

GAO

Testimony

Before the Committee on Small
Business, House of Representatives

For Release on Delivery
Expected at 1:00 p.m. EDT
Wednesday, March 20, 2013

ENTREPRENEURIAL ASSISTANCE

Opportunities Exist to Improve Programs' Collaboration, Data-Tracking, and Performance Management

Statement of William B. Shear, Director
Financial Markets and Community Investment



Chairman Graves, Ranking Member Velazquez, and Members of the Committee:

I am pleased to be here today to discuss our work on economic development programs that provide entrepreneurial assistance. Entrepreneurs play a vital role in the U.S. economy, and the federal government provides a variety of support and assistance to them. In August 2012, we reported information on 52 programs at the Departments of Commerce (Commerce), Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Agriculture (USDA), and the Small Business Administration (SBA) that support entrepreneurs.¹ According to agency officials, these programs, which typically fund a variety of activities in addition to supporting entrepreneurs, spent an estimated \$2 billion on economic development efforts in fiscal year 2011. Economic development programs that effectively provide assistance to entrepreneurs, in conjunction with state and local government and private sector economic development initiatives, may help businesses develop and expand. However, the ways that these programs are administered could lead to inefficient delivery of services, such as requiring entrepreneurs to fill out applications to multiple agencies with varying program requirements. These inefficiencies could compromise the government's ability to effectively provide the needed services and meet the shared goals of the programs.

In January 2011, Congress updated the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA) with the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010 (GPRAMA). GPRAMA establishes a new framework aimed at taking a more crosscutting and integrated approach to focusing on results and improving government performance. Among other things, GPRAMA requires the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to coordinate with agencies to establish outcome-oriented federal government priority goals covering a limited number of policy areas, as well as goals to improve management across the federal government. The President's 2013 budget submission includes the first interim federal government priority goals, including one to increase federal services to entrepreneurs and small businesses, with an emphasis on start-ups and growing firms and underserved markets.

¹GAO, *Entrepreneurial Assistance: Opportunities Exist to Improve Programs' Collaboration, Data-Tracking, and Performance Management*, [GAO-12-819](#) (Washington, D.C.: Aug. 23, 2012).

My testimony today is based on information on these 52 programs that is discussed in our August 2012 report. Specifically, this testimony discusses (1) the extent of overlap, fragmentation, and duplication and their effects on entrepreneurs, as well as agencies' actions to address them; and (2) the extent to which agencies collect information necessary to track program activities and whether these programs have met their performance goals and have been evaluated. This testimony also provides information on the agencies' actions to address recommendations we made in our August 2012 report.

In summary, we found the following:

- Federal programs that support entrepreneurs are fragmented and overlap based on the type of assistance they are authorized to offer, such as financial (grants and loans) and technical (training and counseling), and the type of entrepreneur they are authorized to serve. Much of the overlap among these 52 programs tends to be concentrated among programs that provide a broad range of technical and financial assistance. In addition, while agencies have taken steps to collaborate more in administering these programs, they have not implemented a number of good collaborative practices we have previously identified, and some entrepreneurs struggle to find the support they need. GPRAMA's crosscutting framework requires that agencies collaborate in order to address issues such as economic development that transcend more than one agency, and GPRAMA directs agencies to describe how they are working with each other to achieve their program goals. Without enhanced collaboration and coordination, agencies may not be able to make the best use of limited federal resources in the most effective and efficient manner.
- Agencies do not track program information on entrepreneurial assistance activities for many programs, a practice that is not consistent with government standards for internal controls. In addition, we found that 33 of the 52 programs had set goals for their programs, but 19 of these 33 programs did not meet any of their goals or only met some of their goals.² Further, agencies have conducted

²Two programs have goals but did not have goal accomplishment information. Goal accomplishment information for HUD's Section 4 Capacity Building for Affordable Housing and Community Development program is unknown because HUD did not provide it. In addition, goal accomplishment information for USDA's Small Business Innovation Research program is not available because the program goals are based on 2-year time periods and the current period has not yet ended.

evaluations of only 20 of the 52 active programs since 2000. As a result, information on program efficiency and effectiveness is limited, and scarce resources may be going toward programs that are less effective. GPRAMA requires agencies to set and measure annual performance goals, and recognizes the value of program evaluations because they can help agencies assess programs' effectiveness and improve program performance. Without more robust program information, agencies may not be able to administer programs in the most effective and efficient manner.

Based on our findings, we recommended that the four agencies and OMB explore opportunities to enhance collaboration among programs, both within and across agencies, and that the four agencies track program information and conduct more program evaluations. The agencies neither agreed nor disagreed with the recommendations but did provide information on their plans to address them.

For our August 2012 report, on which this testimony is based, we focused our analyses on 52 economic development programs at Commerce, HUD, USDA, and SBA that are authorized to support entrepreneurs. We reviewed statutory and regulatory authority on the activities and services the agencies can conduct to administer each of the programs, and we found significant overlap and fragmentation among programs that provide technical assistance to entrepreneurs (35 of the 52 programs). Therefore, we focused on how the agencies provide this assistance. We reviewed agency documents and conducted interviews in both headquarters and field offices to determine how technical assistance is provided to entrepreneurs and the extent of agency collaboration at the local level, including both urban and rural areas. We assessed this technical assistance information against promising collaborative practices that we have previously identified.³ For all 52 programs, we also evaluated the agencies' methods for tracking the activities conducted and assistance provided against standards for internal controls that we have previously identified.⁴ For each program, we reviewed information on program mission and goals, performance goals and accomplishments, and

³GAO, *Results-Oriented Government: Practices That Can Help Enhance and Sustain Collaboration among Federal Agencies*, [GAO-06-15](#) (Washington, D.C.: Oct. 21, 2005).

⁴GAO, *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government*, [GAO/AIMD-00-21.3.1](#) (Washington, D.C.: Nov. 1, 1999).

program evaluations conducted during the last decade. We evaluated this information against promising practices of leading organizations and the requirements of GPRAMA. In addition, we obtained and reviewed the agencies' statements on their plans for implementing the recommendations made in our August 2012 report. The work on which this statement is based was performed from June 2011 through March 2013 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

Fragmented Programs Overlap, and Agencies' Efforts to Collaborate Have Been Limited

Federal efforts to support entrepreneurs are fragmented, which occurs when more than one agency or program is involved in the same broad area of national interest. In fiscal year 2011, the 52 programs we reviewed that support entrepreneurial efforts were distributed across four agencies: Commerce (8 programs), HUD (12 programs), SBA (19 programs), and USDA (13 programs). Based on a review of the statutes and regulations for these 52 programs, we determined that the programs overlap in both the type of assistance they provide and the characteristics of the beneficiaries they target. The programs generally can be grouped according to at least one of three types of assistance that address different entrepreneurial needs: (1) technical assistance, (2) financial assistance, and (3) government contracting assistance. Many of the programs can provide more than one type of assistance, and most focus on technical assistance, financial assistance, or both:

- *Technical assistance:* Thirty-five programs distributed across the four agencies provide technical assistance, including business training, counseling and research, and development support. SBA administers 10 of the 35 programs.
- *Financial assistance:* Thirty programs distributed across the four agencies support entrepreneurs through financial assistance in the form of grants, loans, and venture capital. SBA administers 10 of the 30 programs.
- *Government contracting assistance:* Five programs, all of which are administered by SBA, support entrepreneurs by helping them qualify for federal procurement opportunities.

Appendix I lists the programs GAO identified that may have similar or overlapping objectives, provide similar services, or be fragmented across government missions.

We found that overlap tends to be concentrated among programs that provide technical and financial assistance. Within the technical assistance category, 24 of the 35 programs are authorized to provide or fund a broad range of technical assistance both to entrepreneurs with existing businesses and to nascent entrepreneurs—that is, entrepreneurs attempting to start a business—in any industry, including SBA’s Small Business Development Centers Program. Similarly, 16 of the 30 financial assistance programs can provide or guarantee loans that can be used for a broad range of purposes to existing businesses and nascent entrepreneurs in any industry, including SBA’s 7(a) Loan Program.

In addition, a number of programs overlap based on the characteristics of the targeted beneficiary. Most programs either target or exclusively serve one of four types of businesses: businesses in rural areas, businesses in economically distressed areas, disadvantaged businesses, and small businesses.⁵ For example, SBA’s 19 programs are all limited to serving small businesses, with several programs that either target or exclusively serve disadvantaged businesses. Entrepreneurs may fall into more than one beneficiary category—for example, an entrepreneur may be in an area that is both rural and economically distressed. Therefore, these entrepreneurs would be eligible, based on program authority, for more than one subset of programs. For example, a small business in a rural, economically distressed area, such as Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania, could, in terms of program authority, receive a broad range of technical assistance through at least nine programs at all four of the

⁵The definition of rural varies among these programs, but according to USDA—the agency that administers many of the economic development programs that serve rural areas—the term rural typically covers areas with population limits ranging from less than 2,500 to 50,000. Based on statutory language, we characterize economically distressed areas as communities with high concentrations of low- and moderate-income families or high rates of unemployment, underemployment, or both. See, e.g., 42 U.S.C. § 3141; 42 U.S.C. § 5301. Likewise, based on statutory language, we characterize disadvantaged businesses as those owned by women, minority groups, or veterans, among other factors. See, e.g., 15 U.S.C. § 637(a); 15 U.S.C. § 656. The definition of small business varies among these programs, but according to SBA—the agency that administers many of the economic development programs that serve small businesses—the term small business refers to businesses that have annual receipts or total employee numbers under an agency-defined value for their specific industry.

agencies, including SBA's SCORE and Small Business Development Centers programs and USDA's Rural Business Enterprise Grants and Rural Business Opportunity Grants programs. Similarly, a small business that is both minority- and women-owned in an urban, non-economically-distressed area, such as Raleigh, North Carolina, could receive financial assistance in the form of guaranteed or direct loans for a broad range of uses through at least four programs at two of the four agencies, including SBA's 7(a) Loan and Small Business Investment Companies programs. While many programs overlap in terms of statutory authority, entrepreneurs may in reality have fewer options to access assistance from multiple programs. For example, while entrepreneurs seeking technical assistance in Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania, are eligible to receive this support through USDA's 1890 Land Grant Institutions program, the closest funded third-party intermediary (e.g., nonprofit or local government) that actually provides this service is in Delaware, making it unlikely that such an entrepreneur would utilize services through this program.

SBA administers five programs that provide government contracting assistance to entrepreneurs, but our analysis did not identify significant overlap in the types of assistance these programs provide or the types of entrepreneurs they serve. These programs tend to target specific types of entrepreneurs and provide unique types of assistance. For example, the Procurement Assistance to Small Businesses program coordinates access to government contracts for small and disadvantaged businesses with other federal agencies, while the 8(a) Business Development Program coordinates certification of eligible disadvantaged businesses for the contracts made available at these other agencies, in addition to providing business development assistance during their 9 years of eligibility.⁶

Although we identified a number of examples of statutory overlap, we did not find evidence of duplication among these programs (that is, instances when two or more agencies or programs are engaged in the same activities to provide the same services to the same beneficiaries) based on available data. However, as discussed later, most agencies were not

⁶SBA's 8(a) program, named for a section of the Small Business Act, is a development program created to help small, disadvantaged businesses compete in the U.S. economy and access the federal procurement market. Participating businesses, which are generally referred to as 8(a) firms, are eligible to participate in the program for 9 years.

able to provide the programmatic information, such as data on users of the program, that would be necessary to determine whether or not duplication actually exists among the programs.

Some entrepreneurs struggle to navigate the fragmented programs that provide technical assistance. For example, some entrepreneurs and various technical assistance providers with whom we spoke—including agency field offices, intermediaries, and other local service providers—told us that the system can be confusing and that some entrepreneurs do not know what services are available or where to go for assistance.⁷ Technical assistance providers sometimes attempt to help entrepreneurs navigate the system by referring them to other programs, but these efforts are not consistently successful. In addition, programs' Internet resources can also be difficult to navigate. Each agency has its own separate website that provides information to entrepreneurs, but they often direct entrepreneurs to other websites for additional information. SBA, Commerce, USDA, and other agencies have collaborated to develop a joint website called BusinessUSA with the goal of making it easier for businesses to access services. Some technical assistance providers and entrepreneurs we spoke with suggested that a single source to help entrepreneurs quickly find information instead of sorting through different websites would be helpful.

Enhanced collaboration between agencies could help address some of the difficulties entrepreneurs experience and improve program efficiency. In prior work we identified practices that can help to enhance and sustain collaboration among federal agencies, which can help to maximize performance and results, and we have recommended that the agencies follow them.⁸ These collaborative practices include identifying common outcomes, establishing joint strategies, leveraging resources, determining roles and responsibilities, and developing compatible policies and procedures. In addition, GPRAMA's crosscutting framework requires that agencies collaborate in order to address issues such as economic

⁷Federal funds typically flow from the federal agencies to different eligible intermediaries, which are third-party entities that receive federal funds, such as nonprofits or universities. These intermediaries in turn may provide technical assistance to entrepreneurs by, for example, helping them to develop a business plan or put together a loan package to obtain financing. Although intermediaries are the primary providers of technical assistance, agency field offices may also provide some technical assistance.

⁸[GAO-06-15](#).

development that transcend more than one agency, and GPRAMA directs agencies to describe how they are working with each other to achieve their program goals. While the agencies have agreed to work together by signing formal agreements to administer some of their similar programs, they have not implemented a number of other good collaborative practices we have previously identified. For example, SBA and USDA entered into a formal agreement in April 2010 to coordinate their efforts aimed at supporting businesses in rural areas. We previously testified that USDA's April 2011 survey of state directors indicates progress under the memorandum of understanding in several areas, including field offices advising borrowers of SBA's programs, referring borrowers to SBA and its resource partners, and exploring ways to make USDA and SBA programs more complementary.⁹ However, as we reported in August 2012, the agencies have not implemented other good collaborative practices, such as establishing compatible policies and procedures to better support rural businesses.

Agencies Lack Information to Track Program Activities and Measure Performance

While the four agencies collect at least some information on program activities in either an electronic records system or through paper files, most were unable to summarize the information in a way that could be used to help administer the programs. Table 1 summarizes the type of information that the agencies maintain in a readily available format that could be tracked to help administer the programs. For example, SBA collects detailed information on the type of technical assistance provided and type of entrepreneur served for 5 of its 10 technical assistance programs. SBA categorizes the types of technical assistance it provides into 17 categories of training and counseling, such as helping a business develop its business plan. All of this information is maintained in an electronic database that is accessible by agency staff. Although USDA does not collect detailed information on the type of technical assistance provided for its eight programs that provide technical assistance, it does collect detailed information on the industry of each of the entrepreneurs it supports for all of its programs. USDA also collects detailed information (19 categories) on how entrepreneurs use proceeds, such as for working capital, provided through five of its financial assistance programs. USDA

⁹GAO, *Entrepreneurial Assistance: Efficiency and Effectiveness of Fragmented Programs Are Unclear*, [GAO-12-601T](#) (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 29, 2012).

maintains this information in an electronic database, and officials stated that they can provide this type of detailed information upon request.

Table 1: Programs that Can Support Entrepreneurs and Maintain Readily Available Information, by Agency

	35 Technical Assistance Programs					
Information Maintained		Commerce (8)	HUD (9)	SBA (10)	USDA (8)	Total (35)
Type of technical assistance provided?	yes	2	0	5	0	7
	no	6	9	5	8	28
Industry entrepreneur is working in?	yes	8	0	5	8	21
	no	0	9	5	0	14
Type of entrepreneur by targeted categories? ^a	yes	8	1	5	7	21
	no	0	8	5	1	14
	30 Financial Assistance Programs					
		Commerce (2)	HUD (10)	SBA (10)	USDA (8)	Total (30)
Type of financial assistance provided?	yes	2	8	9	8	27
	no	0	2	1	0	3
Use of proceeds?	yes	2	1	7	5	15
	no	0	9	3	3	15
Industry entrepreneur is working in?	yes	2	0	5	8	15
	no	0	10	5	0	15
Type of entrepreneur by targeted categories?	yes	2	3	8	5	18
	no	0	7	2	3	12

Source: GAO analysis of information provided by Commerce, HUD, USDA, and SBA.

Note: This table is based on 50 of the 52 programs that can support entrepreneurs because we excluded the 2 SBA programs that only support government contracting assistance. Some of the 50 programs can provide both financial and technical assistance.

^aTargeted categories can include businesses in rural or economically distressed areas, disadvantaged businesses, or small businesses.

According to OMB, being able to track and measure specific program data can help agencies diagnose problems, identify drivers of future performance, evaluate risk, support collaboration, and inform follow-up actions. Analyses of patterns and anomalies in program information can also help agencies discover ways to achieve more value for the taxpayer's money. In addition, agencies can use this information to assess whether their specific program activities are contributing as planned to the agency goals. Government internal control standards state that agencies should promptly and accurately record transactions to

maintain their relevance and value for management decision making.¹⁰ Furthermore, this information should be readily available for use by agency management and others so that they can carry out their duties with the goal of achieving all of their objectives, including making operating decisions and allocating resources.

We also found that for fiscal year 2011, a number of programs that support entrepreneurs failed to meet some or all of their performance goals. Table 2 summarizes accomplishment data for the programs that support entrepreneurs and set goals for fiscal year 2011. For example, 7 of the 14 SBA programs that set goals either did not meet any of their goals or only met some of their goals.

Table 2: Accomplishment Data for Programs that Support Entrepreneurs and Set Goals, Fiscal Year 2011

	Programs that did not meet goals	Programs that met some goals	Programs that met all goals
Commerce	1	5	2
HUD	2	0	0
SBA	2	5	7
USDA	4	0	3
Total	9	10	12

Source: GAO analysis of data from Commerce, HUD, SBA, and USDA.

Note: Two programs have goals but did not have goal accomplishment information. Goal accomplishment information for HUD's Section 4 Capacity Building for Affordable Housing and Community Development program is unknown because HUD did not provide goal accomplishment information. Goal accomplishment information for USDA's Small Business Innovation Research program is not available because the program goals are based on 2-year time periods and the current period has not yet ended.

Measuring performance allows organizations to track the progress they are making toward their goals and gives managers crucial information on which to base their organizational and management decisions. Leading organizations recognize that performance measures can create powerful incentives to influence organizational and individual behavior. Some of their good practices include setting and measuring performance goals. GPRAMA also requires agencies to develop annual performance plans that include performance goals for an agency's program activities and

¹⁰ [GAO/AIMD-00-21.3.1](#).

accompanying performance measures. According to GPRAMA, these performance goals should be in a quantifiable and measurable form to define the level of performance to be achieved for program activities each year.

Further, since 2000 the agencies have conducted program evaluations of only 20 of the 52 programs that support entrepreneurs. Based on our review, we found that SBA has conducted performance evaluation studies on 9 of its 19 programs, including 3 programs that provide counseling and training. We also found that USDA has conducted an evaluation on 1 of its 13 programs, but the study did not address the extent to which the program was achieving its mission. Although GPRAMA does not require agencies to conduct formal program evaluations, it does require agencies to describe program evaluations that were used to establish or revise strategic goals, as well as program evaluations they plan to conduct in the future. Additionally, while not required to do so, agencies can use periodic program evaluations to complement ongoing performance measurement. Program evaluations that systematically study the benefits of programs may help identify the extent to which overlapping and fragmented programs are achieving their objectives. In addition, program evaluations can help agencies determine reasons why a performance goal was not met and give an agency direction on how to improve program performance.

To address these issues and to help improve the efficiency and effectiveness of federal efforts to support entrepreneurs, in our August 2012 report, we made the following recommendations:

- The Director of the Office of Management and Budget; the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Housing and Urban Development; and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration should work together to identify opportunities to enhance collaboration among programs, both within and across agencies.
- The Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Housing and Urban Development and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration should consistently collect information that would enable them to track the specific type of assistance programs provide and the entrepreneurs they serve and use this information to help administer their programs.

-
- The Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Housing and Urban Development and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration should conduct more program evaluations to better understand why programs have not met performance goals and the programs' overall effectiveness.

The agencies, together with the administration, have taken some steps to address our recommendations. For example, the administration has initiated steps that provide the agencies with a mechanism to work together to identify opportunities to enhance collaboration among programs. In particular, it introduced a cross-agency priority goal to increase services to entrepreneurs and small businesses in the fiscal year 2013 budget submission.¹¹ One of the objectives under this goal is to utilize programs and resources across the federal government to improve and expand the reach of training, counseling, and mentoring services to entrepreneurs and small business owners. According to the fiscal year 2012 fourth quarter status update for this goal, the administration established an interagency group (including Commerce, SBA, USDA, and others) that aims to streamline existing programs, improve cooperation among and within agencies, ease entrepreneurs' access to the programs, and increase data-based evaluation of program performance. The update also notes that the interagency group will develop an action plan outlining opportunities to enhance collaboration among programs across agencies and a strategy for increasing data collection and outcome-based program evaluation. However, the update does not specify a timeframe for the completion of these actions. It will be important for the interagency group to follow through on developing an action plan, including milestones, that identifies opportunities to enhance collaboration among programs across agencies and for the agencies to pursue such opportunities.

In addition, the four agencies said that they have taken steps to improve program evaluation and collect information to help track program activities and administer programs that support entrepreneurs. For example,

¹¹GPRAMA, among other things, required OMB to coordinate with agencies to establish outcome-oriented federal government priority goals—otherwise referred to as crosscutting goals—covering a limited number of policy areas, as well as goals to improve management across the federal government. Entrepreneurship and small businesses was one of 14 interim crosscutting priority goals included in the President's 2013 budget submission.

-
- SBA noted that it is engaged in a comprehensive analysis and review of its performance measures and metrics to identify opportunities to make them more efficient and transparent. SBA added that in coordination with its Office of Performance Management, all of its offices are working together to achieve more efficient and effective data-driven performance measures.
 - Commerce's Economic Development Administration noted that it has partnered with two universities to develop a comprehensive set of performance measures that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of its programs and has engaged a third-party firm to assess best practices within the agency's University Center Program, with the findings scheduled to be completed in 2015.
 - USDA noted that its Rural Business-Cooperative Service is developing a strategic plan that includes an initiative to improve the quality of performance measurement within the next 2 years.
 - HUD noted that it included a proposed study of its Community Development Block Grant economic development activities in its draft research roadmap for fiscal years 2014 to 2018.

Chairman Graves and Ranking Member Velazquez, this concludes my prepared statement. I would be happy to answer any questions at this time.

Contacts and Staff Acknowledgements

For further information on this testimony, please contact me at (202) 512-8678 or shearw@gao.gov. Contact points for our Offices of Congressional Relations and Public Affairs may be found on the last page of this statement. Key contributors to this testimony include Marshall Hamlett, Assistant Director; John McGrail; and Jennifer Schwartz.

Appendix I: List of Programs That Support Entrepreneurs and Related Budgetary Information

Agency	Program	FY 2011 obligations ^a
Department of Commerce	Grants for Public Works and Economic Development Facilities	114,529,000
	Economic Development/ Support for Planning Organizations	31,352,000
	Economic Development/ Technical Assistance	13,373,000
	Economic Adjustment Assistance	78,720,000
	Trade Adjustment Assistance	15,418,000
	Global Climate Change Mitigation Incentive Fund	17,466,000
	Minority Business Centers	17,948,122
	Native American Business Enterprise Centers ^b	0
U.S. Department of Agriculture	Woody Biomass Utilization Grant Program	3,000,000
	1890 Land Grant Institutions Rural Entrepreneurial Outreach Program/Rural Business Entrepreneur Development Initiative ^c	0
	Small Business Innovation Research	22,635,200
	Biomass Research and Development Initiative Competitive Grants Program	2,075,000
	Value Added Producer Grants	1,318,000
	Agriculture Innovation Center	0
	Small Socially-Disadvantaged Producer Grants	2,940,000
	Intermediary Re-lending	7,364,000
	Business and Industry Loans	70,202,000
	Rural Business Enterprise Grants	38,586,000
	Rural Cooperative Development Grants	8,424,000
	Rural Business Opportunity Grants	2,581,000
	Rural Microentrepreneur Assistance Program	6,668,000
	Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)/Entitlement Grants ^d	325,549,306
Department of Housing and Urban Development	CDBG/Special Purpose/Insular Areas ^e	214,396
	CDBG/States ^f	559,961,961
	CDBG/Non-entitlement CDBG Grants in Hawaii ^g	338,257
	CDBG/Brownfields Economic Development Initiative	0
	CDBG/Section 108 Loan Guarantees	6,000,000
	Section 4 Capacity Building for Affordable Housing and Community Development	50,000,000
	Rural Innovation Fund ^h	0
	CDBG Disaster Recovery Grants	0
	Indian CDBG	64,000,000
	Hispanic Serving Institutions Assisting Communities	0

**Appendix I: List of Programs That Support
Entrepreneurs and Related Budgetary
Information**

Agency	Program	FY 2011 obligations^a
	Alaska Native/Native Hawaiian Institutions Assisting Communities	0
Small Business Administration	8(a) Business Development Program	58,274,000
	7(j) Technical Assistance	6,502,000
	Procurement Assistance to Small Businesses	21,171,000
	Small Business Investment Companies	26,305,000
	7(a) Loan Program	88,000,000
	Surety Bond Guarantee Program	4,865,000
	SCORE	12,980,000
	Small Business Development Centers	130,323,000
	504 Loan Program	38,888,000
	Women's Business Centers	19,446,000
	Veterans' Business Outreach Centers	8,995,000
	Microloan Program	38,729,000
	PRIME	8,863,000
	New Markets Venture Capital Program ⁱ	0
	International Trade	7,681,000
	HUBZone	15,569,000
	Small Business Technology Transfer Program	352,000
	Small Business Innovation Research Program	781,000
	Federal and State Technology Partnership Program	1,885,096
Total		1,950,272,338

Source: GAO analysis of information provided by Commerce, HUD, SBA, and USDA.

^aFiscal year 2011 obligations were provided by agency officials for each program. HUD's figures represent fiscal year 2011 actual budget authority rather than obligations. SBA figures represent fiscal year 2011 fully allocated costs rather than obligations.

^bCommerce's Native American Business Enterprise Centers program incurred obligations in fiscal year 2011, but Commerce officials could not provide funding data at the program level. Funding for this program is included in the fiscal year 2011 obligations for Commerce's Minority Business Center program.

^cUSDA's 1890 program does not have a congressional appropriation but is instead funded through USDA's Salaries and Expenses account. Funding is not reported separately for this program and is listed as \$0 here, but the program is active and funded.

^dThis figure is an estimate of actual budget authority used for activities that GAO categorizes as economic development, rather than total program expenditures, and does not include other costs for activities such as housing or public services.

^eThis figure is an estimate of actual budget authority used for activities that GAO categorizes as economic development, rather than total program expenditures, and does not include other costs for activities such as housing or public services.

**Appendix I: List of Programs That Support
Entrepreneurs and Related Budgetary
Information**

^fThis figure is an estimate of actual budget authority used for activities that GAO categorizes as economic development, rather than total program expenditures, and does not include other costs for activities such as housing or public services.

^gThis figure is an estimate of actual budget authority used for activities that GAO categorizes as economic development, rather than total program expenditures, and does not include other costs for activities such as housing or public services.

^hHUD officials noted that \$31,355,236 in 5-year grants was awarded in September 2011 through this program, but those funds will not be obligated until after fiscal year 2011. These funds include \$25,000,000 that was appropriated in fiscal year 2010 for the program and additional funds recaptured through HUD's Rural Housing and Economic Development program.

ⁱAccording to SBA officials, the New Markets Venture Capital program is a one-time pilot program that received one-time funding in fiscal year 2001.

This is a work of the U.S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. The published product may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from GAO. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.

GAO's Mission

The Government Accountability Office, the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of Congress, exists to support Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities and to help improve the performance and accountability of the federal government for the American people. GAO examines the use of public funds; evaluates federal programs and policies; and provides analyses, recommendations, and other assistance to help Congress make informed oversight, policy, and funding decisions. GAO's commitment to good government is reflected in its core values of accountability, integrity, and reliability.

Obtaining Copies of GAO Reports and Testimony

The fastest and easiest way to obtain copies of GAO documents at no cost is through GAO's website (<http://www.gao.gov>). Each weekday afternoon, GAO posts on its website newly released reports, testimony, and correspondence. To have GAO e-mail you a list of newly posted products, go to <http://www.gao.gov> and select "E-mail Updates."

Order by Phone

The price of each GAO publication reflects GAO's actual cost of production and distribution and depends on the number of pages in the publication and whether the publication is printed in color or black and white. Pricing and ordering information is posted on GAO's website, <http://www.gao.gov/ordering.htm>.

Place orders by calling (202) 512-6000, toll free (866) 801-7077, or TDD (202) 512-2537.

Orders may be paid for using American Express, Discover Card, MasterCard, Visa, check, or money order. Call for additional information.

Connect with GAO

Connect with GAO on [Facebook](#), [Flickr](#), [Twitter](#), and [YouTube](#). Subscribe to our [RSS Feeds](#) or [E-mail Updates](#). Listen to our [Podcasts](#). Visit GAO on the web at www.gao.gov.

To Report Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Federal Programs

Contact:

Website: <http://www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm>

E-mail: fraudnet@gao.gov

Automated answering system: (800) 424-5454 or (202) 512-7470

Congressional Relations

Katherine Siggerud, Managing Director, siggerudk@gao.gov, (202) 512-4400, U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7125, Washington, DC 20548

Public Affairs

Chuck Young, Managing Director, youngc1@gao.gov, (202) 512-4800 U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7149 Washington, DC 20548



Please Print on Recycled Paper.