

Tool 2: Table for Collecting and Assessing Information on the Potential Effects of Fragmentation, Overlap, and Duplication

Step 2 of this guide directs analysts to develop a comprehensive list of the potential positive and negative effects associated with the fragmentation, overlap, or duplication identified in [Step 1](#) of this guide. Fragmentation, overlap, and duplication can affect program implementation, outcomes and impact, and cost-effectiveness. To identify potential positive and negative effects, analysts can consult existing sources of information or conduct original research for evidence of these effects. The following questions and table can help guide and summarize analysts' assessments.

Table: Questions to Help Identify Potential Positive and Negative Effects of Fragmentation, Overlap, and Duplication

Assessment area	Questions	Description of evidence	Analyst's assessment
Implementation	<p><u>Is there evidence of the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs and agencies work together to provide logical and coordinated benefits, services, or products? • Related programs and agencies have strategic agreements in place to help achieve outcomes? • Roles and responsibilities of related programs and agencies are clear? • The collective programs cover all who might be eligible for benefits, services, or products? • The fragmentation, overlap, or duplication was planned or intentional—such as to fill a gap, complement an existing program, or try a new method—and is still necessary or justified? • Any unplanned or unintentional fragmentation, overlap, or duplication has positive effects? 		<p>Select one</p> <p>Evidence of positive effects</p> <p>Evidence of negative effects</p> <p>Evidence of both positive and negative effects</p>

<p>Outcomes and impact</p>	<p><u>Is there evidence of the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The collective provision of benefits, services, or products helps agencies meet the individual and shared goals and objectives of their programs? • Agencies are able to measure the “whole” effort, if multiple agencies and programs are working together to meet shared goals and objectives? • Related programs and outcomes are complementary (i.e., not working at cross-purposes or conflicting)? • Those who are eligible for benefits, services, or products are receiving them? • Beneficiaries or customers are receiving benefits, services, or products in a unified and coordinated manner (i.e., not receiving similar or duplicative benefits, services, etc., from multiple programs)? 	<p>Select one</p> <p>Evidence of positive effects</p> <p>Evidence of negative effects</p> <p>Evidence of both positive and negative effects</p>
<p>Cost-effectiveness</p>	<p><u>Is there evidence of the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The collective provision of benefits, services, or products is economical and efficient? • There is no reduction in benefits resulting from the current structure of providing benefits, services, or products? 	<p>Select one</p> <p>Evidence of positive effects</p> <p>Evidence of negative effects</p> <p>Evidence of both positive and negative effects</p>