Cross Agency Priority Goal Quarterly Progress Update

Benchmark and Improve Mission-Support Operations

Goal Leaders:

Dave Mader, Acting Deputy Director for Management,
Office of Management and Budget
Denise Turner Roth, Administrator, General Services Administration



Overview: Mission-Support Benchmarking

Goal Statement

• Improve administrative efficiency and increase the adoption of effective management practices by establishing cost, quality, and customer satisfaction benchmarks for mission-support operations, giving agency decision makers better data to set priorities, allocate resources, and improve processes.

Urgency

- Federal agencies lack a complete set of tools and reliable data to measure their performance in key administrative areas. This discourages agency executives from taking necessary steps to reduce costs, efficiently deploy resources, and improve quality of service.
- Agencies are often hesitant to adopt shared services for mission-support functions without "apples-to-apples" data that allows them to compare options, quantify potential savings, and ensure equal (or better) service quality.
- Finally, the absence of government-wide benchmarks can hamper the identification and sharing of effective management practices, because OMB and agencies lack full visibility into which agencies or shared service providers are the top performers in a given function.

Vision

- The benchmarking initiative will result in markedly higher efficiency and better performance from Federal mission-support functions, and identify opportunities to apply private sector standards where appropriate.
- The effort will encompass five administrative functions acquisition, financial management, human capital,
 IT management, and real property at major bureaus/components within the 24 CFO Act Federal agencies.
 Lessons and best practices will be shared with all agencies and applied where the greatest benefits will be realized.

Progress update

- In Q3 2015, the General Services Administration (GSA) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) partnered with all 24 CFO Act agencies to complete collection of the second round of Efficiency benchmarks and the first round of Effectiveness benchmarks. In all, there are 40 cost/efficiency measures and more than 30 quality measures spanning five mission-support functions.
- To gather feedback from the internal customers of agency mission-support functions, GSA conducted an extensive customer satisfaction survey which yielded more than 23,000 detailed responses from supervisors and executives across agencies. This represents a 17.3% overall response rate, with many agencies achieving response rates of 30% or greater. The results provide insight into customer perceptions of the importance and effectiveness of 25 different service areas provided by the Contracting, Human Capital, Finance and IT functions.
- GSA and OMB worked closely with agency CxOs and their teams to validate all of the data collected, conduct analysis and design visual representations to best enable agencies to interpret the results. The availability of cost, quality and customer satisfaction benchmarks provides CxOs and agency leadership with a comprehensive view of mission-support performance, including the relationship between expenditures and service quality.
- Each agency was provided with a detailed report on their benchmarking results, enabling CxOs to compare their mission-support performance to peer agencies, compare their own components against one another, and to components across government.
- Agencies and OMB used the benchmarking reports as a key input to data-driven FedStat meetings in Q3 2015.
 FedStat meetings brought together senior officials from OMB and GSA with each CFO Act agency's leadership to examine key mission-support challenges and determine solutions. 23 Agency FedStat meetings were completed and OMB issued follow-up memos to each agency to provide support and track progress against action items.

Action Plan Summary

| Sub-Goal | Actions to Achieve Impact | Key Indicators |
|---|---|--|
| Reduce administrative costs and improve service quality in acquisition functions | Workgroups for each function refine original set of Efficiency metrics and select Effectiveness metrics to measure service quality and customer satisfaction with mission-support functions | |
| Reduce administrative costs, improve service quality, and increase use of shared services in finance functions | GSA, OMB and OPM collect and validate Round 1 of Effectiveness metrics (including customer satisfaction survey responses) and Round 2 of Efficiency metrics Finance, HR and IT Management workgroups collect energtional quality metrics and systemer satisfaction | % of agencies contributing data within each of the five functions % of bureaus/components contributing all data within each of the five |
| Reduce administrative costs, improve service quality, and | operational quality metrics and customer satisfaction measures from Federal shared service providers, to inform agency decisions on shared services adoption GSA updates government-wide benchmarks website with data collected in early 2015, including new user functionalities to analyze and chart cost, quality and customer satisfaction | functions* % of CFO Act agencies participating in benchmarking evaluation meetings with OMB/GSA* Overall % of metrics data collected |
| Reduce administrative costs, improve service quality, and increase use of shared services in IT management functions | measures. GSA and OMB develop customized benchmark findings for each agency and incorporate them into high-level management assessment meetings for agencies to identify priority actions | within each of the five functions Overall % of metrics data collected across all five functions |
| Reduce administrative costs and improve service quality in real property functions | OMB, GSA and OPM work with CxO Councils to review Effectiveness and Efficiency benchmark results for each function, identify the drivers of top performance and share leading practices government-wide | |

^{*} These indicators have proven more difficult than anticipated to accurately measure, because some bureaus and components do not have functional capabilities, and therefore cannot be benchmarked. To compensate, we have added an indicator measuring agency involvement in high-level assessment meetings with OMB/GSA.

Work Plan (2015)

| Milestone Summary | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| Key Milestones | Milestone Due Date | Milestone status | Owner | | | |
| Workgroups for each function refine original set of Efficiency metrics and select Effectiveness metrics to measure service quality and customer satisfaction with mission-support functions | November/December 2014 | Complete | GSA, OMB, OPM | | | |
| GSA, OMB and OPM collect and validate Round 1 of Effectiveness metrics (including customer satisfaction survey responses) and Round 2 of Efficiency metrics | January/February 2015 | Complete | GSA, OMB | | | |
| GSA updates government-wide benchmarks website with data collected in early 2015, including new user functionalities to analyze and chart cost, quality and customer satisfaction measures. | June 2015 | Complete | GSA | | | |
| GSA and OMB develop customized benchmark findings for each agency and incorporate them into high-level management assessment meetings for agencies to identify priority actions. | July 2015 | Complete | OMB, GSA | | | |
| OMB, GSA and OPM work with CxO Councils to review Effectiveness and Efficiency benchmark results for each function, identify the drivers of top performance and share leading practices government-wide | September 2015 | On track | GSA, OMB, OPM | | | |
| Workgroups for each function refine existing set of Efficiency and Effectiveness metrics to measure service quality and customer satisfaction with mission-support functions | November/December 2015 | On track | GSA, OMB, OPM | | | |

Work Plan (2016)

| Milestone Summary | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Key Milestones | Milestone Due Date | Milestone status | Owner | | | |
| GSA, OMB and OPM collect and validate Round 2 of Effectiveness metrics (including customer satisfaction survey responses) and Round 3 of Efficiency metrics | January/February 2016 | On track | GSA, OMB | | | |
| Finance, HR and IT Management workgroups collect operational quality metrics and customer satisfaction measures from Federal shared service providers, to inform agency decisions on shared services adoption | Q1 FY 2016* | On track | OMB, OPM (HRLOB), Treasury (FIT) | | | |
| GSA updates government-wide benchmarks website with data collected in early 2016 | June 2016 | On track | GSA | | | |
| GSA and OMB develop customized benchmark findings for each agency and incorporate them into high-level management assessment meetings for agencies to identify priority actions. | July 2016 | On track | OMB, GSA | | | |

^{*} Efforts to gather benchmarking data from shared services providers are ongoing, with varying progress across the FM, HR and IT functions. However, due to the intensive focus in the near-term on analyzing data that was collected directly from agencies, as well as conducting FedStat meetings with the benchmark results, the shared services benchmarking milestone due date will be moved to early FY 2016.

Key Indicators

| Key Implementation Data | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------|------|-----------------|------------------------|----------|--|
| Efficiency Metrics, Round 2 Effectiveness Metrics, Round 1 | Source | Frequency | 2014 | Target for 2015 | 2015 Actual | Trend*** | |
| % of agencies contributing data within [function] | Agency Data Calls | Annual | 100% | 100% | 100% for all functions | Flat | |
| % of bureaus/components contributing all data within [function]* | Agency Data Calls | Annual | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | |
| % of CFO Act agencies participating in benchmarking evaluation with OMB/GSA, as part of FedStat meetings | GSA project team | Annual | 100% | 100% | 96% | Decrease | |
| Overall % of metrics data collected across all five functions** | Agency Data Calls | Annual | 93% | 100% | 91% | Decrease | |

(Continued on next page)

- * This indicator has proven more difficult than anticipated to accurately measure, because some bureaus and components do not provide mission-support services, and therefore cannot be benchmarked. To compensate, we have added an indicator measuring agency involvement in high-level assessment meetings with OMB/GSA.
- ** Calculated at the agency level. If an agency submitted a data point for a given metric, that metric was considered "complete" for the agency. Excludes customer satisfaction survey responses.
- *** Note that the 2015 collection consisted of many more metrics than 2014, so indicators are not entirely comparable year-over-year.

Key Indicators (continued)

| Key Implementation Data (continued) | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------|------|--------------------------------|-------------|----------|--|
| Efficiency Metrics, Round 2 Effectiveness Metrics, Round 1 | Source | Frequency | 2014 | Target for 2015 | 2015 Actual | Trend** | |
| Overall % of metrics data collected within Acquisition* | Agency Data Calls | Annual | 100% | 100% | 96% | Decrease | |
| Overall % of metrics data collected within Financial Management* | Agency Data Calls | Annual | 91% | 100% | 91% | Flat | |
| Overall % of metrics data collected within Human Capital* | Agency Data Calls | Annual | 94% | 100% | 91% | Decrease | |
| Overall % of metrics data collected within IT Management* | Agency Data Calls | Annual | 96% | 100% | 93% | Decrease | |
| Overall % of metrics data collected within Real Property* | Agency Data Calls | Annual | 90% | 100% | 80% | Decrease | |
| Overall response rate on customer satisfaction survey | GSA-led survey | Annual | N/A | No target for first deployment | 17.3% | N/A | |

^{*}Calculated at the agency level. If an agency submitted a data point for a given metric, that metric was considered "complete" for the agency. Excludes customer satisfaction survey responses.

^{**} Note that the 2015 collection consisted of many more metrics than 2014, so indicators are not entirely comparable year-over-year.

Contributing Agencies and Programs

Contributing Agencies and Programs:

- All of the CFO Act agencies are contributing to the Benchmarking goal, both in shaping the metrics and in submitting data about their agency's functions.
- The federal interagency management councils (Chief Acquisition Officers Council, Chief Financial Officers Council, Chief Human Capital Officers Council, Chief Information Officers Council, Federal Real Property Council) in collaboration with the Office of Management and Budget are serving as the primary forum for analyzing cross-agency benchmarking results. Their objective is to identify shared challenges, drivers of high performance, and common solutions for mission-support functions across government.

Acronyms

- CxO Shorthand for any heads of functions within federal organizations, including Chief Acquisition Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Human Capital Officer, Chief Information Officer, and Chief Operating Officer)
- FIT Office of Financial Innovation and Transformation
- FY Fiscal Year
- GSA General Services Administration
- HR Human Resources
- HRLoB Human Resources Line of Business
- IT Information Technology
- N/A Not Available
- OMB Office of Management and Budget
- OPM Office of Personnel Management