



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

April 4, 2013

M-13-11

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

FROM: Danny Werfel
Controller

SUBJECT: Ongoing Implementation of the Joint Committee Sequestration

Section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act (BBEDCA), as amended, on March 1, 2013, required the President to issue a sequestration order canceling \$85 billion in budgetary resources across the Federal Government for the remainder of fiscal year (FY) 2013. This action was required due to the failure of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction to propose, and the Congress to enact, legislation to reduce the deficit by \$1.2 trillion.

The Administration continues to urge Congress to take action to eliminate the Joint Committee sequestration and restore cancelled budgetary resources as part of a balanced agreement on deficit reduction. However, until Congress takes such action, executive departments and agencies (agencies) must continue to implement the reductions required by sequestration.

This memorandum provides further guidance on specific issues regarding the management and implementation of sequestration that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) preliminarily addressed in prior memoranda. OMB previously issued guidance on the appropriate implementation of sequestration in Memorandum 13-03, *Planning for Uncertainty with Respect to Fiscal Year 2013 Budgetary Resources*; Memorandum 13-05, *Agency Responsibilities for Implementation of Potential Joint Committee Sequestration*; and Memorandum 13-06, *Issuance of the Sequestration Order Pursuant To Section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as Amended*.

Appropriate Use of Existing Reprogramming and Transfer Authority

Sequestration provides an agency with little discretion in deciding where and how to reduce spending. All non-exempt budget accounts in a given spending category must be reduced by a uniform percentage, and the same percentage reduction must be applied to all programs, projects, and activities (PPAs) within a budget account. However, depending on an agency's account structure and any existing flexibilities provided by law, some agencies may have a limited ability to realign funds to protect mission priorities. As directed by Memorandum 13-03, in allocating reduced budgetary resources due to sequestration, agencies should generally "use

any available flexibility to reduce operational risks and minimize impacts on the agency's core mission in service of the American people." Agencies should also "take into account funding flexibilities, including the availability of reprogramming and transfer authority."

Consistent with this guidance, agencies with reprogramming or transfer authority should continue to examine whether the use of these authorities would allow the agency to minimize the negative impact of sequestration on core mission priorities. In doing so, agencies must consider the long-term mission, goals, and operations of the agency and not just short-term needs. For example, agencies should avoid taking steps that would unduly compromise the ability to perform needed deferred maintenance on facilities, invest in critical operational functions and support, conduct program integrity and fraud mitigation activities, and pursue information technology or other infrastructure investments that are essential to support the long-term execution of the agency's mission. Similarly, while agencies with carryover balances or reserve funds should consider appropriate use of these funds to maintain core mission functions in the short term, it is important not to use these funds in a manner that would leave the agency vulnerable to future risks due to a potential lack of available funds in future years.

Agencies should consult with their OMB Resource Management Office (RMO) to assess options for utilizing existing authorities and ensure that any proposed actions appropriately balance short-term and long-term mission priorities. Agencies must also consult closely with their OMB RMO on any proposed actions that would reduce carryover balances or reserve funds below historical levels.

Funding for Agency Inspectors General

Funds for agency Inspectors General (IGs) from non-exempt accounts are subject to sequestration under the March 1, 2013 sequestration order. The head of each agency has the final responsibility for implementing the reductions required by sequestration. Upon making such determinations, IGs have the final responsibility for determining how their authorized budgets will be allocated.

To the extent an agency has discretion in implementing reductions to IG funding due to sequestration, agency heads should be mindful of the independence of the Office of Inspector General and should consult with the IG on a pre-decisional basis on matters that may impact IG funding. In particular, agencies must remain cognizant of the provisions in section 6 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, which outline the need for IGs to maintain the appropriate resources and services necessary to perform their statutory duties and describe the manner in which IG budgets are requested.

In cases where IG funds are not intermingled with other agency funds and exist as their own PPA, the IG should be provided full discretion to determine how to implement the reductions required by sequestration. In cases where IG funds are intermingled with other agency funds within a PPA, while the specific amount of reductions will vary by agency and account, a benchmark that should be considered by the head of the agency—in consultation with the IG—is to apply a percentage reduction to IG funds that is same as the average percentage reduction for all other funds within the PPA. Upon determining the amount of the reduction for

IG funds in such cases, the agency head should then defer as appropriate to the IG in determining how the IG manages the reductions.

Agencies should consult with their OMB RMO throughout this process as well.

Discretionary Monetary Awards

OMB Memorandum 13-05 directs that discretionary monetary awards should not be issued while sequestration is in place, unless issuance of such awards is legally required. Discretionary monetary awards include annual performance awards, group awards, and special act cash awards, which comprise a sizeable majority of awards and incentives provided by the Federal Government to employees. Until further notice, agencies should not issue such monetary awards from sequestered accounts unless agency counsel determines the awards are legally required. Legal requirements include compliance with provisions in collective bargaining agreements governing awards.¹

Consistent with past guidance, certain types of incentives are not considered discretionary monetary awards for the purposes of this policy. These include quality step increases (QSIs); travel incentives recognizing employee savings on official travel; foreign language awards for mission-critical language needs; recruitment, retention, and relocation incentives (3Rs); student loan repayments; and time-off awards. While these items are permitted, in light of current budgetary constraints, they should be used only on a highly limited basis and in circumstances where they are necessary and critical to maintaining the agency's mission. In addition, consistent with the policy set forth in the *Guidance on Awards for Fiscal Years 2011 and 2012*, jointly issued by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and OMB on June 10, 2011, spending for QSIs and 3Rs should not exceed the level of spending on such incentives for fiscal year 2010.

With respect to Federal political appointees, agencies should continue to follow the policy set forth in the August 3, 2010 Presidential Memorandum, *Freeze on Discretionary Awards, Bonuses, and Similar Payments for Federal Political Appointees*. OPM previously issued guidance on implementation of this memorandum.

Reducing Burden for State, Local, and Tribal Governments

To the extent agencies provide grants or other forms of financial assistance to States, localities, or tribal governments, agencies should consider if there are ways to help such entities mitigate the effects of funding reductions due to sequestration through reducing administrative burdens or other standard administrative processes, consistent with applicable legal requirements associated with the funds provided. In doing so, agencies should consult closely with their State, local, and tribal partners to determine whether such steps enable public funds to be used in a more cost-effective manner.

¹ Consistent with legal requirements, agencies may consider engaging in discussions with employees' exclusive representatives to explore revisions to such provisions in existing collective bargaining agreements, in recognition of this guidance.