



The Bottom Line

Newsletter of the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR BUDGET & PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Vol. XXIII, Number 2

June 2003

President's Message



This past year has flown by. My year as President of AABPA is almost over. Service as President this past year has truly been an honor.

This experience has afforded me the opportunity to work with an outstanding group of professionals dedicated to improving the knowledge and skills of budget analysts across government. Joan McKean has put together another outstanding set of symposiums that I hope all of you had the opportunity to participate in. Our Spring symposium had an outstanding group of keynote speakers: Dr. Zakheim from DOD, Mr. Holtz-Eakin the new Director of CBO and Stan Collender, who's insights in to the Federal Budget are a perennial AABPA favorite. The panel sessions cover many of the topics foremost on the minds of the Federal budget community: Activity Based Costing, Competitive Sourcing, and the PART Initiative to name a few.

Teri Gullo has given us an outstanding series of monthly programs. I hope you have had the opportunity to take advantage of at least some of these. Most recently Barry Anderson, Deputy Director of CBO and long-time participant and sometime observer of the Federal budget gave an excellent presentation at the April

program followed by our annual wine and cheese reception. These panels are informative and a great networking opportunity, as well.

Pat Mullen, our Vice President for Communications has done an outstanding job with our newsletter. The newsletter is another great benefit of membership in AABPA. Pat has brought us excellent articles and has spiced it up this year with a little budget humor. (Is that an oxymoron?).

AABPA is a great organization and to stay a great organization we need to continuously attract new members. If you are enjoying the benefits of AABPA membership, the symposia, the monthly panels, the newsletter, the journal, then pass it on. Tell your colleagues at work about AABPA and how being a member of **the** organization for budget analysts has enhanced your career. Encourage them to look at our website, aapba.org and to become a member. Kesha Pendergrast our Membership Director is working hard to bring in new members. If you or someone you know would like to join please feel free to contact Kesha at (703) 637-2826. If you were a member, but have let your membership lapse, please contact us as we would love to have you back.

Along that same vein, if you are a member but have not sent in your

dues please do so today. In order to continue bringing you the benefits of membership we need the hard work of the people I have named above and others, but we also need your financial support. With an annual membership fee of \$45.00, AAPBA is a great bargain and an excellent investment in your career. If you're not sure if your dues are up-to-date or you're not sure where to send the check call Chris Lawson, our Executive Secretary at (703) 941-4300 or e-mail us at AABPA@aol.com. Mark Brown, our Treasurer will take good care of your dues. Mark makes sure that every dollar paid to AABPA is a dollar well spent. If you believe that AABPA provides valuable programs and information, help us continue to do good work by attending the symposia, becoming a member or keeping your membership current.

My sincere thanks to Joan, Teri, Pat, Kesha and Mark. These dedicated volunteers are why AABPA is such a high-performing association. If you are an active member but would like to be more involved by serving on the Board of AABPA please contact our President-Elect, Rex Reagan (703) 432-3695 or myself, Debi Schilling, at (202) 501-0719. You will truly benefit from the experience of working with a great group of officers and directors. ★

The American Association for Budget & Program Analysis is a non-profit organization devoted to furthering knowledge in budgeting, program analysis and related fields. Through its programs, AABPA provides for the exchange of ideas and experience of its members in government, academic and private sectors. For more information, write AABPA, Box 1157, Falls Church, VA 22041, or call (703) 941-4300.

OFFICERS

Debi Schilling (202) 501-0719
President

Rex Reagan (703) 432-3695
President-Elect

Joan McKean (301) 427-1009 x 128
Vice President, Symposia

Pat Mullen (202) 512-4410
*Vice President, Communications
(Newsletter Editor)*

Teri Gullo (202) 225-3220
Vice President, Programs

Kesha Pendergrast (703) 637-2826
Membership Director

Mark Brown (301) 713-0718
Treasurer/Secretary

Edward Brigham (202) 366-4347
Past President

DIRECTORS:

Ron Boster (703) 820-1225

Sandy Davis (202) 226-2837

Art French (202) 690-5922

Urie Gottesman (703) 568-5350

Jim Goulden (202) 493-6810

Phil Joyce (202) 994-4071

George Krumbhaar (202) 364-0108

Don Matheson (202) 208-6264

Shelly McAllister (202) 395-3831

Carl Moravitz (703) 207-3998

Gail Zimmerman (202) 395-3882

AABPA WEB MASTER:

Charlie Towle (202) 208-5219

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE

SECRETARY:

Chris Lawson (703) 941-4300
fax: (703) 941-1535

Dr. Paul C. Light Comments on “The New Public Service”

Al Kliman, Reporter

Dr. Light is the director of the Center for Public Service at the Brookings Institution. Dr. Light's topic was the “state of the public service.” He started with two themes:

1. “Public service” encompasses more than just government employees. It also includes the private contractors, non-profit sector, and the faith-based organizations that are also involved in carrying out government programs. These are, he said, as much a part of the public service as any civil servant. He termed this, “the new public service,” and he further characterized it as a service where people are constantly switching between sectors – between private, public, non-profit and faith based
2. Public employees should be motivated primarily by the desire to accomplish something worthwhile. This is true not just for public employees; it applies equally to the private contractors in this world.

Dr. Light criticized the tendency among many gurus to try to bring in practices from the private sector, especially in the context of developing the new Department of Homeland Security. After all, he commented, “What this new Department is about is not making potato chips and salad dressing.” What government could really use, he went on, are some practices from the non-profit sector, which could teach civil servants about making a difference and how to love their jobs. If only the new Department had people like that, it would be greatly advantaged.

Dr. Light posited that there is a serious problem today in the federal civil service. It is populated largely by baby-boomers who thought they were going to be around forever. But the retirement bulge is coming. We have a high velocity turnover on the

front lines. We have a “bathtub effect” between the front lines and the aging cohort of baby boomer ranks. And we have to deal with this. But it is not a threat – it is an opportunity to help reshape the hierarchy and reshape careers so that we can attract them to new public service, hold them a while, and let them come and go as they wish.

Characteristic of a Health Public Service – and How The Federal Civil Service Scores

This part of Dr. Light's discussion was based in large part on a telephone survey of a sample of 80,000 public employees. This was done before Sept 11, 2001, and then repeated with the same group after Sept. 11.

First, a healthy public service comes to work every day for the right reason – the chance to accomplish something worthwhile. The public thinks that most public employees are just looking for security – and many federal employees say that is why they joined it – and they come to work every day for the pay. The fact is that there are many federal employees who really do not know why they are in their jobs in the post 9/11 world. Their leadership is not communicating with those not involved in the war on terrorism. That federal; employees say they come to work for the pay shows a sick public service. Non-profit employees come to work, on the other hand, because they love their jobs – and they are willing to take less money for the chance to do what they are doing.

Second, a healthy public service provides the kinds of jobs that talented Americans want. Federal recruiters are telling him that they are

looking for the top of the bottom quartile. Dr. Light says we are not talking to young Americans about what they want. And for the past 12 years, we have been sending a message to young Americans to not come into public service – employment freezes, buyouts, and outsourcing. His survey shows also that many federal employees do not like their jobs and are telling that to new people. What young people want is the ability to acquire new skills and a place to learn and advance and grow. About a third of young people find this in the private sector – where they also get good salaries that the federal government cannot match. Another large proportion goes to the non-profit sector.

Third, a healthy public service is continually improving, so that, as people leave, you replace them with someone a little better. Federal employees surveyed say this is not happening.

Fourth, a healthy public service gives employees the resources to do their jobs well. Dr. Light says that downsizing and buyouts for the past 12 years has eviscerated capacity in some federal agencies. There is difficulty in accessing technology. There is difficulty in getting access to training. And the buyout program that has eviscerated the top of the federal service has no criterion other than date of birth. In addition, too many things are outsourced. The typical hierarchical structure is disappearing. He asked if the President's management agenda has helped. The response was that "re-inventing" is perceived as making their jobs more difficult. His research shows that, in the private sector, there are a lower percentage of reinventing and a higher percentage of improving resources than in the federal government. He concludes that is not a good thing to continue to propel agencies by re-inventing. He does think there are some good things in the President's management agenda and in the use of scorecards. But the management scorecard is too broad to be of much value, though it *is* colorful. The value

in the management agenda is that agencies will respond to questions budget analysts raise about management.

Fifth, in a healthy public service, employees get rewarded for a job well done. We do not do this very well. Performance appraisal systems do not work well. Almost everyone is "outstanding." Everyone gets the same grade, and there is no recognition of a job well done. There is a lot more poor performance than agencies admit.

Sixth, a healthy public service has the respect and confidence of the people it serves. The public regularly disparages our public service. Witness the recent debate on civil service in connection with the Homeland Security Legislation.

Question And Answer Session

What can we learn from the private sector? Can we learn from the private sector about the need for transparency? The companies that Dr. Light admires have clear missions, share authority downward, and engage in participatory management. And the federal government is not configured for that. Appointees come and go rapidly, and they barely trust the senior staff until they have been there a while. And by the time they get to trust the staff, they are ready to go.

What is Dr. Light's prescription to cure the ills he has recited? Develop multiple career paths in the federal government. Use the coming retirement bulge to reshape hierarchies. Get rid of layers and reduce the distance between the top and the bottom. Develop a strategy to recapture the jobs that are being exited during the retirement bulge. See what you want to do with them. Develop a means to look at those jobs and determine if they should be refilled or reallocated. There are a lot of little things to do as well – including fixing pay compression and organizing around mission rather than stakeholders. Dr. Light said he is working with Paul Volcker in an effort to develop detailed recommendations. ★

Public Financial Publications, Inc.

Public Financial Publications, Inc. (PFP) is a nonprofit corporation headquartered in the District of Columbia. PFP publishes the quarterly professional journal, Public Budgeting and Finance. It was formed by the Association for Budget and Financial Management (part of the American Society for Public Administration) and the American Association for Budget and Program Analysis. The goal is educational, by publishing the journal and also awarding the Jesse Burkhead award. The Board of Directors is a mix of practitioners (from various agencies) and several academics. Its Board is national in scope and the two journal editors are well known academics. PFP's editorial board dots many major educational institutions, professional societies and government entities and its authors are international. The current Board and Officers are:

Margaret Armen, *President*

Ron Boster

Ed Brigham

William Early

John P. Forrester

Thad Juszczak

Tom P. Lauth

Roy Meyers, *Vice President*

Patrick R. Mullen, *Secretary*

Herb Persil

Marvin Phaup, *Treasurer*

Paul Posner

James Savage

William E. Schuerch

Debi Schilling

George H. Strauss

CBO Director Pronounces The Congressional Budget Process Dead

Angela Seitz, Reporter

The federal budget process “is dead,” outgoing Congressional Budget Office director Dan Crippen pronounced at the AABPA Fall Symposium on November 22, 2002. The power to manage the budget has swung back to the President, and Crippen believes it will be some time before the Congress retakes control. This is unfortunate, in his estimation, because of the looming budget problems brought on by the aging baby boom generation.

Crippen walked the audience through the history of the modern budget process, beginning with President Nixon’s efforts to impound appropriated funds and the angry Congressional response. Taking advantage of the President’s by-then-weakened position in 1974, Congress persuaded Nixon to approve the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act. This act swung budgetary power back to the Congress, away from the President.

The Budget Act gave the Congress methods for an “overarching” formulation of the federal budget, which strengthened Congressional responsibility in certain areas. It also created the Congressional Budget Office. Crippen described the law’s requirement for an initial budget resolution at the beginning of the year, to be followed by a second resolution that would take into account significant changes in the economic and/or fiscal outlook. A bill at year’s end would reconcile the budget resolution to actual circumstances, if necessary.

This reconciliation procedure rarely occurred, according to Crippen, and by 1981 reconciliation had evolved into a tool for implementing a range of policy changes.

The budget process had changed from an accounting system with some budgetary controls, to a method for altering national policy. This remained the dominant force behind the budget process for a number of years. Many authorizing committees felt a loss of control to appropriating committees, and their oversight activities diminished as a result, according to Crippen. By this point, the budget process had frustrated most of the parties involved. “It made enemies of the authorizers, the appropriators, and sometimes the leadership,” said Crippen. As a result of this and the waning influence of the budget law’s original proponents, the CBO director suggested the budget process today is dead.

Aside from the resolution process, few other modern enforcement tools remain. Discretionary caps and pay-as-you-go mechanisms expired in September 2002. The Senate extended its legislative pay-as-you-go rules temporarily (until mid-April), but they probably will not be effective. Fiscal 2002 marked only the second year since 1975 in which the Congress failed to adopt a budget resolution. Crippen suggested that this lack of a budget resolution played at least a partial role in the Congress’ failure to pass appropriation bills.

The expiration of budget enforcement mechanisms and the Congressional failure to pass a budget resolution are evidence that much of the budgetary power has swung back to the White House, Crippen said. Without a budget resolution in the Congress, the President’s budget is the driving force. The Congress has let go of the control it wrested away from former President Nixon. It also has become easy for the President to “economically and actually impose his will on the Congress in these matters,” due to the lax oversight by authorizing committees.

While he has expressed interest in reasserting Congressional power over the budget process, Sen. Don Nickles(R-OK), the incoming Senate Budget Committee chairman, may find it difficult to do so, Crippen said. This is not a new situation, but Crippen believes that its timing is particularly unfortunate due to the fiscal demands attributable to the impending retirement of the baby boom generation. “Programs for the elderly will go from currently spending about 7 percent of GDP to somewhere in the neighborhood of 16 percent or 17 percent of GDP,” said Crippen. To handle this increase in expenditures, the federal government will be forced to dramatically raise taxes, cut spending on these or other programs, or borrow from future generations. Without a stronger budget process, Crippen believes the Congress will be unable to respond effectively to this large shift in fiscal policy. ★

Angela Styles Discusses Public-Private Competition

Patrick Mullen, Reporter

Margie Armen introduced Angela B. Styles, OMB's Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, who discussed recent developments regarding the President's management initiative to increase public-private competition for delivery of government services. President Bush nominated Ms. Styles to her current position on April 23, 2001, and the Senate unanimously confirmed her nomination on May 24, 2001.

Ms. Styles said she was very pleased to deliver the counterpoint arguments to those of Paul Light from the morning session. She noted that a draft of the Bush administration's revamped Circular A-76, which details how agencies conduct public-private competitions for federal work, was published Nov. 15 in the Federal Register. Comments from the public will be accepted for 30 days and OMB will publish the final circular soon thereafter. The new circular shortens the time frame for public-private competitions and allows for consideration of factors other than lowest cost when making a contract award. Styles said she thinks both industry and government will embrace the new procedures outlined in the revised circular. "We've tried to make a faster, cheaper process that in the end provides a better deal for the taxpayer. We tried to create an environment where we can force more competition in commercial activities performed in the federal government and make sure the process works well for agencies, federal employees and the private sector," she said.

Ms. Styles pointed out that publication of the revised A-76 circular comes six months after the Commercial Activities Panel (CAP) finished its work. The CAP was comprised of the Comptroller General and GAO support, and a

group of government, industry, academic, and federal employee union representatives. The CAP recommended sweeping changes to the A-76 process, which is widely seen as too lengthy, costly and unfair to both government and industry. Ms. Styles said the new circular mirrors the CAP recommendations. The panel called for the government to replace the A-76 process with a new competitive procedure based largely on the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR). Federal officials have said government workers often don't have the training necessary to compete for their jobs, while industry representatives have argued that federal agencies can't fully account for their costs, which puts the private sector at a competitive disadvantage.

The new circular outlines two proposed processes for conducting public-private competitions for government work that is commercial in nature. One procedure mirrors the process by which private sector firms compete for federal work under rules laid out in the FAR. This process allows for consideration of best value, not just lowest cost, when awarding a contract. Initially, the FAR-based process will be used in competitions for information technology work, for any type of new work that has never been performed by federal employees, and for any type of work that is being expanded at least 30 percent. Agencies can also ask OMB for permission to use the FAR process for other types of work. The second process, which is similar to the existing A-76 process, allows for contract awards based on lowest cost. Use of the first process will be limited until officials can see how it works in practice.

Ms. Styles said private-sector companies often declined to compete for work put up for competition under

A-76 because the process took three to four years. The new process should change that, she said. In the new circular, OMB calls for agencies to complete public-private competitions within a year. Agencies will be required to issue solicitations within eight months after announcing competitions, and will be required to make contract awards four months after the solicitations are issued.

Ms. Styles concluded by saying that through the new A-76 process the administration is "trying to achieve best value for the taxpayer." In addition, however, she also noted "This is not a thinly veiled attempt to reduce the federal work force. This is going to make us better managers." The final result is intended to get a larger base of suppliers, better service, and lower cost for the taxpayers in the delivery of government services.

A question was asked if OMB was working with OPM in order to get the staff with the proper skills to oversee contracts. Ms. Styles said that they are working on the human capital aspects to make sure the resources and people are in place in order to do the competitions and oversee the resulting contracts. Another question dealt with whether agencies will be allowed to retain any savings realized through the competitions. Ms. Styles said it is the intent that agencies will keep the savings, which is different than from past practice, but we will have to see if Congress agrees in the appropriations process. A final question dealt with how you determine what is inherently governmental vs. commercial. Ms. Styles said the administration is starting from the presumption that a lot of what people do in the federal government is not inherently governmental and can be competed out to the private sector. ★

Creating The Department of Homeland Security: Structural and Oversight Issues

Victoria Allred, Reporter

In the months after the September 11th terrorist attacks, demand for a new agency to combat terrorism and protect the United States grew. The President proposed the new Department in the summer of 2002, and after six months of congressional debate, he signed a bill creating the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). For most Americans, DHS began operations immediately. However, the largest reorganization of the Federal government since the 1940s cannot succeed overnight.

As the DHS bill moved to enactment, an AABPA panel convened to address the fundamental issues facing DHS. The four panelists and moderator Gail Zimmerman of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) discussed how DHS will affect discussions about federal spending priorities, the definition of homeland security, DHS' creation of a departmental mission and culture, and the practical implementation of the new Department.

Cost of DHS and Its Impact on Other Long-Term Federal Priorities

The Administration has argued that the creation of DHS will not increase federal spending and will produce savings with the integration of financial management, administrative systems, and security activities. Panelist Beth Robinson, Deputy Assistant Director of Budget Review and Concepts at OMB, pointed out that the spending on homeland security activities had doubled since September 11th and that much of predicted increases in homeland security spending are already included in the federal budget. The creation

of a new Department might actually produce administrative savings in the long-term as similar agencies providing homeland security could combine their administrative costs.

However, several panelists questioned the cost-neutral status of DHS and agreed the long-term costs may be in the billions of dollars. Panelist Matt Schmit, an analyst at the Congressional Budget Office, discussed how the new function of homeland security will affect government-wide priorities. Schmitt argued the long-term financial costs of DHS and homeland security activities may impinge on other government priorities. The new threats to American security will significantly affect the federal budget and will require a reassessment of national priorities such as education, prescription drugs benefits, and defense spending.

Defining Homeland Security

Defining homeland security spending is a major challenge facing Congress and the Administration. Spending for Homeland Security activities is spread across budget functions, accounts, and agencies, even after the creation of DHS. Currently only two-thirds of spending on homeland security activities are within DHS. The panelists concurred that this division of labor will affect the mission and success of DHS. DHS will face significant hurdles in coordinating agencies on homeland security activities.

Panelist Denise Fantone, Assistant Director for Strategic Issues at the General Accounting Office, suggested that how the new Department handles the non-Homeland Security functions such as

flood relief and maritime safety will also be an important indicator of its success. Will those non-Homeland Security functions get adequate support and visibility? Congress, too, remains focused on these functions, and may provide a thorn in DHS' side as it sets its priorities and strategy.

The Initial Transition and the Creature of a DHS Culture

Panelist Robert Gardner, Associate Undersecretary for Finance and Administration at the Transportation Security Administration, addressed the basic problems that any new department has to face: how to pay people, how to create a mission and strategy from scratch, how to employ the right people, and how to resolve the clash of work cultures. His recent experience in creating a new agency alerted him to the pitfalls DHS faces, especially in communicating its mission and integrating a diverse workforce. Ms. Fantone echoed the importance of the initial transition period, suggesting DHS' long-term success is dependent on this period, particularly its ability to articulate its mission and core values to the public and its workforce. DHS will also have to work on the national strategy for homeland security, especially assessing security risks and setting security priorities.

On March 1 DHS became an official agency. However, the challenges and obstacles that the four panelists raised were not resolved immediately. The success of DHS and its formative months and years will present new challenges to budget and program analysts. ★

The Role of Federal, State and Local Government in Homeland Security: Who Sets the Standards? Who Foots the Bill?

Gregory R. Waring, Jr., Reporter

The Fall 2002 Symposium featured an afternoon panel of federal and state government representatives that discussed the intergovernmental coordination necessary for a national homeland security strategy. The participants of "The Role of Federal, State, and Local Government in Homeland Security: Who Sets the Standards? Who Foots the Bill?" included George W. Foresman, Deputy Assistant to the Governor of Virginia for Commonwealth Preparedness; Frank Shafroth, Director of the Office of State-Federal Relations at the National Governors' Association; and Thomas James, Assistant Director in the Strategic Issues group at the U.S. General Accounting Office. Since state and local governments will continue to serve a variety of roles in homeland security, all of the speakers highlighted the importance of the federal government in providing national direction in standards and funding. Specifically, the country's homeland security strategy should include:

- Clear communications from the federal government,
- Federal funding that is consistent and flexible, and
- Performance measures that account for agency interactions and program implementation progress.

Considering the large number of potential actors in federal, state, and local government, it will be vital for the federal government to effectively and efficiently communicate with those involved in the homeland security effort. George Foresman said the creation of the Department of Homeland Security will present a challenge to federal-state/local communication. In order for state and local officials to receive clear, non-conflicting program instructions, the

congressional committees with oversight over the smaller pieces of the Department, and the cooperating federal agencies, must avoid power struggles and turf wars. The Department needs to speak in one voice when directing first responders, program administrators, and local officials. Further, any directions and resources the states receive from the federal government should flow through the governors' offices. This will ensure that information and funding are placed in the right hands. Tom James echoed this point by stating that many states have developed their own domestic security infrastructures, with the governor at the top of the hierarchy. Several of the state domestic security plans were put in place as a response to the events of September 11th. If the federal government grants funding directly to local programs, the state's own priorities may not be realized and competition for federal resources, instead of coordination, may develop within state boundaries.

Federal funding of state and local communication system upgrades (common incident management systems, for example), additional manpower, and new programs is not a foregone conclusion. Frank Shafroth notes that the fundamental question in homeland security policy is: Who is paying for what needs to be done? Considering the falling revenues of most state governments, the resulting struggle to maintain the effort of existing programs, and unfunded mandates from the federal government in other policy areas, it would be difficult for state and local officials to make new commitments to homeland security. For example, how do state and local officials balance contributions to homeland security with the unfunded mandates contained in the election reform legislation?

Where should state and local priorities be? Further, if federal funding to support state and local programs does materialize, how long will the partnership last? States will be reluctant to invest in infrastructure and new programs if they will be unable to maintain the additions with uncertain federal support in the future. Federal support for state and local actors needs to be consistent.

If the federal government provides funding to support state and local homeland security efforts, states should have flexibility in the use of those resources. Foresman suggests that states should be able to expand their proposed security missions from terrorism to a comprehensive hazard approach. States are just as concerned about natural disasters, school safety, cyber-crime, foreign animal disease, energy shortages, and special event planning (the Olympic games, for example).

Finally, the Department of Homeland Security, state and local officials, and oversight bodies (congressional committees, the GAO, state legislatures) will have to work together to create performance measures for homeland security programs. With the large number of actors and the cooperation (perhaps dependency) needed between different entities to achieve specific outcomes, the development of targeted performance measures for an organization will be very difficult. Tom James believes that, contrary to GAO practice, performance measures will begin few in number in order to get a handle on program implementation issues. A phase-in will allow officials to develop new programs and bring existing programs up to speed with the national strategy for homeland security. James points out that although there

continued on page 9

How to Become a Certified Government Financial Manager

By Patrick Mullen, Reporter

Budget and program analysts interested in becoming a Certified Government Financial Manager (CGFM) can improve their career development opportunities by achieving certification. Even someone who is not an accountant is able to qualify based on budget and program analysis work. This article is a summary of a past presentation at an AABPA symposium for those who are interested in pursuing certification. The panel included:

- Charlie Culkin, a former Assistant Director of GAO's Budget Concepts Group and currently Executive Director of the Association of Government Accountants (AGA), which administers the certification program, who would discuss the certification process;
- Herb Persil, consultant and former budget director at HUD, to discuss efforts several years ago by himself and other AABPA members to establish a certification program for budget and program analysts and provide his thoughts on professional certification; and
- Patrick Mullen, Senior Analyst at GAO, AABPA Vice President for Communications, and a CGFM.

Mr. Culkin provided history of the (CGFM) program, which began in 1994 to recognize the importance of professional financial management; and in response to the call for professionals who can lead the way to a more accountable and effective government. The CGFM program responds to this need by measuring a wide range of knowledge and skills, and the test requires extensive knowledge in a wide variety of functional areas.

Candidates must pass three tests, which were written by government financial management experts to address special knowledge needs of

today's government financial manager, within a five-year period. They must also possess a Bachelor's degree with 24 hours of study in financial management courses and two years of professional experience. Those passing the tests must adhere to AGA's Code of Ethics and fulfill continuing professional education (CPE) requirements.

Mr. Culkin said the CGFM provides the first certification broad enough to cover the entire field of government financial management, and currently there are over 13,000 people who have obtained CGFM status. He said the benefits to your employer of your being a CGFM include enhanced prestige and credibility of financial management staff, which builds public confidence in agency program administration. The individual's benefits by becoming a CGFM include providing a roadmap for personal growth; helping attain professional goals; and providing a credential that carries across government and beyond government service. Earning a CGFM is the mark of professional excellence and certification is transferable across agencies and government levels. Your agency may change, your job may change, but the CGFM, like a college degree, remains constant.

Mr. Persil said he thought the CGFM is a tremendous program. The preparation required to study for examination is demanding and the examination itself is formidable. You need to be serious about financial management in order to consider going through the CGFM process. Looking at certification from the point of view of someone who makes hiring decisions, the CGFM denotes a positive part of an applicant's resume and indicates someone who is serious about their profession. He said he had some questions about the examination from his perspective as a budget professional, such as how universal

the examination and certification processes should be. Perhaps the examination attempts to be too universal in that the process covers both the federal and the local levels of government. Even in the federal budget section of the examination, there may be a need for more specialization because of the amount of detail that is needed to prepare someone for a specific area. This is not to argue against a general examination, but to say that the budget professional may also have to augment the CGFM process with more specific training or other options. Perhaps another certification process should be considered for the more specialized fields of budgeting. He asked if the preparers of the CGFM examination had taken into consideration the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program's (JFMIP) core competencies for budget analysts.

Mr. Mullen said he had a copy of the JFMIP core competencies for people to see at the break. He thought the CGFM test designers were also involved in developing the core competencies, saying this was a good way to open for questions by asking Mr. Culkin about Mr. Persil's observations and questions. Mr. Culkin said he agreed with Mr. Persil's observations and the designers of the CGFM program debated considering the number of topics and level of detail to cover in the examination. The core competencies were a factor in deciding what to include in the budgeting section of the exam. In addition, several members of the audience asked questions about the CGFM process and brochures about becoming a CGFM were distributed to those in attendance and are also available from AGA. Information on the CGFM process is also available on

continued on page 9

PFP Grant Opportunities Available

Public Financial Publications, Inc., the firm that publishes your journal, *Public Budgeting and Finance*, has funds available to make one or more grants to support projects that will promote education, professional improvement or policy analysis in the areas of budgeting, taxation, program analysis or related fields. If you have a project you would like to see funded, send a short narrative to the Board of Directors explaining your proposal and the amount it would cost. Be sure to include a statement of the benefit your project would have on our profession. Two to 4 grants of \$5,000 to \$10,000 are being considered. Selection criteria and selection will be at the complete discretion of the Board. To be considered, please submit your proposal no later than May 15. The Board of Directors will acknowledge receipt of all proposals. Email proposals to PFP Secretary Pat Mullen, mullenp@gao.gov or to AABPA@aol.com for forwarding. Thank you.

The Role of Federal, State and Local Government in Homeland Security: Who Sets the Standards? Who Foots the Bill?

from page 7

is no baseline set of measures for this type of strategy, current police and fire performance models should provide a start. Frank Shafroth did interject that without federal funding, the ability of the Department of Homeland Security and other federal bodies to create performance targets for state and local actors would be in question.

Since state and local actors play such a vital role in the country's homeland security strategy (emergency response, public health information, transportation security, etc.), it is important for the federal government to provide clear direction, flexible and consistent financial support, and sensible performance measures to the states. Considering the daunting task of creating the Department of Homeland Security and bringing all of the non-federal actors into the larger security strategy, the speakers offered some advice to the incoming secretary of the Department. The Secretary should continue to focus on intergovernmental relationships. Tom Ridge, the current Director of Homeland Security, has done a good job thus far. Relationship management is especially important because the new Department and the overall strategy will not create cost savings or efficiencies in the short term. The Secretary should work hard to manage the expectations of the actors and the public. Full implementation of the national strategy will take some time due to financial, physical, and political limitations. ★

How to Become a Certified Government Financial Manager

from page 8

the AGA web site. Contact AGA at 800-AGA-7211 or www.agacgfm.org. Copies of the Core Competencies for Budget Analysts in the Federal Government are available from JFMIP (through GAO reports distribution at 202-512-6000) and are also on the JFMIP site at www.financenet.gov. ★

DILBERT BY SCOTT ADAMS



DILBERT reprinted by permission of United Feature Syndicate, Inc.



Departing CBO Director Dan Crippen discusses his thoughts on the budget process during the luncheon address.



Ed Brigham introduces Paul Light from the Brookings Institution to get the Fall symposium off to a rousing start.



Gail Makinen receives the Jesse Burkhead award for best article in Public Budgeting and Finance.



Ed Brigham presents Nick Stoer an award for his years of service as AABPA Treasurer/Secretary.



OMB's Angela Styles discusses the Administration's contracting out proposals, after being introduced by Margie Armen.



GAO's Gail MacColl and former OMB executive Jonathan Breul discuss the Program Assessment Reporting Tool (PART).



Gail Zimmerman convened a panel of OMB, GAO and agency representatives to talk about the establishment of the new Department of Homeland Security.



AABPA Vice President for Symposia Joan McKean talks to Gail MacColl about logistics before the PART panel discussion gets underway.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR BUDGET & PROGRAM ANALYSIS

P.O. BOX 1157
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041

Return address correction requested