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What Is Different?

Government modernization will be rooted in the intersection of transforming technology, data, process, and people rather than working in silos.
IT Modernization Framework

- IT Modernization Report Opportunities
- Agency IT Transformation Priorities
- Administration IT Priorities

ENABLING CAPABILITIES

- Executive Orders and Policy
- Legislation
- Implementation Support
- Flexible Funding Vehicles
- Innovative Acquisition Capabilities
Data, Accountability, and Transparency

A Federal Data Strategy for Today’s Work Environment

Enterprise Data Governance

- Access, Use, & Augmentation
- Commercialization, Innovation, & Public Use
- Decision-Making & Accountability

4 Crosscutting Drivers of Change
- Policy
- People
- Process
- Platform
People - Workforce of the Future

STRATEGIC WORKFORCE MANAGEMENT

Actively Manage the Workforce
Improve Employee Performance Management & Engagement

Develop Agile Operations
Reskill & Redeploy Human Capital Resources

Acquire Top Talent
Simple & Strategic Hiring

ENABLERS:
- Leverage data and analytics
- Utilize information technology and tools
- Align financial models/incentives
- Simplify legal and policy framework
  (requires legislative and regulatory change)

CONTINUOUS LEARNING: INNOVATIONS, RESEARCH & PILOT PROJECTS
Cross Agency Priority (CAP) Goals

- IT Modernization
- Data, Accountability and Transparency
- People - Workforce for the 21st Century
- Improving Customer Experience
- Sharing Quality Services
- Shifting From Low-Value to High-Value Work
- Category Management
- Results-Oriented Accountability for Grants
- Getting Payments Right
- Federal IT Spending Transparency
- Improve Management of Major Acquisitions
- Modernize Infrastructure Permitting
- Security Clearance, Suitability, and Credentialing Reform
- Lab-to-Market
Priority Areas for Transformation

Key Drivers of Transformation

**Cross-Cutting Priority Areas**
- Improving Customer Experience (CAP Goal 4)
- Sharing Quality Services (CAP Goal 5)
- Shifting From Low-Value to High-Value Work (CAP Goal 6)

**Functional Priority Areas**
- Category Management (CAP Goal 7)
- Results-Oriented Accountability for Grants (CAP Goal 8)
- Getting Payments Right (CAP Goal 9)
- Federal IT Spending Transparency (CAP Goal 10)
- Improve Management of Major Acquisitions (CAP Goal 11)
CAP GOAL #8 Results Oriented Accountability for Grants
Grants Challenges by Stakeholder Community

Oversight Community
- Weak internal controls
- Funds mismanagement
- Fraud
- Improper payments

Recipients and the Communities they Serve
- Burden
- Fragmentation
- Conflicting guidance

Federal Awarding Agencies
- Need for improved coordination across lines of businesses and program
- Opportunities to improve access to and quality of data
- Unstandardized business process
Striking the Right Balance between Historically Competing Goals

Alleviate burden and compliance costs

Reduce the risk of fraud, waste, and abuse
Tension between Program Design and Recipient Needs

Development of unique programs (introducing silos and fragmentation)

Recipient interest in engaging a Federal partner on a holistic set of challenges
Past Reforms and Initiatives

- Single Audit Act of 1984


  - Uniform Guidance – finalized in December 2013

Overview - Results Oriented Accountability for Grants

Goal Statement
- Maximize the value of grant funding by applying a risk-based, data-driven framework that balances compliance requirements with demonstrating successful results for the American taxpayer.

Challenge
- The Federal government uses grants to invest approximately $700 billion each year in mission-critical needs for American taxpayers, but managers report spending 40% of their time using antiquated processes to monitor compliance instead of analyzing data to improve results.

Opportunity
- Identify, open, standardize, and link critical data sets to power data analytics to enhance financial stewardship, performance management, and accountability. Use digital tools to modernize antiquated compliance processes. Leverage available data such as those produced by annual audits of recipients to drive a risk-based framework for performance management that drives results.
Goal Structure - Results Oriented Accountability for Grants

**Standardize Data**
Identify, open, standardize, and link critical data sets to power analytics to enhance financial stewardship, performance management, and accountability.

**Digital Tools to Manage Risk**
Use digital tools to modernize antiquated form-based compliance processes to assess and manage risk.

**Risk-Based Performance Management**
Leverage existing data such as those produced by annual audits of recipients to drive a risk-based framework for performance management that drives results.

**Better Results**
Data standardization reduces recipient burden, supports faster and more transparent decision making. Initial work will focus on the establishment of a comprehensive taxonomy for core grants management data standards.

This strategy supports the Improving the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Administrative Services Across Government and Leveraging Data as a Strategic Asset CAP Goals.

**June 2017**
- Develop core capabilities for grants management

**September 2018**
- Standardize core data elements to inform comprehensive taxonomy for core grants management data standards
- Develop plan for outreach, governance, and maintenance of data taxonomy

**Future Work**
- Develop and execute long-term for implements data standards government-wide
The Federal government has a tremendous amount of data that may be leveraged to identify opportunities and better manage risk, but that data is currently locked in an antiquated process, and driving burdensome compliance exercises. Powerful data and analytics based on risk could set the stage for a risk-based performance management framework in Strategy 3.

- **June 2018**
  - Draft business capabilities for single audit resolution common solution

- **Summer 2018**
  - Draft risk-management framework

- **September 2018**
  - Develop draft business capabilities for risk management tool

- **Future Work**
  - Deploy single audit resolution common solution, integrate to include risk-management tool
Strategy 3: Risk-Based Performance Management

A comprehensive risk-management tool for determining Federal funding awards that are low-risk and high value must include consideration of past performance results, financial risk, and an applicant’s capabilities to deliver the proposed results. In order to do this, agencies need to have ready access to performance data and have the data infrastructure to include performance in risk modeling.

Spring 2018
- Issue 2018 ‘skinny’ Single Audit Compliance Supplement

Summer 2018
- Conduct survey and follow-up interviews to document best practices in performance management
- Identify forward-thinking agencies

Fall 2018
- Select programs to pilot flexibilities in agencies with strong risk management that ties in performance

Spring 2019
- Streamline 2019 Single Audit Compliance Supplement with an increased focus on compliance requirements that inform performance

Future Work
- Scale lessons learned from pilots to establish risk-based performance management
- Revise OMB guidance for risk-based performance management
This initiative will require extensive engagement with key grants management stakeholders, including the following internal and external communities:

- Federal Awarding Agencies
- Recipients
- Taxpayers
- Congress
- Oversight Community
- Software Providers
CAP GOAL #9 Getting Payments Right
Not all improper payments represent a cash loss to the government

Not all improper payments are recoverable
Goal Statement
Reduce the cash loss to the tax payers by issuing payments correctly the first time and, as appropriate, recovering funds that were paid incorrectly.

Challenge
While improper payments may compromise citizens’ trust in government, they are not always indicative of fraud, nor do they necessarily represent payments that should not have been made. The cash loss to taxpayers is not only the incorrect payment, but also includes costs associated with prevention and recovery.

Opportunity
To improve the efficiencies of government programs by focusing on getting government payments right the first time they are made and reducing the cost associated with an incorrect payment.
The impact of an individual improper payment is larger than the monetary value of the payment

- More than one in three of the 90 VA disability claims reviewed in 2014 were incorrectly processed, according to an audit by the VA Office of Inspector General. Veterans who receive overpayments often get an unexpected bill when the VA fixes the mistake. In four cases involving overpayments, the VA overpaid veterans totaling $139,052.

- When an improper payment occurs within government healthcare programs due to billing mistakes such as duplicate payments, billing for medically unnecessary or, non-covered services, it can cause the government to pay more and may result in beneficiaries having to pay higher out-of-pocket costs for healthcare.

Recovering an improper payment is often difficult and inefficient

- The Federal government has only been able to recover approximately $0.47 of every $1.00 overpayment identified between 2013 and 2017.
Goal Structure - Getting Payments Right

Reduce the Amount of Cash Loss

- Identify why we are making incorrect payments and implement solutions to stop the incorrect payments from occurring in the future.

Clarify and Streamline Requirements

- Clarify and streamline compliance and reporting requirements to increase focus on reducing incorrect payments.

Partner With States

- Strengthen partnerships with states to identify improvements that will prevent and reduce incorrect payments made by Federally funded state-administered programs.

Reduced Amount of Wasted Resources
Strategy 1: Reduce the Amount of Cash Loss

Each program reporting an estimated cash loss over $100 million will provide goal(s) or milestones, along with progress updates, needed for the program to make payments right the first time.

- **November 2017**: Finalize cash loss estimation methodology and identify cash loss amount
- **April 2018**: Programs unable to identify cash loss and finalize a cash loss estimation methodology will self identify
- **July 2018**: Programs able to identify cash loss will identify what caused the cash loss
- **January 2019**: Identify what needs to be done to get the payment right the first time
- **For each program**, establish progress goal(s) or milestones that address the cause of incorrect payments, and determine frequency of reporting progress
Strategy 2: Clarify and Streamline Requirements

Identify areas where clarification or modification of requirements is needed to assist with improving the prevention of improper payments. This will contribute to the Government’s success in correctly making payments.

- **October 2017**: Identify needed statutory changes and share with Congress
- **Spring 2018**: Revise and publish agency guidance based on 2017 burden reduction engagements
- **May 2018**: Identify additional guidance improvements needed to increase payment accuracy and prevent cash loss
- **June 2018**: Communicate remaining needed changes with OMB and Congress
- **Summer - Fall 2019**: Revise and publish agency guidance; Implement guidance revisions
States receiving federal funding play a critical role in ensuring that the funding is spent correctly. By partnering with states, the Federal Government will learn more about opportunities to help them be successful.

- **December 2017**: Identify an initial set of states that the Department of the Treasury Do Not Pay Business Center (DNP Business Center) should explore working with.
- **May 2018**: Identify Federally funded state-administered programs reporting an estimated cash loss over $100 million.
- **June 2018**: Identify ways the DNP Business Center can assist these States with development and implementation of mitigation strategies.
- **August 2018**: Identify what, if any, State actions contribute to the cash loss.
- **January 2019**: Identify ways the Federal Government could assist the States with development and implementation of mitigation strategies.
- **May 2019**: Implement mitigation strategies through pilots and evaluate effectiveness for implementation on a larger scale.
Key Metrics - Getting Payments Right

Key Performance Indicator #1
- Annual Amount of Cash Loss

Key Performance Indicator #2
- Reductions in Cash Losses Over Time

Key Performance Indicator #3
- Progress Achieving Program Quarterly Milestone

Key Performance Indicator #4
- Reduction in Inefficient Requirements

Key Performance Indicator #5
- Improvements in State Programs
Agencies with Programs Estimating Cash Loss over $100M in FY2017

- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Defense
- Department of Education
- Department of Health and Human Services
- Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Department of Transportation
- Department of the Treasury
- Federal Communications Commission
- Office of Personnel Management
- Social Security Administration
- Veterans Administration
Key Metrics – Amount of Cash Loss and Change in Cash Loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Activity</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earned Income Tax Credit</td>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>-$497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Fee For Service</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>-$2,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Part C</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>-$2,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Security Income</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>-$1,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>-$1,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National School Lunch</td>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Breakfast</td>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Loan</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Part D</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>-$1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Service Funds-Lifeline</td>
<td>FCC</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Care</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Retirement</td>
<td>OPM</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>-$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrens Health Insurance</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children</td>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Pay</td>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>$38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Crop Insurance Corporation</td>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>-$51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Pay</td>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration Highway Planning and Construction</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>$48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Services Fund-Schools &amp; Libraries</td>
<td>FCC</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>-$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Public and Indian Housing - Tenant-Based Rental Assistance</td>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>-$1,505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash Loss - Cash loss to the Government includes amounts that should not have been paid and in theory should/could be recovered.

*Amounts were reported in millions of dollars

* Excludes programs with estimated cash loss below $100 million
Questions

Rhea Hubbard    Rhubbard@omb.eop.gov
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