6-year period.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010	34% over FY04		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)

Agency: Department of the Interior

Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Measure: Increase technology transfer to end-users by increasing the production rate of S&T Bulletins per program dollar by 5% each year.

Additional Information: The goal is intended to catalyze putting R&D outputs in the hands of end-users. This measure tracks production of relevant R&D findings & their dissemination to end-users as an efficiency ratio of electronic S&T Bulletins produced per program dollar.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual	(Efficiency Measure)
2004	baseline			
2005	5% over FY04			
2006	5% over FY05			
2007	5% over FY06			
2008	5% over FY07			

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Competitive Grant Programs

Name of Program: Title XVI Water Reuse and Recycling

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	Purpose is to identify and investigate opportunities for reclaiming and reusing wastewater and naturally impaired ground and surface water, and to provide financial and technical assistance to local water agencies for planning and development of water recycling projects. This program helps Reclamation meet its mission to manage and develop water and related resources in an economically and environmentally sound manner.	Title XVI of P.L. 102-575, as amended. "Guidelines for Preparing, Reviewing, and Processing Water Reclamation and Reuse Project Proposals Under Title XVI of Public Law 102-575, as Amended".	20%	0.2
2 <i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Municipalities in the west are facing increases in fresh water demand due to changing population trends, decreasing water supplies and drought. This program helps local agencies reduce demand for new sources of non-recycled potable water, improve water supply reliability, and protect against future droughts by reclaiming and reusing treated wastewater for nonpotable purposes and naturally impaired ground and surface water.	Southern California must reduce its use of water from the Colorado River from about 5.2 to 4.4 million acre-feet per year, its legal entitlement. When completed, ongoing Title XVI projects will provide as much as a half million acre-feet per year of reclaimed water for non-potable uses, thereby reducing demand on imported supplies. Other Title XVI examples of reductions in demand for potable water include Albuquerque, NM; San Jose, CA; El Paso, TX; and Las Vegas, NV.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	This program is designed to provide the incentive to local agencies to implement water recycling projects by providing seed money that helps to defray the cost of these expensive alternative water supply projects. Many water recycling projects would not be feasible without Federal financial assistance and would not be implemented at the local level. This program leverages Federal dollars with funds from state agencies and the sponsoring local agencies.	Federal funding can account for as much as 25% of total project costs subject to legislated ceilings. Funding for appraisal and feasibility studies can be as much as 100% and 50%, respectively. Research can be funded at 50%. Since Congress first appropriated funding in FY1994, Reclamation has expended more than \$260 million for Title XVI activities. This funding leverages significant local dollars. Federal participation also helps local partners improve their bond rating status, improving their financial performance.	20%	0.2
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	No other Federal program provides assistance to local agencies to develop water recycling projects. Congress designed this program to provide the incentive to local agencies to implement water recycling projects by providing seed money that helps to defray the cost of these expensive alternative water supply projects. The program also assists local agencies, particularly in small communities lacking sufficient staff and expertise, with technical support for planning, design and construction of the water reuse and recycling projects.	EPA and state agencies provide funds through State Revolving Fund programs. These agencies, however, do not provide direct technical support or project management assistance. Other Federal agencies do not have formal programs. EPA and others have received Congressional write-ins for various reuse projects, but have a very limited or no role in project development or technical support.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	This program funds as many projects as possible by limiting the funding provided to any one project in any given year, thereby providing incentives to the greatest number of local agencies to move forward with project implementation. Federal funds are leveraged in such a way as to have the greatest net benefit to the most local project sponsors. Although taken by itself the program is well-designed, it works at cross-purposes with other Reclamation projects. Traditional water development projects produce cheap, subsidized water with a price that does not reflect its true cost, thereby discouraging the expansion of more expensive water reuse and recycling.	This program is designed to provide funds as an incentive for local agencies to plan, design and construct projects. Ownership to the title of facilities remains with the local sponsor who is also responsible for operation and maintenance costs (O&M). Although Title XVI allows for cost-sharing on O&M for research and demonstration projects, it is Reclamation policy to not provide funds for this purpose. Thus, the Federal exposure to long-term funding is avoided. The Federal cost-share limitations ensure that the project sponsor, who typically designs and constructs the project, does so in an efficient and cost effective manner, as it is the sponsor who pays the great majority of the total project cost. The Federal participation ends when the cost-share ceiling has been reached. Refer to P.L. 102-575 and the "Guidelines for Preparing, Reviewing, and Processing Water Reclamation and Reuse Project Proposals Under Title XVI of Public Law 102-575, as Amended".	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					100%	100%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	<i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	No	Although the Title XVI program has long-term goals, they do not meet all the criteria necessary to receive a 'Yes'. In particular, they do not have clear timeframes, which compromises the usefulness of data indicating progress toward meeting the long-term goal of attaining 500,000 acre-feet per year of recycled and reused water. The principal long-term desired outcome is to increase the total water supply availability in critical water short regions (e.g. southern California) without causing undue harm to the environment by constructing new dams and reservoirs, or to the agricultural community by requiring a change of use from irrigation to Municipal and Industrial (M&I) use in order to meet the growing demand for fresh water in urban areas of the western US. The current long-term goals for water reuse and recycling projects are to increase the reclamation and reuse of reclaimed water by 500,000 acre-feet per year, and reduce the cost of treating wastewater by 10%.	Draft FY 2004 End Outcome Goal in Reclamation's Strategic Plan: Deliver Water in an Environmentally Responsible and Cost-efficient Manner. The long-term goal for southern California is to reduce the use of Colorado River water to the state's legal entitlement of 4.4 million acre feet by 2015. Implementing ongoing and future water recycling projects can help to make up most of the water supply shortfall, without the need to import additional supplies from northern California or build new storage facilities.	14%	0.0
2	<i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	The principal annual goal is to make all funding provided by Congress available to project sponsors in the year funds were appropriated, and in as timely a manner as possible during the course of the year. This is achieved by expeditiously completing or approving feasibility studies and environmental compliance activities, and entering into cost-share agreements so that water recycling project sponsors can meet work schedules and projects can be implemented as soon as possible. While this goal is useful in indicating progress in meeting the long-term goals, it would be more useful if the long-term goals had timeframes, which in turn could be shown to drive the setting of short-term goals.	Project data. Program accomplishment data is available from previous fiscal years.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	All project sponsors have consistently met or exceeded their cost-share requirements in a timely manner such that projects remain on schedule to the degree possible.	Project sponsors are required to enter into cost-share agreements (Cooperative Agreements) before funds can be made available. These agreements define the funding arrangements and each entities' responsibility. Funds are only provided to the sponsor after actual costs have been incurred and the cost-share requirement has been met. All submittals for reimbursement are scrutinized to ensure that only eligible project costs are being reimbursed.	14%	0.1
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	Increasing total water supply availability at the Federal level through water recycling is optimized when planning and project implementation is coordinated with local and state efforts and when done in a regional context, which is generally beyond the jurisdiction of individual water agencies. Also, maximum efficiencies are achieved when regional recycling activities are combined with water conservation programs, conjunctive use programs and other innovative alternative water supply strategies, including integrated resources planning.	Reclamation has established partnerships and entered into cooperative agreements with non-Federal project sponsors for each project and program Congress has funded. These partnerships ensure that project specific goals are achieved, the National Environmental Policy Act is adhered to, and benefits are maximized to the extent possible. Reclamation emphasizes a regional approach to project planning and formulation when such opportunities arise by cooperating and coordinating with similar reuse activities in neighboring districts.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	Yes	Most of the activities required to implement a recycled water project are being conducted by local project sponsors and their contractor. These water districts are ultimately responsible for program accomplishment and undergo periodic audits conducted by independent auditors, because they are local governmental agencies that are subject to state regulations. In addition, Reclamation requires yearly single audits of projects in order to ascertain project progress and the appropriateness of expenditures incurred during the year.	Reclamation staff are intimately involved with the project sponsors on all aspects of project development. However, staff are not involved in independent audits conducted by water agency contractors. Reclamation is involved with single audits conducted at the end of each year and upon completion of the project when the cooperative agreement is closed and a single audit is conducted by Reclamation finance staff.	14%	0.1
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	Yes	Funding is prioritized each year to support on-going authorized projects which have had strong local participation and are showing progress towards project completion. Reductions in the Bureau's budget proposal result in participation in fewer projects, and can delay completion of ongoing projects. Although Reclamation generally provides its cost-share after the local sponsors have expended funds for a particular phase of project implementation, future phases may not be completed as scheduled if subsequent year Federal funding is inadequate to justify the outlay of 100% financing by the non-Federal project sponsor for the next phase of development. This can lead to delays in realizing full project benefits.	Schedules which indicate funding requirements by project, expectations of Federal contributions by fiscal year, and anticipated acre-feet of water recycled/produced by project operation.	14%	0.1
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	Solid criteria are in place to evaluate potential projects prior to funding, and also to monitor and evaluate projects under construction. The strong degree of local participation (including local funding) ensures cost-efficient designing, value engineering, and monitoring of costs and quality control during the planning and construction phases.	Guidelines for Preparing, Reviewing, and Processing Water Reclamation and Reuse Project Proposals Under Title XVI of Public Law 102-575, as Amended.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					100%	86%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	Reclamation staff are in frequent contact with the project sponsors on all aspects of project development. Local Reclamation staff maintain on-going communication with local project sponsors and monitor the progress of each project. Federal funds are requested and dispersed only for qualified projects exhibiting the required local participation and adherence to planning/construction schedules. Each cooperative agreement includes a requirement for regular progress reports, at least quarterly.	Project experts in several Reclamation offices; field reports from site visits; planning and construction reports; and progress reports from local sponsoring agencies. Progress reports are used to compare available funding with actual needs, and can result in moving funds from one component to another in order to maximize efficient use of Federal funds.	10%	0.1
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	See above. Since the Title XVI projects are construction projects, interim goals are well-defined and easy to monitor.	All program managers have performance measures tied to program accomplishments. All grantees are required to document accomplishments and justify funding needs prior to modification of cooperative agreements. No reimbursements are made to grantees until actual work has been accomplished and documented.	10%	0.1
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	The Title XVI construction projects have obtained an obligation rate of over 95% almost every fiscal year. The funds have been spent for the intended purpose, which is to support authorized water recycling projects. In large part, projects have proceeded on schedule once funds are made available. The high degree of local participation and funding ensures the local sponsor uses all funds in a timely and responsible fashion.	Project data. Program accomplishment data is available from previous fiscal years.	10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	No	No formal mechanisms are in place. However, as stated previously, the strong degree of local participation and funding ensures cost-efficient planning and design, and the timely and responsible use of all funds. Congress specifically authorizes each Title XVI construction project, and the effectiveness of the program is measured by program accomplishment, or how much of the appropriated funds are actually obligated each fiscal year. Since the Title XVI construction projects obligate over 95% of their funds for authorized projects almost every fiscal year, there is a high confidence level that funds are being used for their intended purpose.	Program accomplishment data is available from previous fiscal years.	10%	0.0
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	No	Present cost accounting systems of the Department of the Interior comply with Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board #4 - Managerial Cost Accounting. Full costs are reported at the segment level from the Department of the Interior perspective and also from the bureau perspective. This includes full cost reporting by Department strategic goals in the Department's Annual Accountability Report and by bureau mission goals in bureau-level annual financial statements. Cost accounting at lower levels, as requested by individual PART reviews, does not currently accumulate full costs as defined in the PART instructions and OMB Circular A-11; for example, "the full employer share of the annual accruing cost of retiree pension and health benefits is not included".		10%	0.0
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	Financial management practices are in place, and auditors have noted no deficiencies. While there have been payment errors, they have always been promptly discovered and corrected.	Financial records are kept and tracked in the Denver Finance Office, the Regional Office, and the Area Office so that two offices always check the third whenever an action is processed.	10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	Program management is primarily the responsibility of the Area Offices, with Reclamation-wide coordination and oversight provided by Reclamation's Office of Policy in Washington and Denver.	In June 1997, the Department of the Interior Office of the Inspector General (OIG) issued a Survey Report on the Title XVI program, and two minor deficiencies were noted. They are: 1. Implement the 1994 "Procedures for Reviewing Cost-Share Agreements," and 2. Follow up on the Single Audit Act process by: --Obtaining copies of single audit reports from project grantees and following up on any identified reportable conditions or material weaknesses; --Requesting copies of management letters and information on deficiencies communicated orally to the grantees; --Obtaining information on corrective actions planned or taken. Reclamation agreed with the two recommendations, and has implemented corrective actions.	10%	0.1
8 (Co 1.)	<i>Are grant applications independently reviewed based on clear criteria (rather than earmarked) and are awards made based on results of the peer review process?</i>	No	Funding for the construction portion of Title XVI projects is not subjected to a grant application process, but is determined by the annual appropriations process. However, the research aspect of Title XVI involves an independent review of grant applications. Sec. 1605 of Title XVI of P.L. 102-575 authorizes research. Congress has directed Reclamation to support the WaterReuse Foundation's research agenda. The Foundation assists Reclamation by providing competed, merit reviewed research projects to address national needs. The Foundation also provides management of the research projects and continued peer review through completion and dissemination of the final report.	Reclamation uses a ranking and priority process to decide on which new-starts to fund when budget targets allow for such new-starts. The criteria Reclamation uses to set priorities are based, in part, on the authorizing legislation and are described in the "Guidelines for Preparing, Reviewing, and Processing Water Reclamation and Reuse Project Proposals Under Title XVI of Public Law 102-575, as Amended".	10%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (Co 2.) <i>Does the grant competition encourage the participation of new/first-time grantees through a fair and open application process?</i>	N/A	Major funding comes in the form of Congressional additions for new projects, and not through a traditional grant process. This question does not apply because nearly the entire budget each year is dedicated to ongoing obligations associated with previously initiated projects. Because of many years of limited funding in comparison to the large number of authorized projects, Reclamation's focus has been to complete and adequately fund existing projects already under construction, and thus fulfill its commitment to the local sponsors. Thus, new applicants have been at a disadvantage. Funding to support the Research component of the program is competed annually through a well-defined process, however, the budget for research is only about 3% of Reclamation's annual request for Title XVI activities. Generalized needs and specific projects are determined at an annual WaterReuse Foundation Research Conference jointly sponsored by Reclamation, EPA, and three other nonprofit research foundations.	Reclamation uses a ranking and priority process to decide which new starts to fund when budget targets allow for such new-starts. The criteria Reclamation uses to set priorities are based, in part, on the authorizing legislation and are described in the "Guidelines for Preparing, Reviewing, and Processing Water Reclamation and Reuse Project Proposals Under Title XVI of Public Law 102-575, as Amended". Because the research program started two years ago, all the contractors are first-time grantees.	0%	
10 (Co 3.) <i>Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?</i>	Yes	Reclamation staff are in close communication with the project sponsors on all aspects of project development. See response to #1 above. The research program has been developed to include a Reclamation employee on the Research Committee, and all Project Advisory Committees.	Progress reports are used to compare available funding with actual needs, and can result in moving funds from one component to another in order to maximize efficient use of Federal funds. See response to #1 above. Each research project has a Project Advisory Committee responsible for evaluating proposals, monitoring accomplishment, and checking budget expenditures.	10%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
11 (Co 4.) <i>Does the program collect performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?</i>	No	Due to the nature and variability of the projects, no formal procedure is in place to collect performance data. Information is collected on a case by case basis as the grantee submits requests for reimbursement or a modification to a cost-share agreement is negotiated. This information is not made readily available to the public.	The research program sponsors an annual research conference held by the WasteReuse Foundation. Proceedings from the conference are publicly available and include information on the program and projects.	10%	0.0
Total Section Score				100%	60%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1	<i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	No	The program has been successful at making progress toward meeting its long-term goals, but because of the lack of any timetable associated with meeting those goals, it is not possible to ascertain whether the progress is sufficient.	20%	0.0
---	---	----	--	-----	-----

<p>Long-Term Goal I: Increase the total water supply availability by reclaiming and reusing wastewater and impaired ground and surface water.</p> <p>Target: 500,000 acre-feet of reclaimed water reused by participating local water agencies per year.</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward 98,000 acre-feet per year now being reused as a result of progress on currently funded authorized projects.</p> <p>goal:</p>					
<p>Long-Term Goal II: Increase the affordability and public acceptance of water reuse projects by improving and enhancing treatment technologies through research</p> <p>Target: 10% reduction in wastewater treatment cost.</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward No progress to date, as the Title XVI research component is only in its second year of existence.</p> <p>goal:</p>					
<p>Long-Term Goal III:</p> <p>Target:</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward</p> <p>goal:</p>					

2	<i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Yes	The program has largely met its annual performance goals.	20%	0.2
---	--	-----	---	-----	-----

<p>Key Goal I: Execution of all necessary cooperative agreements and obligation of appropriated funds.</p> <p>Performance Target: 100% obligation in each Fiscal Year</p> <p>Actual Performance: FY 2000 - 97.3% obligation; FY2001 - 97.7% obligation; FY2002 - 98% obligation (est.)</p>					
<p>Key Goal II: Identify and investigate new opportunities for future water recycling projects.</p>					

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Performance Target: Complete at least one new appraisal and one feasibility study each year. Actual Performance: Two appraisal studies and one feasibility study completed in FY2002.					
	Key Goal III: Performance Target: Actual Performance:					
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	No	From a budget perspective, the program is being administered at a 97% success rate and has little margin for demonstrating improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness. From a project perspective, in almost all cases to date Reclamation has little actual responsibility or control over project implementation and schedule.	See Section IV, Question 2 above.	20%	0.0
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Yes	Reclamation's program performance is based on actual work accomplished, as evidenced by obligation or expenditure of Federal funds for project implementation and research.	Within budgetary limitations, Reclamation has consistently met its cost-share requirements and obligations to the non-Federal project sponsor in a timely manner, and therefore, performance equals or exceeds that of the non-Federal programs of similar nature, such as the various State Revolving Fund programs. Funds that were not obligated in the past 2 years were carried over due to schedule slippage on the part of the non-Federal program. (See performance goals in question IV.2)	20%	0.2
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Yes	Most of the activities required to implement a recycled water project are being conducted by local project sponsors and their contractor. These water districts are ultimately responsible for program accomplishment and undergo annual single audits to account for the expenditure of Federal funds during the year.	Yearly single audits of the funded projects conducted for Reclamation have yet to disclose any issues or misappropriation of Federal funds for project purposes, which is evidence that the program is being effective in meeting the goal of providing financial assistance to local agencies for water reuse project implementation.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					100%	60%

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Tribal Courts
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
40%	25%	0%	0%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: BIA's Tribal Courts program has no specific, statute-based goals or purposes. GPRA performance objectives are limited to tribal codes/training to implement specific IIM trust regulations.

Evidence: Indian Tribal Justice Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-176) [25 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.] directs BIA to survey tribal court systems to determine conditions, caseloads, capabilities, and needs for a Report to Congress by July 1994. A survey report was published in 2000 (see section 1.2).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Indian reservations have violent crime rates (657 per 100,000 residents) higher than national average (506 per 100,000 residents), higher aggravated assault rates (600 vs. 324), and lower property crime rates (1,083 vs. 3,618). Based on a 1998-99 survey, about 42% of tribal court cases were criminal with potential jail time. Other caseloads included: traffic (26%), juvenile (15%), family (7%), housing/land use (3%), and commercial (3%).

Evidence: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Fact Sheet (January 2003). Survey of Tribal Justice Systems & Courts of Indian Offenses, American Indian Law Center, Inc. (May 2000). The final survey report was not approved by DOI and OMB prior to release by the Center.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Jurisdiction: BIA has no current inventory of tribal courts, but estimates about 275 general, special (i.e. traffic, juvenile, family) and appellate courts serve about 40 tribes. Tribal courts have primary jurisdiction on civil and criminal crimes committed on Indian lands by a tribal member against other members. Some tribal courts adjudicate matters between members of different tribes within jurisdiction. Federal and state courts serve about 522 tribes that have not established tribal courts. Most tribes have adopted modern and customary codes; modern codes are usually based on federal and state statutes. Federal Assistance: U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) provides discretionary grant assistance to develop and improve tribal justice systems. DOJ grants are intended to supplement BIA's support for tribal court operations and improvements.

Evidence: Jurisdiction: Felix S. Cohen's Handbook of Federal Indian Law, 1982 Edition (pp. 250-265) for general discussion and legal citations. Financial Assistance: Indian Tribal Justice and Technical Assistance Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 3651 et seq.) authorizes DOJ to award grants to (1) Indian tribes for development/operation of judicial systems, (2) national/regional organizations to provide training/technical assistance to tribes, and (2) non-profit entities to provide criminal/civil legal assistance to tribes and tribal members. DOJ grants are available for tribal courts assistance (\$8 million); adult, juvenile, family drug courts; alcohol/substance abuse demonstration project; and technology/information sharing outreach.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: BIA operates 22 Courts of Indian Offenses. Tribes operate others under contract/compact agreements, with performance monitoring subject to negotiation with each tribe. BIA's statute precludes imposing federal standards on tribal court administration and conduct. DOJ's grant program authorities cannot encroach upon, diminish, impair the rights of each tribal government to determine its judicial system.

Evidence: Indian Tribal Justice Act of 1993 [25 U.S.C. 3611(d) and (e)(1)(E)]. Indian Tribal Justice and Technical Assistance Act [25 USC 3665]

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Tribal Courts
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
40%	25%	0%	0%	

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Within BIA's Tribal Priority Allocation (TPA) program, tribal governments determine annual allocations among over 35 programs, including tribal court operations. In FY 2003, TPA funds total \$772 million, of which \$26 million is available for tribal courts. BIA plans to target \$5.5 million on Probate and Supervised IIM Account (25 CFR 15/115) codes and cases.

Evidence: Federal Register, Vol. 68, No. 22, pp. 37857-8 (June 25, 2003). BIA to provide information on TPA reprogrammings to/from tribal court subprogram since FY 1999 (due by 7/11/03) for further analysis.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: BIA is reevaluating program capabilities, goals and targets for the new DOI Strategic Plan. The BIA will work with OMB and the Tribal Courts program manager to clarify program goals and measures.

Evidence:

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: BIA is reevaluating program capabilities, goals and targets for new DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence: BIA's FY 2004 Budget Justifications (p. 36). OMB may consider new information submitted prior to/with the FY 2005 budget estimates.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Annual number of tribal codes/court procedures and training sessions for enforcing recent changes in Indian Probate (25 CFR 15) and Supervised IIM Accounts (25 CFR 115) regulations.

Evidence: FY 2003 targets are number of tribal codes/court procedures (3) established and training sessions (10) conducted on 25 CFR 15/115 regulations.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: FY 2002 annual targets were estimated without baseline data for reliable projections.

Evidence: BIA's FY 2004 Budget Justifications (p. 36). OMB may consider new information submitted prior to/with the FY 2005 budget estimates.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Program lacks long-term goals and annual performance measures.

Evidence: Tribal courts not required to report on staffing, caseloads, time for adjudication, appeals to non-tribal courts, case dispositions, or other performance indicators.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Tribal Courts
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
40%	25%	0%	0%	

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: No credible independent evaluations have been conducted or are planned.

Evidence: Survey of Tribal Justice Systems & Courts of Indian Offenses, American Indian Law Center, Inc. (May 2000) published without proper review/approval by DOI and OMB. Recently, the BIA/Tribal Budget Advisory Council established a Judicial Subgroup to conduct a survey of tribal court funding needs for FY 2005 budget planning. In May 2003, the National Tribal Justice Resource Center published the survey results on its website without proper review/clearance by DOI and OMB.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: In 2003, about 20% of tribal court funds are targeted for Supervised IIM accounts (25 CFR 115) or for other priority or backlog cases. No status/progress report is available.

Evidence: In FY 2002, BIA targeted \$1.5 million for tribal court enforcement of 25 CFR 15/115. Thirteen tribal courts applied for and received awards. In FY 2003, \$5.5 million is targeted for these caseloads.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: DOI/BIA are reevaluating program capabilities, goals and targets for new DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence: OMB may consider new information submitted prior to/with the FY 2005 budget estimates.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: NO Question Weight: 15%

Explanation: See section 2.5

Evidence:

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: NO Question Weight: 15%

Explanation: See sections 1.5 and 2.5.

Evidence:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Tribal Courts
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
40%	25%	0%	0%	

- 3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 15%
 Explanation: See sections 1.5 and 2.5.
 Evidence:
- 3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%
 Explanation: Tribal courts are an inherently governmental function, not subject to competitive sourcing. BIA's statute precludes imposing federal standards on tribal court administration and conduct.
 Evidence: Indian Tribal Justice Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-176) [25 U.S.C. 3601, 3611(d) and 3631.]
- 3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%
 Explanation: BIA and DOJ do not coordinate on technical/financial assistance programs, including oversight to assure that DOJ grant awards supplement BIA funding.
 Evidence: BIA to provide information on TPA reprogrammings to/from tribal court subprogram since FY 1999 (due by 7/11/03) for further analysis.
- 3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 15%
 Explanation: See sections 1.5, 2.5 and 3.5.
 Evidence:
- 3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 15%
 Explanation: DOI/BIA are reevaluating program capabilities, goals and targets for new DOI Strategic Plan.
 Evidence:
- 4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%
 Explanation: BIA is reevaluating program capabilities, goals and targets for new DOI Strategic Plan.
 Evidence:
- 4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%
 Explanation: BIA is reevaluating program capabilities, goals and targets for new DOI Strategic Plan.
 Evidence:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Tribal Courts
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
40%	25%	0%	0%	

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: See sections 1.5, 2.5, 3.1 - 3.3.

Evidence:

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: See sections 1.5, 2.5, 3.1 - 3.3. No performance data on tribal court available to compare with U.S. court or state court systems. No study located that compares Indian reservations served by tribal courts to those served by federal/state courts on operational efficiency, cost effectiveness, or quality of services.

Evidence: The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts issues periodic performance reports on district and appellate courts. Trend indicators include: civil and criminal cases filed, pending, terminated; civil cases by nature of suit; civil cases over 3 years old; criminal cases by major offenses; judgeships filled and vacant; court support staffing and workloads.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: No GAO, IG or other credible independent evaluations have been conducted or are planned.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Tribal Courts
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs

Measure: Measure Under Development
Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------------------

Measure: Measure Under Development
Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Measure Under Development
Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)
-------------	---------------	---------------	--

Measure: Number of tribal codes/court procedures to enforce 25 CFR 15/115.
Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Number of training sessions on 25 CFR 15/115.
Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Capital Assets & Service Acquisition Programs

Name of Program: **TRIBAL LAND CONSOLIDATION**

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	Statutory purposes of pilot program are to: (1) acquire small ownership interests in Indian trust lands; (2) prevent further fractionation; (3) consolidate for tribal development.	Indian Land Consolidation Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-462), Title I, Sec. 213, authorizes federal acquisition of fractional ownership interests. Priority for small (2% or less) interests.	25%	0.3
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Federal Government's Indian trust responsibilities include maintaining legal records (title, probate, survey, lease) on land ownership and lease transactions. Ownership shares fractionate over each generation, compounding workload demands on trust administration.	Over 10 million acres of Indian trust lands owned by individuals, with about 4 million interests distributed among 400,000 individuals. Over 1.4 million interests are 2% or less.	25%	0.3
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Acquisitions eliminate/reduce the Government's current and future costs in managing land title records, probates, leases, and individual trust fund accounts.	Through FY 2002, the Midwest pilot projects have inactivated 664 IIM accounts, closed 125 IIM accounts, and avoided 1,688 future probate cases.	25%	0.3
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	No	ILCA requires federal acquisitions be coordinated with tribal land acquisition and development programs. Pilot projects are adjusting to these recent statutory requirements, but have a high volume of pending applications from voluntary sellers to process.	Pilot projects, initiated in 1999, acquire interests from voluntary (willing seller) applicants without priority consideration of tribal development plans or income generation.	25%	0.0
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	NA	Active pilot projects on five Indian reservations: Bad River, Lac Courte Oreilles, Lac du Flambeau, and Red Cliff (WI) and Keewanee Bay (MI). Recent expansion to Rosebud (SD) is excluded from this review.	Significant program planning and additional resources will be needed to expand to other Indian reservations with high concentrations of fractional ownership interests.	0%	
Total Section Score					100%	75%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)						
1	<i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	No	Statutory long-term goal is to consolidate fractional ownerships for tribes to develop lands for economic and social benefits, with repayment of the Government's purchase costs from future revenues.	No references in DOI and BIA Strategic Plans despite relevance to Indian trust fund management reforms. DOI to address in Strategic Plan for FY 2003-2008.	13%	0.0
2	<i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	BIA pilot projects focus on acquiring ownership interests from voluntary willing sellers rather than annual plans based on goal-directed priorities.	BIA to address in FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan.	13%	0.1
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	BIA pilot projects supported by tribal partners with tribal resolutions of endorsement and cooperative agreements for outreach efforts to notify landowners of acquisition program.	BIA pilot projects have limited coordination with tribal land acquisition priorities, consolidation, and development plans. These recent statutory requirements should become program prerequisites at new locations.	13%	0.1
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	NA	No other federal Indian land consolidation program.		0%	
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	Yes	BIA issued first program evaluation: Indian Land Consolidation Pilot Project Report (April 2002), conducted by Booz-Allen-Hamilton. Recommends program management improvements needed prior to expansion to other locations.	Report includes various program performance indicators, and 24 recommendations to improve program management and accountability. Midwest Region to establish a team to address or implement recommendations.	13%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	No	Budget/accounting structure separates Land Acquisition, Youpee Escheatment, and Administration. Acquisition Fund established to deposit revenues received from acquisitions. No linkage between budgetary resources and program workloads and performance measures.	ILCA assumes repayment for each interest purchased. Recommend amendments to consolidate revenues to avoid maintaining or establishing accounts for each ownership. Criteria needed for repayment (partial or full) waiver provisions.	13%	0.0
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	No	BIA should develop a strategic plan for expanding the land acquisition and consolidation program to other regions and reservations. (Also see B-A-H Report. p. IV-13.) BIA should establish national program manager to plan/coordinate future program expansions.	DOI-BIA has initiated strategic planning activities, including federal-tribal workgroup, to assess policy and program initiatives.	13%	0.0
8 (Cap 1.)	<i>Are acquisition program plans adjusted in response to performance data and changing conditions?</i>	Yes	High unobligated balances during 1999-2002 despite volume of willing sellers. BIA's Midwest Region required full-time staff to handle program demands.	FY 2002 budget provided for increased administrative expenses to hire dedicated staff. Staff has expanded from 10 to 17 full-time personnel in Midwest region.	13%	0.1
9 (Cap 2.)	<i>Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule and performance goals?</i>	No	Alternative strategies should be assessed, such as concentrating acquisitions on: (1) owners with active IIM accounts, and/or (2) land parcels with tribal development plans. Such priorities could produce more immediate federal cost-savings and repayment schedules.	Cost-savings analyses needed to estimate current and future federal benefits associated with eliminating IIM accounts, land title records, probates, and other trust-related administration activities.	13%	0.0

Total Section Score					100%	50%
----------------------------	--	--	--	--	-------------	------------

Section III: Program Management (Yes, No, N/A)

1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	Midwest region provides monthly status and activity reports on key performance indicators: interests acquired, acres, average costs, IIM accounts made inactive or closed, probates avoided, and pending applications and interests.		10%	0.1
---	--	-----	--	--	-----	-----

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	Midwest projects are closely monitored by BIA agency superintendent, BIA regional director, and OMB.		10%	0.1
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	No	Low annual obligation rates: 41% in FY 1999; 50% in FY 2000; 37% in FY 2001, and 41% in FY 2002.	Over \$8 million carried over into FY 2002; and \$11.7 million carried over into FY 2003. Reduced FY 2003 Budget to spend down carryover balances.	10%	0.0
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	B-A-H Report recommends actions to improve business processes, activity based costing, and standard performance and management processes before expanding to other regions or reservations.	Midwest Region is forming team to review/assess B-A-H Report recommendations for implementation.	10%	0.1
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	No	B-A-H Report recommends full cost analysis, including outreach, appraisal, title search, purchase price, labor, benefits, and other administrative expenses. See Item # 9 below.	Recommend further quantification of federal program costs and benefits. Ownership transfers accrue current and future benefits (cost savings) in federal trust administration that offset original purchase price.	10%	0.0
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	B-A-H Report finds pilot program records are auditable, and recommends actions to improve business processes and management controls.	Funds are not disbursed to seller prior to receipt of deed transfer. However, no audits conducted on financial management practices.	10%	0.1
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	Midwest Region has hired dedicated program staff to address most immediate management concern.	Temporary personnel hired for training and performance assessment prior to conversion to full-time status.	10%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	<i>Does the program define the required quality, capability, and performance objectives of deliverables?</i>	No	Midwest pilot project acquisitions not targeted towards performance (outcome) goals.	Outcome goals are: (1) reduce land management and accounting costs and (2) economic development to repay purchase costs.	10%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (Cap 2.) <i>Has the program established appropriate, credible, cost and schedule goals?</i>	Yes	B-A-H Report outlines administrative processes, with unit time and costs for each stage. Labor costs exclude benefits and overhead.	Estimate of administrative costs: \$295 per case, or \$15 per interest acquired.	10%	0.1
10 (Cap 3.) <i>Has the program conducted a recent, credible, cost-benefit analysis that shows a net benefit?</i>	Yes	B-A-H Report demonstrates customer responsiveness, customer satisfaction, and future cost benefits for Government.	Example cost-benefit - Average purchase cost: \$328 per interest. Average future probate savings: \$450 per interest.	10%	0.1
11 (Cap 4.) <i>Does the program have a comprehensive strategy for risk management that appropriately shares risk between the government and contractor?</i>	NA	ILCA Act precludes tribal governments from operating federal acquisition program under contract/compact agreements.		0%	

Total Section Score	100%	70%
----------------------------	-------------	------------

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1	<i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	Yes	Through FY 2002, 47,188 ownership interests acquired in 25,044 acres. About 91% of interests purchased were small (2% or less) ownerships.	About 32% of all individual ownership interests purchased on pilot reservations.	25%	0.3
---	---	-----	--	--	-----	-----

<p>Long-Term Goal I: Prevent further fractionation of ownership interests in Indian trust land allotments. Target: None established. Actual Progress achieved toward Rate of fractionation reduced, but total number of fractionated interests remained about the same. Acquisitions could not keep goal: pace with applications and ownership transfers (inheritance) from deceased owners.</p>						
<p>Long-Term Goal II: Consolidate fractional ownership interests into usable land parcels for tribal economic and community development. Target: None established; pilot projects not fully coordinated with tribal land consolidation and development plans. Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>						
<p>Long-Term Goal III: Repayment of Government's purchase price of interests acquired from income generated. Target: None established; pilot projects respond to owners willing to sell small interest holdings regardless of productive value of land. Actual Progress achieved toward goal: As of August 2002, \$945 deposited into Acquisition Fund from revenues derived from acquired ownership interests.</p>						

2	<i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	NA	No annual performance goals since pilot projects respond to applications from voluntary sellers.	Annual goals could be set if acquisitions targeted on land parcels, IIM accountholders with low activity, and other priorities.	0%	
---	--	----	--	---	----	--

<p>Key Goal I: Acquisition of small ownership interests in Indian trust land allotments Performance Target: FY99: NA FY00: NA FY01: NA FY02: NA</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

		Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score	
		Actual Performance: FY 99: 8,178 FY00: 17,523 FY01: 10,788 FY02: 10,699 Total: 47,188						
		Key Goal II: Number of IIM accounts inactivated/closed.						
		Performance Target: FY 99: NA FY00: NA FY01: NA FY02: NA						
		Actual Performance: FY 99: NA FY00: NA FY01: 310 FY02: 479 Total: 789						
		Key Goal III: Number of probates avoided.						
		Performance Target: FY 99: NA FY00: NA FY01: NA FY02: NA						
		Actual Performance: FY 99: NA FY00: NA FY01: 654 FY02: 1,034 Total: 1,688						
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	No	See Sec. III, Q-4.			25%	0.0	
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	NA	No other federal Indian land acquisition program.			0%		
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Yes	B-A-H Report (April 2002). OMB has monitored the pilot program for 2.5 years, including field visits/reviews, since a Report to Congress is due to identify/assess impacts of reductions in fractional interests on BIA accounting and recordkeeping.	ILCA Act, Sec. 213 requires Report to Congress on pilot program due three years after certification (expected in 2003) to address possible extension and modifications.		25%	0.3	
6 (Cap 1.)	<i>Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?</i>	Yes	During FY 1999-2001, pilot program had substantial balances due to lack of full-time staff available for processing pending applications from the unanticipated number of willing sellers.	Pilot program increased cumulative obligations to 63% through 2002 as Midwest agency staff was expanded.		25%	0.3	
Total Section Score						100%	75%	