



United States  
General Accounting Office  
Washington, D.C. 20548

160550

Resources, Community, and  
Economic Development Division

B-279997

May 28, 1998

The Honorable F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.  
Chairman, Committee on Science  
House of Representatives

Subject: Results Act: Observations on DOE's Annual Performance Plan for  
Fiscal Year 1999

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As requested, this report summarizes our observations on the Department of Energy's (DOE) annual performance plan for fiscal year 1999, which was submitted to the Congress in February 1998. As you know, the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (the Results Act) requires federal agencies, beginning with fiscal year 1999, to prepare annual performance plans covering the program activities set out in their budgets. To analyze DOE's performance plan, we condensed the requirements in the Results Act into three basic questions: (1) To what extent does the agency's performance plan provide a clear picture of intended performance across the agency? (2) How well does the performance plan discuss the strategies and resources that the agency will use to achieve its performance goals? (3) To what extent does the agency's performance plan provide confidence that its performance information will be credible?<sup>1</sup>

In summary, we found that DOE's performance plan for fiscal year 1999 (1) partially addresses annual performance issues across the Department, (2) partially discusses how the Department's strategies and resources will help achieve DOE's annual performance goals, and (3) partially provides confidence

---

<sup>1</sup>These questions are based on the criteria in the Results Act, the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) guidance to federal agencies on developing their plans, and a December 17, 1997, letter to OMB from eight congressional leaders on their expectations for these plans.

160550

that its performance information is credible. One of the plan's strengths is that its annual goals and measures cover mission-critical management problems and issues. In addition, the annual performance plan contains a mission statement and strategic goals, as identified in DOE's strategic plan. However, we believe that opportunities exist to improve the performance plan. These opportunities include providing a clearer picture of intended performance departmentwide by enhancing the annual goals to better define expected performance, specifying further how the annual performance goals and the structure of DOE's program activities described in its budget are related, and describing how DOE plans to coordinate with other agencies having similar strategic or performance goals. DOE should also elaborate more on how its strategies and resources will help achieve its goals by showing more clearly how its strategies are related to the annual performance goals and should discuss the resources it will need to achieve them. In addition, DOE could increase the validity of its performance information by elaborating further on how the Department will help ensure that its performance information is sufficiently complete, accurate, and consistent—specifically, by identifying significant data limitations and their implications for assessing the achievement of its performance goals.

On April 20, 1998, we received written comments on a draft of these observations from DOE's Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs (see enc. II). DOE generally agreed with the observations, stating that many of our recommended improvements were thoughtful and will greatly benefit DOE's continued efforts to improve its implementation of the Results Act. However, DOE believes that our analysis should have included some commentary on the Department's overall approach to strategic planning. DOE noted that it has established a departmentwide system to rationalize its approach to implementing the Results Act and other management reforms. According to DOE, this system provides clear linkages from strategic planning to annual performance planning, to annual budgets, and to performance reporting. In addition, DOE also offered several technical corrections that were incorporated. A list of related GAO products appears at the end of this report.

-----

We conducted our work from February through April 1998 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. We are sending copies of this report to the appropriate congressional committees; the Secretary of Energy; and the Director, Office of Management and Budget. We will also make copies available to others on request.

B-279997

If you or your staff have any questions about this report, please call me at (202) 512-3841. Major contributors to this report were Jeffrey E. Heil and Gary Malavenda.

Sincerely yours,



Susan D. Kladiva  
Associate Director, Energy,  
Resources, and Science

Enclosures - 2

OBSERVATIONS ON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN

The following presents our detailed observations concerning how well the Department of Energy's (DOE) fiscal year 1999 performance plan addresses the three basic questions inherent in the Results Act: (1) To what extent does the agency's performance plan provide a clear picture of intended performance across the agency? (2) How well does the performance plan discuss the strategies and the resources that the agency will use to achieve its performance goals? (3) To what extent does the agency's performance plan provide confidence that its performance information will be credible?

DOE'S PERFORMANCE PLAN PARTIALLY ADDRESSES ANNUAL PERFORMANCE ISSUES ACROSS THE DEPARTMENT

Overall, we found that DOE's performance plan for fiscal year 1999 partially addresses annual performance issues departmentwide. The annual performance goals and measures contained in the plan cover mission-critical management problems or issues, and the plan contains a mission statement and strategic goals as identified in the Department's strategic plan. However, the annual performance plan could show a clearer relationship between annual performance goals and measures and DOE's program activity structure in its budget presentation. Finally, the performance plan falls short in addressing how DOE plans to coordinate with other agencies having related strategic or performance goals.

Defining Expected Performance

DOE's performance plan partially provides a clear picture of the intended performance for subsequent comparison with the actual performance. Specifically, the annual goals cover mission-critical management problems or issues and, in some cases, adequately indicate the progress toward performance. In other instances, however, the annual goals allow too much interpretation. In addition, while some of the annual goals are objective, measurable, and quantifiable, others are not. Also, many annual performance goals and measures are output-focused (i.e., the goals are expressed as the services or the goods produced) when they could be more outcome-oriented (i.e., the goals could be expressed as the results of the services or the goods produced).

According to its annual plan, DOE uses measures that incorporate both the performance measures (i.e., the units) and the performance goals (i.e., the amounts) that define the expected program performance. For example, one of DOE's fiscal year 1999 measures and goals is deactivating about 39 surplus nuclear facilities. In this example, the performance measure is deactivating surplus nuclear facilities, and the performance goal is deactivating about 39 of them. Most of the performance goals were taken directly from DOE's strategic plan and cover mission-critical management problems or issues. However, as we have indicated in previous reports, many of DOE's performance

measures appear limited in scope, are unclear, or are not very useful indicators of performance.<sup>2</sup> For example, we questioned the usefulness of DOE's indicators of how its programs will affect the economy's vulnerability to disruptions in the oil supply. In addressing this issue in its performance plan, DOE presents six strategies and related measures. The first strategy requires DOE to support research and development, policies, and improved regulatory practices to help end the decline in domestic oil production before 2005. Under this strategy, one of DOE's annual goals and related measures of success is for DOE to demonstrate four advanced technologies for enhancing production that could ultimately add about 190 million barrels of domestic reserves, including about 30 million barrels during fiscal year 1999. As we reported, DOE's measures to increase production to reduce oil imports had little effect on the dependency of the U.S. economy on oil imports. We do not believe that this measure is a very useful indicator of how DOE's programs will affect the economy's vulnerability to disruptions in the nation's oil supply because it is not expressed in terms that measure vulnerability. Neither does it consider projected increases in the global demand for oil and other potential changes in the world's economy that could affect the vulnerability of the U.S. economy.

DOE's plan partially provides annual goals that are objective, measurable, and quantifiable. However, we also found examples of annual goals that promote subjective considerations; do not include a quantifiable, numerical target level; or do not describe the level of intended performance. For example, one annual performance goal and measure is increasing activities to remove the barriers to U.S. companies in energy efficiency, renewables, oil and gas recovery, and clean coal technology markets, in China, Indonesia, the Philippines, Brazil, India, South Africa, as well as newly independent countries and other developing economies. In our opinion, this goal is too vague because it does not provide a quantifiable performance target. Furthermore, the goal does not provide any definitions of the existing barriers, list which ones will be removed during the fiscal year, or include the criteria for knowing that they have been removed.

Many of DOE's goals and measures do not provide or refer to baseline or trend data to allow for the goals to be measured in terms of improvement. For example, the annual measure "expanding the use of risk assessments, cost-benefit analyses, and other tools in setting technology R&D [research and development] priorities" does not describe the baseline to be used to measure success. Finally, many of the plan's goals are output-focused rather than outcome-oriented. Whenever possible, the plan should include

---

<sup>2</sup>Managing for Results: Agencies Performance Plans Can Help Address Strategic Planning Challenges (GAO/GGD-98-44, Jan. 30, 1998); Results Act: Observations on the Department of Energy's August 15, 1997, Draft Strategic Plan (GAO/RCED-97-248R, Sept. 2, 1997); and Results Act: Observations on the Department of Energy's Draft Strategic Plan (GAO/RCED-97-199R, July 11, 1997).

outcome goals. For example, one of DOE's outcome-oriented goals for national security is to ensure that radiation exposure to workers or the public from naval reactor activities are within federal limits and that no significant adverse findings result from environmental inspections by state and federal regulators. However, most of DOE's intended performance is represented by output goals and not outcome goals. For example, the goals and the measures for producing 200 canisters of high-level waste at the Defense Waste Processing Facility at the Savannah River Site, completing two nationwide solar technology "Super-ESPCs" for use by all federal agencies, and weatherizing 78,000 homes bringing the total number of homes weatherized to 4.7 million are outputs—not outcomes. These goals and measures could be expressed as outcomes by communicating the results of the services and goods produced by achieving them.

### Connecting Mission, Goals, and Activities

DOE's annual performance plan generally links the annual goals to the Department's mission, the goals in its strategic goals, and its program activities with its budget request. Overall, the plan contains the mission statement and the strategic goals that are in the strategic plan. Many of the performance measures in DOE's annual performance plan are also taken directly from its strategic plan.

To link DOE's mission, goals, and objectives to the performance plan, that plan uses the same structure as the Department's strategic plan and has the identical mission statement, business lines, and strategic goals and objectives. DOE's performance plan generally relates the program activities in its budget request to its performance goals. The performance plan contains a matrix showing which program activities support each of its strategic objectives. Although each of the strategic objectives is associated with several performance goals, the plan does not show any connection between DOE's corporate management goals and specific program activities in its budget. According to the plan, because all programs participate in the corporate management area, no table was provided. DOE officials explained that because the business line for corporate management supports so many of the annual performance plan's goals and measures, it was impractical to try and include a matrix to show the relationships. Without this connection, however, the budgetary resources needed to fund the program activities to achieve DOE's corporate management performance goals are unclear. DOE can improve its performance plan by showing a more specific relationship between DOE's program activities and its annual performance goals for corporate management.

Because the performance plan uses strategic goals as the basis for linking program activities and performance goals, assessing how specific program activities affect the achievement of DOE's annual performance goals can be difficult. For example, the matrix in the performance plan indicates that the budgeted program/decision unit entitled Environmental Management Privatization helps support six of seven strategic objectives

within the environmental quality business line. Although these six objectives contain over 20 annual performance goals and measures, we identified only one that contained any reference to privatization. A senior policy officer in DOE's Office of Strategic Planning, Budget and Program Evaluation told us that the remaining annual goals and measures were related to privatization, although the link may not be obvious. For example, we could not make the same connection for the measure, "completing 456 release site assessments," which is not obviously linked to privatization.

### Recognizing Crosscutting Efforts

Overall, DOE's annual performance plan falls short of showing coordination with other agencies that have related strategic or performance goals. Its plan contains very little evidence of specific goals and measures that address crosscutting programs and only briefly describes coordination with other agencies. As we previously reported,<sup>3</sup> DOE's mission involves or overlaps those of other agencies. For example, basic research is also performed by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Commerce; environmental and energy resources issues are also addressed by the Environmental Protection Agency and other agencies; and nuclear weapons production is done to fulfill the requirements of the Department of Defense. While DOE's strategic plan states that DOE is committed to continuing to work closely with other federal agencies and with OMB and the Congress, DOE's annual performance plan does not identify annual performance goals for these crosscutting efforts. Furthermore, its performance plan does not clearly describe efforts to coordinate with other agencies. DOE's Office of Strategic Planning, Budget and Program Evaluation officials told us that a description of coordination efforts was not included because they believe that it belongs in the strategic plan. In addition, the officials stated that also including it in the annual performance plan might result in a voluminous document that would deter that plan's use. However, we believe that DOE can improve its annual performance plan by clearly identifying agencies that share responsibilities in any crosscutting efforts and discussing how they are coordinated with the other agencies.

### DOE'S PERFORMANCE PLAN PARTIALLY DISCUSSES HOW DOE'S STRATEGIES AND RESOURCES WILL HELP ACHIEVE ITS GOALS

DOE's annual performance plan did not provide specific annual strategies. However, the plan did use the multiyear strategies from its strategic plan to show how it intends to

---

<sup>3</sup>GAO/RCED-97-199R and GAO/GGD-98-44.

accomplish its goals for fiscal year 1999. The plan partially describes the resources that DOE will use to achieve its performance.

#### Connecting Strategies to Results

In general, DOE's annual performance plan partially provides clear and reasonable strategies for achieving the Department's annual performance goals. Specifically, the plan does not clearly explain how those strategies will contribute to achieving the DOE's performance goals. While not required, the plan does not discuss the key external factors that might affect performance during fiscal year 1999; although DOE's strategic plan did include such a discussion. We believe that the absence of this discussion reduces the likelihood that decisionmakers will clearly understand how DOE intends to use or mitigate these external factors to achieve its performance goals. According to officials from the Office of Strategic Planning, Budget and Program Evaluation, such discussions should occur in the strategic plan and not the annual performance plan. Their goal was to not duplicate information from the strategic plan and to avoid overwhelming the reader with a long performance plan. We believe that DOE's performance plan would be more useful if it described the important external factors that are likely to affect DOE's fiscal year 1999 performance and also discussed how DOE will mitigate or use those factors in achieving its performance goals.

#### Connecting Resources to Strategies

DOE's annual performance plan partially identifies the resources needed to accomplish its annual performance goals. For each of DOE's business lines, the performance plan includes tables that show requested budgetary authority and personnel (expressed as full-time equivalent staff), by program unit. However, the performance plan only partially describes DOE's capital requirements and the technical skills that are needed to achieve its performance goals and related benefits.

Although not required by the Results Act, DOE could improve the usefulness of its performance plan by more directly indicating the relationship between requested budgetary resources and program results. This could be done by allocating the funding levels from each of the program activities in its budget request to its annual performance goals in the annual performance plan. As we reported in April 1998, the Acting Director, Office of Strategic Planning, Budget and Program Evaluation, told us that the annual performance plan does not need to provide this level of specificity because DOE's budget request is performance-based.<sup>4</sup> However, DOE acknowledged that better linkage is

---

<sup>4</sup>Results Act: DOE Can Improve Linkages Among Plans and Between Resources and Performance (GAO/RCED-98-94, Apr. 14, 1998).

needed and that the Department has started to document the linkage between the annual performance plan and the resources requested in its budget.

While DOE's annual performance plan partially discusses the capital assets needed, it does not describe how they will contribute to achieving specific performance goals. For example, DOE's contractor-operated laboratories have at least 55 supercomputers and have plans to acquire more, but the performance plan does not explain how these additional supercomputers will affect DOE's performance. The plan would be more useful if it (1) referenced related asset plans and briefly described new capital acquisitions that might significantly affect the achievement of DOE's performance goals and (2) discussed how the needed assets could reduce program costs, increase productivity, decrease cycle or processing time, improve service quality, or increase customer satisfaction.

DOE's annual performance plan partially discusses needed human resources and technical skills for its federal and contractor workforce. The plan briefly describes the human resources and the technical skills needed, but not how they will help achieve DOE's performance goals. As far back as 1991, we raised concerns over problems that related to insufficient technical staff in DOE's carrying out of its programs and oversight functions.<sup>5</sup> Recent examples indicate that this problem continues. For example, in July 1997, we reported that one of the reasons why DOE chose to privatize its cleanup activity at its Idaho facility was the lack of internal expertise to evaluate the related technical proposals.<sup>6</sup> In October 1997, DOE reported that it still faced challenges in getting needed skilled employees to manage its contracts.<sup>7</sup>

**DOE'S ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN PARTIALLY PROVIDES SUFFICIENT CONFIDENCE THAT THE DEPARTMENT'S PERFORMANCE INFORMATION WILL BE CREDIBLE**

Overall, DOE's annual performance plan partially meets the criteria to provide sufficient confidence that its performance information will be credible. While the plan discusses the validation and verification of DOE's performance, it does not explain how the

---

<sup>5</sup>Federal Management: Overview of Major Management Issues Facing Executive Agencies (GAO-OCG-98-1R, Jan. 1998).

<sup>6</sup>Nuclear Waste: Department of Energy's Project to Clean Up Pit 9 at Idaho Falls Is Experiencing Problems (GAO/RCED-97-180, July 28, 1997).

<sup>7</sup>Assessment of the Use of Performance-Based Incentives in Performance-Based Management and Management and Integration Contracts, Office of Procurement and Assistance Management, DOE (Oct. 1997).

Department will ensure that significant errors do not occur during data collection, maintenance, processing, management, and analysis. In addition, the plan does not identify data limitations and their implications for assessing the achievement of DOE's performance goals.

### Verifying and Validating Performance

DOE's performance plan generally discusses how the Department will ensure that its performance information is sufficiently complete, accurate, and consistent. The plan describes the responsibility for verification and validation pursuant to its performance measures. Specifically, the plan describes a performance measure-reporting structure in which the heads of program offices responsible for performance commitments will take actions to validate the data for their performance measurement information and maintain support documentation to help ensure the data's accuracy and reliability. Under this structure, DOE will issue guidance and offer training to program offices to clearly delineate their specific roles and responsibilities for preparing performance information that will be included in DOE's required annual reporting package for its financial statement. The performance plan refers to this package as an annual performance report.

Furthermore, in conjunction with the annual audit of DOE's financial statements, the plan states that heads of departmental units will be required to prepare and sign management representation letters to attest to the accuracy and reliability of performance results as well the validity of the financial information. The Inspector General's (IG) annual audit of the financial statements will provide an independent assessment of the performance information included in the reporting package for the financial statement.

Notwithstanding these issues, which we consider to be the strengths of the verification and validation section, the plan does not discuss the details of the procedures that DOE plans to use to help ensure the quality of data, such as the quality controls for automated information systems. In addition, the plan does not provide information on procedures specific to the data required for performance measures proposed in the plan, including both data gathered on an ongoing or on a periodic basis. Furthermore, the plan's validation and verification section focuses almost entirely on controls over reporting and not over the management and the process of data collection itself (except for a brief reference to reviewing records). According to DOE officials, such details were not provided because it is inappropriate for a department-level performance plan and because the Results Act does not require it.

### Recognizing Data Limitations

DOE's annual performance plan does not identify significant data limitations and their implications for assessing the achievement of its performance goals. Specifically, while

the plan includes a section on validation and verification, it does not (1) describe known data limitations, (2) indicate when performance data come from external sources, or (3) reference any significant new information systems or major changes to existing systems that have been proposed to make more credible data available for performance measures.

DOE's plan does not identify and describe the specific data required and the means for collecting, maintaining, and analyzing them. While DOE does not identify data limitations, the plan does acknowledge that data collection and validation efforts can be improved. In our July 1997 report, we noted several weaknesses in the information systems that DOE used to track performance measures.<sup>8</sup> For example, one of DOE's corporate management goals and measures is to prevent fatalities, or serious accidents and environmental accidents or releases at departmental sites. However, in our July 1997 report, we noted that DOE's IG was concerned that the Department's computerized accident reporting system underreports the number of significant work-related illnesses and injuries.

DOE's recent IG reports have noted weaknesses related to financial performance information. For example, in May 1997 and more recently in February 1998, DOE's IG reported that some performance measurement data included in the Overview of the Consolidated Financial Statements were not consistently reported, contained inaccurate information, and/or were not always adequately supported.<sup>9</sup> In addition, in June 1997, DOE's IG reported that (1) the Department and its contractors had not implemented systems to effectively identify, collect, and disseminate scientific and technical information on a life-cycle basis, as required, and (2) the Office of Scientific and Technical Information was not receiving all scientific and technical information generated by DOE's contractors.<sup>10</sup>

DOE's annual performance plan should also indicate when performance data come from external sources. Although most of DOE's work is completed by external contractors, the plan states that data sources are within the program offices that perform the work. The Acting Director, Office of Strategic Planning, Budget and Program Evaluation, told us that DOE relies on internal procedures to ensure that its data are accurate. However, a recent

---

<sup>8</sup>GAO/RCED-97-199R.

<sup>9</sup>Audit of the U.S. Department of Energy's Consolidated Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 1996 (Inspector General, DOE, CR-FS-97-02, May 1, 1997) and Audit of the U.S. Department of Energy's Consolidated Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 1997 (Inspector General, DOE, IG-FS-98-01, Feb. 26, 1998).

<sup>10</sup>Audit of the Department of Energy's Scientific and Technical Information Process (DOE/IG-0407, June 17, 1997).

DOE review found that many of its field organizations lacked adequate systems to provide data and information on the costs and the performance.<sup>11</sup> That DOE review also noted that there was a general overreliance on unvalidated contractors' systems to provide that data. The review noted instances where DOE did not have adequate resources or systems to develop performance and cost objectives as well as validation techniques. Accordingly, field offices had to rely on contractors' expertise and systems to supplement DOE's resources. Although the contractors' work was monitored by federal employees, the general lack of sufficient resources and independent systems reduces the effectiveness of contract administration in this area.

In addition, DOE does not reference any significant new information systems or major changes to existing systems that have been proposed to make more credible data available for performance measures. For example, the plan does not discuss a proposed Office of Environmental Management's electronic management system, which is intended to tie budgetary resources to the expected level of performance. However, DOE officials told us that this system was still too early in the conceptual phase to be described in the performance plan.

Moreover, while the plan mentions changes to make computer systems Year 2000 compliant, it does not discuss planned changes that are behind schedule and their related implications for measuring performance. For example, in February 1998, DOE reported that its Savannah River Site has six of eight critical systems that will not meet the March 1999 goal to have federal computer systems Year 2000 compliant.<sup>12</sup> According to DOE, the most recent data indicate that the number of critical systems that will not meet this goal has been reduced to five.

#### OTHER OBSERVATIONS

In another matter related to performance, DOE was late in providing annual contract goals and incentive fees for its performance-based management and operating contracts, which account for approximately 70 percent of DOE's total obligations, for the fiscal year beginning on October 1, 1997.<sup>13</sup> As a result, the contractors that manage DOE's facilities began their work several months before approved goals and incentive fees were made a

---

<sup>11</sup>Assessment of the Use of Performance-Based Incentives in Performance-Based Management and Management and Integration Contracts, Office of Procurement and Assistance Management, DOE (Oct. 1997).

<sup>12</sup>Status of Department of Energy Year 2000 Efforts: Quarterly Progress Report, DOE (Feb. 15, 1998).

<sup>13</sup>GAO/RCED-98-94.

part of their contracts. For example, 16 of the 20 contractors' annual performance goals and incentive fee agreements were not approved until after the fiscal year had begun on October 1, 1997. Of these 16, 6 were approved in November 1997, 3 were approved in December 1997, 6 were approved in January 1998, and 1 was approved in March 1998.

COMMENTS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**Department of Energy**

Washington, DC 20585

April 20, 1998

Ms. Susan D. Kladiva, Associate Director  
 Energy, Resources, and Science Issues  
 United States General Accounting Office  
 Resources, Community, and  
 Economic Development Division  
 Washington, D.C. 20548

Dear Ms. Kladiva:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the GAO report entitled, "Observations on the Department of Energy's Fiscal Year 1999 Annual Performance Plan." As has been the case in previous reports on our efforts to implement the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), many of the recommended improvements are thoughtful and will greatly benefit our efforts to continuously improve our implementation of this very important legislation. It is our steadfast belief, and commitment, that performance-based management, the heart of this legislation, will not only compel better management on the part of all Federal agencies but makes clearer to the American people and Congress the benefits and important results derived from investments made by the Department of Energy.

As we have detailed in previous comments to GAO on this matter, the Department established a DOE-wide system to rationalize our approach to implementing GPRA and other management reforms. We call the approach the Strategic Management System and it provides clear linking from strategic planning to annual performance planning, to annual budgets, and to performance reporting. A systematic approach to these efforts is imperative if the management initiatives envisioned by the Administration and Congress and enacted in GPRA are to succeed. In fact, viewing the individual products needs to be done with this systems approach fully in mind. Although we are heartened that the GAO finds that one of the strengths of the Annual Performance Plan is its clear linkage with the Strategic Plan, we would have welcomed, and in fact believe necessary, some commentary on the overall approach that the Strategic Management System embodies. Though all agencies will be working to continuously improve the quality of specific performance measures, it is a systems approach to performance management that will drive this improvement. We are confident our approach will attain the desired result.

Specific reactions to the report are enclosed. If there are any questions on this response, please contact me or John Sullivan at (202) 586-5390.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert W. Gee".

Robert W. Gee  
 Assistant Secretary for Policy and  
 International Affairs

Enclosure: as stated

## RELATED GAO PRODUCTS

Results Act: DOE Can Improve Linkages Among Plans and Between Resources and Performance (GAO/RCED-98-94, Apr. 14, 1998).

Federal Management Overview of Major Management Issues Facing Executive Agencies (GAO/OCG-98-1R, Jan. 1998).

Managing for Results: Agencies' Annual Performance Plans Can Help Address Strategic Planning Challenges (GAO/GGD-98-44, Jan. 30, 1998).

Results Act: Observations on the Department of Energy's August 15, 1997, Draft Strategic Plan (GAO/RCED-97-248R, Sept. 2, 1997).

Results Act: Observations on the Department of Energy's Draft Strategic Plan (GAO/RCED-97-199R, July 11, 1997).

(141201)

ent

---

### **Ordering Information**

**The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. VISA and MasterCard credit cards are accepted, also. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.**

**Orders by mail:**

**U.S. General Accounting Office  
P.O. Box 37050  
Washington, DC 20013**

**or visit:**

**Room 1100  
700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW)  
U.S. General Accounting Office  
Washington, DC**

**Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 512-6000  
or by using fax number (202) 512-6061, or TDD (202) 512-2537.**

**Each day, GAO issues a list of newly available reports and testimony. To receive facsimile copies of the daily list or any list from the past 30 days, please call (202) 512-6000 using a touchtone phone. A recorded menu will provide information on how to obtain these lists.**

**For information on how to access GAO reports on the INTERNET, send an e-mail message with "info" in the body to:**

**[info@www.gao.gov](mailto:info@www.gao.gov)**

**or visit GAO's World Wide Web Home Page at:**

**<http://www.gao.gov>**

---

**United States  
General Accounting Office  
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001**

**Bulk Rate  
Postage & Fees Paid  
GAO  
Permit No. G100**

**Official Business  
Penalty for Private Use \$300**

**Address Correction Requested**

---