PART II: MANAGEMENT AND GROWTH OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Part II of the dissertation discusses management and growth of reporting requirements. Chapter 3 shows that the volume and variety of reports, prepared at considerable cost, represent a major information resource. As illustrated by the various computerized systems developed by the Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate, and the management and tracking systems of the four case study agencies (Government Accountability Office, Department of Defense, Department of Health and Human Services, and Federal Reserve Board), considerable time and resources are devoted to the management of congressional reports. The discussion in this chapter illustrates Rosenbloom’s view of agencies as extensions of Congress in carrying out public policy and efforts by Congress to develop capacity for oversight—thus contributing to a legislative-centered public administration.

Chapter 4 focuses on another set of case studies—performance-reporting requirements—because they are the newest set of reporting requirements created by Congress and they differ from agency-specific requirements in that they apply to all major federal departments and independent agencies. The discussion focuses on how and why performance-reporting requirements are created and it notes that the purpose of performance-reporting requirements is to strengthen management controls and processes to increase agency accountability. The information required in these reports is intended to be a valuable resource for Congress in carrying out its program authorization, oversight, and appropriations responsibilities, as well as to ensure the public a more accountable and responsive government.
This chapter discusses management of congressional reporting requirements and the tracking mechanisms used by the Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate, as well as GAO, DOD, HHS, and the Federal Reserve Board to show how selected departments and agencies track their reporting requirements. The objective is to provide background and context for describing how reporting requirements fit Clay’s definition of a management process. In undertaking this research, the two databases maintained by the Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate were used; and databases, reports and documents from the various agency offices that track reporting requirements were reviewed. Before discussing the case studies of how reports are tracked and managed, let us first discuss the magnitude of the congressional reporting requirements that the federal government needs to manage as a whole.

3.1 MAGNITUDE OF THE REPORTING BURDEN TO BE MANAGED

It is possible to track the reporting burden over time by using the documents compiled and published by the Clerk of the House for each session of Congress. These documents are titled Reports to Be Made to Congress and are compiled pursuant to Clause 2, Rule III of the rules of the House of Representatives. These documents were used to track the growth (and recent decline) of reporting requirements from 1900 to 2000, as shown in Figure 3.1. The databases that track reporting requirements and reports received are described later in this chapter, and some of the reasons for the growth and decline of reporting requirements are discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, which respectively discuss the growth due to a new kind of reporting requirement, performance-reporting (e.g., GPRA), and the laws that eliminated hundreds of reporting requirements.
As shown in Figure 3.1, the number of reporting requirements stayed well below 500 from 1900 to 1950, even showing some declines during the Great Depression. World War II saw some modest increases until the Great Society programs began in the 1960s. Then the number of requirements skyrocketed during the 1970s, which was characterized as a period of profound distrust, brought on by the Vietnam War, the Watergate scandal, and divided government of a Democratic Congress and the Republican presidencies of Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford. Institutional changes within Congress itself also had an impact on the growth shown in Figure 3.1, with the congressional “resurgence” of the 1970s, the decentralization of power within both chambers (following the subcommittee and other reforms), and the increased growth and professionalism of committee staff leading to calls for more oversight and a related rise in the number of reporting requirements.

3.1.1 Divided Government Impact on Reporting Requirements

Divided government was relatively infrequent during the first half of the 20th Century, and did not appear to have an impact on the growth or decline of the number of reporting requirements. Periods of divided government became routine in the 1970s and definitely had an impact on the growth of reporting requirements that were used as a tool of the opposition party in Congress to get information from and exert control over the executive branch controlled by the other party.
Party control of Congress, the presidency, and periods of divided government from 1900 to the present, are shown in Appendix A: Party Control Impact on Growth of Reporting Requirements.

As noted by Gilmour and Halley (1994), “When the policy disagreement went beyond the normal bounds of difference toward institutional distrust, congressional co-management—taking the forms of preaudit program controls and direct congressional intervention in implementation often followed.”

Use of reporting requirements was one of the major tools cited in eight of the ten case studies in the book, examining congressional co-management to exert control over programs where the Congress took issue with the executive branch as to how programs were being managed or policies were being implemented. Gilmour and Halley concluded that “The central question is not whether Congress will co-manage policy and programs with the executive branch but how effectively both branches can use this form of governance to ensure vigorous partisan debate . . .”

In the twentieth century, until the 1970s, government power was concentrated in the executive branch through generally broad congressional delegations of authority in authorizations and appropriations laws. In the 1970s, however, partly as the fallout of the Vietnam War and Watergate scandals as well as divided government, “Congress began to curtail or withdraw its sweeping, open-ended grants of unchecked executive authority . . . . Many congressional requirements of executive agencies were made more detailed and precise.”

---

2 Ibid pp. 368-369.
As shown in Table 3.1, the number of reporting requirements increased dramatically as a result of these forces during the 1970s.

Table 3.1: Comparison of Reporting Requirements In Effect Before and After Vietnam/Watergate (1973/1980)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Agent</th>
<th>Number of Reporting Requirements in 1973</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number of Reporting Requirements in 1980</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. President*</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. The Head of Each Department and Agency**</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Cabinet-level Departments</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Independent Agencies</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Judicial Branch</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Legislative Branch</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Boards, Commissions, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Federally Chartered Private Corporations</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>99***</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>97***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Requiring reports submitted to Congress directly by the President and the Executive Office, and cabinet departments and independent agencies through the President.

** Counted only once for each entry.

*** Due to rounding.


Table 3.1 shows that the total number of reporting requirements more than doubled after Vietnam and Watergate, going from 958 in 1973 to 1,917 in 1980. There was a corresponding increase in reporting on legislative branch activities, going from 55 to 103 reporting requirements for the legislative branch—also about double—during the same timeframe. However, the majority of these legislative branch reports were tasked to GAO but concerned executive branch operations. Chapter 5 contains a discussion and tables that show the growth and decline of reporting requirements since 1980 to illustrate the impact of the various laws that increased performance-reporting requirements and also eliminated no longer needed reporting requirements.
3.2 STUDIES ON THE MANAGEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The earliest study on management of congressional reporting requirements was conducted in the late 1920s. On January 17, 1928, the House Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments (now the Government Reform and Oversight Committee) held a hearing on a bill (HR 8534) to eliminate some agency reports to Congress that were considered useless. At the request of a Committee chair, the U.S. Bureau of Efficiency had gone through the 313 annual reports to Congress that were listed in House Document 83 of the 68th Congress and House Document 101 of the 69th Congress. The Bureau then testified at the hearing that about 90 of those reports should be discontinued. The 1927-8 bill that the Committee held a hearing on was not enacted into law. The Committee introduced a new bill (HR 12064) in the 71st Congress that was signed into law (P.L. 70-611).

In more recent times, studies by the Foreign Affairs Division of the Congressional Research Service, the Commission on Government Procurement, and GAO emphasized the need for an adequate monitoring system and offered suggestions for improving the management of information submitted to Congress. One of these suggestions was that congressional committees would find useful a subject matter index of all executive reports required for submission to Congress. Another suggestion was to institute a system for recording whether reporting requirements have been met and to make inquiries of agencies when they have not submitted their reports on time. This would help insure that information is available when it is needed. Continual study and evaluation of the usefulness of reports were also suggested as aids to eliminate unnecessary reports and improve inadequate ones. GAO also started to publish reports on the subject of reporting requirements starting in the early 1970s. In a 1973 study, in response to a request from the Chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations

---


expressing concern over the volume and variety of recurring reports, GAO recommended that legislation be introduced to eliminate or modify some of the statutory reporting requirements.6

The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-344) contained a provision requiring GAO to develop and maintain a database of reports submitted to Congress. The database GAO developed was named the Congressional Information Source Inventories and Directories Database (CISID). GAO used CISID data to examine the universe of reporting requirements and analyze their usefulness to Congress, including use in the Federal budget process. In these studies, GAO further emphasized the need for a monitoring system to make managing and using the reporting requirements more effective.7 Title VIII of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 directs the Comptroller General, the head of GAO, to:

“[A]ssist committees in developing their information needs, including such needs expressed in legislative requirements, and . . . monitor the various recurring reporting requirements of the Congress and committees and make recommendations to the Congress and committees for changes and improvements in their reporting requirements to meet congressional information needs ascertained by the Comptroller General, to enhance their usefulness to the congressional users and to eliminate duplicative or unneeded reporting.” (31 U.S.C. 1152(d))

The database identified reporting requirements addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate as well as those addressed to individual House and Senate committees. Each record included the title of the report, the name of the agency preparing it, the requisite frequency and due date of the report, the legislative authority for it, its appropriations account title and account code, the names of the committees responsible for the subject matter, a synopsis of the reporting requirement, an abstract of the report’s contents, and cost data associated with its preparation. The database was kept current through legislative

research and annual requests to the agencies to supply updated information about their reporting requirements.\(^8\)

Before GAO eliminated the CISID database in the mid-1980s because of budget considerations,\(^9\) CISID contained reporting requirements spanning the years 1789 to 1985. For a time the inventory was maintained by the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress in its SCORPIO system’s Terminating Programs file, until it, too, was eliminated because of budget considerations and the need to develop the current THOMAS system.

GAO used the CISID database to develop a major report that identified problems in the way congressional reporting requirements were being managed, thus affecting the timeliness and usefulness of the information Congress received in support of its legislative, oversight, and budgetary functions.\(^10\) The report stated that improvements were needed within the federal government, including Congress itself. Congressional reporting requirements were not being managed in a way that achieved the objectives for which they were created. They were managed by several organizations acting independently, with little or no coordination among them. As a result, performance of tasks overlapped, and functional and informational gaps existed. GAO concluded that there was no comprehensive monitoring system for the reporting requirements. The most serious flaws were that receipt of reports by Congress was not adequately recorded, delinquent reporting was not followed up, and distribution and use of report documents were not monitored or evaluated. GAO said that Congress, the federal agencies, and the Executive Office should consider:

1. The development of a uniform policy and guidance for the congressional groups with principal functional responsibility for meeting the reporting requirements;

---

\(^8\) The data GAO collected came from its legislative research and from information the agencies supplied to GAO in response to an annual request. GAO staff researched the legislative history of every statute that contained a reporting requirement and, in doing so, identified the committees that had jurisdiction over each reporting requirement. In GAO’s annual requests, it provided each agency with a computer printout from the CISID database. Each printout listed the existing requirements for reports that were identified as that agency’s responsibility. With this, GAO also sent a list of new requirements from legislation affecting that agency in the most recent Congress. GAO asked the agencies to update, confirm, or refute the elements of this information that were not in its database, such as the date of submission of a report document in response to a reporting requirement.

\(^9\) While GAO discontinued doing this work, the legal requirement is still in effect.

2. Streamlining the identification and inventory tasks;
3. Creating an adequate monitoring system;
4. Reducing late executive agency responses to reporting requirements; and
5. Improving the ability of Congress to relate each report it receives to the policy and program issues that the reporting requirements are designed to address.

While some improvements in the management process for reporting requirements have taken place since the above GAO recommendations were made, more needs to be done if a comprehensive reports management system is the goal. This is discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

3.3 CONGRESSIONAL DATABASES FOR TRACKING REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Congress itself currently performs the tasks of managing and administering reporting requirements, particularly through the congressional committees, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of the Senate. In addition, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Federal agencies responsible for preparing the reports also have management and tracking responsibilities. For example, OMB clears all reports prepared by agencies for the President to submit to Congress and reviews potentially controversial reports to assure compliance with Administration positions. The discussion below describes the responsibilities of each of these organizational entities as well as the way they fulfill those responsibilities.

Because reporting requirements help the Congress oversee Federal programs and obtain information on policy issues, performance measurement, budgets, and legislative proposals, it may assume that the reporting requirements are to be administered according to its intent.

3.3.1 The Legislative Information System (LIS)

The Legislative Information System (LIS) is required to disseminate accurate and timely congressional legislative information to all Capitol Hill intranet users (i.e., the House, Senate,
and the legislative support agencies). The LIS home page is a portal to a variety of commercial, academic, and government legislative sources, including LIS specialized databases. LIS databases, identified by the LIS logo on the search pages, include Bill Summary and Status, Bill Text, the Congressional Record, and Committee Reports, as well as Executive Communications to the House and Executive Communications to the Senate.

The Clerk of the House prepares, and transmits annually to the Speaker of the House, a list of the reports based on the LIS inventory that officers and departments must make to the Congress. The list is arranged by the branch of Government and by agencies within each branch. For each requirement, the list identifies the report title and description, the agency responsible for submitting the report, the legislative citation mandating the report, and the report’s due date. This inventory is maintained in a computerized publications system that also has a tracking feature noting the receipt of reports. The database is available to congressional staff on the congressional Intranet. Figure 3.2 shows what the “Executive Communications to the House” web site looks like.

11 LIS is developed under the policy direction of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the House Committee on Administration. It is a collaborative project of the offices and agencies of the legislative branch, including the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House; House Information Resources, the Senate Computer Center, and the Senate Office of Telecommunications; the Government Printing Office; the Government Accountability Office; the Congressional Budget Office; the Congressional Research Service; and the Library of Congress. Per the directives of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the House Committee on Administration, the Congressional Research Service has responsibility for the coordination of the system and the Library of Congress is responsible for its technical development and operation.

As shown in Figure 3.2, the “Executive Communications to the House” web site is a computerized catalog of the communications to the House, including required reports, since the 100th Congress, and the requirements that mandate communications, including congressional reporting requirements. There are two types of records in this database: Transaction Records and Requirement Records.

1. Transaction Records identify specific communications sent to the House. There are four categories of Transaction Records: Executive Communication (EC), Presidential Message (PM), Memoral (ML), and Petition (PT).

2. Requirement Records identify the Congressional mandates for reports from all branches of the Federal Government.
Not all Transaction Records are mandated. The content of the file is updated as new information is entered throughout the day by the Executive Communications Clerk, Legislative Resource Center, Clerk of the House, and becomes searchable in the Legislative Information System early the next morning.\(^{13}\) The entire catalog record is searchable, either in the Word/Phrase box, or, more narrowly, in special field searches. The whole page combines into one search, with the exception of the requirement number. More illustrations of search results for the House web site and an illustration of the Senate web site and search results are in Appendix B: Illustrations of House and Senate Executive Communications Web Sites.

### 3.4 EXAMPLES OF REPORTING MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES IN SELECTED AGENCIES

Officials in four selected cases—the Government Accountability Office, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Defense, and Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System—were contacted during the course of this research to obtain samples of policies and procedures for managing their reporting requirements. Tracking memos and spreadsheets were obtained from these four departments and agencies to illustrate the similarities or differences in the approaches taken by each. Figure 3.3 is a schematic of the typical flow of a reporting requirement from its origination in Congress through receipt at the agency and, ultimately, through the report being sent to Congress.

---

\(^{13}\) Each night the information is FTP’ed from the Clerk of the House to the Library of Congress. Data is also FTP’ed from the Secretary of the Senate to the Library to maintain its executive communications database, which is discussed later in this paper. The Library reads the Senate Communications data into an Oracle database. The House Communications data is read into a proprietary data structure used by the InQuery search engine, and not stored in Oracle.
Figure 3.3 shows statutory as well as non-statutory reporting requirements contained in laws and committee reports, as discussed in Chapter 1. The figure also includes non-statutory requests for information contained in letters to the agency, as opposed to in laws or committee reports.

Interviews with the four case study agencies discussed in this chapter confirm that GAO, DOD, HHS, and the FED generally follow this flow chart in tracking their reporting responsibilities, even though the specific tracking mechanism they use differ in terms of their complexity.

Offices of Congressional Affairs in all four case studies were pivotal in receiving and monitoring the agencies’ responses to Congress, with final review of report contents performed by Congressional Affairs, General Counsel, and occasionally Finance/Budget offices. Figure 3.3
nicely illustrates Rosenbloom’s observation about Congress using agencies as extensions of itself in performing its role of gathering information about policy issues and using agencies to provide information to relevant committees for conducting congressional oversight, also in line with the literature on congressional oversight. As will be discussed in Chapter 6, the degree of communication between Congress and the agencies providing reports can be improved to further Rosenbloom’s call for a legislative-centered public administration. Before we do that, though, we need to better understand how agencies manage the reporting requirements they are tasked to do by Congress. The following sections highlight the management approaches of the four departments and agencies to illustrate the way each manages reporting requirements in its own distinctive way. GAO’s approach is the most detailed, because its primary mission is to respond to congressional requests for information. The processes used by HHS and DOD are characteristic of how large executive branch departments and agencies manage their requirements. The FED system, while small in comparison to the other three, is unique in that it displays its reports to Congress on its web site and, as will be discussed in Chapter 6, was proactive in working with its oversight committees to reestablish reporting requirements it wanted to retain.

3.4.1 Government Accountability Office

GAO’s mission is to respond to requests for information from Congress and to manage the resulting reports from beginning to delivery. Consequently, GAO has developed perhaps one of the most elaborate systems for tracking reporting mandates from production to delivery of the resulting reports to congressional stakeholders. GAO’s guidance for working with Congress is contained in a document entitled GAO’s Congressional Protocols (GAO-04-310G), which was released on July 16, 2004. A section titled “Congressional Mandates” states:

GAO treats work that is directed by congressional mandates differently from congressional requests. Because congressional mandates are established by either the Congress or one or more committees, it is GAO's policy that products prepared in response to congressional mandates are immediately available to the Congress and the public. When mandates direct GAO to report to a specific committee, GAO will work with the majority and minority of the designated committee to clarify the scope of work, reporting objectives, and time frames. If the mandate does not specify a committee, GAO will work with the committees of jurisdiction (majority and minority) as set forth in Senate and House rules and any
other committees and/or Members identified by the committees of jurisdiction. While the work is ongoing, GAO will provide the committees (1) periodic status briefings, (2) briefings on the preliminary and final results of the work, and (3) notification before the draft product is sent to the agency for comment. GAO will offer a copy of the draft for informational purposes. (p. 10)

Within GAO, the Congressional Relations Office (CR) is responsible for monitoring and review of congressional reporting requirements and for the establishment of an inventory. CR is the central point for the receipt of congressional requirements and their assignment to the appropriate functional area team to comply with the requirement by doing the appropriate analysis and drafting the report. Also, as discussed in more detail in Chapter 6, CR includes a questionnaire to congressional requesters asking them about their level of satisfaction with the final product and tracks the results of the survey. Table 3.2 shows entries for the same mandate from each of the two lists of reporting requirements maintained by CR and provided to me by GAO officials.

**Table 3.2: Examples From GAO’s Two Mandates Tracking Lists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CR’s List of Mandates Currently in MATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCAR #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CR’s List of Mandates Ever Appearing in GAO’s MATS System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.L. 103-356—GOVT MGMT REFORM ACT OF 1994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top entry in Table 3.2 is from a listing of all open and closed mandates that are currently in GAO’s Management and Tracking System (MATS), listed by legal citations. The Congressional Correspondence Activity Reporting (CCAR) system maintained by CR assigns a CCAR number to each contact memorandum written when a meeting or phone call occurs about each assignment and this is noted in the list. The “O” or “C” under the date tells whether the mandate
is still open or closed out. The bottom entry in Table 3.2 is from a listing of all citations for mandates ever entered into the MATS database since the system was developed, thus showing mandates that are no longer in the current MATS database. It does not show which codes are currently open or closed, which can be obtained by looking at the current MATS database.

Procedures for reports preparation are contained in GAO guidance entitled *Electronic Assistance Guide for Leading Engagements (EAGLE)*, a central source of engagement-related information. The EAGLE provides a guide through the GAO risk-based engagement management process. This internal web site is maintained by the Office of Quality and Continuous Improvement and updated frequently to provide the most current policy and guidance. The EAGLE identifies GAO-wide engagement process requirements and also provides links to supplemental team information. Figure 3.4 shows what the main page of the EAGLE GAO Intranet page looks like as taken from a GAO official’s computer monitor.
Figure 3.4: GAO’s Electronic Assistance Guide for Leading Engagements (EAGLE)

Figure 3.4 only shows the “tip of the iceberg” of what is available on the EAGLE site. Clicking on any of the seven gates on the left or the four summary icons on the right provides a wealth of information about sub gates, and specific guidance and forms for that gate or summary information.

The costing of reports preparation is done through tracing staff hours by an assignment code that is established for each mandated report. Mandates are tracked on a web-based system called the Engagement Reporting System (ERS) and time charges to job codes are reflected in the Management and Tracking System (MATS). Figure 3.5 shows what the main page of the ERS GAO Intranet page looks like as taken from a GAO official’s computer monitor.
Figure 3.5: GAO’s Engagement Reporting System (ERS)

Similar to EAGLE discussed above, Figure 3.5 also only illustrates the “tip of the iceberg” about the information provided by the ERS system, in that the user can click on each of the tabs at the top of the page in order to get more detailed information about each assignment.

3.4.2 Department of Defense

Department of Defense Directive 5000.19, “Policies for Management and Control of Information Requirements,” establishes guidelines and procedures for congressional reporting. The responsibility for calculating cost and developing systems capability for reporting rests with the functional area that has primary responsibility for the requirements. In addition, a central office in the DOD Inspector General’s Office handles one-time requirements from appropriations
committees. DOD Directive 5000.22 establishes cost on information requirements. These guidelines are based on GSA’s “Guide for Estimating Costs,” discussed at the end of this chapter and included in Appendix C: Cost Estimating Methodology. Table 3.3 shows a typical DOD reports tracking spreadsheet provided by a DOD official, using an example from the Office of the Secretary of Defense for reports to Congress on military construction programs.

Table 3.3: Example of DOD Reports Tracking Spreadsheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>ACTION REQUIRED</th>
<th>DUE DATE</th>
<th>CITATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MilCon authorization bill</td>
<td>SECDEF submit the military authorization bill to Congress each fiscal year</td>
<td>During the first 10 days after the President's Budget is provided to Congress</td>
<td>10 U.S.C. 2859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on backlog of maintenance and repair</td>
<td>SECDEF submit report to Congress identifying the Department's deferred maintenance and strategic plan for reducing the backlog</td>
<td>Annually, when the budget is submitted</td>
<td>House Report 106-945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on NSIP obligations</td>
<td>DoD submit to Congress a quarterly report on NSIP obligations</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>House Report 104-137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual value reports</td>
<td>SECDEF, in coordination with OMB, submit status reports to Congress on residual value negotiations between the US and Germany.</td>
<td>Annually in November/December</td>
<td>Sec. 2896 FY96 Authorization Act (PL 104-106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction and housing report</td>
<td>SECDEF submit to appropriate congressional committees a status report on military construction and design</td>
<td>Annually with the MilCon authorization. Note: Provided FY02 legislative proposal repealing Congressional reporting requirement</td>
<td>10 U.S.C. 2861 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint use military construction projects</td>
<td>SECDEF certify in budget justification materials that military construction projects have been considered for joint use.</td>
<td>Annually with budget justification starting with FY03 budget</td>
<td>Report 106-945 page 430; to be included in title 10 U.S.C. 2815 subchapter I of Chapter 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New housing construction</td>
<td>SECDEF notify Congress 30 days prior to transferring funds appropriated for a new construction project into a private sector pilot project at the same location</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>House Report 106-614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although not as detailed as the GAO tracking system(s), the DOD model shown in Table 3.3 follows the ideal type of tracking system as illustrated in Figure 3.3. Note that the last column
for the citation of the reporting requirement includes citations from both laws and committee reports. In the “Action Required” column in Table 3.3, notice the differentiation in reporting requirements (in bold in chart and not changed from the original) between submit reports, certify that an action has taken place, or notify Congress. These are the same types of reporting requirements cited by Johannes in his work in the 1970s that were discussed in Chapter 1, with examples provided in Table 1.1 for reporting required by law and in Table 1.2 for reporting requirements contained in committee reports.

3.4.3 Department of Health and Human Services

Chapter 10 of the HHS General Administrative Manual establishes guidelines and procedures for congressional reporting. Each bureau within HHS has an individual assigned to coordinate reporting requirements. HHS maintains a list of reporting requirements; the list is periodically reviewed for modification and possible eliminations. In 1978, the Secretary of HEW required that the cost of producing congressional reports be placed on the cover of each report, using GSA’s “Guide for Estimating Costs.” However, HHS offices preparing reports to Congress are no longer required to do so.

HHS officials provided a memorandum containing instructions describing its fiscal year 2005 congressional requirements for reports and significant items derived from selected House and Senate reports affecting its operations. The memorandum included an attachment that described reports requested in Appropriations Committees report language. The memorandum directs that operating and staff division officials must respond to directives for reports on programs, projects and activities within their purview. Reports should be prepared and transmitted to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget according to a schedule attached to the memorandum. All reports must be transmitted in draft to be cleared by Departmental and OMB staffs. To expedite the review process, the memorandum asks that electronic copies of draft reports be transmitted to a central contact e-mail address. Departmental and OMB clearance, comments and/or edits pertaining to these draft reports are then returned to designated staff person(s) responsible for preparing the reports in the divisions. The revised reports should be prepared in final, signed by the appropriate official, and transmitted electronically in PDF, Microsoft Word, or WordPerfect format back to the central contact who then transmits final reports to the appropriate
Table 3.4 contains examples of entries for the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) from the HHS memorandum provided by HHS officials.

**Table 3.4: Examples of Entries From HHS Memorandum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING DIVISION</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Draft due in DASB</th>
<th>Final Due in DASB</th>
<th>Final Due to Cmte.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FDA</td>
<td><strong>Orphan products</strong> – The Committee directs that no less than $15,000,000 be available for grants and contracts awarded under section 5 of the Orphan Drug Act, an increase of $1,808,000 over the amount available in fiscal year 2004. The Committee encourages the Commissioner to support the Office of Orphan Product Development in the coordination of government-wide efforts to accelerate development and approval of orphan drugs. Concurrent with this, the Committee requests confirmation that the agency’s stakeholder initiative is fully implemented in the orphan product area. The Committee also requests a schedule of outreach activities, including workshops and meetings planned for fiscal year 2005, and a list of those that occurred in fiscal year 2004, by January 31, 2005.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12/13/04</td>
<td>01/24/05</td>
<td>01/31/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FDA</td>
<td><strong>Rare eye disorders</strong> – The Committee is concerned about the availability of diagnosis and treatment for rare eye disorders, and requests that the agency update the Committee on progress in this area.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>01/10/05</td>
<td>02/21/05</td>
<td>No specified due date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FDA</td>
<td><strong>Diagnostic tests</strong> – The Committee is concerned that there has been insufficient attention to the development of diagnostic tests for rare diseases. The Committee requests that the Commissioner, in consultation with the Office of Orphan Products Development, evaluates this situation and reports to the Committee by January 31, 2005, on current activities and on what steps have been taken to increase FDA's commitment and results in this area.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12/13/04</td>
<td>01/24/05</td>
<td>01/31/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 shows HHS’ way of listing reporting requirements by operating division, along with details about the subject to be covered and the due dates for various stages of report production.

In addition, the memorandum contains a list of “Significant Items” contained in Congressional Appropriations Committees report language. Operating and staff divisions must respond to significant items pertaining to their programs, projects and activities and these responses must be included in the “Significant Items” section of their FY 2006 Congressional Justification. HHS
asks agencies to list significant items, provide the page number on which the language is located and describe the action that will be taken. An example of how significant items should be listed is shown in Box 3.1:

**Box 3.1: HHS Example of a “Significant Item”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric liver disease database</td>
<td>The Committee encourages NIDDK to consider supporting a pediatric liver disease national database and registry. Such a registry would permit hypothesis testing and outcomes research to determine the health and financial impact of liver transplants on a child and the child’s family. (Page 66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action taken or to be taken</td>
<td>Liver transplantation for children remains the major means of management for end-stage liver disease, and is a life saving and life-sustaining procedure. Approximately 600 transplants are done yearly in children with liver disease; five and ten-year patient survival is excellent. During the past seven years, the pediatric liver transplant community has created an interactive database on children undergoing liver transplantation known as SPLIT. This database has been supported by industry-sponsored grants and academic societies. Over the last two years, NIDDK staff have met with the SPLIT investigators in an attempt to develop a means of continuing this database with NIH support. Accordingly, the SPLIT investigators have recently submitted a large research project grant application to NIDDK for long-term support. This application will be given high priority for funding consideration and support will be shared by other NIH institutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The HHS tracking system illustrated in Table 3.4 and Box 3.1 is also consistent with the ideal model of a tracking system discussed in Figure 3.3. The HHS model differs somewhat from the GAO and DOD models where there is a stronger monitoring role for Congressional Relations to make sure the reporting requirements are satisfied. The HHS model, in contrast, puts this policing function in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget.

### 3.4.4 Federal Reserve Board

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (the FED), an independent agency, has perhaps the most comprehensive list of its reporting requirements as the result of systematically delineating requirements that are currently in effect, those that were sunsetting by the sunset provision of P.L. 104-66, and those that were sunsetting and reinstated by P.L. 106-569. The listing, “Statutes Requiring Periodic Reports to Congress by the Federal Reserve Board,” is maintained by the Board’s Law Library and is available electronically to staff throughout the
Federal Reserve System. Table 3.5 provides examples of reporting requirements that are contained in the list provide by FED officials and shows the coding scheme to show sunset status.

**Table 3.5: Examples of Entries From the Federal Reserve Board List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Category</th>
<th>Sunsetted Status</th>
<th>Act Name and Citation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutes Requiring Inclusion in the Board’s Annual Report to Congress</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td>Federal Reserve Act, 12 U.S.C. 247</td>
<td>Requires the Board to make annually a full report of its operations, including the budget review, to the Congress. (The original annual report requirement.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstated</td>
<td>[Note: Underlined text denotes links]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Statutes Requiring Periodic Reporting (Annual or Otherwise) to Congress</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Federal Reserve Act, Section 2A, 12 U.S.C. 225a</td>
<td>Required the Board to submit a report to Congress, not later than February 20 and July 20 of each year, regarding the monetary policy objectives of the Board and of the Federal Open Market Committee. This was repealed by section 1004 of Public Law 106-569 and replaced with a new Section 2B – see below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunsetted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Other Statutes Requiring Limited (Usually One Time) Reporting to Congress</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td>Federal Reserve Act, Section 2B, 12 U.S.C. 225b</td>
<td>Requires the Chairman of the Board to present a report on monetary policy before the House and Senate banking committees, twice a year, on an alternating schedule. See Monetary Policy Report to the Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Sunsetted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Sunsetted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5 shows that the FED tracking mechanism is also consistent with the model approach laid out in Figure 3.3, although it may seem unusual that the list of reporting requirements is maintained by the Board’s Law Library staff. However, it must be noted that the FED has a very small Congressional Relations unit of two people (compared to GAO with a dozen, HHS with many congressional liaison offices, and DOD which even has military liaison offices in congressional office buildings). It must also be noted that the Board’s Law Library is outstanding in its research capabilities and the FED has a limited number of committees requesting a smaller number of reports, making tracking much easier. While the format illustrated in Table 3.5 is similar to the way DOD and HHS track their reporting requirements, the FED was aggressive in consulting with congressional committees to make sure the reports it was preparing met congressional needs. As will be discussed in Chapter 5, the Federal Reports
Elimination and Sunset Act eliminated hundreds of reporting requirements and sunsetted others. The FRB response to the sunset provisions of that law will be discussed in Chapter 6 as an example of a “best practices” approach to managing and tracking congressional reporting requirements through completing a feedback loop with affected congressional committees.

3.5 PERSPECTIVES REGARDING THE CONGRESSIONAL REPORTING PROCESS

Complaints by federal managers about the number of congressional reporting requirements imposed on agencies have existed for a long time. Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney and Vice President Al Gore held similar news conferences 10 years apart with stacks of reports intended to make the same point—that congressional reporting requirements were excessive and impaired government efficiency. As discussed in the last chapter, an NPR recommendation led to passage of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995, and hundreds of reports were subsequently eliminated. But the sunset provision, as will be discussed in Chapter 5, was not fully implemented because agency officials in most cases did not know how to implement it and, the need to eliminate reporting requirements, as well as consolidate reports, persists.

While many observers agree that there are too many reporting requirements, they also agree that many important and useful reporting requirements are needed for effective oversight. As discussed in Chapter 4, members of Congress face a broad range of decisions as members of committees, including budget, authorization, oversight, and appropriations. The useful reports also help departmental and agency leadership, budget and planning analysts, OMB, GAO, and IGs to carry out their management and oversight responsibilities. Because of the importance of these requirements, it is essential that Congress and agency management collaborate on how these reporting requirements can be better managed in order to better serve the information needs of all users. Box 3.2 illustrates the range of views about the usefulness of reporting requirements.
Congressional Relations (CR) serves as a liaison between GAO and the Congress and coordinates GAO contacts with Congress. CR advises the Comptroller General, his Executive Committee, GAO Senior Executives, and GAO staff on congressional relations policy and relations. It works closely with Congressional leadership, Members, committee and personal staffs in helping assure that GAO products and other services are delivered in a timely and useful manner.—GAO Congressional Affairs Office

There are so many reporting requirements! I can’t do justice to them all. Which ones do I really need to pay attention to, and which ones do I just make sure we check the box on?-----Defense agency official

My Cabinet Secretary was finally confirmed and in office just two weeks when he was asked to certify the accuracy of the contents of a big, fat report on the financial condition and performance levels of the entire department for the previous year. The report had been under preparation by his predecessor probably for six months before he came into office. He had no idea what he was being asked to sign. Submitting the report on time was required by law.-----Observations of a 2001 Presidential Team Advisor

(Question) What do you think Congress expects of you in fulfilling your role or in preparing a particular report? (Answer) That is difficult to answer, because I think there are differing opinions of what Congress expects. For example, the appropriation committee (which my office works closely with) did not write GPRA law, so at times it seems less interested in GPRA. Look at the number of testimony questions our Secretary or Assistant Secretaries receive on GPRA compared to other "budget" items. The Government Reform committee, which wrote GPRA, seems more interested in using it. Additionally, it seems that OMB is more interested in GPRA than Congress, particularly this Administration.-----HHS departmental official responsible for performance reporting

There are probably elements of obsolescence in some of the language in the requirements of the report. It may be as you take up the question of reauthorization that it might not be a bad idea to have a discussion on how we can improve the particular transmission of information from the Federal Reserve to this committee and the comparable committee in the House. But that's the choice of the committee, and as far as we're concerned, we think it is essential that we continue to be required to come up on a periodic basis to this committee and explain what it is we are doing.—Greenspan Testimony before the Senate Banking Committee (February 23, 1999)

The GAO quote shows the amount of attention the agency pays to making sure its clients in congressional committees are happy with the services GAO’s provides through reports and testimonies the clients request. The next two quotes illustrate the reality of what agency officials face when overwhelmed with too many reporting requirements, especially when there is turnover in political appointees. The quote from the HHS official reflects the fragmentation of congressional committees and the fact that different committees are, not surprisingly, only
interested in information that meets that particular committee’s needs. The last quote from Alan Greenspan was in response to the fact that the Humphrey-Hawkins semi-annual reporting requirement was sunset by the 1995 law (discussed in detail in Chapter 5) and the Federal Reserve Board wanted the reporting requirement to be reauthorized. Although each quote is different in its characterization of reporting requirements, they do shed light on agency officials’ views of themselves as extensions of Congress in fulfilling their responsibilities as partners in a legislative-centered public administration.

3.6 OMB AND NARS RESPONSIBILITIES FOR REPORTS TO CONGRESS

In addition to agency requirements for tracking and reporting their individual congressional reporting requirements, OMB and the National Archives and Records Service (NARS) have important responsibilities for management of congressional reporting requirements, as explained briefly below.

3.6.1 OMB Responsibilities

OMB’s Legislative Reference Division must approve reports from the executive agencies that the President is required to submit to Congress. OMB simply determines that nothing in the body of a report is contrary to any policy of the administration. OMB does not compare the substance of the report with the legal requirements, nor does it monitor agencies’ preparation procedures.

OMB Directives, such as A-11 on budget preparation, note that congressionally mandated reporting requirements stipulate that Federal agencies are to submit reports to the Congress at stated times or intervals or when certain events occur. OMB recognizes that most agencies’ congressional liaison offices note the reporting requirements for which they are responsible and maintain an organizational machinery to respond to them, but that report preparation procedures used by the various agencies are far from uniform.
3.6.2 National Archives and Records Service

NARS’ Center for Legislative Archives (www.archives.gov/records_of_congress) is the repository, reference center, and outreach facility for the historically valuable records of the U.S. Congress, including thousands of reports submitted by agencies in response to reporting requirements. Holdings of the official records of the standing, special, select, and joint committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate fill nearly 170,000 cubic feet of records dating from the First Congress in 1789 to modern Congresses. These are accessed through the National Archives Building in downtown Washington, D.C. In addition, the Center's education program supplements its archival functions to bring the records of Congress into classrooms and public exhibition halls.

Although the records remain the legal property of the House and Senate, they are preserved and made available by the Center for research. Other records from legislative branch support organizations, including publications of government agencies from the Government Printing Office are also preserved at the Center. Also, a series of special collections donated to NARS, which include congressional research interviews conducted by historians, journalists, and political scientists, is being developed at the Center to provide a more complete view of the legislative process.

The Center applies the rules of access for congressional records as determined by the House and the Senate. Access to House records is governed by the provisions of House Rule VII subject to determination of the Clerk of the House; and for the Senate it is based on Senate Resolution 474 from the 96th Congress. Although the House and Senate regularly transfer records to NARA, these remain closed to researchers for designated periods of time. Most House records are closed to the public for 30 years, with investigative records and records involving personal privacy closed for 50 years. The records are closed for 20 years for most Senate records, with a similar 50-year closure period for sensitive Senate records. Some Senate committees have instructed the Center to open selected series of records to researchers upon receipt of the records by NARS. It is important to note that the records of Congress are not subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act.
Before becoming an independent agency, NARS was part of the General Services Administration (GSA). In 1985 GSA issued fairly detailed guidelines on reports management when it had responsibility for records and information management. It issued a series of handbooks on records and information management to help Federal agencies improve their office systems and procedures, including effective reports management and practices. GSA’s reports handbook focused on methods and procedures of reports management with an emphasis on increased efficiency, effectiveness and economy. While primarily aimed at internal, interagency, and public reports, the guidance also applied to reports required by Congress.

The objectives of reports management are to ensure that needed information is provided to decision-makers at the right time, in the best format, and at the lowest possible price. As in managing any activity, it is important to know how much reporting activities cost. A basic function of effective reports management is, therefore, the development of the costs associated with reporting activities. This knowledge enables officials to make a cost/benefit analysis of individual reporting requirements and to eliminate reports that are not determined to be cost-effective. To do this, GSA developed a methodology for estimating reporting costs. Much of what is in Appendix C: Cost Estimating Methodology is from the GSA guide.14

The NAR’s Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress was established by P.L. 101-509 (November 5, 1990) to advise Congress and the Archivist of the United States on the management and preservation of the records of Congress. The Committee membership includes congressional officials, the Archivist of the United States, and public members appointed by Congress, who include historians, political scientists, congressional archivists, and other users and caretakers of legislative records. As required by law, the Committee meets twice a year, actively promotes a more complete documentation of the legislative process, and issues reports on its meetings and activities.

14 U.S. General Services Administration, (July 1985), Reports Management, Washington, D.C. This guide was provided by GAO to be used by the Congressional Budget Office to develop cost estimates of bills proposing to eliminate reporting requirements, as discussed in Chapter 5.
Joy Clay (1991, 1994, and 1996) describes the characteristics that help define public management processes and applies them to the congressional hearings process. She provides the conceptual lens for seeing that the congressional reporting process also constitutes an institutionalized management process. Clay (1996, p. 95) states, “The most clearly identifiable public-institutional processes are public budgeting and public personnel management. However, other organizational activities have public-institutional process characteristics.” She cites examples of regulatory and rule-making processes; preparation and development of agency testimony for congressional hearings; major acquisition and contracting processes; and congressional casework, among others. To this list we can add the congressional reporting process as a clearly identifiable public institutional process. Clay quotes Wamsley (1992), who wrote that, “Management Processes can be defined as regularized cycles of activities (formal or informal) which bring people within organizations and between organizations into interaction in order to work through or “live through” the performance of some function or the solving of some problem.”

Clay cites four characteristics that help define management processes:

1. **Regularity**—a sense of recurrence around the task or function.

2. **Cycles of activities**—routines and subroutines and expectations about the routines form the activities that demarcate the management process.

3. **Interaction**—people, with their particular reading of the task or function, agency mission, personal agenda, and environment, come together to “perform” their respective tasks and functions.

---


16 Wamsley goes on to note “Rather than formal or informal, our understanding of the dynamics of public-institutional processes is enhanced if we view the cycles of activities as a collection of both formal and informal routines and subroutines.”

17 Unpublished manuscript cited by Clay in *Refounding Democratic Public Administration.*
4. Outcome oriented—some end product is identifiable with the management process, such as budget document, personnel action, regulation, and congressional testimony.

These four characteristics of a management process were one of the lenses used for this dissertation topic, the other one being of course Rosenbloom’s legislative centered public administration. In each case they provided “glasses” to see the topic, but the dissertation is not about the “glasses,” per se. Using Clay and Rosenbloom it can be seen that congressional reporting is a clearly identifiable public institutional process (as the hearings process was shown to be in Clay’s dissertation) and that the process can be improved so that required reports better contribute to a legislative-centered public administration.

The congressional reporting process meets the four characteristics that define management processes as discussed in Clay’s definition:

1. Regularity—a sense of recurrence around the task or function—evidenced by the listings of requirements published by the Clerk of the House at the beginning of each session of Congress and the lists maintained by agencies to track their recurring and one-time reporting requirements.

2. Cycles of activities—routines and subroutines and expectations about the routines form the activities that demarcate the management process—evidenced by preparation of the reports in cycles of activities from planning, writing, processing and issuing required reports (e.g., GAO’s EAGLE and ERS systems as just one example of ways to guide and track cycles of activities).

3. Interaction—people, with their particular reading of the task or function, agency mission, personal agenda, and environment, come together to “perform” their respective tasks and functions—as evidenced by the interaction between groups to pass reporting requirements in law and the interaction among stakeholders and those in the agencies who prepare the reports in compliance with administration policies.

4. Outcome oriented—some end product is identifiable with the management process, such as budget document, personnel action, regulation, and congressional testimony—as evidenced by, in this case, passage of reporting requirements in law and the resulting reports to Congress.

Clay emphasizes the importance of understanding public management processes in order to either achieve stability in relationships, or more importantly for this dissertation, to understand how the public management process can be changed to bring about improvements for all parties involved in the process. Clay states that, “To understand the essentially political and institutional
quality of management processes in government agencies is to begin to understand what makes public organizations different from private organizations.”\(^{18}\) In this dissertation public management process is not limited to the management process within an agency. Rather it is broadly construed to encompass the relationships between the agencies and Congress in the congressional reporting process. The discussion in the dissertation shows the political nature of the process and that agencies’ function as extensions of Congress, in line with Rosenbloom’s legislative-centered public administration. Clay goes on to make the point that, “Management processes in government . . . are important not only for the end products and finite decisions they produce (e.g., a budget document), but also for enabling agencies to interact with their interested publics, make sense of institutional and environmental forces, marshal resources, and serve the public interest.”\(^{19}\) Similarly, the reporting requirements process in important not only for the reports which are produced, but because it provides an opportunity for interaction among stakeholders and ensures agency accountability. Clay goes on to make the point that “Public institutional processes in public organizations provide a sense of stability as the people involved in them develop shared understandings and yet allow organizations to adapt to the forces of change. . . . [P]ublic institutional processes provide the capacity for administrative action.”\(^{20}\) It is this call for administrative action to bring about improvements in the congressional reporting process that will be discussed in Chapter 6.

### 3.8 CONCLUSIONS

The numbers of reporting requirements throughout the first two-thirds of the 20th Century were modest—about 500 to 1000. Then in the 1970s the Vietnam and Watergate era ushered in a dramatic increase in reporting requirements, peaking at about 3500 in 1990. Studies of the management of the reporting process pointed out the need to better manage the reporting burden. However, these studies also recognized that the volume and variety of reports, prepared at considerable cost in response to congressional reporting requirements, nevertheless represent a major information resource for Congress, agencies, and the public. This resource has tremendous potential for facilitating congressional decision-making in line with Rosenbloom’s

---

\(^{18}\) Clay in Refounding Democratic Public Administration, p. 93.

\(^{19}\) Ibid.

\(^{20}\) Ibid.
call for a legislative-centered public administration. In order for this resource to be useful and cost effective it must be managed well. As illustrated by the various computerized systems developed by the Clerk of the House, Secretary of the Senate, the four agencies’ management and tracking systems, and OMB and NARS roles, considerable time and resources are devoted to the management of congressional reports. This chapter shows that the congressional reports management process in Congress, and the four agencies cited in this chapter, meet Clay’s definition of a management process. It also illustrates Rosenbloom’s observation of agencies as extensions of Congress in carrying out public policy and efforts by Congress to develop capacity for oversight activities—thus contributing to a legislative-centered public administration.

Chapter 6 explains how the current system of managing congressional reporting requirements can be significantly improved in order to contribute to Rosenbloom’s call for a legislative-centered public administration. The following two chapters provide insight into the creation of reporting requirements, using selected performance-reporting requirements as case studies; and provide a discussion of laws eliminating reporting requirements, concentrating on the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (P.L. 105-66).