
PERFORMANCE AND MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENTS

2. BUDGET AND PERFORMANCE INTEGRATION AND THE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATING TOOL

The President's Management Agenda (PMA) is helping the Federal Government become results-oriented. In addition to making it more efficient—reducing waste, fraud, and abuse—it is leading managers to ask whether programs are working as intended and if not, what can be done to achieve greater results.

Government programs, however worthy their goals, should demonstrate they are actually effective at solving problems. That is why it is so important that we consistently ask, for instance, whether the Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems Initiative at the Department of Energy is meeting its goals toward creating a next-generation nuclear energy system, or whether the National Institutes of Health's HIV/AIDS Research program is on track to developing an HIV/AIDS vaccine by 2010. If we are not meeting our goals, then we should do something differently to address the shortfall. If we are not measuring our performance at all, that is a bigger problem.

The Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) is designed to help assess the management and performance of individual programs. The PART helps evaluate a program's purpose, design, planning, management, results, and accountability to determine its overall effectiveness. Recommendations are then made to improve program management and performance.

The Administration has assessed approximately 400 programs representing approximately 40 percent of the Federal Budget; 234 programs were assessed last year and another 173 programs were assessed this year.¹ In three more years, the Administration plans to have assessed the performance and management of roughly 100 percent of the Federal Budget.

With the help of the PART, we know much more about the performance of 40 percent of the budget than we did before. This year, there is a reduction in the percentage of programs that cannot demonstrate results and there was a modest increase in the programs rated "Effective." Other results:

- About 40 percent of programs were rated either "Effective" or "Moderately Effective"; a quarter of programs rated just "Adequate" or "Ineffective"; and about 40 percent of programs were unable to demonstrate results.
- The PARTed programs for which we have current budget information show: almost \$713 billion spent effectively or moderately effectively; almost \$162 billion spent just adequately or ineffectively; and almost \$209 billion spent on programs for which we cannot demonstrate results.

The goal of the Budget and Performance Integration Initiative (part of the President's Management Agenda) is to have the Congress and the Executive Branch routinely consider performance information, among other factors, when making management and funding decisions. This will enable the Government to better describe to taxpayers what they are getting for their money. The evolution and institutionalization of the PART goes a long way towards achieving this goal.

There are a number of programs that have substantially improved their management practices or actual performance by implementing recommendations made through the PART process. For example:

- The Broadcasting Board of Governors' efforts to broadcast to Near East Asia and South Asia could not demonstrate that they were achieving results last year. But following the recommendations in last year's PART, the program this year set goals for weekly audience, program quality, signal strength and cost-per-listener. With additional funding, the program dramatically increased its reach to Arab speaking countries to an estimated 10.5 million listeners each week, up from just 3.9 million in 2002.
- Last year, the Administration on Aging, which provides services and benefits to the elderly so they can remain in their homes and communities, could not measure its impact. This year, the program was able to show it was moderately effective after demonstrating that its services enable the elderly to remain in their homes and communities and setting goals for increasing the number of people served per each million dollars spent. With level funding, the program plans to increase by 6 percent in 2004 and 8 percent in 2005 the number of people served per million dollars in funding.
- The Department of Energy's (DOE) Advanced Scientific Computing Research program—which provides world-class scientific supercomputing facilities and funds research in applied mathematics, computer science, and networking—did not have a sufficient strategic vision or adequate performance measures in last year's PART. This year, the program has developed a strategic plan and has adopted performance measures that will focus on keeping its supercomputer hardware procurements on cost and schedule, and on making high-impact scientific advances by dedicating a substantial fraction of its supercomputing capacity to a small number of important, computationally intensive, large-scale research projects. These measures will routinely assess the usefulness and the

¹Some reassessed programs were combined for review for the 2005 Budget, which is why the number of programs assessed for the 2004 Budget and the number of programs assessed for the 2005 Budget do not add up to exactly 400 programs.

efficiency of the facilities the program provides to scientists.

- The PART completed for the TRIO Upward Bound Program (Department of Education), which provides intensive services to improve academic performance and college preparation for high school students, found the program was inadequately targeted to the high-risk students who have potential

for college but are not performing successfully in high school. In response, the Department of Education has created a special competition and awarded \$19.2 million to projects that serve high-risk students. The Department will monitor the college enrollment rate for these participants and will use the results of this demonstration Initiative to guide future changes in the program.

What is the PART?

The PART is a questionnaire which consists of approximately 30 questions. It examines four critical areas of assessment—purpose and design, strategic planning, management, and results and accountability.

The first set of questions gauges whether the programs' design and purpose are clear and defensible. The second section involves strategic planning, and weighs whether the agency sets valid annual and long-term goals for programs. The third section rates agency management of programs, including financial oversight and program improvement efforts. The fourth set of questions focuses on results that programs can report with accuracy and consistency.

- The answers to questions in each of the four sections result in a numeric score for each section from 0 to 100 (100 being the best). These scores are then combined to achieve an overall qualitative rating of either Effective, Moderately Effective, Adequate, or Ineffective. Programs that do not have acceptable performance measures or have

not yet collected performance data generally receive a rating of Results Not Demonstrated.

- The PART helps determine a program's strengths and weaknesses and focuses particularly on a program's performance. The PART is best seen as a complement to traditional management techniques, and can be used to stimulate a constructive dialogue between program managers, budget analysts, and policy officials. The PART serves its purpose if its findings and recommendations play a substantial role in spending, management and other decisions on programs.
- The PART was revised for the 2005 Budget to clarify the guidance and questions. The accompanying table provides a brief description of the four sections along with examples of programs that scored high or low in 2005. For more detailed information regarding PART guidance and PART worksheets, visit the OMB website at www.omb.gov/part.

Table 2–1. THE PART IN SECTIONS

Section	Description	Low Score Example	High Score Example
Program Purpose and Design Weight = 20 percent	To assess whether the program's purpose and design are clear and sound	USDA Direct Crops Payment Program—program design needs improvement to effectively reduce need for government income support	USDA Soil Survey Program—clear program; strong purpose commonly held by interested parties
Strategic Planning Weight = 10 percent	To assess whether the agency has established valid long-term and annual measures and targets for the program	EPA Brownfields Program—lacks strategic planning, ambitious goal setting	EPA Existing Chemicals Program—Long-term measures are outcome focused
Program Management Weight = 20 percent	To rate agency management of the program, including financial oversight and program improvement efforts	DOE Fusion Energy Sciences Program—program merit review processes yet to be validated for impact on quality and performance of the research portfolio	DOE Distributed Energy Resources Program—strong and responsive management and oversight
Program Results/Accountability Weight = 50 percent	To rate program performance on measures and targets reviewed in the strategic planning section through other evaluations	DOD Defense Health Program—no fully developed performance measures	DOD Energy Conservation Improvement Program—program achieves results, reduction in cost, net savings for investment

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

Table 2-2. THE PART QUESTIONNAIRE

Key Questions for Every Program	Description
<p>PROGRAM PURPOSE AND DESIGN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the program purpose clear? Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest, or need? Is the program designed so it is not redundant or duplicative of any other federal, state, local or private need? Is the program designed free of major flaws that would limit program effectiveness? Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach the intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? 	<p>This section examines the clarity of program purpose and soundness of program design. It looks at factors including those the program, agency, or Administration may not directly control but which are within their influence, such as legislation and market factors. Programs should generally be designed to address a market failure—either an efficiency matter, such as a public good or externality, or a distributional objective, such as assisting low-income families—in the least costly or most efficient manner. A clear understanding of program purpose is essential to setting program goals, measures, and targets; maintaining focus; and managing the program. Potential source documents and evidence for answering questions in this section include authorizing legislation, agency strategic plans, annual performance plans, and other agency reports. Options for answers are <i>Yes</i>, <i>No</i> or <i>Not Applicable</i>.</p>
<p>STRATEGIC PLANNING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance goals that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Do all partners (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? Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest or need? 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? Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies? 	<p>This section focuses on program planning, priority setting, and resource allocation. Key elements include an assessment of whether the program has a limited number of performance measures with ambitious—yet achievable—targets, to ensure planning, management, and budgeting are strategic and focused. Potential source documents and evidence for answering questions include strategic planning documents, agency performance plans and reports, reports and submissions from program partners, evaluation plans, budget submissions and other program documents. Options for answers are <i>Yes</i>, <i>No</i> or <i>Not Applicable</i>.</p>
<p>PROGRAM MANAGEMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? 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? Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Does the program have procedures (i.e. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Does the program use strong financial management practices? Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? 	<p>This section focuses on a variety of elements related to whether the program is effectively managed to meet program performance goals. Key areas include financial oversight, evaluation of program improvements, performance data collection, and program manager accountability. Additionally, specific areas of importance for each program type are also explored. Potential source documents and evidence for answering questions in this section include financial statements, GAO reports, IG reports, performance plans, budget execution data, IT plans, and independent program evaluations. Options for answers are <i>Yes</i>, <i>No</i> or <i>Not Applicable</i>.</p>
<p>PROGRAM RESULTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goal(s)? Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? 	<p>This section considers whether a program is meeting its long-term and annual performance goals. This section also assesses how well the program compares to similar programs and how effective the program is based on independent evaluations. Potential source documents and evidence for answering questions in this section include annual performance reports, evaluations, GAO reports, IG reports and other agency documents. Assessments of program results should be based on the most recent reporting cycle or other relevant data. Answers in this section are rated as <i>Yes</i>, <i>Large Extent</i>, <i>Small Extent</i>, and <i>No</i>.</p>

The PART segments mandatory and discretionary federal programs into seven categories. In addition to the questions which apply to all programs, each section includes questions that have been tailored for a specific type of program. A complete list of these questions is available at the OMB website. Table 2–3 describes the program categories.

Problems and Revisions

Since its inception, the PART has been improved annually based on feedback received from agencies and the public. Last year approximately 20 percent of programs were addressed using the PART, and for the 2005 Budget an additional 20 percent of programs were assessed. Those programs originally PARTed for the 2004 Budget were reassessed only where evidence showed an agency's rating was likely to change.

Changes to the PART centered on clarification of PART guidance and refinement of PART questions. Although all sections were revised to some degree, the strategic planning section received the bulk of the revision, having two key questions on long-term and annual performance measures enhanced to require more detailed information on appropriate measures and targets. Because of the strong focus on strategic planning and results and accountability, several questions in the two sections are linked. For instance, if a program was not able to demonstrate appropriate goals and targets in

the strategic planning section, they were not given credit for measuring results against those targets in the performance results section. To alleviate this problem, agencies must improve the quality of the goals and targets arrived at through their strategic planning process.

This year's guidance was changed to include clarification on PART metrics. While the PART strives to focus on outcome performance measures, outputs can be appropriate practical measures in some cases. The 2005 guidance articulated the need for a high standard of justification for answers to receive a Yes. The completed PART is available to the public and as such, the review and its scores must be based on evidence.

For the 2005 Budget, PART worksheets were revised in order to produce a database of PART responses more effectively. PART responses across agencies are available at www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2005/pma.html.

Possible Areas for Improvement

PART assessments will continue to be used for informing budget decisions, supporting management, identifying design problems, and promoting performance measurement and accountability. The performance of Government activities is sometimes difficult to measure and it will always be a challenge to assess the diversity of its programs in a uniform way. The Admin-

Table 2–3. THE PART, BY CATEGORY

Program Type	Description	Examples
Competitive Grant Programs	Programs that distribute funds to state, local and tribal governments, organizations, individuals and other entities through a competitive process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head Start • Weed and Seed
Block/Formula Grant Programs	Programs that distribute funds to state, local and tribal governments and other entities by formula or block grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocational Education State Grants • Native American Housing Block Grants
Regulatory-Based Programs	Programs that employ regulatory action to achieve program and agency goals through rulemaking that implements, interprets or prescribes law or policy, or describes procedure or practice requirements. These programs issue significant regulations, which are subject to OMB review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupational Safety and Health Administration • Food Safety and Inspection Service
Capital Assets and Service Acquisition Programs	Programs where the primary means to achieve goals is the development and acquisition of capital assets (such as land, structures, equipment, and intellectual property) or the purchase of services (such as maintenance and information technology) from a commercial source	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign • DOD—Shipbuilding
Credit Programs	Programs that provide support through loans, loan guarantees and direct credit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Electric Utility Loans and Guarantees
Direct Federal Programs	Programs in which support and services are provided primarily by federal employees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coin Production • National Weather Service
Research and Development Programs	Programs that focus on creating knowledge or applying it toward the creation of systems, devices, methods, materials or technologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solar Energy • Mars Exploration

istration, however, is committed to assessing the performance of the Government's programs and to addressing and attempting to overcome the challenges associated with the effort.

One area that will require additional attention is the consistency among assessments. OMB will continue to promote consistency in the standards applied to PART assessments. This year the internal OMB Performance Evaluation Team again conducted a consistency check on PART worksheets. This review was then examined by the Performance Consortium of the National Academy of Public Administration. Recommendations for strengthening the PART review process for next year include adequately justifying explanations with evidence; explicitly addressing statutory barriers to improved performance; focusing on completed, not planned, actions; and rating new programs.

How the PARTs affect budget decisions

PART ratings do not result in automatic decisions about funding. Clearly, over time, funding should be targeted to programs that can prove they achieve measurable results. But a PART rating of Ineffective or Results Not Demonstrated may suggest that greater funding is necessary to overcome identified shortcomings, while a program rated Effective may be in line for a proposed funding decrease. For example:

- Although the Youth Activities program was rated "Ineffective," the program's proposed funding remains relatively stable. The program provides for-

mula grants to States and local areas to provide training to low-income and other disadvantaged youth to help them secure employment, but does not have the authority to target funds to the areas of greatest need. To allow it to be more effective, the Administration proposes to give the Secretary of Labor and States increased authority to reallocate resources to areas of need.

- Despite the Department of Energy's Distributed Energy Resources Program's "Moderately Effective" rating, the Administration proposes a small reduction in funding for the program. The program funds research for improved energy efficiency of and reduced emissions from on-site energy production. The decrease in funding is attributable not to the program's rating, but to relative priorities among Department of Energy programs.

The following table lists summary PART results and funding information for each assessed program. It affirms the fact that PART ratings are one factor, but not the only factor, in the Administration's budget formulation process. The PART gives the Executive Branch, the Congress, and individual program managers valuable insight into ways we can improve program performance on behalf of the American people. Individual PART summaries are included on the CD that accompanies the Analytical Perspectives volume; full PART worksheets can be found on OMB's web page www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2005/pma.html.

Table 2-4. PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATING TOOL (PART)

(Current Data for All Programs Assessed by PART)¹

Agency/ Program Title	Rating	Primary Program Type	Program Funding Level (dollars in millions)		
			2003 Actual	2004 Estimate	2005 Estimate
Department of Agriculture:					
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund—Guaranteed Loans	Moderately Effective	Credit	3,080	2,416	2,866
Animal Welfare	Adequate	Regulatory Based	16	16	17
APHIS Plant and Animal Health Monitoring Programs	Effective	Regulatory Based	165	173	261
Bioenergy	Adequate	Direct Federal	116	150	100
CCC Marketing Loan Payments	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	4,999	2,701	2,954
Community Facilities Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Credit	489	508	527
Conservation Technical Assistance	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	663	694	560
Crop Insurance	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	2,982	3,372	3,295
Direct Crop Payments	Adequate	Direct Federal	4,151	5,375	5,284
Farmland Protection Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	78	101	121
Food Aid Programs	Results Not Demonstrated	Mixed	154	152	148
Food Safety and Inspection Service	Adequate	Regulatory Based	755	775	715
Food Safety Research	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	95	97	106
Food Stamp Program	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	23,653	27,293	28,917
Forest Legacy Program (FLP)	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	68	64	100
Forestry Research Grants	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	22	22	22
Land Acquisition	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	133	67	67
Multifamily Housing Direct Loans and Rental Assistance	Results Not Demonstrated	Mixed	775	776	769
National Forest Improvement and Maintenance	Adequate	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	548	559	505
National Resources Inventory	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	29	29	22
National School Lunch	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	6,352	6,623	6,786

Table 2-4. PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATING TOOL (PART)—Continued(Current Data for All Programs Assessed by PART) ¹

Agency/ Program Title	Rating	Primary Program Type	Program Funding Level (dollars in millions)		
			2003 Actual	2004 Estimate	2005 Estimate
Pesticide Data/Microbiological Data Programs	Adequate	Direct Federal	22	21	21
Plant Materials Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	11	11	10
RBS Business and Industry Guaranteed Loan Program	Adequate	Credit	894	556	600
Rural Electric Utility Loans and Guarantees	Results Not Demonstrated	Credit	4,069	3,989	2,640
Rural Utilities Service Telecommunications Loan Programs	Results Not Demonstrated	Credit	495	514	495
Rural Water and Wastewater Grants and Loans	Results Not Demonstrated	Mixed	1,596	1,628	1,475
Snow Survey and Water Supply Forecasting	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	9	9	9
Soil Survey Program	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	85	86	87
USDA Wildland Fire Management	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	1,371	1,633	1,695
Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	24	52	59
Department of Commerce:					
Advanced Technology Program	Adequate	Competitive Grant	179	171
Bureau of Economic Analysis	Effective	Direct Federal	65	67	82
Coastal Zone Management Act Programs	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	129	113	111
Commerce Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	8	4
Current Demographic Statistics	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	54	58	61
Decennial Census	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	145	253	433
Economic Development Administration	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	319	315	320
Intercensal Demographic Estimates	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	9	9	11
Manufacturing Extension Partnership	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	106	39	39
Minority Business Development Agency	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	29	29	34
National Marine Fisheries Service	Adequate	Regulatory Based	754	676	662
National Weather Service	Effective	Direct Federal	755	825	839
NIST Laboratories	Effective	Research and Development	423	401	482
NOAA Navigation Services	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	70	74	73
Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	129	89	100
Survey Sample Redesign	Effective	Direct Federal	13	13	12
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office—Patents	Adequate	Direct Federal	1,053	1,090	1,371
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office—Trademarks	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	129	132	162
US and Foreign Commercial Service (USFCS)	Adequate	Direct Federal	206	202	212
Department of Defense—Military:					
Air Combat Program	Moderately Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	15,149	16,023	16,457
Airlift Program	Moderately Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	5,300	4,798	5,937
Basic Research	Effective	Research and Development	1,369	1,404	1,341
Chemical Demilitarization	Ineffective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	1,449	1,650	1,457
Comanche Helicopter Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	877	1,079	1,252
Communications Infrastructure	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	5,600	6,273	6,276
Defense Health	Adequate	Direct Federal	15,398	16,392	17,640
DoD Small Business Innovation Research/Technology Transfer	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	963	1,100	1,133
Energy Conservation Improvement	Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	35	50	60
Facilities Sustainment, Restoration, Modernization, and Demolition	Adequate	Direct Federal	6,620	6,424	6,643
Housing	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	13,683	14,230	15,672
Military Force Management	Effective	Direct Federal	93,500	98,956	103,100
Missile Defense	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	7,490	9,095	10,298
Recruiting	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	2,404	2,369	2,361
Shipbuilding	Adequate	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	9,457	12,201	11,477
Department of Education:					
21st Century Community Learning Centers	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	993	999	999

Table 2-4. PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATING TOOL (PART)—Continued(Current Data for All Programs Assessed by PART)¹

Agency/ Program Title	Rating	Primary Program Type	Program Funding Level (dollars in millions)		
			2003 Actual	2004 Estimate	2005 Estimate
Adult Education State Grants	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	587	590	590
Comprehensive School Reform	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	233	234
Even Start	Ineffective	Block/Formula Grant	248	247
Federal Family Education Loans	Adequate	Credit	3,432	2,880	7,050
Federal Pell Grants	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	11,365	12,007	12,830
Federal Perkins Loans	Ineffective	Credit	99	99
Federal Work-Study	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	999	999	999
GEAR UP	Adequate	Competitive Grant	293	298	298
IDEA Grants for Infants and Families	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	434	444	467
IDEA Grants to States	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	8,874	10,068	11,068
IDEA Part D—Personnel Preparation	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	92	91	91
IDEA Part D—Research and Innovation	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	77	78	78
IDEA Preschool Grants	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	387	388	388
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	2,931	2,930	2,930
Independent Living (IL) Programs	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	85	96	96
National Assessment	Effective	Research and Development	95	95	95
National Center for Education Statistics	Effective	Research and Development	89	92	92
Nat'l Institute on Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	109	107	107
Occupational and Employment Information	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	9	9
Safe and Drug Free Schools State Grants	Ineffective	Block/Formula Grant	469	441	441
Student Aid Administration	Adequate	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	900	912	935
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	760	770	770
Teacher Quality Enhancement	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	89	89	89
Tech-Prep Education State Grants	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	107	107
Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	7	7	7
TRIO Student Support Services	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	264	264	267
TRIO Talent Search	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	145	146	146
TRIO Upward Bound	Ineffective	Competitive Grant	279	282	281
Troops-to-Teachers	Adequate	Competitive Grant	29	15	15
Vocational Education State Grants	Ineffective	Block/Formula Grant	1,192	1,195	1,012
Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	2,533	2,584	2,636
William D. Ford Direct Student Loans	Adequate	Credit	4,225	2,381	-492
Department of Energy:					
Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	57	67	46
Advanced Scientific Computing Research	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	167	202	204
Advanced Simulation and Computing (ASCI)	Effective	Research and Development	674	721	741
Basic Energy Sciences	Effective	Research and Development	1,020	1,011	1,064
Biological and Environmental Research	Effective	Research and Development	507	641	502
Bonneville Power Administration	Moderately Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	-462	-30	-10
Building Technologies	Adequate	Research and Development	67	60	58
Clean Coal Research Initiative	Adequate	Research and Development	345	378	447
Distributed Energy Resources	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	61	61	53
Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium Production Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	122	50	50
Environmental Management	Adequate	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	6,952	7,034	7,434
Facilities and Infrastructure	Moderately Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	235	239	316
Fuel Cells (Stationary)	Adequate	Research and Development	61	71	23
Fusion Energy Sciences	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	247	263	264
Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems Initiative	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	17	24	31
Geothermal Technology	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	29	26	26
High Energy Physics	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	718	734	737
High Temperature Superconducting R&D	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	39	34	45
Hydrogen Technology	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	39	82	95
Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign/NIF Construction Project	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	499	514	492

Table 2-4. PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATING TOOL (PART)—Continued(Current Data for All Programs Assessed by PART)¹

Agency/ Program Title	Rating	Primary Program Type	Program Funding Level (dollars in millions)		
			2003 Actual	2004 Estimate	2005 Estimate
International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation	Effective	Direct Federal	333	258	238
Natural Gas Technologies	Ineffective	Research and Development	47	43	26
Nuclear Energy Research Initiative	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	17	11
Nuclear Physics	Effective	Research and Development	380	390	401
Nuclear Power 2010	Adequate	Research and Development	32	20	10
Oil Technology	Ineffective	Research and Development	42	35	15
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF), Operations	Moderately Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	996	1,022	1,018
Safeguards and Security	Adequate	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	529	553	667
Solar Energy	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	84	83	80
Southeastern Power Administration	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	5	5	5
Southwestern Power Administration	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	27	28	29
Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR)	Effective	Direct Federal	172	171	172
Weatherization Assistance	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	224	227	291
Western Area Power Administration	Moderately Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	168	177	173
Wind Energy	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	42	41	42
Yucca Mountain Project	Adequate	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	457	577	880
Department of Health and Human Services:					
317 Immunization Program	Adequate	Competitive Grant	651	643	534
Administration on Aging	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	1,367	1,374	1,377
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry	Adequate	Competitive Grant	82	73	77
CDC State and Local Preparedness Grants ..	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	939	934	829
Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education Payment Program	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	290	303	303
Children's Mental Health Services	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	98	102	106
Chronic Disease—Breast and Cervical Cancer	Adequate	Competitive Grant	199	210	220
Chronic Disease—Diabetes	Adequate	Competitive Grant	63	67	67
Community Mental Health Services Block Grant	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	437	435	436
Community Services Block Grant	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	646	642	495
Data Collection and Dissemination	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	62	67	64
Developmental Disabilities Grant Programs	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	132	138	138
Domestic HIV/AIDS Prevention	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	700	695	696
Food and Drug Administration	Moderately Effective	Regulatory Based	1,652	1,695	1,845
Foster Care	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	4,451	4,706	4,871
Head Start	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	6,687	6,775	6,944
Health Alert Network	Adequate	Competitive Grant	183	183	183
Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control (HCFAC)	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	160	160	160
Health Centers	Effective	Competitive Grant	1,505	1,617	1,836
Health Professions	Ineffective	Competitive Grant	401	409	126
HIV/AIDS Research	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	2,716	2,850	2,930
Hospital Preparedness Grants	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	515	515	476
IHS Federally-Administered Activities	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	1,346	1,378	1,408
IHS Sanitation Facilities Construction Program	Moderately Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	93	93	103
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	1,788	1,900	2,001
Maternal and Child Health Block Grant (MCHBG)	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	730	730	730
Medicare	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	277,464	298,916	326,716
Medicare Integrity Program (HCFAC)	Effective	Block/Formula Grant	720	720	720
National Health Service Corps	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	171	170	205
Nursing Education Loan Repayment and Scholarship Program	Adequate	Competitive Grant	20	27	32
Office of Child Support Enforcement	Effective	Block/Formula Grant	3,845	4,413	4,074
Patient Safety	Adequate	Research and Development	55	80	84

Table 2-4. PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATING TOOL (PART)—Continued(Current Data for All Programs Assessed by PART)¹

Agency/ Program Title	Rating	Primary Program Type	Program Funding Level (dollars in millions)		
			2003 Actual	2004 Estimate	2005 Estimate
Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	43	50	55
Refugee and Entrant Assistance	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	481	448	473
Resource and Patient Management System	Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	58	65	70
Runaway and Homeless Youth	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	105	105	105
Rural Health Activities	Adequate	Competitive Grant	184	147	56
Ryan White	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	1,993	2,020	2,055
State Children's Health Insurance Program	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	4,355	5,232	5,299
Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant	Ineffective	Block/Formula Grant	1,754	1,779	1,832
Substance Abuse Treatment Programs of Regional and National Significance	Adequate	Competitive Grant	317	419	517
Translating Research into Practice	Adequate	Research and Development	10	8	5
Urban Indian Health Program	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	31	32	32
Department of Homeland Security:					
Aids to Navigation	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	805	808	855
Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	745	746	500
Aviation Passenger Screening Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	1,875	1,531	1,586
Border Patrol	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	1,981	1,847	1,862
Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	533	688	704
Container Security Initiative	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	48	62	126
Detention and Removal	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	1,150	1,130	1,259
Disaster Relief Fund—Public Assistance	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	1,113	1,037	1,075
Drug Interdiction	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	648	774	822
Federal Air Marshal Service	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	537	640	613
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	171	192	196
Federal Protective Service	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	448	424	478
Hazard Mitigation Grant	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	167	155	161
Immigration Services	Adequate	Direct Federal	1,425	1,653	1,711
Marine Environmental Protection	Moderately Effective	Regulatory Based	145	252	267
Metropolitan Medical Response System	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	50	50
National Flood Insurance	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	1,655	1,719	1,787
Search and Rescue	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	591	842	891
Department of Housing and Urban Development:					
Community Development Block Grant (Formula)	Ineffective	Block/Formula Grant	4,340	4,331	4,331
HOME Investment Partnerships Program	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	1,987	2,006	2,084
HOPE VI	Ineffective	Competitive Grant	570	149
Housing for Persons with Disabilities	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	249	250	249
Housing for the Elderly	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	778	774	773
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	290	295	295
Housing Vouchers	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	12,458	14,602	13,364
Lead Hazard Grants	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	165	164	129
National Community Development Initiative	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	32	35	30
Native American Housing Block Grants	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	645	650	647
Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing (PATH)	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	8	8	2
Project-Based Rental Assistance	Ineffective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	4,766	4,769	5,102
Department of the Interior:					
Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	190	191	244
DOI Wildland Fire Management	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	650	685	743
Energy and Minerals Management	Adequate	Direct Federal	106	108	108
Energy Resource Assessments	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	24	25	25
Geologic Hazard Assessments	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	75	75	74
Habitat Restoration Activities	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	145	147	147
Indian Forestry Program	Adequate	Direct Federal	49	52	53
Indian Law Enforcement	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	162	172	182
Indian School Construction	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	294	295	229
Indian School Operations	Adequate	Direct Federal	513	522	522

Table 2-4. PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATING TOOL (PART)—Continued(Current Data for All Programs Assessed by PART) ¹

Agency/ Program Title	Rating	Primary Program Type	Program Funding Level (dollars in millions)		
			2003 Actual	2004 Estimate	2005 Estimate
Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)					
State Grants	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	97	94	94
Mineral Resource Assessments	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	56	55	49
Minerals Revenue Management	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	83	80	82
National Fish Hatchery System	Results Not Demonstrated	Mixed	54	58	57
National Historic Preservation Programs	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	88	93	97
National Mapping	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	133	130	128
National Park Service Facility Management	Adequate	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	657	700	725
National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	191	198	205
National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	368	391	388
Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Studies	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	16	16	16
Partners for Fish and Wildlife	Adequate	Direct Federal	38	42	50
Reclamation Hydropower	Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	145	148	159
Recreation Management	Adequate	Direct Federal	58	61	59
Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities	Results Not Demonstrated	Regulatory Based	105	105	109
Rural Water Supply Projects	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	80	83	68
Science & Technology Program (S&T)	Effective	Research and Development	13	16	10
Title XVI Water Reuse and Recycling	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	32	28	12
Tribal Courts	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	17	18	18
Tribal Land Consolidation	Moderately Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	8	22	75
Department of Justice:					
ATF Firearms Programs—Integrated Violence Reduction Strategy	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	601	615	632
Bureau of Prisons	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	4,045	4,414	4,517
Community Oriented Policing Services	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	978	742	44
Cybercrime	Adequate	Direct Federal	157	206	265
Drug Courts	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	45	38	70
Drug Enforcement Administration	Adequate	Direct Federal	1,802	1,677	1,797
Juvenile Accountability Block Grants	Ineffective	Block/Formula Grant	189	59
National Criminal History Improvement Program	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	40	30	58
Organized Crime/Drug Enforcement	Adequate	Direct Federal	478	495	512
Residential Substance Abuse Treatment	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	65	76
State Criminal Alien Assistance Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	248	297
USMS Apprehension of Fugitives	Adequate	Direct Federal	180	180	184
USMS Protection of the Judicial Process	Adequate	Direct Federal	514	540	554
Weed and Seed	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	59	58	58
White Collar Crime	Adequate	Direct Federal	474	512	509
Department of Labor:					
Black Lung Benefits Program	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	1,461	1,452	1,423
Bureau of Labor Statistics	Effective	Direct Federal	492	519	532
Community Service Employment for Older Americans	Ineffective	Direct Federal	442	439	440
Davis-Bacon Wage Determination Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Regulatory Based	10	10	10
Dislocated Worker Assistance	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	1,150	1,173	1,106
Employee Benefits Security Administration (EBSA)	Results Not Demonstrated	Regulatory Based	116	124	132
Federal Employees Compensation Act (FECA)	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	2,475	2,558	2,631
Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers	Ineffective	Competitive Grant	77	77
Mine Safety and Health Administration	Adequate	Regulatory Based	273	269	276
Occupational Safety and Health Administration	Adequate	Regulatory Based	450	458	462
Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP)	Results Not Demonstrated	Regulatory Based	78	79	82
Trade Adjustment Assistance	Ineffective	Direct Federal	972	1,338	1,057
Unemployment Insurance Administration State Grants	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	2,634	2,619	2,711

Table 2-4. PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATING TOOL (PART)—Continued(Current Data for All Programs Assessed by PART)¹

Agency/ Program Title	Rating	Primary Program Type	Program Funding Level (dollars in millions)		
			2003 Actual	2004 Estimate	2005 Estimate
Youth Activities	Ineffective	Block/Formula Grant	994	995	1,001
Department of State:					
Anti-Terrorism Assistance	Effective	Direct Federal	64	96	128
Capital Security Construction Program	Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	608	761	888
Contribution to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	100	100	90
Demining	Effective	Direct Federal	45	50	59
Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs in Near East Asia and South Asia	Effective	Competitive Grant	49	49	60
Humanitarian Migrants to Israel	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	60	50	50
Military Assistance to new NATO and NATO Aspirant Nations	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	99	95	22
Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	15	30	30
PKO—OSCE Programs	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	18	32	3
Refugee Admissions to the U.S.	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	113	136	136
Security Assistance for the Western Hemisphere	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	124	158	124
Security Assistance to Sub-Saharan Africa ..	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	102	60	96
Support for Eastern European Democracy & Freedom Support Act	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	1,277	1,026	950
Terrorist Interdiction Program (TIP)	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	5	5	5
UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	303	310	229
Visa and Consular Services	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	664	807	865
Worldwide Security Upgrades	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	553	647	659
Department of Transportation:					
FAA Air Traffic Services	Adequate	Direct Federal	5,666	6,097	6,522
FAA Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport Improvement Program)	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	3,378	3,400	3,500
Federal Lands	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	773	767	947
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Grant Program	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	164	165	168
FHWA Highway Infrastructure	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	29,847	32,462	32,138
Hazardous Materials Transportation	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	14	14	14
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Grant Program	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	446	449	456
New Starts	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	1,275	1,356	1,599
Railroad Safety Program (RSP)	Moderately Effective	Regulatory Based	115	129	138
Research, Engineering & Development	Effective	Research and Development	163	113	117
Department of the Treasury:					
Administering the Public Debt	Effective	Direct Federal	189	174	175
African Development Fund	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	107	112	118
ATF Consumer Product Safety Activities	Adequate	Regulatory Based	23	23	23
Bank Enterprise Award	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	18	9	5
Coin Production	Effective	Direct Federal	311	431	441
Debt Collection	Effective	Direct Federal	48	47	47
Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) Compliance	Ineffective	Direct Federal	145	201	176
International Development Association	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	844	977	1,068
IRS Tax Collection	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	957	1,002	1,083
New Currency Manufacturing	Effective	Direct Federal	90	325	400
OCC Bank Supervision	Effective	Regulatory Based	439	477	488
Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC)	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	20	21	22
OTS Thrift Supervision	Effective	Regulatory Based	158	174	178
Submission Processing (SP)	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	721	726	734
Treasury Technical Assistance	Adequate	Direct Federal	33	19	18
Department of Veterans Affairs:					
Burial Benefits	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	397	431	455
Disability Compensation	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	25,385	27,712	32,266
Medical Care	Adequate	Direct Federal	25,348	28,297	29,471
Montgomery GI Bill (MGIB) (Education Benefits)	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	1,776	1,988	2,112
VA Research and Development	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	818	820	770

Table 2-4. PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATING TOOL (PART)—Continued(Current Data for All Programs Assessed by PART)¹

Agency/ Program Title	Rating	Primary Program Type	Program Funding Level (dollars in millions)		
			2003 Actual	2004 Estimate	2005 Estimate
Corps of Engineers-Civil Works:					
Corps Hydropower	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	252	245	220
Emergency Management	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	75	50
Flood Damage Reduction	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	1,011	972	930
Inland Waterways Navigation	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	715	690	630
Non-regulatory Wetlands Activities	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	279	260	300
USACE Regulatory Program	Moderately Effective	Regulatory Based	138	139	150
Environmental Protection Agency:					
Acid Rain	Moderately Effective	Regulatory Based	17	17	17
Air Toxics	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	100	113	113
Brownfields	Adequate	Competitive Grant	167	170	210
Civil Enforcement	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	431	448	456
Clean Water State Revolving Fund	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	1,341	1,342	850
Criminal Enforcement	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	40	42	43
Drinking Water State Revolving Fund	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	850	845	850
Ecological Research	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	132	132	110
Environmental Education	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	9	9
Existing Chemicals	Adequate	Direct Federal	16	17	17
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	72	76	73
New Chemicals	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	15	15	15
Nonpoint Source Grants	Results Not Demonstrated	Block/Formula Grant	237	195	209
Particulate Matter Research	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	61	65	65
Pesticide Registration	Adequate	Direct Federal	45	66	66
Pesticide Reregistration	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	72	77	83
Pollution Prevention and New Technologies	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	49	42	36
RCRA Corrective Action	Adequate	Regulatory Based	35	39	39
Superfund Removal	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	196	200	183
Tribal General Assistance	Adequate	Block/Formula Grant	57	62	62
General Services Administration:					
Asset Management of Federally-Owned Real Property	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	1,754	1,805	1,819
GSA's Regional IT Solutions Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	5,810	6,080	6,282
Leasing Space	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	3,467	3,641	4,018
Multiple Award Schedules	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	414	420	443
Personal Property Management Program (FBP)	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	26	27	27
Real Property Disposal (PR)	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	32	40	44
Supply Depots and Special Order	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	993	847	856
Vehicle Acquisition	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	1,227	1,216	1,199
Vehicle Leasing	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	1,230	1,447	1,569
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:					
Biological Sciences Research	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	269	368	492
Earth Science Applications	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	78	91	77
Mars Exploration	Effective	Research and Development	500	595	691
Mission and Science Measurement Technology	Moderately Effective	Research and Development	304	467	1,094
Solar System Exploration	Effective	Research and Development	1,039	1,316	1,187
Space Shuttle	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition and Service Acquisition	3,301	3,945	4,319
Space Station	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	1,462	1,498	1,863
National Science Foundation:					
Facilities	Effective	Research and Development	527	612	683

Table 2-4. PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATING TOOL (PART)—Continued(Current Data for All Programs Assessed by PART) ¹

Agency/ Program Title	Rating	Primary Program Type	Program Funding Level (dollars in millions)		
			2003 Actual	2004 Estimate	2005 Estimate
Individuals	Effective	Research and Development	417	447	498
Information Technology Research	Effective	Research and Development	299	313	220
Nanoscale Science and Engineering	Effective	Research and Development	221	249	305
Small Business Administration:					
Business Information Centers	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	14	14
Disaster Loan Program	Moderately Effective	Credit	190	169	197
Section 504 Certified Development Company					
Guaranteed Loan Program	Adequate	Credit	13	17	14
Service Corps of Retired Executives	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	9	14	12
Small Business Development Centers	Moderately Effective	Block/Formula Grant	95	98	103
Small Business Investment Company	Adequate	Credit	13	13	13
Social Security Administration:					
Disability Insurance	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	71,523	78,645	84,119
Supplemental Security Income for the Aged	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	4,208	4,298	4,652
International Assistance Programs					
Broadcasting Board of Governors:					
Broadcasting to Africa	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	15	13	14
Broadcasting to Near East Asia and South Asia	Moderately Effective	Direct Federal	88	128	95
Export-Import Bank of the United States:					
Export Import Bank—Long Term Guarantees	Moderately Effective	Credit	564	55	156
Overseas Private Investment Corporation:					
Overseas Private Investment Corporation—Finance	Adequate	Credit	24	24	24
Overseas Private Investment Corporation—Insurance	Adequate	Credit	1,753	1,800	2,000
Trade and Development Agency:					
U.S. Trade and Development Agency	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	58	50	50
United States Agency for International Development:					
Child Survival and Health (LAC)	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	158	154	137
Development Assistance	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	261	268	242
Office of Transition Initiatives	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	50	55	63
Public Law 480 Title II Food Aid	Adequate	Competitive Grant	1,441	1,185	1,185
USAID Climate Change	Adequate	Competitive Grant	214	175	155
USAID Development Assistance—Population	Moderately Effective	Competitive Grant	444	430	425
Other Independent Agencies					
American Battle Monuments Commission:					
World War II Memorial	Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	76	55	22
Armed Forces Retirement Home:					
Asset Management of AFRH Real Property	Moderately Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	68	65	61
Consumer Product Safety Commission:					
Consumer Product Safety Commission	Results Not Demonstrated	Regulatory Based	57	60	63
Corporation for National and Community Service:					
AmeriCorps	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	174	312	292
Federal Communications Commission:					
Schools and Libraries—Universal Service Fund	Results Not Demonstrated	Regulatory Based	2,250	2,250	2,250
Federal Election Commission:					
Compliance—Enforcement	Results Not Demonstrated	Regulatory Based	50	51	52
National Archives and Records Administration:					
Records Services Program	Adequate	Direct Federal	332	374	391
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Fuel Facilities Licensing & Inspection	Effective	Regulatory Based	14	16	26
Reactor Inspection and Performance Assessment	Effective	Regulatory Based	97	96	157
Office of National Drug Control Policy:					
CTAC Counterdrug Research & Development	Results Not Demonstrated	Research and Development	22	18	18

Table 2-4. PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATING TOOL (PART)—Continued(Current Data for All Programs Assessed by PART) ¹

Agency/ Program Title	Rating	Primary Program Type	Program Funding Level (dollars in millions)		
			2003 Actual	2004 Estimate	2005 Estimate
CTAC Technology Transfer Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	26	22	22
Drug-Free Communities Support Program ...	Adequate	Competitive Grant	60	70	80
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA)	Results Not Demonstrated	Competitive Grant	226	226	208
Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign	Results Not Demonstrated	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	150	145	145
Office of Personnel Management:					
Federal Employees Group Life Insurance (FEGLI)	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	2,022	2,069	2,164
Federal Employees Retirement Program	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	50,512	53,092	55,210
FEHBP Integrity	Effective	Direct Federal	8	11	15
Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia:					
Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia	Results Not Demonstrated	Direct Federal	23	25	30
Securities and Exchange Commission:					
Full Disclosure Program (Corporate Review)	Results Not Demonstrated	Regulatory Based	44	61	79
Tennessee Valley Authority:					
TVA Power	Moderately Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	7,585	7,474	7,579
TVA Resource Stewardship (Non-Power)	Effective	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition	83	84	83

¹ If a program definition changed between the 2004 Budget and the 2005 Budget, only the program that was most recently PARTed is listed.