

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

PART ASSESSMENTS¹

¹ For each program that has been assessed using the PART, this document contains details of the most recent assessment. These details are presented in their original form; some programs have revised performance targets and developed or replaced performance measures since the original assessment. The PART summaries published with the 2006 Budget (in February 2005) provide current information on follow-up to recommendations and other updates.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Page</u>
Aids to Navigation.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	3
Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	9
Baggage Screening Technology.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	18
Biological Countermeasures.....	Effective.....	27
Border Patrol.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	41
Coast Guard Domestic Icebreaking Program.....	Effective.....	52
Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement.....	Moderately Effective.....	58
Coast Guard Migrant Interdiction Program.....	Moderately Effective.....	67
Coast Guard Polar Icebreaking Program.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	75
Container Security Initiative.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	81
Detention and Removal.....	Moderately Effective.....	87
Drug Interdiction.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	97
Federal Air Marshal Service.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	103
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	112
Federal Protective Service.....	Moderately Effective.....	120
FEMA Response.....	Adequate.....	129
Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions.....	Effective.....	146
Hazard Mitigation Grant.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	159
Immigration Services.....	Adequate.....	169
Inspection Technology.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	180
Marine Environmental Protection.....	Moderately Effective.....	192
Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS).....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	202
National Flood Insurance.....	Adequate.....	209
Office of Investigations.....	Adequate.....	218
Passenger Screening Technology.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	229
Protective Intelligence.....	Effective.....	238
Recovery (FEMA).....	Adequate.....	253
Screener Training.....	Adequate.....	262
Screener Workforce.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	272
Search and Rescue.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	284
Standards--Science and Technology.....	Adequate.....	290
State Homeland Security Grants.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	298
Threat and Vulnerability, Testing and Assessment (TVT).....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	312

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: Aids to Navigation (ATON)

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	The program purpose is to establish, operate, and maintain radio and short-range aids to navigation to provide positioning capability to mariners and promote safety.	14 USC 2 requires Coast Guard to operate aids to navigation for the promotion of safety in US waters; 14 USC 81 provides more details on the program. US Code available at www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode .	20%	0.2
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	ATON allows large ships, barges, and fishing vessels to navigate safely and efficiently through US waters.	Many buoys and ranges are put in place by CG specifically in response to accidents or complaints. When aids are removed in winter to avoid icing, mobility in those areas is reduced. Waterways Analysis Management System (WAMS) reports. http://www.uscg.mil/d13/oan/wams/	20%	0.2
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The Federal government is the only provider of radionavigation services (DOD provides GPS; CG provides DGPS and Loran-C). It maintains over half of US short-range aids; non-Federal aids are at the fringes of the system, not in primary waterways.	Short-range aids system includes: 35,000 CG aids, 15,000 CG river buoys, and about 50,000 non-Federal aids. http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-cp/comrel/factfile/index.htm (Short Range Aids to Navigation)	20%	0.2
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	Radionavigation systems are sometimes purposefully redundant to back up other Federal systems: DGPS augments GPS by improving its accuracy and providing to users an integrity warning of any detected faults in the GPS service, and Loran-C is less vulnerable than GPS. No other Federal agency provides short-range aids. State and local entities maintain short-range aids only at the fringes of the navigation system.	http://www.volpe.dot.gov/gps/gpsvuln.html (Vulnerability Assessment of the Transportation Infrastructure Relying on the Global Positioning System); http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g%2Dcp/comrel/factfile/factcards/dgps.html (summary of DGPS);	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	Previous studies have not demonstrated conclusively that other program designs would not be more efficient or effective, including capital assets and service acquisition; competitive grants; and block/formula grants.	1989 report on Aids to Navigation Servicing Trial Contracts; 1990 DOT Evaluation of Contracting the Servicing of SRA.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					100%	80%

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	No	The ATON program has no long-term goals.	FY 2004 Budget request to OMB; OST Office of Performance Planning.	17%	0.0
2	<i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	DOT's measure is the percentage of days waterways are available for commerce (2004 goal 98%). Coast Guard's measure is the number of collisions, allisions, and groundings (2004 goal 1,923). Collision is when two moving objects hit each other; allision is when a vessel hits a stationary object. Coast Guard also tracks the percentage of time aids are available, but that measure is an output rather than an outcome.	FY 2004 Budget request to OMB; OST Office of Performance Planning.	17%	0.2
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	N/A	Program has no grantees, sub-grantees, or contractors.	_____	0%	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	On radionavigation programs, CG works closely with DOD (which operates GPS) and FAA (aviation radionavigation). On short-range aids, CG works with Army Corps of Engineers (dredging -- buoys align with channels), DOD mapping, and NOAA.	http://www.navcen.uscg.gov/pubs/frp2001/FRP2001.pdf (Federal Radionavigation Plan)	17%	0.2
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	No	No independent, quality evaluations of program performance are conducted regularly. ATON has had various in-house and other evaluations conducted to assess major processes, facilities, and program management.	http://www.uscg.mil/news/reportsandbudget/rolesandmissions/R&M.html (Roles and Missions Report)	17%	0.0
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	Yes	CG's Mission Cost Program model provides comprehensive cost information for individual programs, including overhead and other indirect costs as well as direct costs.	FY 2004 Budget request to OMB; CG Mission Cost Program model	16%	0.2
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	DOT has been working with CG to improve its performance measures. Coast Guard also uses an agency-wide Business Planning Process to collect data and develop goals and strategies.	DOT and CG performance reports; CG Business Plan. http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/nmc/gendoc/fy2001pp.pdf	16%	0.2
Total Section Score					100%	66%

Section III: Program Management (Yes, No, N/A)						
	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	CG's Waterways Analysis and Management System (WAMS) reviews each waterway and analyzes the aid system on a regular schedule to help servicing units and program managers better allocate resources and promote safety.	Waterways Analysis Management System (WAMS) reports.	17%	0.2
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	No	Performance measures are used as resource arguments and not personnel performance assessments.	_____	17%	0.0
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	99% of operating expenses are obligated in the first year. Virtually all acquisition, communication, and improvement funds are obligated prior to expiring.	1) Estimated obligations by quarter in apportionments. 2) Actual obligations by quarter.	17%	0.2
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	Decisions are decentralized to the district level to delayer the organization. The program allows for flexible local sourcing for site management. CG continually looks to improve efficiency through IT and technological advances. As an example, the short-range aids program transitioned from primary batteries to solar power systems to reduce costs and improve signal performance.	_____	17%	0.2
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	Yes	CG uses an activity-based costing model developed by KPMG that significantly exceeds the requirements of the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board. The system is based on reliable cost data that is reconciled to CG's audited financial statements.	Coast Guard activity-based costing model.	16%	0.2
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	The program has no internal control weaknesses.	Three consecutive CFO audits. http://www.oig.dot.gov/show_pdf.php?id=713 http://www.oig.dot.gov/show_pdf.php?id=206	16%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	N/A	No management deficiencies have been identified.	_____	0%	
Total Section Score				100%	82%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	No	The program does not have long-term goals.	FY 2004 Budget request to OMB; OST Office of Performance Planning.	20%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:					
Long-Term Goal II: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:					
Long-Term Goal III: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:					

2 <i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Large extent	The DOT goal is new for 2004. Data on performance are not yet available. The program did achieve the Coast Guard goal.	FY 2004 Budget request to OMB; OST Office of Performance Planning.	20%	0.1
--	--------------	--	--	-----	-----

Key Goal I: Performance Target: Actual Performance:	DOT goal: Percentage of time waterways are available for commerce. 2004: 98% N/A				
Key Goal II: Performance Target: Actual Performance:	CG goal: Total number of commercial vessel collisions, allisions, and groundings. 2001: 2,261 2002: 2,098 2003: 2,010 2001: 1,677				
Key Goal III: Performance Target: Actual Performance:					

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Yes	CG has examples of efficiency gains: transition from primary batteries to solar power systems; Loran-C recapitalization project maintains performance while reducing maintenance.	_____	20%	0.2
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Yes	International ATON programs share the 99.7% aid-availability target.	The Northwest European Loran System had availability of 99.60% in 2001, compared to the Coast Guard Loran availability rate of 99.81%. www.nels.org	20%	0.2
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	No	No independent, quality evaluations of program performance are conducted regularly.	_____	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					100%	53%

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Office for Domestic Preparedness
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
20%	57%	90%	13%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of the program is specified in the authorizing statute as "...protecting the health and safety of the public and firefighting personnel against fire and fire-related hazards."

Evidence: Federal Fire Protection and Control (FPCA) of 1974 as amended.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: NO

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Despite a long-term trend in reduced deaths, losses, and injuries from fire, fire service organizations claim there are inadequate levels of basic equipment, training, vehicles, and staffing, especially in small cities and towns. These shortfalls cataloged in self-reported surveys, are blamed for the inability of many small departments to comply with various capability standards. However, a link between meeting these standards and reducing fire deaths and injuries has not been established. It is not clear which of the fourteen activities authorized under the statute has the greatest relative impact on protecting firefighters and the public.

Evidence: Fire Loss in the United States, 2002; Firefighter Fatalities in the United States, 2002; A Needs Assessment of the Fire Service, 2002

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: NO

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program was created explicitly to make up for claimed inadequacies in state and local funding. Most of the eligible activities covered by the program have historically been a state or local responsibility. There is also the potential for duplication with fire department assistant programs currently ongoing at the Departments of Agriculture (Rural Fire Assistance) and Interior (Volunteer Fire Assistance), principally in equipment and training for wildfire firefighting and prevention. To mitigate overlaps, there are agreements with each agency on the sharing of information and collaboration of staff. The DHS IG identified overlaps between AFG and other DHS first responder programs which must be addressed as the AFG is moved into the Office for Domestic Preparedness, but this effort will be complicated by the lack of state-level involvement in AFG.

Evidence: Surveys of grantees indicated that many grant-funded activities were consistent with normal operating or capital expenses. MOU with Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior; FPCA - maintenance of expenditures clause. Review of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, DHS Office of Inspector General, Sept. 2003.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: NO

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Providing direct Federal grants to thousands of local grantees presents a number of inherent challenges, most significantly the difficulty of centrally reviewing, processing, and overseeing thousands of grants. While Congressional appropriations have increased, the average grant size has remains small (approx \$71,000), resulting in lengthy grant processing times and some backlogs in monitoring grantee activities. The statute's maximum award level of \$750,000 and the current implementation of cost-sharing requirements puts fire departments in large cities at a major disadvantage.

Evidence: FY 01-03 Federal Register Rules and Notice of Funds Available (NOFA); FY 01-03 Grant Evaluations Plans; award and application reports for FY01-02; Review of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, DHS Office of Inspector General, Sept. 2003.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Office for Domestic Preparedness
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
20%	57%	90%	13%	Demonstrated

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Largely as a result of statutory requirements, the program is strongly oriented towards funding as many fire departments as possible. Large department serving major population centers are disadvantaged by a \$750,000 cap on awards, and a legislative requirement to 'balance' awards among different types communities and department. In 2002, just 29% of all funds went towards suburban and urban departments, with the latter receiving only 9%. Though data is limited, studies indicate that just 12% of fire deaths occur in rural areas, though occurring at a higher per capita rate than in urban areas. Thus, urban areas are relatively under-funded relative to the fire risks they face. USFA does set some priorities for applicants by giving priority to applications for projects benefiting high-risk children and seniors, and utilizing cost/benefit assessments. The DHS IG has recommended greater promotion of regional mutual aid and interoperability.

Evidence: FY 01-03 Federal Register Rules and Notice of Funds Available (NOFA); FY 01-03 Grant Evaluations Plans and the results of the 2001 survey of grantees. Maintenance of expenditures clause of FPCA, as amended. USFA data on 1983-1988 fire fatalities in rural vs. non-rural areas. Review of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, DHS Office of Inspector General, Sept. 2003.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: As currently structured, the program's key long term goal is to reduce annual fire fatalities to 4050 over FY03-07, and to 3825 over FY03-09. The program is also aimed at reducing estimated 100 firefighter deaths that occur annually, though this measure can be significantly affected a few incidents. The DHS Inspector General recommended that these measures have greater focus on fire service capabilities and needs.

Evidence: FEMA Strategic Plan; Fire Prevention and Control Act, Section 33; NFIRS Reports. The USFA maintains the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) which provides some annual statistical data that on fire injuries and deaths. Review of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, DHS Office of Inspector General, Sept. 2003.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The current timeframes and targets are not ambitious. In 2002 there were 3380 civilian fire deaths and 97 firefighter fatalities, well below the projected 'targets' for FY03 and beyond. The declines in civilian fatalities (-10% from 2001, excluding the Sept. 11 attacks) took place before significant grant funds had been awarded. As a result, any potential impact of the Assistance to Firefighters Program would have to be weighed against the impact of other factors already contributing to lower fire fatalities.

Evidence: Fire Loss in the United States, 2002; FEMA Strategic Plan; Firefighter Fatalities in the United States, 2002

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Office for Domestic Preparedness
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
20%	57%	90%	13%	Demonstrated

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Of the annual goals claimed by the program, only the goals for improving application quality, grants management, and grantee reporting represent annual measure, and even these 'process' measures need to be better specified. The program does not have annual measures that can demonstrate actual progress towards achieving the long-term goals. The DHS Inspector General recommended better measures of fire service capabilities and needs. The program is encouraging grantees to provide performance data and participate in the National Fire Incident Response System. If such efforts are successful, it would provide valuable information for developing annual measures of grantee performance, including their terrorism preparedness.

Evidence: Review of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, DHS Office of Inspector General, Sept. 2003.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The program has set baselines and targets for its process measures, though they should be clarified to emphasize those that are most objective and relevant. It has not yet identified annual performance measures covering its grantees activities.

Evidence: FY 2001 report awards report; FY 2002 Applications and Awards Reports; FY 2003 Application Report; FY 2001 close out report due August 2003

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Grantees agree to provide data that reflect the program's long-term goals, such as the number of fire fatalities and response runs. The program gives higher priority to applications focused on firefighters and members of the public at greatest risk (children and seniors).

Evidence: Grant Evaluation Plan, FY 2003

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Only one broad independent evaluation has been performed to date, a DHS Inspector General report issued in September 2003. Internal assessments have been limited to surveys of grantee satisfaction. Nevertheless these efforts are still somewhat ad hoc, a more consistent evaluation strategy is required. Future evaluations should be broader in scope, more focused on grantee performance, and more independent. USFA has asked CDC to examine fire prevention grants as part of a broader fire safety study, and a more thorough independent evaluation may be in the works for 2004.

Evidence: Survey, Assessment and Recommendations for the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program (2003). Review of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, DHS Office of Inspector General, Sept. 2003.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Office for Domestic Preparedness
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
20%	57%	90%	13%	Demonstrated

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Prior to FY 2004, the Administration had requested no funding for this program. The Administration's FY 2004 budget request included Assistance to Fire Grants as part of the First Responder terrorism preparedness initiative.

Evidence:

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Program has shown progress on specifying goals and fostering more independent evaluations. However, little attention has been given to the under-funding of major population centers or new priorities such as terrorism preparedness, authorized under P.L. 107-107. These concerns would be addressed as part of the proposed transfer to a consolidated DHS grants office.

Evidence:

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Program has implemented an online system to facilitate the collection of performance data from grantees. The system also allows the program to list the details of purchases for the use of other entities, including its federal and state partners. Data collected from this system helps inform funding priorities. However, the level of grantee compliance with reporting requirements is uneven: 12% of FY01 grantees and 33% of FY02 grantees have not provided performance reports as of August 2003. The DHS Inspector General has recommended improved grant monitoring.

Evidence: Grant closeout records for FY01. Review of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, DHS Office of Inspector General, Sept. 2003.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: At the Federal level, program accountability rests with the Administrator of the Preparedness Division, and the AFG director. However, they are not required to meet an objective standards for cost, schedule or performance. The chiefs of participating departments are formally accountable for the use AFG funds. However, USFA does not appear to hold them personally responsible for performance, as no action has been taken in the isolated cases where funds were awarded based on misleading information. However, a department's past performance is considered when evaluating new applications.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Office for Domestic Preparedness
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
20%	57%	90%	13%	Demonstrated

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The FY 2001 awards were awarded in a timely manner, and 98% of those funds have been expended by grantees. The FY03 and FY03 awards have been made at a more rapid pace, though substantial amounts remained unobligated at the year's end due to the late date of appropriations and substantial unrequested funding increases. The award of FY02 funds was completed late in FY03, and the FY03 awards will be completed in June 2004. DHS is strongly encouraged to make revisions that expedite this process, such as increasing the minimum and maximum grant amounts. The rate of expenditure by grantees is typical for programs of this size.

Evidence: Weekly 2001 close out records

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Program has been able to establish baseline efficiency measures that include: a) timing of annual application cycle, and b) the numbers of "competitive" applications received. An automated IT component is now being implemented. To encourage competitive procurement, grantees are required to follow local procurement practices or, if none exist, to acquire at least two bids and take the lowest one unless exception is documented.

Evidence: Program statistics; grant agreement articles

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: AFG has an MOU with Agric. and DOI on coordination of their fire department assistance programs. In 2003, AFG is providing to State homeland security coordinators extensive data on materials included in grant awards to enable their resource inventorying. However, the DHS Inspector General has cited the need for increased coordination with other grant programs, and greater disclosure of applicants other federal funding sources.

Evidence: MOU with Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior; sample list of award details available in request. Review of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, DHS Office of Inspector General, Sept. 2003.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The program's recently installed e-grant system has enabled the program to better follow established financial management controls. Bank information is submitted with each application, and this information is recertified before any funds are transferred between EP&R and the grantee. Individual payment requests are vetted through both grants management and program offices, which must pre-approve any changes to the original grant's scope of work. The e-grant system also flags delinquent reporting requirements.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Office for Domestic Preparedness
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
20%	57%	90%	13%	Demonstrated

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Has improved financial and program oversight of grantees, and begun efforts to make grantee performance data more available to the public. The Program has agreed to address many of the recommendations made by the DHS Inspector General.

Evidence: Review of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, DHS Office of Inspector General, Sept. 2003.

3.CO1 Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The program makes extensive outreach efforts, reviews applications using independent panels, and awards funds based rank order of scores. The DHS Inspector General found that application solicitation was adequate, the grant process was competitive, and that application review was equitable. However there are statutory requirements to 'balance' funds among various types of applicants, hindering a fully competitive, merit-based process.

Evidence: Competitive context for program is provided to applicants through workshops, media and internet. Data that show an increase in the average scores realized by applicants for both their application and under peer review support the conclusion that the program is effectively communicating the competitive "rules" of the program. Technical reports for peer reviews document the process and historical data on scores and award recommendations are also available. Review of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, DHS Office of Inspector General, Sept. 2003.

3.CO2 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Program has extensive oversight through three (peer, technical and project officer) reviews of applications, monitoring activities, payment requests, and close out reviews. Most of this effort is self-reported through the online system. As noted in 3.1, almost 90% of FY01 grantees have submitted final performance reports. Approximately 2/3 of FY02 grantees have submitted their mid-year status reports and USFA is striving to obtain information from those that are delinquent. The DHS Inspector General has recommended stricter enforcement of reporting deadlines and more frequent site visits. The program is seeking to increase the level of annual performance data collected from its FY03 grantees.

Evidence: The AFG has an online web-based, e-grant system. The system is named Assistance to Firefighters e-grant System. Review of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, DHS Office of Inspector General, Sept. 2003.

3.CO3 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The program actively collects data on grantee activities. While grantee performance data is not widely available to the public, data on each grantee's funded activities will be made available on the Internet in October 2003.

Evidence: 2001 & 2002 awards reports; 2002 and 2003 applications reports; 2001 assessment

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Office for Domestic Preparedness
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
20%	57%	90%	13%	Demonstrated

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program has only recently begun to specify long term goals, and its current 'targets' are set below recent trends in fire deaths. While initial grantees have reported that funds have led better protection and health to firefighters and improved response capacity, such results have not been quantified or independently confirmed.

Evidence: Fire Loss in the United States, 2002; Survey, Assessment and Recommendations for the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program (2003).

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: As the program has not set clear annual performance goals that related to the long-term goals, it must receive a "No" for this question. Measures reflecting 'application quality' have shown improvement, but these are not strongly linked to the long-term health and safety goals.

Evidence:

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Web-based procedures have been instituted for the application process and performance tracking. Some efficiencies have been identified and realized, for example, an improvement in the purchasing policy of firefighting vehicles was instituted to improve manufacturer responsiveness to grantees.

Evidence: 90% of grantee application and reporting requirements can be accomplished through web-based GMS. While the grant process still requires over a year to complete, the current rate of FY03 awards is 20% faster than the previous year.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: AFG grant procedures appear to compare well to other public safety programs directed at local governments, but as yet there is insufficient information on whether its actual performance or relative impact compares favorably.

Evidence:

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The one assessment conducted to date of 2001 grantees was not independent and was limited in scope. An independent evaluation by the DHS Inspector General focused on grant administration and oversight, not overall effectiveness and results.

Evidence: Survey, Assessment and Recommendations for the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program (2003). Review of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, DHS Office of Inspector General, Sept. 2003.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Office for Domestic Preparedness
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
20%	57%	90%	13%	Demonstrated

Measure: Firefighter casualties
Additional Information: This measure tracks firefighter deaths from fire

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2000		105	
2001		99	
2002		97	
2003	101		
2004	96		

Measure: Firefighter Injuries
Additional Information: This measure tracks firefighter injuries from fire

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2000		43,065	
2001		41,395	
2002		37,860	
2003	40,153		
2004	39,912		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Office for Domestic Preparedness
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
20%	57%	90%	13%	Demonstrated

Measure: Civilian Deaths from Fire
Additional Information: This measure tracks civilian deaths from fire

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2000	4,500	4,045	
2001	4,500	3,745	
2002	4,500	3,380	
2003	4,455		
2004	4,365		

Measure: Direct economic losses (in billions of dollars)
Additional Information: This measure tracks dollar losses from fire

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2000		11.2	
2001		10.54374	
2002		10.337	
2003	10.3		
2004	10		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Baggage Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: The purpose of the Baggage Screening Technology Program is provide the technology necessary to effectively carry out a statutory mandate to prevent the entry of dangerous weapons, particularly explosives, on aircraft through inspection of checked baggage.

Evidence: Section 110(a) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act of 2001 requires that TSA: "shall provide for the screening of all passengers and property, including United States mail, cargo, carry-on and checked baggage, and other articles, that will by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation..." In addition, Section 110(d) provided that explosives detection systems should be deployed "to screen all checked baggage".

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: Aviation remains one of the primary focuses of Middle East and other terrorist organizations for actions against U.S. citizens, and the airport baggage screening function constitutes the front lines of preventing aircraft contraband that can assist in terrorist and other criminal acts intended to harm passengers, aircraft and other persons and property.

Evidence: Transportation Security Administration Transportation risk assessments and audits, classified intelligence/threat data collections and reports, and security oversight inspections, checkpoint arrests, dangerous item confiscation levels at airports.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: This program is the only effort that screens baggage through explosives detection systems before being placed on commercial passenger aircraft.

Evidence: Section 110(a) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act of 2001 requires that TSA: "shall provide for the screening of all passengers and property, including United States mail, cargo, carry-on and checked baggage, and other articles, that will by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation..." In addition, Section 110(d) provided that explosives detection systems should be deployed "to screen all checked baggage".

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: NO

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: Currently-deployed baggage screening technology meets statutorily-required screening output performance. While TSA is still developing desired outcome-based performance targets in areas of security, efficiency, and reliability for this technology, there are indications that the nature of the initial deployment may not be optimal for meeting long term performance needs. Performance issues arise from both the type of technology deployed and the physical placement of that equipment in the airport. TSA has embarked on a program to move baggage screening systems "in-line" with airport baggage sorting systems in some of the nation's busiest airports to address perceived performance needs. Some have been fully implemented. Given the lack of performance targets, it is presently unclear the extent to which additional in-line systems, if any, are necessary to meet TSA's performance goals.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Baggage Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Baggage screening technology can only directly serve the screening purpose and the intended beneficiary -- air carriers and the flying public. Therefore, this question is not relevant to this program.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: TSA has specific long term performance measures under development related to efficiency and reliability outcomes.

Evidence: Primary measures under development include the level of machine efficiency, and reliability.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Most targets are under development.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: TSA has specific annual performance measures under development related to effectiveness, efficiency, and reliability outcomes.

Evidence: Primary measures under development include the level of machine effectiveness, efficiency, and reliability.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Most targets are under development.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The annual and long-term goals of the program are aligned with partners such as maintenance contractors, support contractors, general contractors, etc. The statements of work, task and delivery orders, and schedules of the contracts that support the program have direct input into achievement of program goals.

Evidence: Chief Technology Officer (CTO) Programmatic Documentation: Statements of Work, Scopes of Work, Schedules, CTO Program Plans, CTO Acquisition Plan. Each contain sections that work towards the long-term and/or annual goals of the CTO.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Baggage Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The Baggage Screening Technology Program has not yet received independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality. TSA needs to establish and implement an evaluation agenda to assess and validate key aspects of its program such as the baggage screening technology architecture, equipment maintenance, lifecycle management plans and strategies, investment criteria, and acquisition management/contractor oversight. TSA will complete an evaluation plan by November, 2004.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Baggage technology is uniquely identified in the TSA Budget requests and performance goals and targets are tied to the funding level.

Evidence: All baggage screening technology is differentiated in the Budget justifications and the justifications are organized in a performance based structure.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: TSA's primary strategic planning deficiencies include the lack of clearly defined performance outcome goals and targets, as well as a comprehensive screening technology capital plan supporting technology investment decisions. Outcome goals and targets are under development. TSA has not yet developed a capital plan.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.CA1 **Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: TSA is in the process of performing an alternatives analysis and cost benefit analysis in accordance with OMB Circular A-94.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: TSA does not currently collect and utilize adequate performance information from its primary equipment contractors that supply, install, and maintain baggage screening equipment. However, TSA is in the process of implementing improved management information systems.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Baggage Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Key program partners such as maintenance contractors, support contractors, general contractors, etc., are responsible for achieving results in accordance with TSA performance goals. The DHS IG has found that TSA did not in the past hold its primary equipment service provider accountable for performance. In response, TSA is in the process of improving its future contracts in this area.

Evidence: Current and planned contract documentation such as statements of work, scopes of work, schedules, etc., currently or will include performance targets which tie to program goals. Contractors are required to have earned value management systems.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Program funds are obligated consistently with the overall program plan. The schedule for obligations is established and meets the resource needs of the program. Procedures exist for reporting actual expenditures.

Evidence: Monthly obligations reports.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: While TSA is developing efficiency performance measures and a comprehensive capital plant to help guide efficiency/effectiveness technology decisions, these efforts are not yet sufficiently mature.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The program collaborates with the Passenger Screening Technology, Workforce, and Training programs, as well as commercial airports, in allocating baggage screening equipment. The result is collaborative decisions on the allocation of baggage screening equipment both within specific airports and across the airport network.

Evidence: TSA staff modeling analysis completed in 2004 aligned personnel with baggage screening operation requirements.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: While TSA received a clean audit opinion, it received material weaknesses in internal control, including property management. Property management is substantially related to the Baggage Screening Technology Program.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Baggage Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Notable management deficiencies currently include the lack of a detailed screening technology capital plan guiding management decisions, the lack of an effective and cost-effective plan and contract strategy for managing equipment maintenance, inadequate program management training of TSA staff, and the lack of adequate program management information systems. All of these areas are being actively addressed.

Evidence: TSA will produce a detailed capital plan by the end of 2004; current equipment maintenance strategies are being revised and a new contract approach developed; all equipment program managers are receiving program management training and will become Level III certified; a new management information system is being implemented.

3.CA1 Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The CTO has prepared an Acquisition Plan that has not yet been approved. Current services contracts were awarded under FAA, prior to TSA, and are not performance-based. Equipment contracts are firm-fixed price, with schedules for deliverables. FAA contracts are expiring during FY 2004, and will be upgraded in early FY 2005.

Evidence: CTO Draft Acquisition Plan

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:17%

Explanation: TSA has not yet established targets and timeframes for its long term performance goals.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:17%

Explanation: TSA has not yet established targets for its annual performance goals.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight:17%

Explanation: While TSA is currently re-competing all services contracts to increase program efficiency and lower costs, in this case primarily with respect to technology maintenance, it cannot yet demonstrate efficiency and cost effectiveness improvements. TSA is also still assessing the extent to which any deployment plan of systems integrated with baggage sorting systems may increase operational efficiency. Efficiency performance targets are still under development.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Baggage Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: No organization in the United States performs baggage screening in a manner that adequately compares in the overall size and scope of TSA's operation. TSA should determine how it can compare baggage screening technological enterprise performance with overseas aviation security operators, both public and private. TSA should include such an analysis in its future evaluation plans.

Evidence: Foreign nations often use the same type, if not the same manufacturer, of baggage screening technology as TSA, though often not in the same configuration or with the same capability.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: While the Baggage Screening Technology Program has not been subject to an independent evaluation of sufficient quality and scope, broad evaluations of screening system performance by GAO and the Inspector General have not raised technological performance issues. Issues have been raised with respect to operational efficiency and the potential to reduce long term TSA costs, as well as airport space constraints, through technology improvements going forward.

Evidence: Periodic GAO and IG reports on TSA screening have not indicated any specific performance programs with Baggage Screening Technology.

4.CA1 Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: Budgeted cost and schedule targets changed several times in 2003 for baggage screening technology primarily because of policy changes with respect to capital deployments and ongoing planning negotiations with airports. Consequently, adhering to original schedules proved difficult. It is expected that long term capital planning efforts will foster improvements in execution of both acquisition and sustainment activities.

Evidence: Different cost and schedule deployment plans indicate intent and ability to abide by originally-proposed cost and schedule goals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Baggage Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

Measure: Level of machine effectiveness Measure Under Development

Additional Information: This measure will indicate the performance of systems operating in the field that are tested at startup to determine ongoing ability to detect threat objects at acceptable levels.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

Measure: Level of machine efficiency

Additional Information: This measure is the baggage screening capital cost per bag screened with respect to bulk and trace explosives detection devices.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Baggage Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

2010

Measure: Level of machine efficiency Measure Under Development

Additional Information: This measure is the baggage screening capital cost per bag screened with respect to bulk and trace explosives detection devices.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010			

Measure: Level of machine reliability Measure Under Development

Additional Information: This measure reflects the level of down time versus operation for baggage screening technology.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

Measure: Level of machine reliability

Additional Information: This measure reflects the level of down time versus operation for baggage screening technology.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Baggage Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

Measure: Level of equipment deployed.

Additional Information: This measure will depict the total number of planned explosives detection equipment deployed.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2005	250		
2006	447		
2007	352		
2008	32		
2009	202		
2010	253		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Biological Countermeasures' program provides the understanding, technologies, and systems needed to anticipate, deter, protect against, detect, mitigate, and recover from possible biological attacks on this nation's population, agriculture or infrastructure.

Evidence: Homeland Security Act (HSA) of 2002 May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates Six strategic objectives are also outlined in the Strategic Planning Templates

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of this program is to provide biological countermeasures as required by the HSA of 2002.

Evidence: Homeland Security Act (HSA) of 2002 May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates 37 capabilities identified based on National Guidance, external Federal agency identified gaps, identified customers, and subject matter expert input. Capabilities are mapped to programs and deliverables through FY10.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Federal statute specifies agency responsibilities. HSPD 9 and 10 delineate specific Federal agency R&D roles and responsibilities for biological and agricultural R&D. The portfolio works as an integrated product team with DOD, EPA, FDA, HHS, and other agencies to leverage resources and ensure collaboration of biological R&D efforts across the agencies and eliminate redundant activities. DOD does its own defense board with specific biological R&D parameters and requirements.

Evidence: HSPD 9 & 10 May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates Interagency working group meetings and the Homeland Security Council Counterproliferation Technology Coordinating Committee (CTCC) WMD Medical Countermeasures Working Group HSC Biological Defense End-to-End Studies

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Intramural and Extramural R&D programs are used to leverage both public and private sector technologies. Extramural R&D programs are awarded based on free and open competition in academic and private sectors by means of Broad Area Announcements (BAAs) or similar solicitations. The majority of all intramural projects are peer reviewed.

Evidence: May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates HSPD 9 & 10 Merit-based awards Extramural Broad Agency Announcements (BAAs) and other solicitations Intramural program reviews

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Capabilities, programs, and deliverables were identified and based on National Guidance, external Federal agency identified gaps, identified customers, and subject matter expert input. Approximately 75% of the budget supports Nationally mandated programs/projects. The National BioWatch conference in Feb 2004 and regular BioWatch telecons collect needs/requirements and recommendations to ensure Federal and State end-user receive the support they need.

Evidence: May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates Interagency working group minutes 2004 National BioWatch Conference BioWatch telecon After Action Reports (AARs) PTI/LINC program reports Extramural R&D solicitations

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Milestones have been developed for all R&D programs through FY2010 and are identified in the May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates Efficiency and effectiveness measures such as reduction in false alarm rates, increased sampling coverage and frequency without increased operational costs, increasing the number of assays and the capability to detect additional threats are identified in the Future Years Homeland Security Program (FYHSP)

Evidence: Milestones have been developed for all R&D programs through FY2010 and are identified in the May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates Future Years Homeland Security Program (FYHSP)

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Milestones have been developed for all R&D programs through FY2010 and are identified in the May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates Efficiency and effectiveness measures such as reduction in false alarm rates, increased sampling coverage and frequency without increased operational costs, increasing the number of assays and the capability to detect additional threats are identified in the Future Years Homeland Security Program (FYHSP)

Evidence: Milestones have been developed for all R&D programs through FY2010 and are identified in the May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates Future Years Homeland Security Program (FYHSP)

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Milestones have been developed for all R&D programs through FY2010 and are identified in the May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates. Additional performance and process measures are under development and will be defined in the Performance Management Plan. Extramural R&D contracts have quarterly reviews and annual reviews as deliverables that serve as input to programmatic decisions for continued funding of on-going programs. Efficiency measures are limited due the risk and long-term nature of many of the R&D efforts.

Evidence: May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates Extramural R&D quarterly and annual reviews

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The FY04 Execution Plan had specific milestones for the National BioDefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center (NBACC), NBACC Facility, Plum Island Animal Disease Center, System Studies and Planning Tools, Urban Monitoring System, Domestic Demonstration and Applications Programs (DDAPs), Detection Technologies, Response and Restoration, Bioassays, and Bioforensics and Attribution. The majority of milestones are completed and the remainder are on track. Urban monitoring exceeded FY04 goals and from its initial deployment, has increased monitoring coverage and capacity. During periods of heightened security, monitoring coverage increased and many of the changes continue as routine operations. FY05-10 Strategic planning is currently underway and additional annual performance measures are being finalized. Extramural program contracts have specific technical performance and cost goals that are reviewed so that progression and downselection to follow-on phases depend upon specific metrics and competition between performers in the programs.

Evidence: FY04 Execution Plan May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates .Intramural (Scientific and Technical Analysis and Response Team) Reviews Extramural Program reviews Extramural BAAs No "False Positives" in BioWatch BioWatch AARs

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: All Extramural R&D programs are awarded through established merit-based review and selection procedures. Extramural contracts and other agreements and performance reviews are structured to ensure focus on common program goals in order for performers to be selected for follow-on phases of the program. Intramural projects are peer reviewed. The portfolio strategic plan was based on several interagency studies and portfolio/program managers chair or participate in numerous interagency working groups. HSPD 9 and 10 delineate specific Federal agency R&D roles and responsibilities for biological and agricultural R&D. National S&T Plan is being developed.

Evidence: May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates HSPD 9 & 10 Extramural contracts and other agreements and performance reviews Intramural program peer and performance reviews

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: DHS S&T Programs Analysis and Evaluation (PA&E) has performed an NBACC Facility review in 2004 and a portfolio assessment during the 2004 S&T strategic planning effort. Intramural programs are peer reviewed, evaluations conducted, and recommendations are implemented. The portfolio has not completed a complete annual cycle but reviews are scheduled for July and August. Project reviews are conducted as needed.

Evidence: S&T PA&E review Intramural program peer reviews NBACC Facility Review Extramural technology reviews Portfolio management review

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The portfolio has aligned all budget requests with Federal requirements (HSPDs, President's Budget, etc.) customer requirements, DHS Strategic Objectives, the portfolio's strategic objectives, and the portfolio's desired capabilities. All budget request line items have identified long term milestones.

Evidence: May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Strategic planning and evaluation is currently underway and subsequent deficiencies have not been identified.

Evidence:

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The strategic planning processes identify areas of collaboration and leverage within S&T, with other DHS portfolios, and with other Federal, State, and local agencies such as EPA, DOD, HHS/CDC, etc.

Evidence: May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning TemplatesBioWatch (joint with EPA, CDC)Water Security (joint effort with EPA)Bio Net (joint effort with DOD)NBACC (joint with DOD, CIA, FBI, HHS, and National LaboratoriesPlum Island Animal Disease Center (joint with USDA)

2.RD2 **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: All budget items (programs) are prioritized based on:1. Lead roles and requirements from HSPD 9 and 10 2. Requirements and expectations from President's Budget, HSC, and OVP 3. Critical gaps identified in Bio Defense and Counter Proliferation Technology Coordinating Committee (CTCC) studies

Evidence: May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 8%

Explanation: Intramural and extramural program performance reports are reviewed and analyzed by program managers to determine cost, schedule, scope and quality performance.

Evidence: Extramural/intramural program performance reports and reviews

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 8%

Explanation: Award and continuation of program funding is based on lifecycle management plans and historical program performance of contractors and government partners. Program performance reports and reviews are used by extramural program managers as input for downselection decisions for selection of awardees for out year phases of programs. A review of BioWatch operations and partners was conducted to test and validate procedures and protocols, evaluate deficiencies and take corrective actions, and benchmark best practices to implement system wide. Other programs like BioNet, APDS, Joint Urban 2003, and LINC were also reviewed.

Evidence: Extramural/intramural program performance reports and reviews are in process or scheduled. Extramural programs have contractual review mechanisms. BioWatch Exercise and Evaluation Program BioNet Monthly Program Manager reviews Autonomous Pathogen Detection System review (APDS) Joint Urban 2003 program review Local Integration of National Atmospheric Release Advisory Center with Cities (LINC) program review

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: NO Question Weight: 8%

Explanation: Program funding is tracked regularly to ensure timely and accurate execution. However, during the initial execution of new programs and development of financial processes, there have been delays in FY04 execution. The Biological Countermeasures program inherited a variety of distinct funds in the FY03 transition coupled with carryover into FY04. Task oriented execution plans are being aggressively carried out by performing (intramural and extramural) S&T organizations.

Evidence: DHS S&T Spend Plans Federal Financial Management System (FFMS) for S&T

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 8%

Explanation: Intramural and extramural program performance reports are reviewed and analyzed by program managers to determine cost, schedule, scope, and quality performance. Extramural R&D programs are awarded through full and open competition to ensure cost effectiveness. Additional annual performance measures will be defined in the Performance Management Plan that is in development.

Evidence: Extramural solicitation documents Extramural Source selection plans Extramural Source selection memoranda Intramural program reviews Portfolio management review BioWatch Exercise and Evaluation Program BioNet Monthly Program Manager reviews Autonomous Pathogen Detection System review (APDS) Joint Urban 2003 program review Local Integration of National Atmospheric Release Advisory Center with Cities (LINC) program review

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 8%

Explanation: The portfolio strategic plan was based on several interagency studies and portfolio/program managers chair or participate in numerous interagency committees and working groups. HSPD 9 and 10 delineate specific Federal agency R&D roles and responsibilities for biological and agricultural R&D. A National R&D plan is being developed in conjunction with other Federal agencies. The strategic planning processes identify areas of collaboration and leverage within S&T, with other DHS portfolios and with other Federal agencies like FDA, EPA, CDC, etc. Extramural program managers participate in TSWG program reviews and selection of awardees.

Evidence: May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates Interagency working group minutes Interagency MOAs/MOUs TSWG selections and program reviews

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 8%

Explanation: DHS S&T has established a financial management process

Evidence: DHS S&T Spend Plans Multi-year budges have been broken out with 142 line items Detailed FY04 execution plan; FY05 in development

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 8%

Explanation: Integrated Product Team (IPT) meets as needed and Biological Countermeasures' program managers have weekly staff meetings to address management deficiencies and take corrective action. The formal Performance Management Plan is in development.

Evidence: IPT After Action Reports Staff Meeting Action Items

3.CA1 Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 8%

Explanation: Programs are reviewed and analyzed by program managers to determine cost, schedule, scope, and quality performance. Extramural program quarterly and annual reports and formal program reviews are used for making decisions about down-selection of awardees for continuation into out-year program phases

Evidence: Extramural/intramural program performance reports and reviews Extramural program quarterly and annual reports Intramural program execution plans

3.CO1 Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit? Answer: YES Question Weight: 8%

Explanation: Extramural R&D programs are awarded through full and open competition based upon government subject matter experts evaluation of responses to solicitations.

Evidence: Extramural Solicitations Extramural Source Selection Plan and Selection Decision Memoranda

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

3.CO2 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities? Answer: YES Question Weight: 8%

Explanation: Extramural program managers conduct quarterly and annual performance reviews and require quarterly and annual written documentation of progress in meeting cost, schedule, scope, and quality goals.

Evidence: Extramural written quarterly and annual reports. Extramural presentations at quarterly and annual program reviews.

3.CO3 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner? Answer: YES Question Weight: 8%

Explanation: Annual program reports have not been published since this is the first year of performance. Extramural programs will publish public versions (eliminating details about proprietary information) of annual progress reports.

Evidence: Public annual reports of performers

3.CR1 Is the program managed on an ongoing basis to assure credit quality remains sound, collections and disbursements are timely, and reporting requirements are fulfilled? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

3.CR2 Do the program's credit models adequately provide reliable, consistent, accurate and transparent estimates of costs and the risk to the Government? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

3.RD1 For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality? Answer: YES Question Weight: 8%

Explanation: During the strategic planning process and the execution budgets, all programs are evaluated for intramural or extramural performance. Most of the intramural legacy projects were peer reviewed.

Evidence: May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates Intramural program peer reviews

3.RG1 Did the program seek and take into account the views of all affected parties (e.g., consumers; large and small businesses; State, local and tribal governments; beneficiaries; and the general public) when developing significant regulations? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

3.RG2 **Did the program prepare adequate regulatory impact analyses if required by Executive Order 12866, regulatory flexibility analyses if required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and SBREFA, and cost-benefit analyses if required under the Unfunded Mandates R** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

3.RG3 **Does the program systematically review its current regulations to ensure consistency among all regulations in accomplishing program goals?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

3.RG4 **Are the regulations designed to achieve program goals, to the extent practicable, by maximizing the net benefits of its regulatory activity?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: FY04 Execution Plan goals accomplished or on track for completion. National urban monitoring system established in FY03 and operations continued in FY04. In FY04, monitored three National Security Special Events (NSSEs) and implemented surge activities for 3 Code "Orange" alerts. Plume modeling enhanced. Two detection systems developed and being commercialized (APDS and uChemLab) and Joint Urban 2003 exercise conducted. Interim National BioForensics Analysis Center (NBFAC) capability established and operating. Piloting generation 2 Bio Detection capability in FY04. End-to-End Reference Scenario Systems Study draft completed. National BioDefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center (NBACC) facility design completed. Assumed operation of Plum Island Animal Disease Center and on track to correcting identified deficiencies. Additional long-term goals and specific milestones have been identified in the S&T Strategic Planning Templates with FY04 the initial year of alignment and performance.

Evidence: May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates FY04 Biological Countermeasures Execution Plan FY04 Task Orders NBACC Program Review National Agricultural R&D Plan Plum Island Program Review Intramural program reviews Portfolio management review BioWatch Exercise and Evaluation Program BioNet Monthly Program Manager reviews Autonomous Pathogen Detection System review (APDS) Joint Urban 2003 program review Local Integration of National Atmospheric Release Advisory Center with Cities (LINC) program review

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Current FY04 Execution Plan goals accomplished or on track for completion. National urban monitoring system established in FY03 and operations continued in FY04. In FY04, monitored three National Security Special Events (NSSEs) and implemented surge activities for 3 Code "Orange" alerts. Interim National BioForensics Analysis Center (NBFAC) capability established and operating. Piloting generation 2 Bio Detection capability in FY04. National BioDefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center (NBACC) facility design completed. Assumed operation of Plum Island Animal Disease Center and on track to correcting identified deficiencies. Local Integration of NARAC with Cities (LINC) review completed and additional cities supported. Additional long-term goals and specific milestones have been identified in the S&T Strategic Planning Templates with FY04 the initial year of alignment and performance. Strategic planning is being completed and additional annual performance measures are not finalized. This data will be further defined in the Performance Management Plan that is in development.

Evidence: May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates FY04 Biological Countermeasures Execution Plan FY04 Task Orders NBACC Program Review National Agricultural R&D Plan Plum Island Program Review Intramural program reviews Portfolio management review BioWatch Exercise and Evaluation Program BioNet Monthly Program Manager reviews Autonomous Pathogen Detection System review (APDS) Joint Urban 2003 program review Local Integration of National Atmospheric Release Advisory Center with Cities (LINC) program review

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The portfolio has not completed its initial annual cycle and demonstrated performance on annual or long-term goals have not been fully evaluated/documented.

Evidence:

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The portfolio has not completed its initial annual cycle and demonstrated performance on annual or long-term goals have not been fully evaluated/documented.

Evidence:

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: NBACC has been evaluated by Programs, Analysis, and Evaluation (PA&E). Urban monitoring (BioWatch) has been reviewed by the Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy. Long-term goals and specific milestones have been identified in the S&T Strategic Planning Templates but the portfolio has not completed its initial annual cycle and demonstrated performance on annual or long-term goals have not been fully evaluated/documented.

Evidence: May 2004 S&T Strategic Planning Templates NBACC Program Review Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy (CIDRAP) BioWatch Review

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

4.CA1 **Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?**

Answer: LARGE
EXTENT

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: NBACC has met all of the FY04 milestones with its design completion. Plum Island is on track and on budget for operations and corrective actions.

Evidence: FY04 Biological Countermeasures Execution Plan Plum Island Program Review NBACC Program Review

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

Measure: Milestone completion
Additional Information: Specific Milestones have been established for all programs.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2004	100%		
2005	100%		
2006	100%		
2007	100%		
2008	100%		
2009	100%		

Measure: Performance measure
Additional Information: Increase sensitivity by decreasing false alarm rate (FAR) for detection and assessment of biological threats

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	FAR=10EE4		
2006	FAR=10EE5		
2007	FAR=10EE5		
2008	FAR=10EE6		
2009	FAR=10EE6		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

Measure: Milestone completion
Additional Information: Increase multiplex samples

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	Multiplex 10		
2006	Multiplex 20		
2007	Multiplex 30		
2008	Multiplex 40		
2009	Multiplex 50		

Measure: Cost decrease
Additional Information: Decrease cost of detection and assessment of biological agents

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	10%		
2006	20%		
2007	30%		
2008	40%		
2009	50%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

Measure: Milestone completion
Additional Information: Decontamination technologies and standards for facilities and outdoor areas.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	A		
2006	B		
2007	C		
2008	D		
2009	E		

Measure: Milestone completion
Additional Information: Establishment of a national capability in biodefense analysis and agro-bioterrorism countermeasures

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	A		
2006	B		
2007	C		
2008	D		
2009	E		

Measure:
Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term:
-------------	---------------	---------------	----------------------

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Biological Countermeasures
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	92%	75%	

Measure: Detection capability

Additional Information: Increased capability to detect additional biological threats in urban areas by increasing the number of available assays

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2006	20 assays		
2007	30 assays		
2008	40 assays		
2009	50 assays		

Measure: Next generation solutions

Additional Information: Integrated field demonstrations of operational next-generation solutions

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	2 demos		
2006	3 demos		
2007	3 demos		
2008	3 demos		
2009	3 demos		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Border Patrol
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	63%	86%	47%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Border Patrol (BP) is America's primary law enforcement and security agency, tasked with and committed to protecting our Nation's borders between the Ports-of-Entry. The BP has a clear and unambiguous mission; there is a consensus among interested parties (other Federal law enforcement agencies, state and local law enforcement entities) on the Border Patrol's purpose. Their mission is to secure the borders, enforce the laws, and protect the citizens of the United States.

Evidence: BP managers, supervisors and agents are aware of, fully support, and conduct operations in furtherance of this strategy. In FY2002, the BP arrested 955,102 undocumented aliens, which is a significant decrease from the 1,676,438 arrested in FY00. The decrease in alien apprehensions is attributed to an overall increase in operational effectiveness and deterrence. In FY02, the BP seized 1,234,616 pounds of marijuana and 14,334 pounds of cocaine. Border Patrol National Strategic Plan-1994 and Beyond. Performance Analysis System.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BP enforcement efforts address the national problem of the illegal flow of undocumented migrants and drugs across our borders between the ports-of-entry.

Evidence: Alien apprehensions in San Diego Sector peaked in FY 96 at 484,000. After the successful implementation of Operation Gatekeeper, apprehensions steadily declined. In FY 2002, apprehensions were down to 100,681, an historic low.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Since the BP enforces immigration and other Federal laws between the nation's ports-of entry, there is no duplication of mission with another Federal agency or program.

Evidence: In FY03, the BP has 11,121 FTEs and a budget of \$1.5B dedicated to protecting America's borders. Since the BP focuses on preventing and detecting illegal entries between the ports-of-entry, their mission is not duplicated by any other Federal agency. Other Federal law enforcement agencies (DEA, FBI, etc.) are involved in drug enforcement responsibilities, but their efforts are part of a broader scope and are more investigative in nature as opposed to actual interdiction along the immediate border area.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Our current enforcement strategy is a product of extensive research and consultations within and outside the BP. The Border Patrol maximizes available personnel, technology and infrastructure (force multipliers) to present the strongest deterrence posture possible. There is no conclusive evidence that another approach is more efficient or effective.

Evidence: In FY03, the BP has 11,121 FTEs and a budget of \$1.5B dedicated to protecting America's borders. Since the BP focuses on preventing and detecting illegal entries between the ports-of-entry, their mission is not duplicated by any other Federal agency.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Border Patrol
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	63%	86%	47%	Demonstrated

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight:20%

Explanation: The Border Patrol's mission is a direct Federally funded program. The Patrol receives a direct appropriation as part of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection/DHS budget.

Evidence: All BP funding resources are directed in support of the program's mission. (Training, HRD, Procurement, Budget and Facilities are all funded separately.) Headquarters BP controls funding for centralized program wide procurements, such as uniforms, vehicles, body armor, weapons, air operations, surveillance systems (ISIS), canines, etc. Sectors are funded individually for the local procurement of such expenses as vehicle maintenance, fuel, travel expenses, ADP and office equipment, etc. Funding is provided to the sectors in three distinct accounts, General Expenses, Awards, and Discretionary Overtive. BP resources are deployed in support of the National Strategic Plan, i.e. into the specific geographic areas experiencing the highest level of illegal activity. The BP is currently in Phase II of its strategy and resources in the form of personnel, technology, tactical infrastructure and equipment are being deployed into the Tucson Sector along the southwest border. Prior to the events of September 11, 2001, the northern border of the U.S. had been historically neglected due to the minimal amount of alien activity compared to the southwest border. Since 9/11, some enforcement efforts have been redirected to the northern border. In FY02, an additional 245 Border Patrol Agents were deployed to the northern border, bringing the total number of positions to 613. In FY03, an additional 387 agents are to be deployed along the northern border. A 2000 DOJ IG report examined how the BP collected and assessed information about illegal activity occurring along the northern border and reviewed resource allocation, concluding the allocation was insufficient and that the BP was unable to accurately assess the level of illegal activity along the northern border which made it difficult for the Border Patrol to adequately assess need or properly allocate resource, leaving the agency unable to adequately respond to illegal activity along the northern border. Changes in the allocation of Border Patrol agents since the publication of the report to the eight northern border sectors now more effectively monitor the approximately 4,000-mile border with Canada.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The BP developed and has operated under a National Strategic Plan. Gauging the effectiveness of our national strategy has been the cornerstone of our performance measures.

Evidence: Implemented in 1994, the National Strategic Plan is a multi-year, multi-phased approach to gaining and maintaining control of our Nation's borders. Long and short term performance measures are developed that directly relate to evaluating the success of our strategy. Specific performance measures have been developed that relate to achieving a desired level of optimum deterrence in operational corridors along the southwest border. Several critical factors are considered in these measures including statistical data from alien apprehensions (output) as well as estimates of alien getaways, anecdotal information regarding the effect of deterrence on illegal entry attempts and information received from the local community, such as published crime statistics, increases/decreases in property values, impacts upon the quality of life, etc. (outcome). The measures presented are output measures, not outcome. Please present outcome measures for the program. Outcome measures are still needed.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Border Patrol
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	63%	86%	47%	

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The BP National Strategic Plan embraces the long term goal of securing more than 8,000 miles of our Nation's borders, which is ambitious given the inherent difficulty of our mission and the quantity of personnel, resources and infrastructure required to achieve control of the border. Although the plan does not provide a specific time frame for completion, it does progress incrementally in phases. An acceptable levels of control must be acheived in specific operational corridors prior to advancing into the next phase.

Evidence: DOJ Annual Performance Plan (APP) 2003-2004. (Legacy) INS Implementation Plan (IP). New performance measures are currently being developed as a result of the transition of BP into CBP. Current performance measures relate largely to the southwest border, which has been the focus of the strategy since its inception. The strategy focused on the border areas experiencing the highest level of illegal activity, such as the urban areas of San Diego, CA, and El Paso and Brownsville, TX. As originally implemented, once the desired level of control was acheived along the southwest border, the strategy would focus on the northern border and coastal areas. In response to 9/11, the BP accelerated its enforcement efforts into Phase IV of the strategic plan and to dedicated resources to the northern border. The strategy is not ambitious, it was begun almost 10 years ago, and according to a DOJ IG report, was divided into four phases with no established timeframes or milestones to measure progress. The first three phases concentrated on specific areas of the southwest border. The plan did not address the northern border until its fourth and final phase. In 2000, when conducting field work for its 2000 report, the DOJ IG noted that the Border Patrol was in Phase II of its Plan and would not estimate when implementation of Phase IV would begin. We still maintain that timeframes are needed for a yes answer here, and the Strategy does not have them.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Annual performance measures and long term goals are developed based upon the current enforcement emphasis of our national strategy.Measures continually evolve and are often replaced once their targets have been achieved.

Evidence: The BP's primary measure of performance is identifying the number of operational corridors that have achieved their level of optimal deterrence. This measure is quantifiable and indicates our outcome to measure performance. DOJ Annual Performance Plan (APP). (Legacy) INS Implementation Plan (IP). The Border Patrol has specific performance measures that delineate an optimum level of deterrence in operational corridors along the southwest border. Several critical factors are included in statistical data on alien apprehensions: output, is compared to estimates of alien getaways, anecdotal information regarding the effect of deterrence on illegal entry attempts and information received from the local community, such as published crime statistics, increases/decreases in property values, impacts upon the quality of life, etc. (outcome). The overall measure of performance is outcome related. The Plan has no established timeframes or milestones to measure progress towards achieving optimal deterrence.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Border Patrol
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	63%	86%	47%	Demonstrated

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Baselines for determining the operational effectiveness levels of corridors were established in the 4th QTR of FY00. Since that time, performance has been evaluated on a monthly basis by comparing current performance with the baseline figures.

Evidence: Targets and measures are outlined in the DOJ Annual Performance Plan (APP) for 2003-2004. (Legacy) INS Implementation Plan (IP). Measures include: # of SW border corridors with optimum deterrance, ISIS installations, BSI related measures. Performance targets include: increasing the # of corridors with optimum deterrance and ISIS site deployments. The long term goal of securing more than 8,000 miles of our Nation's borders is ambitious given the inherent difficulty of our mission and the quantity of personnel, resources and infrastructure required to achieve control of the border. Although the plan does not provide a specific time frame for completion, it does progress incrementally in phases. An acceptable levels of control must be acheived in specific operational corridors prior to advancing into the next phase. The targets are not ambitious.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The USBP enjoys excellent cooperative relations with a wide variety of Federal, state and local law enforcement and other agencies and Task Force operations. These include the FBI, DEA, BATF, Legacy US Customs Service, US Attorneys Offices, state and local law enforcement agencies. This also includes relations with Mexican and Canadian Law Enforcement agencies. Discussions with these other agencies are regular and frequent. These cooperative efforts facilitate the flow of intelligence and exchange of information relating to the interdiction of persons and contraband across our borders between the ports-of-entry.

Evidence: The current APP includes measures to develop and prepare bi-national IBET Contingency Plans and Risk Assessments for each of the 14 Northern Border IBETs.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Independent evaluations have been conducted by both government agencies and outside contractors into the overall effectiveness of the BP national strategy. With passage of the 1996 Immigration Reform Act, the General Accounting Office was mandated to conduct an annual review for six years on our efforts to deter illegal entry to the United States. The first review resulted in a recommendation that the Attorney General set up a plan for conducting an evaluation of the strategy to deter illegal entry across the southwest border. GAO has since conducted several additional reviews, each focusing on different aspects of the problem. The Office of Policy and Planning in the legacy INS has also overseen several independent contracted studies intended to identify and clarify relevant indicators of interest for measuring effectiveness.

Evidence: Some of the independent evaluations include: GAO Reports ' GAO/GGD-98-21; 99-33; 99-44; 00-103; and 02-842. Office of Policy and Planning studies -- Evaluations conducted on Operation Gatekeeper, and Operation Rio Grande, Border Patrol Strategy Evaluation Analysis, and Southwest Border Enforcement: An Initial Analytical Framework and Evaluation. The main focus of these studies was on results, i.e., apprehensions, estimates on the flow of illegal entries, and shifting patterns of illegal entry attempts, particularly in response to changes in agent deployment. An additional area of inquiry was to identify specific indicators that should be used in evaluating our effectiveness.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Border Patrol
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	63%	86%	47%	Demonstrated

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Border Patrol resource requests are tied to the annual and long-term performance goals of the program as required by OMB Circular A-11 in the preparation of the annual budget to Congress.

Evidence: Agency budget requests to OMB. Border Patrol requests funding in direct support of its National Strategic Plan. Funding is required for implementation each phase of the strategy. Resources require the deployment of additional personnel, surveillance systems (cameras and sensors), tactical infrastructure and equipment. These areas are often specifically line itemed by Congressional language for funding of the Border Patrol's program needs. Reports to Congress on Border Patrol hiring and status of ISIS program spending. ISIS deployments occurred as planned in the financial report. BP met hiring goals as approved by Congress with the appropriated funds. Budget requests for Border Patrol activities do not make clear the impact of funding on expected performance and do not report all direct and indirect costs needed to attain performance results. We still maintain that the Budget requests for Border Patrol do not make clear the impact of funding on expected performance. They also do not report direct and indirect costs.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The program annually reviews its strategic goals and measures for any deficiencies. The strategic planning process is linked to agency outcomes and to agency goals. Our use of the optimum deterrence measure is one way we have used to improve our strategic planning

Evidence: A number of changes have occurred in the evaluation of the process as well as the evaluation of the specific targets and goals used to measure performance. Regular discussions are held between headquarters and the field to address current issues and accomplishments. Goals are also included in the Performance Work Plans for each Sector.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Performance data is collected by the field and forwarded to BP Headquarters (HQBOR). Data is consolidated and analyzed and operational decisions are made as a result of this information.

Evidence: Performance data is captured routinely as part of the normal work process. Data is reported through ENFORCE, IDENT, IDENT/IAFIS, and the Border Patrol Enforcement Tracking System (BPETS), as well as gathered by agents, aircraft pilots, electronic sensors and camera observations. Analysis is conducted at all levels of the Patrol. Regular updates are provided to upper management.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Border Patrol
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	63%	86%	47%	Demonstrated

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Border Patrol managers must perform their operations within the resources and budgets provided annually. Sector Chief Patrol Agents are allocated an annual budget based upon the FY Budget Execution Plan (BEP).

Evidence: There have been no violations of Anti-Deficiency in the expenditure of appropriated funds by Border Patrol managers. Annual Reports to Treasury of Account balances All Border Patrol managers are held accountable for their performance, which is evaluated on an annual basis. Form DOJ-522, Performance Appraisal Record, contains elements relating to managerial and administrative accountability and operational performance. It is unclear whether performance standards are established for border patrol managers. Please provide documentation to demonstrate that they are held accountable for performance not just budget execution.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Border Patrol funding and expenditures are closely monitored through the automated financial systems.

Evidence: Quarterly expenditure reports are prepared to ensure timely obligations. Funds are controlled through special budget/expenditure codes to ensure funds are spent for their intended purpose.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Agency guidelines and procedures are followed where cost advantages can be obtained in the program process for all major acquisitions. SOPs are contained within the procurement guidelines as part of the Federal Acquisition Program.

Evidence: Agency procurement regulations must be followed in order to execute any contracts for goods or services used in the performance of the program. Under legacy INS, BP did not have direct oversight of the Procurement and Contracting processes. Therefore, the BP did not have the responsibility for maintaining cost effectiveness measures, these were INS management functions. Under CBP, the Border Patrol program will be responsible for development and maintenance of cost effectiveness measures beginning in FY04. We can't give a YES answer for measures under development.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Border Patrol
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	63%	86%	47%	Demonstrated

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Border patrol maintains a very effective liaison and coordination mechanism with other Federal agencies, other (Legacy) INS programs, various state and local law enforcement entities and agencies. The Border Patrol coordinates with many Federal agencies including GSA, OPM, DOA.

Evidence: The Border Patrol coordinates with the DEA, FBI, (Legacy) Customs, USDA, PPQ, BATF, US Attorney's Office, as well as state and local law enforcement. The BP participates in task force operations and ONDCP's HIDTA, and the AZ HIDTA's Operation COBIJA. Many interagency agreements exist between the Patrol and these agencies. In a recent memorandum, the Chief Patrol Agent of the Tucson Sector reported the events of a recent meeting of the Borderland Management Task Force, which is comprised of land resource managers and law enforcement personnel from the Dept. of the Interior (DOI). A representative from DOI specifically mentioned their need to better coordinate with other Federal agencies, specifically the BP. Numerous other agencies and land resource managers indicated a good working rapport has been established with the BP. Specific issues, such as BP access and mobility on Federal lands was mentioned and DOI acknowledged that the law allows latitude into restricted areas for matters of National security, which is the basis for allowing BP access into these areas. In order to improve communication, DOI will designate a single POC and form a working group on border issues. BP has also coordinated with National Park Service for the construction of vehicle barriers and roads adjacent to the immediate border area. BP has also established joint training and intelligence sharing initiatives with NPS. Coordination problems exist between Border Patrol and the Park Service as well as other parts of legacy INS on smuggling cases.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Border Patrol uses GAO approved financial systems for funds control and financial reporting.

Evidence: The Patrol's accounts have received a clean audit opinion as part of the INS audit. Verification and validation of payments and obligations are conducted periodically to ensure audit compliance.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Legacy INS / Office of Internal Audit (OIA) initiated a program called INSpect, in which on-site reviews are conducted to note possible management deficiencies in the sector. The INSpect cadre is composed of subject matter experts from relevant components throughout the (former) INS. INSpect personnel conduct the review and report their findings to the OIA, who compiles the results and returns them to management to allow for corrective action.

Evidence: All management deficiencies are noted in written communication with corrective actions to be taken. Follow-up visits verify actions taken for compliance. An example is the INSpect program which operated for several years. This program involves a regular and recurring review of sector operations. All sectors are reviewed on a regular basis. For example, on 5/19/2003 an INSpect Report was issued describing the review of Blaine Sector operations. Recommendations cover issues such as: procedures for handling alien transport and detention; recording of drug seizures; case reporting on anti-smuggling cases; records management; A-file tracking; Occupational Safety issues; financial tracking; and many other issue areas. The relevant Sector Chiefs have an opportunity to respond to the recommendations. In this case most of the recommendations have been implemented. Oversight and followup to ensure closure on the issues is provided by Headquarters Border Patrol.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Border Patrol
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	63%	86%	47%	Demonstrated

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Current data shows that there has been a clear reduction in illegal entry attempts overall; that the largest share of illegal entry attempts on the southwest border are now focused in the Tucson Sector area; that other southwest border sectors have all experienced dramatic declines in entry attempts; and that smugglers are increasingly using more sophisticated techniques. These results were all anticipated in the Border Patrol Strategic Plan.

Evidence: See Performance Analysis System; and Border Patrol Strategic Plan. Alien apprehensions in San Diego Sector peaked in FY 96 at 484,000. After the successful implementation of Operation Gatekeeper, apprehensions steadily declined. In FY 2002, apprehensions were down to 100,681, an historic low. In other southwest border sectors where the strategy had been implemented show similar declines in apprehensions. Current results on our annual performance plan shows that we are maintaining optimum deterrence in corridors where the strategy has been successfully deployed along the southwest border.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Considerable effort has been devoted to maintaining optimum deterrence as well as in developing new capabilities to establish optimum deterrence for additional corridors, for both the southern and northern borders.

Evidence: DOJ Annual Performance Plan (APP) for 2003-2004. (Legacy) INS Implementation Plan (IP). Current APP results indicate that we are maintaining optimum deterrence in 8 corridors along the southwest border.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program achieves its goals annually with only minimum budget increases annually. BP base budget increases are approximately 5% annually.

Evidence: BP management constantly evaluates it's operational performance and effectiveness while operating within the current FY's budget. Agents and resources are deployed into the areas experiencing the greatest level of illegal activity. Once an area or operational corridor has been deemed to be under control, assets are deployed into other areas as required. The minimum amount of agents and resources required to maintain optimum deterrence are dedicated into a particular area. BP operations in support of the national strategy (Operations Hold the Line-El Paso, Gatekeeper - San Diego and Rio Grande-McAllen) Under legacy INS, BP did not have direct oversight of the Procurement and Contracting processes. Therefore, the BP did not have the responsibility for maintaining cost effectiveness measures, these were INS management functions. Under CBP, the Border Patrol program will be responsible for development and maintenance of cost effectiveness measures beginning in FY04. There are no cost effectiveness measures currently in place.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Border Patrol
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	63%	86%	47%	Demonstrated

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: While there are necessarily some crossover impacts, no other programs have a similar purpose and goal.

Evidence: Other CBP programs such as legacy INS, CG, and Customs are providing protection at the Ports of Entry - no other program is responsible for monitoring between the borders. The Border Patrol is the only agency between the ports-of-entry that conducts routine patrols aimed at preventing and deterring illegal entry into the United States. In the course of duty, the BP makes more arrests than any law enforcement agency in the world, about 1 million last year, addressing diverse border security functions which include Linewatch (patrol), Signcutting (tracking), Traffic Checkpoints, transportation check (bus, train, and plane), Air Patrol, Bike Patrol, Canine Teams (human and drug searches), Horse Patrol, Marine Patrol, Search and Rescue, Tactical Response. Let's discuss -- other LE programs seem applicable for comparison.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Border Patrol Strategic Plan. Independent evaluations conducted on Operation Gatekeeper, and Operation Rio Grande, Border Patrol Strategy Evaluation Analysis, and Southwest Border Enforcement: An Initial Analytical Framework and Evaluation.

Evidence: Results of studies conducted so far indicate that there is a clear reduction in illegal entry attempts overall; that illegal entry attempts have shifted to the Tucson Sector area; San Diego, El Paso, and McAllen Sectors have all experienced dramatic declines in entry attempts; and that smuggling attempts are increasingly using more sophisticated techniques. These results were all anticipated in the Border Patrol Strategic Plan.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Border Patrol
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	63%	86%	47%	Demonstrated

Measure: Number of Southwest border corridors with optimum deterrence. (Optimum deterrence is defined as the level at which applying more Border Patrol agents and resources would not yield a significant gain in arrests or deterrence.)

Additional Information: Optimum deterrence is defined as the level at which applying more Border Patrol agents and resources would not yield a significant gain in arrests/deterrence.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2002	8	8	
2003	9		
2004	11		
2005	13		

Measure: Integrated Surveillance Intelligence System (ISIS) Technology - number of sites deployed. (Monitors the deployment of remote video surveillance (RVS) cameras and electronic sensors in the sectors. The target is the projected annual deployment of new RVS camera systems.)

Additional Information: Integrated Surveillance Intelligence System (ISIS) - monitors the deployment of remote video surveillance (RVS) cameras and electronic sensors in the sectors. The target is the projected annual deployment of new RVS camera systems.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2002	65	76	
2003	65		
2004	65		
2005	65		

Measure: Monitor BSI related migrant deaths of the SWB

Additional Information: A Border Safety Initiative (BSI) related measure that monitors migrant deaths that occur in any of the 44 counties in 9 sectors along the southwest border (SWB).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Border Patrol
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	63%	86%	47%	Demonstrated

Measure: Monitor BSI related migrant rescues on the SWB

Additional Information: A Border Safety Initiative (BSI) related measure that monitors migrant rescues that occur in any of the 44 counties in 9 sectors along the southwest border (SWB)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Monitor BSI related migrant rescue incidents on the SWB

Additional Information: A Border Safety Initiative (BSI) related measure that monitors rescue incidents that occur in any of the 44 counties in 9 sectors along the southwest border (SWB)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Domestic Icebreaking Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	86%	84%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Domestic icebreaking facilitates safe and efficient navigation on national lakes, rivers, channels, and harbors during the winter season.

Evidence: 14 USC 2, 14 USC 93, 14 USC 141; Executive Order 7521

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: With the formation of ice in the Great Lakes and critical Northeast waterways, marine traffic is sustained only with CG icebreaking services. The traffic includes shipments of bulk cargoes and home heating oil.

Evidence: * 15 million tons of materials are shipped during the winter on the Great Lakes alone.* In the winter of 2002-2003, Lakes Superior, Huron, Erie, and Ontario froze over completely.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: CG is the only US agency tasked and funded to fulfill large-scale domestic icebreaking requirements. Commercial icebreaking services are available on a limited basis and are restricted to isolated locations only.

Evidence:

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: A review of activities required for domestic icebreaking yields no evidence that this program would be better served by commercial interests.

Evidence: * Of four commercial Great Lakes icebreaking ventures that have been initiated, only one has remained solvent. It is only operable in the Green Bay area.* A 2002 Center for Naval Analyses study found that the benefit-cost ratio of Great Lakes and East Coast icebreaking is more than 2 to 1.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The domestic icebreaking program is spread over the three geographical districts that experience ice-covered waterways: the Great Lakes, New England, and the Mid-Atlantic. To determine resource allocation, CG tracks commercial traffic, coordinates with Canadian authorities, and maps icebreaking needs.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Domestic Icebreaking Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	86%	84%	

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The long-term goal is the same as the annual goal: to maintain operational channels for navigation by limiting channel closures to two days during average winters and eight days during severe winters. A new performance measure is under development.

Evidence: USCG FY 2005 Congressional Budget JustificationUSCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#ice

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation:

Evidence: USCG FY 2005 Congressional Budget JustificationUSCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#ice

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The long-term goal is the same as the annual goal: to maintain operational channels for navigation by limiting channel closures to two days during average winters and eight days during severe winters. A new performance measure is under development. The new efficiency measure is the value of goods transported during domestic ice operations divided by the resources expended in support of the mission.

Evidence: USCG FY 2005 Congressional Budget JustificationUSCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#ice

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation:

Evidence: USCG FY 2005 Congressional Budget JustificationUSCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#ice

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: CG's work with the Canadian Coast Guard is discussed in question 3.5. The Canadian Coast Guard is appropriately considered as operating a related program rather than as a partner to CG's program.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Domestic Icebreaking Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	86%	84%	

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: In 2002, Coast Guard commissioned two icebreaking studies from the Center for Naval Analyses, including an economic analysis of the domestic icebreaking mission. The economic analysis reviewed prior studies on the subject and revised their methodology to include current assumptions.

Evidence: * "Economic Analysis of the Coast Guard's Domestic Icebreaking Mission," Center for Naval Analyses, January 2002.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Coast Guard's budget requests include detailed performance information. Additionally, the CG's Mission Cost Program model provides comprehensive cost information for individual programs, including overhead and other indirect costs, as well as direct costs. Funding for Coast Guard is provided through assets and people that perform multiple missions, most of them demand-driven, making it impossible to predict exact relationships between funding levels and performance measures for individual programs.

Evidence: USCG FY 2004 Report

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: CG is working to overhaul its domestic ice operations measurements.

Evidence: http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#ice

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The domestic ice operation has weekly and annual reports to keep track of performance standards. The reports are used to determine the placement and activities of assets throughout the icebreaking season.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Domestic Icebreaking Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	86%	84%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: All officers within this program are held accountable for the performance of the program through the Officer Evaluation System (OES) and their individual Officer Evaluation Report (OER) which is done annually and or semi-annually. OERs directly impact promotion and assignment decisions. In fact, the OER is the ONLY required document that is looked at when considering assignment and promotion. Area and District program managers are also held accountable under the same system.

Evidence: Chapter 10, Coast Guard Personnel Manual (COMDTINST M1000.6); LCMA Items & Issue Papers; Q1 FY-04 PMA Report.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Coast Guard obligates substantially all (over 99%) operating funds (Operating Expense Appropriation) each year. Virtually all capital acquisition funds (Acquisition, Construction and Improvement Appropriation) are obligated prior to expiring. The Coast Guard's Office of Resource Management enforces the provisions of COMDTINST 7100.3 (series), Financial Resources Management Manual that specify quarterly spending rates and funding carry over limits.

Evidence: Estimated obligations by quarter in apportionments. Obligation rates are tracked monthly by the Coast Guard's Office of Resource Management. Quarterly spend down rates are enforced in accordance with the Financial Resource Management Manual, COMDINST M7100.3 (series).

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: This program has developed a new efficiency measure, and has also implemented cost-saving projects.

Evidence: The recent Great Lakes icebreaker project has combined the asset operational requirements of a previous 180' buoy tender and the existing icebreaker to replace both vessels with one. This change required state-of-the-art technology which involved more efficient and maneuverable propulsion and command and control systems and allowed the asset to reduce manning requirements.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The program works with and has an MOU with the Canadian Coast Guard relating to domestic icebreaking. They have also integrated a Joint Operations Center.

Evidence: MOU with Canadian Coast Guard

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Domestic Icebreaking Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	86%	84%	

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: NO

Question Weight:14%

Explanation: DHS received a qualified opinion on its 2003 audit, due in part to problems with Coast Guard documentation. The audit also identified five material weaknesses in Coast Guard specifically. This audit presented a number of unique and, in some cases, one-time challenges. In consultation with KPMG LLP, Coast Guard has crafted and is implementing a remedial plan.

Evidence: Independent Auditors' Report on DHS' Financial Statements, Audit Report Number OIG-04-10

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Quality Performance Consultants assist the Coast Guard, Coast Guard units, and individuals in improving overall mission performance through improved management practices.

Evidence:

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?

Answer: LARGE
EXTENT

Question Weight:25%

Explanation: The goals have been met, but they are not ambitious.

Evidence: USCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#ice

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?

Answer: LARGE
EXTENT

Question Weight:25%

Explanation: The goals have been met, but they are not ambitious.

Evidence: USCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#ice

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:25%

Explanation: A 2002 Center for Naval Analyses study found that the benefit-cost ratio of Great Lakes and East Coast icebreaking is more than 2 to 1.

Evidence: * "Economic Analysis of the Coast Guard's Domestic Icebreaking Mission," Center for Naval Analyses, January 2002.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: NA

Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: No other U.S. programs perform a similar mission.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Domestic Icebreaking Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	86%	84%	

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: YES Question Weight 25%

Explanation: A 2002 Center for Naval Analyses study found that the benefit-cost ratio of Great Lakes and East Coast icebreaking is more than 2 to 1.

Evidence: * "Economic Analysis of the Coast Guard's Domestic Icebreaking Mission," Center for Naval Analyses, January 2002.

Measure: Number of days that channels are closed due to ice during the winter

Additional Information: The goal of the program is to keep waterways free for navigation. The goal is two days or fewer in a normal winter and eight days or fewer in a severe winter, as determined by the National Weather Service.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
1999	2	0	
2000	2	0	
2001	8	7	
2002	8	7	
2003	8	7	

Measure: Value of goods transported during domestic ice operations divided by the resources expended in support of the mission

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	100%	53%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The CG's objective is to provide the at-sea enforcement necessary to reach national goals for living marine resource conservation and management. (Fisheries management is the responsibility of Commerce/NOAA.)

Evidence: * Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act of 1976* 1995 CG Fisheries Enforcement Study * 1999 Fisheries Enforcement Strategic Plan, "Ocean Guardian"

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program addresses the threat of illegal fishing and the negative impacts on an industry that provides over \$50 billion/year to the U.S. economy. Enforcement of regulations is necessary to achieve compliance to support NOAA Fisheries efforts to end over-fishing, rebuild and manage fish stocks, and reduce impacts to fish habitat. According to NOAA, 36% of US fish stocks are overfished (i.e., the size of a particular fish stock is below a biological minimum for sustainability).

Evidence: * NOAA Fisheries 'Annual Report to Congress on the Status of U.S. Fisheries ' 2002,' pg. iv, available online at: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/reports.html>* UN FAO OceanAtlas Report, 'Illegal, Unregulated, and Unreported Fishing,' pg. 1, available online at: http://www.oceansatlas.com/world_fisheries_and_aquaculture/html/issues/govern/iuu/default.htm

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The CG shares fisheries enforcement responsibilities with NOAA Fisheries and state enforcement agencies, and the CG is lead for at-sea enforcement of fisheries regulations. Enforcement activity is closely coordinated with NOAA Fisheries and state enforcement agencies. Coast Guard is the only agency capable of projecting a law enforcement presence throughout the 3.34 million square mile U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone and in key areas of the high seas.

Evidence: * 28 USC 1385, POSSE COMITATUS.* Interagency agreement with NOAA.* CG has established liaison officers at State Department Office of Marine Conservation and NOAA Fisheries Office for Law Enforcement to ensure the program's activities are coordinated and complement the national and international efforts of these federal agencies. * The program has also established a Law Enforcement Committee on each of the 8 regional fisheries management councils to coordinate federal and state enforcement activities and priorities with these regulatory bodies.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Fisheries enforcement is a law enforcement activity and is therefore most appropriately conducted as a direct federal program. NOAA conducts the fisheries management aspect as a regulatory program.

Evidence: No other mechanism is feasible.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	100%	53%	Effective

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Coast Guard targets its fisheries enforcement resources through meetings with the regional councils, including federal and state enforcement agencies and industry partners, to identify significant threats, and by studying the history and science of stock migration and fishing activity.

Evidence: Law Enforcement Committees of the regional fisheries management councils coordinate federal and state enforcement activities and ensure efforts are appropriately focused.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The program has two outcome measures that support the program's purpose ' to provide the at-sea enforcement necessary to reach national goals for fish conservation and management. They are observed compliance rate (domestic fisheries enforcement mission) and number of detected Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) incursions (foreign fisheries enforcement mission). NOAA tracks the outcome measure of health of the fish stocks (overarching objective); the CG measures the outcome of its contribution, enforcement, to the overall national objective.

Evidence: FY 2002 Performance Report and FY 2004 Budget in Brief

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The annual and long-term goals for this program are the same. Each year, Coast Guard aims to have 202 or fewer incursions in the EEZ and 97% or better observed compliance rate with domestic regulations. While having a static goal for domestic fisheries enforcement is defensible because of improved targeting, Coast Guard should develop long-term goals that demonstrate annual performance improvement for foreign fisheries enforcement.

Evidence: * Domestic: Improved targeting and implementation of the Vessel Monitoring System will allow Coast Guard to focus on likely violators, which would drive down the observed compliance rate ceteris paribus. If the compliance rate remains at 97%, the program's deterrent impact has increased enough to outweigh the greater focus on likely violators.* Foreign: Although funding for this mission has decreased, efforts are underway to return it to pre-9/11 levels in the future. There is no compelling reason, as in domestic fisheries enforcement, why a static goal represents continuous improvement on this measure in the long term.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The CG tracks the total number of foreign fishing vessel incursions into the U.S. EEZ, as it gauges the program's performance relative to achieving the performance goal of eliminating encroachment of the U.S. EEZ by foreign fishing vessels. The CG also tracks the compliance rate in domestic fisheries, as it gauges the program's performance relative to achieving the performance goal of effectively enforcing federal regulations that provide stewardship of living marine resources and their environments.

Evidence: FY 2002 Performance Report and FY 2004 Budget in Brief

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	100%	53%	Effective

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Each year, the program aims to limit EEZ incursions to 202 or less each year and to maintain the domestic compliance rate at 97% or higher. As short-term goals, these targets are ambitious and indicate success in enforcing fisheries regulations.

Evidence: FY 2002 Performance Report and FY 2004 Budget in Brief

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The program encourages close cooperation with its state and federal law enforcement partners through annual planning guidance and other correspondence. CG also has a seat on all 8 Regional Fisheries Management Councils (RFMC).

Evidence: * Mission Planning Guidance* Interagency agreement between NOAA and CG* Federal-State cooperative enforcement agreements * CG liaisons at State Department Office of Marine Conservation and NOAA Fisheries Office for Law Enforcement * Law Enforcement Committee on each of the 8 regional fisheries management councils* CG/State/NOAA National Plan of Action to Deter Illegal, Unregulated, and Unreported Fishing

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: While numerous studies have considered aspects of the fisheries program, there have been no comprehensive, independent analyses of its effectiveness. Coast Guard is in the early stages of initiating a study with the Center for Naval Analyses that they hope will provide for a plan of regular evaluations.

Evidence: The most substantial review of the fisheries program has been the 1993 "Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement Study." However, this study cannot be considered a program evaluation. It was a summary of workshops attended by Coast Guard, its Federal and state enforcement partners, and the fishing industry. While MicroSystems Integration, Inc., and Battell Ocean Sciences, as independent entities, wrote the summary of the meetings, they did not conduct a scientific study of the program's success in enforcing fisheries laws. The content was provided by the interested parties participating in the workgroup. As the Executive Summary states, this report provides "an overview of the current activities" and "an understanding of the relationship between the various enforcement activities." It is concerned with customer satisfaction. While this is useful information to have and contributes to the program's "Yes" answers on questions such as 1.3, 2.5, and 3.5, it does not fill the need for an objective evaluation of whether the program is meeting its goals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	100%	53%	Effective

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The Coast Guard uses a performance-based budgeting system. This methodology ties funding levels directly to performance goals and targets. Additionally, the CG's Mission Cost Program model provides comprehensive cost information for individual programs, including overhead and other indirect costs, as well as direct costs.

Evidence: * The United States Coast Guard FY2003 Report: Fiscal Year 2002 Performance Budget & Fiscal Year 2004 Budget in Brief * Budget Estimates: Fiscal Year 2004

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: To correct Coast Guard-wide deficiencies identified in earlier PARTs, Coast Guard has initiated a study with the Center for Naval Analyses that they hope will provide for a plan of regular evaluations.

Evidence:

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: * The Maritime Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) and Abstract of Operations (AOPS) databases provide high quality data supporting input measures (i.e. levels of effort such as cutter and aircraft patrol hours, numbers of boardings, etc) and output measures (i.e. types of violations). * The program collects performance information through the monthly District/Area Living Marine Resource Enforcement Summary message report. This report provides detailed information from regional commanders on EEZ and Domestic Fisheries enforcement effort and results, upcoming operations, developing significant fisheries management issues, new regulations requiring additional at-sea law enforcement, and an overall command assessment. This provides the program manager a regional Commander's Assessment used to adjust priorities and resource allocation. * This performance information is collected and analyzed internally and also shared with management and enforcement partners such as the Regional Fisheries Management Councils and State and Federal enforcement agencies through quarterly (or more frequent if necessary) meetings at the HQ and regional level. Through these meetings enforcement priorities, tactics, and operations are planned and coordinated between all participating agencies.

Evidence: * MISLE and AOPS databases * Monthly District/Area Living Marine Resource Enforcement Summary message report

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Coast Guard has launched a Leadership Council Management Agenda (LCMA) to keep senior officials focused on key projects. For each program, the LCMA identifies the lead officials, the desired end-stage, and executable segments of the project, including timetables and resources. The leads report to the Commandant at Leadership Council meetings, while the Chief of Staff tracks their progress between meetings.

Evidence: * LCMA Update Process

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	100%	53%	Effective

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Coast Guard obligates substantially all (over 99%) operating funds (Operating Expense Appropriation) each year. Virtually all capital acquisition funds (Acquisition, Construction and Improvement Appropriation) are obligated prior to expiring. The Coast Guard's Office of Financial Management enforces the provisions of COMDTISNT 7100.3(series), Financial Resources Management Manual that specify quarterly spending rates and funding carry over limits.

Evidence: * Estimated obligations by quarter in apportionments* Actual obligations by quarter

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Operational decisions are decentralized to the district level and lower to delay the organization. The program allows for flexible local sourcing for site management. CG continually looks to improve efficiency through IT and technological advances. As an example, the CG is working with NOAA to institute a National Vessel Monitoring System that will provide our cutters and command centers with near real-time position updates on fishing vessel positions. This has already resulted in 7 significant fisheries violation detections this year that would not have occurred without VMS info and has also been useful in several SAR cases. Additionally, the CG does competitively outsource various elements of the program, including maintenance to the Law Enforcement Asset Needs computer model.

Evidence: * National Vessel Monitoring System

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Enforcement activity is closely coordinated with NOAA Fisheries and state enforcement agencies.

Evidence: * Interagency agreement with NOAA.* CG has established liaison officers at State Department Office of Marine Conservation and NOAA Fisheries Office for Law Enforcement to ensure the program's activities are coordinated and complement the national and international efforts of these federal agencies. * The program has also established a Law Enforcement Committee on each of the 8 regional fisheries management councils to coordinate federal and state enforcement activities and priorities with these regulatory bodies.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Coast Guard is a leader in both financial and managerial accounting among large, multi-mission agencies within the government, employing systems and techniques that meet or exceed the requirements fo the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board. This is evidenced by four consecutive clean audits under the Chief Financial Officers Act and cost accounting techniques for management reporting on asset, mission and performance goal costs that substantially exceed the requirement of Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standard number 4.

Evidence: Four consecutive clean audits under the CFO Act.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	100%	53%	Effective

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Beginning in 1993, every five years the program has conducted a study of its enforcement practices through workshops with representatives from Coast Guard, NOAA, state agencies, and the fishing industry. While this study does not constitute an independent performance evaluation, it is a useful tool for identifying management concerns.

Evidence: 1993 and 1999 Fisheries Enforcement Studies resulted in significant management improvements, including the establishment of:
 * Five Regional Fisheries Training Centers to train fisheries boarding officers* Marine Affairs Postgraduate Program for fisheries law enforcement staff officers* Liaison officers at State and NOAA to better coordinate activities* Law enforcement advisory panels on all eight Regional Fisheries Management Councils* Fisheries intelligence officer billets

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Foreign Fishing Vessel Incursions goal has been met in 2 of the last 7 years. Living Marine Resources compliance rate has been high (greater than 95%) for the last three years, and mid-term FY03 data shows that it should remain at this level.

Evidence: CG Performance Report

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Foreign Fishing Vessel Incursions goal has been met in 2 of the last 7 years. Living Marine Resources Compliance rate has been high (greater than 95%) for the last three years, and goal of 97% was met for the last two years.

Evidence: CG Performance Report

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: YES Question Weight:20%

Explanation: The program has encouraged operational planners to capitalize on efficiencies in operations, including conducting boardings of opportunity during homeland security and other missions and increasing use of VMS and intelligence information to conduct targeted boardings. As of mid-FY03, 7 of the 43 detected significant violations were the direct result of this type of information and would very likely never have been detected without this information.

Evidence: * Law Enforcement Planning Guidance

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	100%	53%	Effective

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: * According to the UN Food and Agricultural Organization, in some countries, up to 30% of the total catch is from illegal, unreported, and unregulated fisheries. While CG does not collect this type of data, the fact that 97% of vessels boarded are in compliance suggests that far less than 30% of the total U.S. catch is from illegal sources.* According to the Scottish Fisheries Protection Agency's 2002 report, in 1,295 at-sea boardings, they detected 82 cases of alleged illegal activity which appear to be in line with the USCG definition of significant violations. This equates to an observed compliance rate of 93.7%, vs. CG's 97.3%.

Evidence: * UN FAO OceanAtlas Report, 'Illegal, Unregulated, and Unreported Fishing,' pg. 1, available online at: http://www.oceansatlas.com/world_fisheries_and_aquaculture/html/issues/govern/iuu/default.htm* Scottish Fisheries Protection Agency 2000 Annual Report, agency key performance measures and targets, available online at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library3/fisheries/sfpa-00.asp>

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: This program has not had comprehensive, independent evaluations of its performance.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	100%	53%	Effective

Measure: Percentage of domestic fishing boats boarded that are in compliance with fishery management plan regulations

Additional Information: This measure tracks the observed compliance rate noted during CG fisheries boardings. The rate is determined by dividing the number of significant violations detected by the number of fisheries boardings conducted.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	97.00%	98.6%	
2004	97.00%	96.3%	
2005	97.00%		
2006	97.00%		

Measure: Foreign Fishing Vessel Incursions

Additional Information: This measure indicates the number of foreign fishing vessel incursions detected within our EEZ.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	202	212	
2004	202	247	
2005	202		
2006	202		

Measure: Percentage of domestic fishing boats boarded that are in compliance with fishery management plan regulations

Additional Information: This measure tracks the observed compliance rate noted during CG fisheries boardings. The rate is determined by dividing the number of significant violations detected by the number of fisheries boardings conducted.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	97.00%		
2006	97.00%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	100%	53%	Effective

2007	97.00%
2008	97.00%
2009	97.00%

Measure:
Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------------------

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Migrant Interdiction Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of the Coast Guard's Migrant Interdiction program is to provide at-sea enforcement to interdict and process illegal and undocumented migrants as far from U.S. shores as possible. The purpose is as much a humanitarian mandate as a law enforcement requirement.

Evidence: The President, using the Executive power to control the borders of the U.S., has suspended the entry of undocumented aliens into the U.S. Executive Order 12807, issued in 1992, directs the Coast Guard to enforce this suspension as part of its border control function. Presidential Decision Directive 9, issued in June 1993 to establish national policy to prevent and suppress alien smuggling, mandates the Coast Guard interdict migrants as far at sea as possible. In *Sale v. Haitian Centers Council, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 155 (1993), the Supreme Court upheld the assertion of Executive Order 12807 that neither refugee screening procedures nor deportation processing requirements apply outside the territory of the U.S. In Executive Order 13276, issued in November 2002, the President delegated responsibilities concerning undocumented aliens interdicted or intercepted in the Caribbean Region to DHS, State, and Defense.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Every year, thousands of individuals attempt to illegally enter the United States via maritime migration and maritime alien smuggling. This activity is both unsafe and undermines U.S. sovereignty. The terrorist attacks of 2001 increased the national focus on border and transportation security and placed a greater emphasis on determining the true identities and nationalities of individuals interdicted at sea to guard against terrorists attempting to enter the country posing as migrants.

Evidence: Since 1980, the Coast Guard has interdicted over 300,000 migrants at sea from 47 different countries. The number of interdicted migrants has been increasing in recent years, from over 4,000 in 2002 to 6,000 in 2003. So far in 2004, nearly 9,000 migrants have been interdicted already, mostly from Haiti and the Dominican Republic.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Although other agencies have migrant enforcement responsibilities (CIS, CBP, ICE), the Coast Guard is the only entity with both the capability and legal authority to conduct at-sea interdiction of illegal migrants.

Evidence: While the U.S. Navy, from a resource standpoint, has the capability to perform this mission, they do not have the legal authority. On the other hand, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) has the authority but only has small boats.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Migrant interdiction is a law enforcement activity, which is inherently governmental.

Evidence: No other program design would be appropriate.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Migrant Interdiction Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Coast Guard is a multi-mission agency. While a certain level of resources and training is targeted specifically toward migrant interdiction at a steady-state level, Coast Guard also has a nearly immediate surge capability to increase its response for mass migration situations.

Evidence: During the Haitian mass migration threat in February and March 2004, Coast Guard assets from Districts along the east coast surged to the scene within 24 hours.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The long-term performance measure is to interdict or deter a set percentage of undocumented migrants attempting to enter the U.S. by maritime routes.

Evidence: USCG FY 2005 Congressional Budget JustificationUSCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#migrant

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: By 2009, Coast Guard aims to interdict or deter 95% of undocumented migrants attempting to enter the U.S. by maritime routes. Since the 2003 interdiction rate was 85.3%, this long-term goal is ambitious.

Evidence: USCG FY 2005 Congressional Budget JustificationUSCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#migrant

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The annual performance measure is to interdict or deter a set percentage of undocumented migrants attempting to enter the U.S. by maritime routes. The (new) efficiency measure is the number of migrants interdicted per resource-hour.

Evidence: USCG FY 2005 Congressional Budget JustificationUSCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#migrant

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Coast Guard aims to interdict or deter 87% of undocumented migrants in 2004, 88% in 2005, and 89% in 2006.

Evidence: USCG FY 2005 Congressional Budget JustificationUSCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#migrant

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Migrant Interdiction Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Coast Guard works closely with ICE, CBP, CIS, and State in migrant interdiction planning and operations, using interagency guidance, MOUs, liaison officers, joint campaign plans, and joint field/tactical level planning and operations.

Evidence: Operation Able Sentry

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Center for Naval Analyses (CNA) evaluation is currently conducting an independent evaluation that is scheduled for completion in June 2004.

Evidence: CNA statement of work

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Coast Guard's budget requests include detailed performance information. Additionally, the CG's Mission Cost Program model provides comprehensive cost information for individual programs, including overhead and other indirect costs, as well as direct costs. Funding for Coast Guard is provided through assets and people that perform multiple missions, most of them demand-driven, making it impossible to predict exact relationships between funding levels and performance measures for individual programs.

Evidence: USCG FY 2005 Congressional Budget JustificationUSCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#migrant

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The CNA evaluation was requested to address the lack of independent evaluations of the program.

Evidence: CNA statement of work for this evaluation

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Migrant Interdiction Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Maritime Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) and Abstract of Operations (AOPS) databases provide high quality data supporting input measures (i.e., levels of effort such as cutter and aircraft patrol hours, numbers of boardings, etc.) and output measures (migrants interdicted). CG monitors migrant interdiction performance through regular reports; Commandant and DHS receives quarterly performance data. Assets, resource hours, and funds may be reallocated to address shifts in the threat.

Evidence: CG Annual Performance Report; Quarterly DHS performance update; Quarterly 2nd tier stats to GAO; CG Office of Law Enforcement migrant database; Commandant's Intent msgs.

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: All officers within this program are held accountable for the performance of the program through the Officer Evaluation System (OES) and their individual Officer Evaluation Report (OER) which is done annually and or semi-annually. OERs directly impact promotion and assignment decisions. In fact, the OER is the ONLY required document that is looked at when considering assignment and promotion. Area and District program managers are also held accountable under the same system.

Evidence: Chapter 10, Coast Guard Personnel Manual (COMDTINST M1000.6); LCMA Items & Issue Papers; Q1 FY-04 PMA Report.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Coast Guard obligates substantially all (over 99%) operating funds (Operating Expense Appropriation) each year. Virtually all capital acquisition funds (Acquisition, Construction and Improvement Appropriation) are obligated prior to expiring. The Coast Guard's Office of Resource Management enforces the provisions of COMDTINST 7100.3 (series), Financial Resources Management Manual that specify quarterly spending rates and funding carry over limits.

Evidence: Estimated obligations by quarter in apportionments. Obligation rates are tracked monthly by the Coast Guard's Office of Resource Management. Quarterly spend down rates are enforced in accordance with the Financial Resource Management Manual, COMDINST M7100.3 (series).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Migrant Interdiction Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:14%

Explanation: CG will have an efficiency measure for this program by June 14. CG also does competitively outsource various elements of the program, including a secured communications network with CIS and maintenance to the Law Enforcement Asset Needs computer model. The Coast Guard is pursuing a multi-year C4ISR improvement plan, which included several sensor and communication improvements. Additionally, the Coast Guard is implementing activity-based costing at support units to increase the understanding of business processes, identify areas of inefficiency, and improve resource management in support of CG assets and missions.

Evidence: Activity-based costing models at Integrated Support Commands; master plan for C4ISR. Efficiency measure June 14.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:14%

Explanation: CG has liaisons to State and to other DHS components to coordinate policy and interdiction operations with BTS, CIS, ICE, and CBP.

Evidence: State and the other DHS entities contributed to the DHS Caribbean Mass Migrantion Plan, VIGILANT SENTRY, which has been recently proven effective during the Haitian surge operations. CG has MOUs with CBP, ICE, Puerto Rico police, and the US Public Health Service.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: NO

Question Weight:14%

Explanation: DHS received a qualified opinion on its 2003 audit, due in part to problems with Coast Guard documentation. The audit also identified five material weaknesses in Coast Guard specifically. This audit presented a number of unique and, in some cases, one-time challenges. In consultation with KPMG LLP, Coast Guard has crafted and is implementing a remedial plan.

Evidence: Independent Auditors' Report on DHS' Financial Statements, Audit Report Number OIG-04-10

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Quality Performance Consultants assist the Coast Guard, Coast Guard units, and individuals in improving overall mission performance through improved management practices. As an example of a particular change CG has implemented, the CNA program evaluation is underway.

Evidence: CNA statement of work

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?

Answer: SMALL
EXTENT

Question Weight:25%

Explanation: The performance goal for the past five years has been 87%. Of those five years, the goal has been met three times. Moreover, the progression has not been linear: after reaching 88% in 2002, the interdiction rate dropped to 85% in 2003. This pattern does not inspire confidence that the long-term goal of 95% will be met by 2009.

Evidence: USCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#migrant

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Migrant Interdiction Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 25%

Explanation: The performance goal for the past five years has been 87%. Of those five years, the goal has been met three times.

Evidence: USCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#migrant

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: YES Question Weight 25%

Explanation: There were 5,331 Coast Guard migrant interdictions in FY03 compared to 2,409 in FY02, an increase in over 120% for interdictions, although funding did not increase.

Evidence: USCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#migrant

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: No other migrant interdiction programs have performance measures.

Evidence: N/A

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 25%

Explanation: The Center for Naval Analyses (CNA) evaluation, scheduled for completion in June 2004, will be fairly positive.

Evidence: CNA statement of work

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Migrant Interdiction Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

Measure: Percentage of undocumented migrants attempting to enter the U.S. by maritime routes who are interdicted or deterred
Additional Information: Rate = 1 - (number of landings by undocumented migrants in U.S. / total predicted flow of undocumented migrants to U.S. in that year)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	87%	82.5%	
2002	87%	88.3%	
2003	87%	85.3%	
2004	87%		
2005	0.88		

Measure: Percentage of undocumented migrants attempting to enter the U.S. by maritime routes who are interdicted or deterred
Additional Information: Rate = 1 - (number of landings by undocumented migrants in U.S. / total predicted flow of undocumented migrants to U.S. in that year)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2004	0.87		
2005	0.88		
2006	0.89		
2007	0.91		
2008	0.93		
2009	0.95		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Migrant Interdiction Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

Measure: Number of migrants interdicted per resource-hour

Additional Information:

Year

Target

Actual

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Polar Icebreaking Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	25%	71%	8%	Demonstrate

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of the program is to break ice in the polar regions; to provide heavy polar icebreaker system capability support for U.S. national interests. However, it is not clear to what end it performs this function. A variety of possible answers, provided by multiple agencies, would include enabling National Science Foundation (NSF) programs, conducting oceanographic research, supporting U.S. military interests in polar regions, and protecting the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone around Alaska.

Evidence: 14 USC 2, 14 USC 93, 14 USC 94, 14 USC 141, 15 USC 4101, 15 USC 4109: all authorize or require Coast Guard to perform icebreaking.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Breaking the ice in the Arctic and Antarctic is necessary for NSF and other agencies to conduct the U.S. Antarctic Program and the U.S. Arctic Research Program. Aside from NSF research, the other missions supported by the program are either very occasional (polar search and rescue) or theoretical (military requirements in the Antarctic).

Evidence: U.S. Antarctic Program Summary

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: While Canadian Coast Guard icebreakers provide support the U.S. Air Force Base in Greenland and could be used for other U.S. missions, Coast Guard polar icebreakers are the only U.S. assets capable of breaking polar ice throughout the year.

Evidence: Other nations with heavy icebreaking capability are Russia and the Baltics.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: NO

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Although Coast Guard conducts this mission almost exclusively to support other agencies, primarily the National Science Foundation, it collects only a small percentage of the total operating costs through reimbursement from the other agencies. NSF is driving the costs of the Coast Guard program but is not itself bearing them, a market failure that precludes efficiency. The program is designed so that we cannot know if the costs of the program are justified by the benefits.

Evidence: 15 USC 4109 and 16 USC 2441 allow Coast Guard to be reimbursed only for recurring incremental costs associated with specific projects. In 2003, the direct costs of operating the polar icebreakers were \$43m, total costs of the polar icebreaking mission were xx, and Coast Guard received only \$9 million in reimbursements from other agencies.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Polar Icebreaking Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	25%	71%	8%	Demonstrate

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: This program may be subsidizing activities that would have occurred in its absence. NSF's work constitutes most of the work of the polar icebreaking mission. If NSF had to pay the full cost of operating the Coast Guard icebreaking program, it might find less costly solutions, including icebreakers owned by other countries.

Evidence: For example, USCG is officially responsible for supporting the resupply of Thule Air Force base in Greenland. However, because USCG polar icebreakers are located on the West Coast, USCG has an agreement for the Canadian Coast Guard to actually perform this mission. This situation is an example of how U.S. icebreaking needs in polar regions can be met without USCG involvement.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: In the past, CG has used as its measure a percent-success rate for meeting other agencies' (primarily NSF's) requests for icebreaking services. The goal is 100% every year. This measure is problematic because it does not take into consideration if the request is met effectively or efficiently. No performance measure was used in the 2004 performance report or 2005 Budget. CG has been developing a new measure, a science and logistics management index.

Evidence: USCG FY 2005 Congressional Budget Justification USCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#iceDraft Polar Ice Operations measurement plan Polar Ice Operations Mission Success index spreadsheets

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The measures used to date are not ambitious since CG has met 100% of all icebreaking support requested since the program began.

Evidence: Draft Polar Ice Operations measurement plan Polar Ice Operations Mission Success index spreadsheets

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: In the past, CG has used as its measure a percent-success rate for meeting other agencies' (primarily NSF's) requests for icebreaking services. The goal is 100% every year. This measure is problematic because it does not take into consideration if the request is met effectively or efficiently. No performance measure was used in the 2004 performance report or 2005 Budget. CG has been developing a new measure, a science and logistics management index.

Evidence: USCG FY 2004 and 2005 Congressional Budget Justification USCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#iceDraft Polar Ice Operations measurement plan Polar Ice Operations Mission Success index spreadsheets

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The measures used to date are not ambitious since CG has met 100% of all icebreaking support requested since the program began.

Evidence: Draft Polar Ice Operations measurement plan Polar Ice Operations Mission Success index spreadsheets

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Polar Icebreaking Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	25%	71%	8%	Demonstrate

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Coast Guard is essentially a partner in NSF's Arctic and Antarctic research programs. To date, Coast Guard's performance measures have not taken into consideration if or how well the research was completed.

Evidence: USCG FY 2004 and 2005 Congressional Budget Justification National Science Foundation FY 2003 Performance and Accountability Report
<http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf0410/start.htm>

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Center for Naval Analyses (CNA) may begin an evaluation of this program in the next few years, as appropriate.

Evidence:

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Coast Guard's budget requests include detailed performance information. Additionally, the CG's Mission Cost Program model provides comprehensive cost information for individual programs, including overhead and other indirect costs, as well as direct costs. Funding for Coast Guard is provided through assets and people that perform multiple missions, most of them demand-driven, making it impossible to predict exact relationships between funding levels and performance measures for individual programs.

Evidence: USCG FY 2004 Report

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: CG is working to overhaul its polar ice operations measurements.

Evidence: http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#ice

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Annually or after each deployment, the program collects information on success of mission, operational risk, operational deficiencies, program deficiencies, and customer feedback. These factors are considered when managing the program.

Evidence: Deployment summary messages, deployment cruise reports, engineering reports

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Polar Icebreaking Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	25%	71%	8%	Demonstrate

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: All officers within this program are held accountable for the performance of the program through the Officer Evaluation System (OES) and their individual Officer Evaluation Report (OER) which is done annually and or semi-annually. OERs directly impact promotion and assignment decisions. In fact, the OER is the ONLY required document that is looked at when considering assignment and promotion. Area and District program managers are also held accountable under the same system.

Evidence: Chapter 10, Coast Guard Personnel Manual (COMDTINST M1000.6); LCMA Items & Issue Papers; Q1 FY-04 PMA Report.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Coast Guard obligates substantially all (over 99%) operating funds (Operating Expense Appropriation) each year. Virtually all capital acquisition funds (Acquisition, Construction and Improvement Appropriation) are obligated prior to expiring. The Coast Guard's Office of Resource Management enforces the provisions of COMDTINST 7100.3 (series), Financial Resources Management Manual that specify quarterly spending rates and funding carry over limits.

Evidence: Estimated obligations by quarter in apportionments. Obligation rates are tracked monthly by the Coast Guard's Office of Resource Management. Quarterly spend down rates are enforced in accordance with the Financial Resource Management Manual, COMDINST M7100.3 (series).

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The efficiency measure is the cost of arctic & Antarctic research funding/the cost of Polar Ice Operations program. This measure is designed to provide a benefit to cost ratio of the polar science conducted to the cost of breaking ice to support that science.

Evidence: IT improvements have been implemented on all the polar icebreakers, including 24-hour internet access. The newest icebreaker, the Healy, greatly improved efficiency by increasing the vessel's capability while reducing manning requirements.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Although CG works closely with US Transportation Command, Canadian Coast Guard, NSF, and the University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System, its performance measures are not coordinated with its client agencies' and the client agencies do not pay a representative share of their costs of operating the icebreakers.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Polar Icebreaking Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	25%	71%	8%	Demonstrate

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: DHS received a qualified opinion on its 2003 audit, due in part to problems with Coast Guard documentation. The audit also identified five material weaknesses in Coast Guard specifically. This audit presented a number of unique and, in some cases, one-time challenges. In consultation with KPMG LLP, Coast Guard has crafted and is implementing a remedial plan.

Evidence: Independent Auditors' Report on DHS' Financial Statements, Audit Report Number OIG-04-10

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: CNA program evaluation is underway. Additionally, Quality Performance Consultants assist the Coast Guard, Coast Guard units, and individuals in improving overall mission performance through improved management practices.

Evidence:

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The program does not have meaningful long-term performance goals.

Evidence: USCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#ice

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The program does not have meaningful annual performance goals.

Evidence: USCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#ice

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The efficiency measure is the cost of arctic & Antarctic research funding/the cost of Polar Ice Operations program. This measure is designed to provide a benefit to cost ratio of the polar science conducted to the cost of breaking ice to support that science.

Evidence: USCG FY 2004 Report http://www.uscg.mil/CG_2004_html/goals.html#ice

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: No other U.S. program perform a similar mission.

Evidence: N/A

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coast Guard Polar Icebreaking Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: U.S. Coast Guard
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	25%	71%	8%	Demonstrate

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NO Question Weight 25%

Explanation: No evaluations have been completed.

Evidence:

Measure: Percent success rate in meeting requests for icebreaking

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
1999	1	1	
2000	1	1	
2001	1	1	
2002	1	1	
2003	1	1	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Container Security Initiative
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	34%	83%	0%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The CSI targets and inspects containers for Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) at foreign ports of lading.

Evidence:

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The program screens for WMD and other implements of terror before the cargo leaves the foreign port, decreasing the risk to U.S. ports, trade, and citizens. CSI secures the supply chain by targeting and inspecting high risk containers.

Evidence:

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: No other agency, public or private, is conducting such inspections.

Evidence:

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: NA

Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: We are still in the development and implementation stage: making agreements with foreign governments; opening, furnishing, and supplying offices; relocating staff on detail in CSI ports. While some adjustments are being made to accommodate differences between and among the ports, no major flaws that would affect the efficacy or efficiency of the program have been identified.

Evidence: CSI is still in developmental stages.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Phase I of the CSI was targeted at the 20 foreign sea ports that are responsible for 70% of the maritime traffic to the U.S.

Evidence: Phase II targets an additional 25 ports of political or strategic significance. Phase III targets 23 strategic ports that require capacity building.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 17%

Explanation: Long-term performance measures are currently under development. Meetings will be held to formulate more specific long-term performance measures and collection processes that will better measure the depth of this program.

Evidence: While BCBP has little specifics, there are two long term goals; higher percentage of containers screened and total number of ports enrolled.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Container Security Initiative
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	34%	83%	0%	Demonstrated

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:17%

Explanation: The program supports the strategic goal of protecting our homeland from acts of terrorism by pushing our nation's zone of security beyond our physical borders to deter and prevent the threat of WMD and implements of terrorism from being smuggled into the US by maritime container.

Evidence: Current measures may include: Complete transition to CSI pilot teams in 11 additional international seaports with signed Declaration of Principles. Fill 100% of inspector positions at the additional ports. Train 100% of inspectors at each port. Maintain system response times. Maintain/achieve level of systems' availability of 99% or better within the operational hours.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:17%

Explanation: The program's initial goal was to complete implementation of Phase I by the end of the fiscal year by making the top 20 ports operational.

Evidence: Specifics need to be developed, including year two, three, etc. Transition 20% of ports from pilot to permanent status with concomitant transition of personnel from TDY to permanent status. Complete Declaration of Principles (DOP) with 50% of the countries containing the 24 Phase II ports. In 2006 transition 40% of ports from pilot to permanent status and complete DOPs with 50% of the countries containing the 24 Phase II ports.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:16%

Explanation: CSI is in the process of establishing appropriate baseline measures that capture more than volume of examinations and/or workload. In July 2003, we will meet to evaluate appropriate measures and a means of capturing the data.

Evidence: See above.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:17%

Explanation: Our "partners" in the program are the foreign Customs administrations with whom we have signed Declarations of Principles. Our partners commit to sharing container information, intelligence and inspecting high-risk containers. Within CBP, the CSI task force also works with the Office of Field Operations to ensure the program has an adequate supply of well trained inspectors. The Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement also supplies the team leaders for each CSI port. While the trade is not actually a "partner" in this program, they benefit in having their containers inspected during the dwell time in a foreign port thus improving trade facilitation and the transparency of the program.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Container Security Initiative
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	34%	83%	0%	Demonstrated

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Since the program is less than one year old and not fully implemented, independent evaluations of "the program" would be premature. However, GAO did conduct an evaluation of the program's roll out. In their preliminary draft report, they recommended that we: 1) develop human capital plans clearly describing how CSI will recruit, train and retain staff to meet the program's growing demands; 2) expand efforts already initiated to develop performance measures; and 3) develop a strategic plan that clearly lays out goals, objectives and detailed implementation strategies.

Evidence:

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: Budget requests are tied to the goals of placing CSI teams in the 20 largest ports (Phase I) and in other significant and strategic ports (Phase II).

Evidence: The FY 2004 budget request for CSI was not tied to specific goals nor were the resource needs transparent (ie, number of inspectors needed). The request had little detail.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: This program is less than one year old. It was developed in response to the global terrorist threat. The program is being implemented as part of the Agency Strategic Plan and the Comprehensive Plan to address the threat of nuclear and radiological terrorism. The specific strategic plan for CSI is so new and implementation has barely begun so not possible to gauge where deficiencies may lie until the program is fully operational for several years.

Evidence:

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: Performance goals are currently under development. Meetings were held to formulate more specific long-term performance measures and collection processes that will better measure the depth of this program. The measures are being developed will allow senior management to compare and contrast the effectiveness of the program at each port.

Evidence: We are gathering an extensive set of data creating baseline measures, both quantitative and qualitative, for each port. e.g., number of containers screened, number of containers examined and measures of targeting effectiveness. Additionally, qualitative measures are being developed to demonstrate the value of the relationships with the host governments as it relates to targeting effectiveness.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Container Security Initiative
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	34%	83%	0%	Demonstrated

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:17%

Explanation: The CSI Director executes the program objectives within the budget and personnel resources provided.

Evidence:

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:17%

Explanation: All funding and expenditures are monitored through the automated financial systems.

Evidence:

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight:17%

Explanation: Agency guidelines and procedures are followed where cost advantages can be obtained in the program process for all major acquisitions.

Evidence: Efficiency measures and targets would be sufficient. These do not yet exist. Experience gained from each port opening has reduced the time required from signing of DOP to making the port operational in terms of IT, personnel and infrastructure.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: We place inspectors, intelligence analysts and special agents through effective and efficient collaboration and coordination with the Office of Field Operations and the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement in order to meet the needs of the programs.

Evidence: Evidence/Data? Data gathered by the Intelligence Analyst and leads developed by the Senior Special Agent (both under the jurisdiction of ICE) is translated into quantitative measures that can be used to improve the sensitivity of the Automated Targeting System.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:17%

Explanation: CSI uses approved financial systems for funds control and financial reporting.

Evidence:

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: This program is less than one year old, and implementation has barely begun, so it is impossible to gauge where management deficiencies may lie until the program is fully operational for several years.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Container Security Initiative
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	34%	83%	0%	Demonstrated

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: Question Weight: 100%

Explanation: Program has been in place about a year and actually implemented in the first port for 10 months. 14 of the top 20 ports are now operational. It is premature to assess long-term goals at this stage. Where the program is in place, it is successfully achieving progress towards meeting and achieving the long-term goals.

Evidence:

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The program has not been in existence for a full year so it can not be measured on any "annual" measures yet. This year has been focused on program rollout which has been highly successful and on making agreements with foreign governments for CSI operations at their ports.

Evidence:

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: In one regard only, we have been able to affect efficiencies in bringing ports to operational status. Through experience, we have been able to add operational ports in progressively shorter time frames. Measures under development will show that the CSI program improves the efficiency of U.S. ports and provides an effective means of achieving the CBP program goal of stopping instruments of terror from entering the U.S.

Evidence:

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: No other agency, public or private, is conducting such inspections.

Evidence:

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Thus far, the results lie in the agreements with 19 of the 20 proposed foreign government ports to open CSI operations and in the rollout of operations at 14 ports.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Container Security Initiative
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	34%	83%	0%	Demonstrated

Measure: Improved Targeting Rates (Under Development)

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: More Cargo Screened (Under Development)

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Additional Ports added to CSI (Under Development)

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The mission of the Detention and Removal Program (DRO) is to promote public safety and national security by ensuring the departure from the United States of all removable aliens through the fair and effective enforcement of the nation's immigration laws. This includes all aliens that receive final orders of removal from an immigration judge and meet the following criteria: 1) They are not currently serving a criminal sentence; 2) They do not qualify for Temporary Protective Status; 3) They are from a country with whom the United States has a repatriation agreement. DRO serves as the last critical step in the immigration enforcement process. Other programs such as the U.S. Border Patrol, Immigration Inspections and Immigration Investigations identify and apprehend aliens in violation of immigration law. However, DRO manages those cases through immigration proceedings and then conducts the final removal of the alien.

Evidence: Detention and Removal Strategic Plan

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The primary goal of the Detention and Removal Program is to remove all aliens not entitled to be in the United States. Case management involves placing aliens in proceedings to determine whether they are allowed to remain in the United States or must leave. Approximately 400,000 aliens have received final orders of removal but are not confirmed to have departed the United States. In order to improve removal rates, the Detention and Removal Program employs several tools, including the detention of certain aliens to ensure removal. However, when a final order of removal is not confirmed, DRO must act through activities, such as Fugitive Operations, to locate and apprehend those aliens who have remained beyond their removal order. The United States has a growing criminal alien population that poses a potential threat to both public safety and national security. These aliens are convicted of deportable crimes and may even be issued orders of removal by an immigration judge. Their removal from the country is essential to ensure public safety and national security.

Evidence: Detention and Removal Strategic Plan

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Detention and Removal Program is the only program in government that removes aliens with final orders of removal. Aliens are identified and apprehended by other programs such as Immigration Investigations, the Border Patrol, and Immigration Inspections. Aliens may also be identified by state and local law enforcement jurisdictions. However, DRO is the only entity to manage their cases through immigration proceedings and then execute final orders of removal that are issued by an immigration judge. DRO utilizes other entities to assist in their detention responsibilities, including the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP), and the United States Marshal Service (USMS). DRO's approach to case management must be multi-pronged to address a diverse population of aliens. This includes detaining some aliens, releasing others with certain conditions, and placing others in alternative settings such as female facilities, family shelter care, halfway houses, or under electronic monitoring. Those held in detention have requirements that differ from traditional incarceration. ICE detainees are held for purely administrative processing. The standards of their confinement require that they have what is needed to understand their rights and participate fully in the immigration process. Unlike criminal cases, they do not have the right to an attorney provided at government expense. Consequently, they must have access to legal materials, communication with consular officials, and pro bono or hired counsel, where appropriate.

Evidence: Detention and Removal Strategic Plan

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

1.4 **Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: There is no evidence that another approach would be more efficient or effective in removing all aliens not entitled to be in the U.S. Although recent increases in workload (apprehensions, incarcerated criminals, etc) for DRO has outpaced certain staffing increases, the Program is well organized to perform its mission to remove aliens. DRO has undertaken several integrated initiatives to decrease the backlog of cases such as dedicated Fugitive Operations teams, a Most Wanted list, and various Alternatives to Release pilot programs. These illustrate a more sophisticated approach to backlog reduction.

Evidence: Detention and Removal Strategic Plan

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: DRO is designed by program activities. Resources for these activities are coded so that expended funds and positions can be tracked to specific activities. This ensures that resources are utilized directly for their intended purpose. There are currently six program elements under DRO for tracking resources: Alternatives to Detention, Case Management, Custody Management, Fugitive Operations, Institutional Removal Program (IRP), and Transportation & Removals Management.

Evidence: DRO internal tracking, Definition of Program Elements

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program has engaged in an extensive strategic and business planning process and has developed outcome goals and measures for the program. The ultimate goal of the Detention and Removal Program is to remove all removable aliens from the United States. This measure illustrates the desired outcome of completing the immigration enforcement process. The outcome is measurable because it is possible to count the number of final orders of removal that are issued and then compare them to the number of removals completed within the same time period. DRO also has measures that represent subsets of the removable alien populations that are addressed by different initiatives. DRO is developing efficiency measures such as appearance rates for immigration proceedings and removals. These measures will demonstrate improvement in the weaker areas of the removals process.

Evidence: Detention and Removal Strategic Plan Six-Year Business Plan

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The program has developed an ambitious "golden measure" goal of having the number of final order removals executed and the number of final orders of removal issued equal one. Along with this overarching goal are a number of other performance indicators that have been developed to monitor progress in achieving that goal. The program has set milestones and targets so that by the end of FY 2009, it will reach a 100% removal rate and will eliminate the fugitive population. This will require not only increasing the productivity rate for removals, but also establishing and strengthening initiatives that impede the growth of the fugitive population. DRO will also increase its capacity to identify, process, and remove criminal aliens among the incarcerated population. Each of these milestones has been laid out in the DRO six-year business plan.

Evidence: Detention and Removal Strategic PlanSix-Year Business Plan

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: DRO has developed a six-year business plan (FY2004-2009) to implement its strategic plan with annual milestones and targets. This business plan will accompany the program's FY 2005 budget submission in June 2003. This plan focuses on each of the program's priorities and lists annual increments of productivity necessary so that the combined efforts of each priority will lead to fulfillment of the overall DRO strategic goal by the end of FY 2009. The business plan will also define the resources needed to reach each successive increment of productivity. As part of the strategic and business plan development for this program, a number specific goals have been developed that will show progress towards achieving the stratgic goal of the program.

Evidence: Six-Year Business Plan

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: DRO has established annual targets and milestones so that by the end of FY 2009, it will have established a 100% removal rate and will have eliminated the backlog of fugitive aliens. These targets were established using baseline data collected in the drafting of the Detention and Removal Strategic Plan. They are ambitious, requiring the program to more than double its productivity in a six-year period. All relevant components of the business process for detaining and removing removable aliens have been baselined and ambitious targets established for annual measures.

Evidence: Monthly GPRA Reports (Removals & Custody Management)Six-Year Business Plan

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: DRO must partner with other immigration programs for enforcement resources to be employed most effectively. DRO has identified a position to liaison with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection. However, the new structure has not been in place long enough to demonstrate significant results. DRO continues to work closely with state and local law enforcement in the areas of IRP and Fugitive Operations. The Law Enforcement Support Center (LESC) also acts as a conduit for communication to state and local law enforcement so that the DRO activities can be accomplished in a more efficient and effective manner. DRO has also implemented the Detention Management and Control Plan (DMCP) to ensure the compliance of contracted facilities with those standards required for alien confinement. Detention facilities are inspected annually against the 37 standards. Regarding removals goals, DRO must partner with the Executive Office of Immigration Review and the ICE Office of the Principal Legal Advisor (OPLA) to be sure that cases are processed efficiently and that DRO is aware of removal orders as soon as they are issued. To address weaknesses in these areas DRO is conducting a pilot program in Hartford, CT, where ICE officers have access to the courtrooms where immigration hearings take place. Likewise, the OPLA constructed its FY05 budget request stressing the integration of its performance with DROs case management performance. This will help to balance the workload between the two offices and provide greater effectiveness overall.

Evidence: DRO Strategic Plan Monthly GPRA Reports (Custody Management)

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Until March 2003 (due to transition to DHS), the legacy INS Office of Internal Audit (OIA) provided regular reviews of DRO components. OIA conducted briefings on findings with field and HQ managers, as well as provided written reports of findings. OIA actively tracks all open recommendations from program assessment findings, IG audits, and GAO investigations. The Office of the Inspector General, Department of Justice produced reports on aspects of immigration detention and removal. It is assumed that the OIA function will still occur and that a DHS Inspector General will conduct follow-up reviews to what had been initially reported by the Department of Justice. GAO reviews have also been conducted on the major portions of this program.

Evidence: INSpect Review Guides for Detention and Removal, OIA program assessment reports, "Review of Operations" prepared legacy INS Office of Internal Audit DOJ IG Reports [I-2003-004 - INS' Removal of Aliens Issued Final Orders, I-2001-009 - Unaccompanied Juveniles in INS Custody, I-2001-005 - INS Escort of Criminal Aliens, 02-41 - INS Institutional Removal Program], multiple GAO reportes (1988 -- present).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: DRO has developed a six-year business plan to accompany its FY 2005 budget formulation. The business plan addresses each of the program's priorities and identifies annual milestones and targets leading to fulfillment of the strategic goal in FY 2009. The outcomes shown in the business plan are the basis for determining the resource requirements. The desired outcomes are identified first and the required resources are then calculated based upon those outcomes. The business plan will be updated annually to inform budget requests.

Evidence: Six-Year Business Plan, Department of Homeland Security Budget Requests

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: In FY 2001, the program initiated a strategic planning process. This included the assembly of a national working group representing all levels of the program. The group identified core business functions as well as strategic goals and objectives. The resulting ten-year strategic plan was implemented beginning in FY 2003. The working group continues to convene on a quarterly basis to refine performance measures, identify additional action items, and ensure adherence to strategic initiatives as the program transitions to the new Department of Homeland Security.

Evidence: DRO Strategic Plan

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The agency collects performance information on a monthly basis in the form of removal reports and detention reports. This information is generated by the Deportable Alien Control System (DACS) the primary data system for DRO. Other more complex data or data from other sources are generally collected and analyzed on a quarterly basis. Performance information is collected and reported monthly to the Program Manager and Head of the Agency. Corrective measures are implemented or emphasis placed on areas based on performance data. Briefings or one-on-one meetings held as needed. As DRO is the only entity to conduct final order removals, we only rely on our own data systems to track that information. Inspections of detention facilities are completed by DRO officers. Therefore, data to measure compliance goals would come directly from DRO, rather than a partner. When constructing its resource requirements, DRO also relies on information from other immigration enforcement programs such as the Border Patrol. Any increase in Border Patrol resources will mean additional apprehensions generating greater demand for bed space, case management and removal resources. Therefore, DRO must use information from other programs to illustrate its piece of the information process. Generally, the information is gathered from planning and budget counterparts in those programs.

Evidence: Monthly Removals Report, Monthly Detention Report, Monthly Performance Reports

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Traditionally, fulfillment of GPRA performance goals have been a critical element of Performance Work Plans (PWP) for program and field managers, thereby requiring their accountability regarding performance. It is anticipated that PWPs under the new Department will contain similar, or more likely enhanced, accountability features. Additionally, the DMCP ensures the compliance of detention program partners regarding ICE standards. Adherence to those standards promotes the timely processing of detained aliens, thereby supported the fulfillment of DRO removal goals. Since the implementation of the new program elements, DRO has been able to collect resource data related to the program activities. The Federal Financial Management System (FFMS) provides the financial data. The National Finance Center and our Position Tracking System provide personnel data. This data collection method began in FY 2003 and is being used to identify a baseline. The data is also under evaluation to determine that the methodology is sound and understood by the users. As these new accounting procedures are refined, DRO will be able to ensure manager accountability by cost, schedule, and corresponding performance results.

Evidence: DRO Internal tracking, Definition of Program Elements

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: DRO does obligate funds in a timely manner based upon spending plans and operational requirements. To better identify the link between specific activities and expenditures, DRO has introduced six new program elements. These were implemented in FY 2003 and will be used to establish a baseline that can be referenced in future budget and planning exercises. By having access to a greater level of financial detail, DRO management will increase the reliability and effectiveness of their decision-making.

Evidence: Various FFMS Reports DRO Internal tracking, Definition of Program Elements

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: DRO has simplified its management structure as part of its transition to the Department of Homeland Security, removing two management layers. Bed space, a major cost category, is acquired competitively and in the case of Inter Governmental Service Agreements, a financial contractor will evaluate proposals. Program activities are reviewed for efficiency and initiatives begun to implement improvements. Examples are the Removals and Escort Country Clearance (RECC) system, centralized ticketing, alternatives to detention and video teleconferencing. Efficiency and effectiveness are also measured through long-term and annual performance measures that are consistent with the Strategic Plan. DRO is currently developing an efficiency measure in the form of appearance rates for immigration hearings and for removal. The data for this measure is not yet easily available, but the Program has recognized the importance of this information to measure progress toward our goals and the overall performance of our strategic initiatives. The effect that an initiative has on appearance rates will demonstrate its success toward eliminating the growth of the absconder population. Since June 9, 2003, DRO has been an autonomous program and can take a more active approach to improving efficiencies. To do this, DRO has implemented pilot programs such as the one in Hartford, CT and another at Rikers Island, New York. The Rikers Island pilot involves full ICE staffing at that facility for 90 days to determine the resource requirements for ICE to provide nationwide Institutional Removal Program coverage of all incarcerated aliens. Both pilots will also document best practices that can be employed in other parts of the country. With the final reports from each pilot, ICE will make more informed resource requests and deployment decisions.

Evidence: DRO Strategic Plan , DRO Organizational Chart Six-Year Business Plan

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Coordination with other related programs is key to management of the Detention and Removal Program, as the outputs of immigration law enforcement activities become the inputs to removal proceedings. The transition to the new Department of Homeland Security has made coordination with other programs more critical as DRO customers are now located in different bureaus within Homeland Security. To improve collaboration, DRO has taken a series of steps. First, the program's field structure is geographically aligned with that of the Investigations program. This will make ICE field level coordination smoother. Additionally, DRO has created a liaison position with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection. Finally, DRO is coordinating its budget submission for FY 2005-2009 so that it reflects the projected productivity of the other immigration enforcement programs. The program, however, still does not coordinate effectively (and does not have signed MOUs) for two critical areas of operations: unaccompanied juvenile detention with the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS); and the procurement of non-federal detention space through the Office of Federal Detention Trustee (OFDT).

Evidence: ICE Organizational Chart DRO Organizational Chart DRO FY05-09 Budget Submission

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: DRO program is free of material internal control weaknesses reported by auditors, and the financial information related to the program is accurate and timely.

Evidence: Independent Auditor's Report on Internal Controls, Definition of Program Elements, INSpect review reports, DOJ IG review of bond management (# I-98-18)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: DRO has taken several steps to reduce its management deficiencies. First, the program has introduced additional program elements to better track resources by activity. It has also established a six-year business plan to implement its strategic plan and link project performance with resource requirements. Through the transition to the Department of Homeland Security, DRO has reduced layers of management and streamlined its operational chain of command. This new structure will expedite communication between the field and Headquarters, thereby increasing the accountability of individual managers. Additionally, corrective action is taken on deficiencies found through internal reviews, program assessments by Internal Audit, IG audits, and GAO investigations. Internal Audit conducts briefings on findings with field and HQ managers, as well as providing written reports of findings. The Office of Internal Audit actively tracks all open recommendations of program assessment findings, IG Audits, and GAO investigations. The Program's strategic and business planning efforts have been significant and have addressed all the major program performance issues of DRO. Results have yet to be demonstrated, however, since the implementation of the new plan is just beginning.

Evidence: Definition of Program Elements DRO Organizational Chart Internal Audit program assessment reports "Review of Operations" prepared by legacy INS Office of Internal Audit

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:20%

Explanation: The ultimate goal of the Detention and Removal Program is to remove all removable aliens. This includes all aliens that receive final orders of removal from an immigration judge and meet the following criteria: 1) They are not currently serving a criminal sentence; 2) They do not qualify for Temporary Protective Status; 3) They are from a country with whom the United States has a repatriation agreement. DRO has increased its number of removals each year for the last few years and continues to work with the State Department to obtain approval for the removal of aliens to countries that are reluctant to accept their returned citizens. With the implementation of its Strategic Plan, DRO developed additional measures to include the number of final orders issued. With future emphasis on fugitive operations, criminal aliens and alternatives to detention, it is expected that the appearance rate of aliens at proceedings will increase significantly.

Evidence: DRO Strategic Plan Six-Year Business Plan

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:20%

Explanation: In recent years, DRO has met its annual performance goals. DRO is also on track to meet its goals for FY2003. These goals were developed over time as DRO conducted a lengthy and comprehensive strategic planning process. The resulting strategic plan will be viewed as a living document and program goals may evolve to an even more mature level as the program itself progresses.

Evidence: Monthly GPRA Reports (Removals & Custody Management)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: DRO continually strives to keep detention per capita costs, the major component of the program budget, down. Financial professionals review bed cost proposals to determine if they are reasonable. DRO also utilizes free Bureau of Prisons bed space when available and appropriate.

Evidence: Monthly GPRA Reports (Removals & Custody Management)

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Core elements of a federal law enforcement entity that detains individuals can be used to compare DRO to others. The presence of 400,000 absconders demonstrates that it does not meet the requirements of a yes answer.

Evidence: Department of Justice Annual Performance Report

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Components of the Detention and Removal Program have been reviewed regularly by the legacy INS Office of Internal Audit (OIA). DRO has also been the subject of four reports by the Office of the Inspector General, Department of Justice. The reports have generally identified areas for improvement in areas such as the Institutional Removal Program (responsibility shared with Investigations), the removal of non-detained aliens with final orders of removal, and the escort of criminal aliens. Where changes in policy or procedures can be accomplished, those recommendations have been implemented. In many cases the corrective action requires additional resources and planning for those enhancements is coordinated with the budget process. DRO strategic planning efforts have addressed each of these issues and resource requests for FY 2005-2009 will focus on strengthening these particular areas.

Evidence: INSpect reviews, "Review of Operations" - prepared by legacy INS Office of Internal Audit

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	100%	86%	67%	Effective

Measure: Removals as a percentage of final orders issued (under development)
Additional Information: DRO should conduct remove one alien for every removal order that is issued by an immigration judge.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2001			

Measure: Number of completed removals
Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	96,500	107,556	
2002	107,500	115,495	
2003	112,875	142,008	

Measure: Appearance Rates for Immigration Hearings (under development)
Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)
2001			

Measure: Appearance Rates for Removal
Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)
2001	NA	NA	

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: Drug Interdiction

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	Purpose is to support the National Drug Control Strategy by interdicting illicit drugs in the transit and arrival zones.	http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/publications/policy/03ndcs/index.html (National Drug Control Strategy); CG Strategic Plan	20%	0.2
2 <i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Program addresses the threat of maritime drug trafficking, and is part of a broader effort to reduce illegal drug use.	In 2000, an estimated 645 metric tons of cocaine left source countries for the U.S., of which 568 metric tons traveled via non-commercial maritime means. http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/publications/pdf/cocaine2002.pdf	20%	0.2
3 <i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	This program is designed to disrupt the market for illegal drugs and reduce the profitability of the drug trade by intercepting maritime traffic. States and local municipalities do not have jurisdiction over Federal crimes or on the high seas.	14 USC 89; 46 USC App. 1903. http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode	20%	0.2
4 <i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	CG is designated lead agency for maritime drug interdiction, and co-lead with Customs Service for air interdiction. Customs has limited maritime assets that can only effectively operate within 24 miles of the coast.	CG is uniquely qualified for maritime drug interdiction as the nation's only armed service with law enforcement authority (28 USC 1385, POSSE COMITATUS). Also only such entity with deepwater capability. http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-o/g-opl/mle/drugs.htm	20%	0.2
5 <i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	No other program structure is feasible.	Law enforcement is an inherently government activity.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score				100%	100%

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	No	For long-term goals, DOT has adopted verbatim the long-term goals set by ONDCP to reduce drug use in the U.S. This decision essentially ignores the role of drug education and treatment, as well as of other agencies participating in drug interdiction, border control, and source country initiatives. Assuming that Coast Guard's interdiction efforts alone will achieve the nation's goals in reducing drug use is not sensible. There is no clear link between the annual goal of total amount of drugs seized and the long-term goal of reduction in use.	1) By 2005, reduce current drug use among 12-17 year olds by 10 percent. 2) By 2005, reduce current drug use among 18 year olds and older by 10 percent. 3) By 2008, reduce current drug use among 12-17 year olds by 25 percent. 4) By 2008, reduce current drug use among 18 year olds and older by 25 percent. FY 2004 Budget request to OMB; DOT FY 2004 Performance Plan; http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/publications/pdf/Strategy2002.pdf	15%	0.0
2 <i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	Coast Guard tracks the seizure rate for cocaine shipped through the transit zone as a performance measure for this program. This measure is useful because it gauges the program's performance relative to the total volume of drugs being smuggled. While DOT has sometimes used the total amount of drugs seized or destroyed at sea, a less valid measure, Coast Guard has continue to use the seizure rate in its Budget submissions and performance reports.	Goal: seizure rate for cocaine that is shipped through the transit zone. 2001 target: 15%; 2001 actual: 11%. FY 2004 Budget request to OMB.	25%	0.3
3 <i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	N/A	CG has no program partners that meet the definition in the PART, though it does work with other Federal agencies, such as Customs, in drug interdiction.	—	0%	

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4 <i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	CG has close relationships with other agencies and international partners to facilitate interoperability.	http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-o/g-opl/mle/drugs.htm ; www.jiatfe.org ;	20%	0.2
5 <i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	No	No comprehensive evaluations are completed regularly.	---	20%	0.0
6 <i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	Yes	CG's Mission Cost Program model provides comprehensive cost information for individual programs, including overhead and other indirect costs as well as direct costs.	FY 2004 Budget request to OMB; CG Mission Cost Program model	20%	0.2
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	N/A	---	---	0%	0.0
Total Section Score				100%	65%

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	CG monitors drug interdiction performance through regular reports; Commandant receives quarterly performance data. Assets, resource hours, and funding may be reallocated to address shifts in the threat.	DOT Annual and Midterm Performance Reports; CG Office of Law Enforcement drug seizure database.	17%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2 <i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	No	Personnel decisions regarding individuals are not directly determined by whether the program achieves its goals.	---	17%	0.0
3 <i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	Virtually all funds are obligated before their availability expires.	1) Estimated obligations by quarter in apportionments. 2) Actual obligations by quarter.	17%	0.2
4 <i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	CG does competitively outsource various elements of the program, including a secured communications network with Customs and maintenance to the Law Enforcement Asset Needs computer model.	---	17%	0.2
5 <i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	Yes	CG uses an activity-based costing model developed by KPMG that significantly exceeds the requirements of the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board. The system is based on reliable cost data that is reconciled to CG's audited financial statements.	Coast Guard activity-based costing model.	17%	0.2
6 <i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	The program has no internal control weaknesses.	Three consecutive CFO audits. http://www.oig.dot.gov/show_pdf.php?id=713 http://www.oig.dot.gov/show_pdf.php?id=22	17%	0.2
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	N/A	No significant management deficiencies were identified in the June PART review.	---	0%	
Total Section Score				100%	83%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	No	Program does not have meaningful long-term goals.	FY 2004 Budget request to OMB; DOT FY 2004 Performance Plan; http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/publications/pdf/Strategy2002.pdf	20%	0.0
Long-Term Goal I:		By 2005, reduce current drug use.			
Target:		Reduce use by 10 percent.			
Actual Progress achieved toward goal: N/A		No link established between Coast Guard interdiction and drug use.			
Long-Term Goal II:		By 2008, reduce current drug use.			
Target:		Reduce use by 25 percent.			
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:		N/A			
Long-Term Goal III:					
Target:					
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:					
2 <i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	No	Coast Guard's seizure rate has not matched the DOT FY 2004 Performance Plan performance goals and has not improved in recent years.		30%	0.0
Key Goal I:		Seizure rate of cocaine shipped through transit zone.			
Performance Target:		13% in 2000, 15% in 2001, 19% in 2002.			
Actual Performance:		11% in 2000, 11% in 2001.			
Key Goal II:					
Performance Target:					
Actual Performance:					
Key Goal III:					
Performance Target:					
Actual Performance:					
Footnote: Performance targets should reference the performance baseline and years, e.g. achieve a 5% increase over base of X in 2000.					
3 <i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Yes	CG has increased the ratio of pounds of drugs seized per counter-drug resource hour from 0.9 in 1998 to 1.5 in 2001.	—	25%	0.3
4 <i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	N/A	No other programs have similar purpose and goals.	—	0%	

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 <i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	No	No such evaluations are available.	—	25%	0.0
Total Section Score				100%	25%

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
75%	68%	100%	0%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: The purpose of the Federal Air Marshals Service (FAMS) is to enhance aviation security by providing a security presence during flight inside commercial passenger aircraft.

Evidence: Section 105 of the Aviation Transportation Security Act (ATSA) of 2001 specifically provides that TSA (1) may provide for the deployment of Federal air marshals on every passenger flight of air carriers in air transportation or intrastate air transportation; and (2) shall provide for the deployment of Federal air marshals on every such flight determined by the Secretary to present high security risks.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: Specific and credible intelligence suggests that al Qaeda still actively seeks to conduct terrorist missions aimed at taking over U.S. commercial aircraft. At this point in time, it is not clear that other layers of security apart from air marshals are sufficiently robust as to adequately prevent a terrorist or team of terrorists from boarding an aircraft with capable weaponry. Should this occur, reinforced cockpit doors and air marshals provide a last line of defense for an aircraft.

Evidence: Evidence is classified.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: No other Federal, State, or local program provides a law enforcement presence on commercial aircraft.

Evidence: Section 105 ATSA specifically provides that TSA (1) may provide for the deployment of Federal air marshals on every passenger flight of air carriers in air transportation or intrastate air transportation; and (2) shall provide for the deployment of Federal air marshals on every such flight determined by the Secretary to present high security risks. No other law enforcement entity is authorized to provide on-board coverage of commercial air carrier flights.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: NO

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: It is not clear the program is free of major design flaws. Key aspects of program design need independent assessment and validation. In particular, the FAMS program should validate its requirements on numbers of FAMS in a covered flight, the seating protocols, and the planned number of training and field office days.

Evidence:

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?

Answer: NA

Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The nature of the FAMS program is such that the entire flying public is intended to be the beneficiary of program resources. Therefore, this question is not relevant to the FAMS program.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	68%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: A set of long term measures have been finalized addressing critical program areas including terrorist incident outcomes, flight coverage, operational tempo, and air marshal training.

Evidence: PART performance measure section.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:16%

Explanation: Long term targets are under development.

Evidence:

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: A set of annual measures have been finalized addressing critical program areas including terrorist incident outcomes, flight coverage, operational tempo, and air marshal training.

Evidence: PART performance measure section.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:16%

Explanation: Long term targets are under development.

Evidence:

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: Key partners supporting FAMS program goals include the FBI, terrorism task forces across the country, and other Federal law enforcement agencies. The FAMS program has established close working relationships with relevant organizations in each area.

Evidence: The FAMS program has an MOU with the FBI establishing the FAMS role as full participants in all of the Joint Terrorism Task Forces and the NJTTF located at FBI HQ. FAMS also participate with the Anti-Terrorism Task Forces sponsored by U.S. Attorney Offices around the country. FAMS coordinate with the Council of Governments and the National Capitol Region Coordinating Center for security activities related to aviation. The FAMS created and coordinate the Force Multiplier program to leverage other Federal law enforcement assets flying armed on commercial air carriers.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	68%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The FAMS program has not been in existence long enough to assess this question. To date, just one significant evaluation was performed, but the scope of that evaluation was narrow.

Evidence:

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The FAMS program has not been in existence long enough to assess on this basis. The FAMS program has had just one budget submission to OMB and the Congress (FY 2004), but this was done in the early stages of the program's development. The FY 2005 budget cycle is the first 'normal' budget cycle for this program.

Evidence:

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The primary strategic planning deficiencies have been the lack of a strategic plan with adequate performance goals, measures, and targets. Meaningful actions have been taken to address these deficiencies.

Evidence: A draft strategic plan has been developed, as well as a related operational business plan. As part of the PART review, comprehensive performance goals, measures, and targets generally have been finalized.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The primary strategic management emphasis is flight coverage, including the identification of high risk flights to ensure adequate coverage, and maximizing air marshal days dedicated to core missions. Current data collection efforts meet management needs in these areas.

Evidence: The FAMS collects a range of pertinent performance information, such as monthly missions flown and aircraft incidents. In addition, FAMS mission operations liaison collect data from groups to include: the airport operators; Airline Pilots Association; Air Transport Association; executive offices of air carriers; and, other law enforcement agencies, regarding various interactions with FAMS personnel/operations.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	68%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: The TSA established a permanent performance management system that defines performance agreements for groups of employees at all levels, including TSA screeners, supervisors and executives. The Federal Air Marshal Service is a part of that system, and managers and partners will be held accountable for cost and performance results. The strategic planning process is refining specific long-term and annual performance targets which will be used to measure program and managerial effectiveness. Field office managers are required to provide headquarters with a work plan identifying annual program goals and fiscal requirements. Managers are evaluated based on their ability to accomplish the goals stated in the work plans.

Evidence: The TSA performance management system collects FAMS outcome and output data, field managers have specific performance goals included in annual workplans.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The FAMS program has not been in existence long enough to assess obligation data on this basis.

Evidence:

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: The FAMS program has procedures to ensure efficiencies and effectiveness. Air marshal scheduling is automated, and man hours are closely monitored. IT acquisition is managed centrally through a managed services contract in TSA. Administrative services are outsourced.

Evidence: A key efficiency performance measure of the FAMS program is level of man hours allocated to core mission activities. The central management of information technology purchases of FAMS products by the TSA Office of the Chief Information Officer via a UNISYS contract ensures consistency, control, and a lack of duplication in services, equipment and expenditures. The FAMS Mission Scheduling System's automated SABRE system has replaced the time-consuming, expensive manual operation, making deployment more efficient and reducing the incidence of scheduling error. All travel vouchers, contracts, accounting system services and the SABRE program management are provided by the TSA Technical Center via an interagency service level agreement that delivers consistent, cost-effective service to the FAMS, as it makes unnecessary any duplication of those functions by the FAMS. Acquisition procedures require contract sourcing, and the procurement of cost quotes from at least three vendors prior to a purchase requisition.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	68%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: While the necessary collaboration for success in meeting FAMS goals is limited, the FAMS program does collaborate to a great extent with internal and external programs and activities that either have direct bearing on goal outcomes or will help ensure mission success.

Evidence: TSA assigned the FAMS responsibility for the operational management of the Federal Flight Deck Officer (FFDO) program. The FAMS provides 24/7 support and incident management to ensure full and effective coordination with the armed commercial pilots (FFDO) and the aviation industry. The FAMS created and coordinate the Force Multiplier program to leverage other Federal law enforcement assets flying armed on commercial air carriers. The FAMS manage TSA's Less-Than Lethal weapons program by responding to requests from air carriers to deploy LTL devices. FAMS participating in FBI-JTTFs; USAO-ATTFs; TSA CAPPs and screener working groups; and various executive Table-Top exercises. Daily FAM MOC communication with the FAA contributes to force efficiencies and critical incident management.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: The FAMS program appears to manage financial resources properly.

Evidence: No material weaknesses are attributable to the FAMS program.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Specific management-related deficiencies were identified in recent report of the Inspector General, and the FAMS program has begun taking meaningful steps in each area to address these problems.

Evidence: The FAMS response to the Inspector General report identified specific, responsive actions the organization had taken.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:50%

Explanation:

Evidence:

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:50%

Explanation:

Evidence:

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	68%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
75%	68%	100%	0%	

Measure: Percentage level in meeting FAM coverage target for each individual category of identified risk. (Targets are under development but data is classified for security reasons)

Additional Information: Addresses general flight FAM coverage. Target performance is a uniform percentage level in meeting each individual coverage level for the risk categories (i.e, actual coverage reached xx% of coverage target).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Number of successful terrorist and other criminal attacks initiated from commercial passenger aircraft cabins with FAM coverage.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2009	0		

Measure: Level of operational FAMs verified as meeting recurrent training requirements.

Additional Information: The program has determined that each FAM should receive 20 days of required training each year. The target therefore depicts 100 % of FAMs receiving the required level of training.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2009	100%		

Measure: Level of FAM coverage on flights with identified threats. (Targets and actual data are classified for security reasons)

Additional Information: This measure addresses FAM coverage on flights that have a specific threat that has been identified, as opposed to a flight that is in a general risk category.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Level of FAM days allocated to core mission (i.e., the number of days FAMS are flying on aircraft versus training and other activity days).

Additional Information: This measure depicts the utilization rate of available FAM days for the core mission activity -- flight coverage -- as opposed to training and field office days.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)
2003	80%		
2004	80%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	68%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

2005	80%
2006	80%
2007	80%

Measure: Number of successful terrorist and other criminal attacks initiated from commercial passenger aircraft cabins with FAM coverage.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	0		
2004	0		
2005	0		
2006	0		
2007	0		

Measure: Level of operational FAMs verified as meeting recurrent training requirements.

Additional Information: The program has determined that each FAM should receive 20 days of required training each year. The target therefore depicts 100 % of FAMs receiving the required level of training.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	100%		
2004	100%		
2005	100%		
2006	100%		
2007	100%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	68%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

Measure: Level of operational FAMs who successfully complete Phase II training.

Additional Information: The program has determined that each FAM should receive two layers of non-recurring, initial training. The purpose of the measure is to gauge management success in ensuring every current and new FAM receives both phases of training.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	33%		
2004	67%		
2005	100%		
2006	100%		
2007	100%		

Measure: Level of FAM coverage for each identified category of risk.

Additional Information: Addresses general flight FAM coverage. Target performance is a uniform percentage level in meeting each individual coverage level for the risk categories (i.e, actual coverage reached xx% of coverage target).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2009	classified		

Measure: Level of FAM coverage on flights with identified threats.

Additional Information: This measure addresses FAM coverage on flights that have a specific threat that has been identified, as opposed to a flight that is in a general risk category.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2009	classified		

Measure: Level of FAM days allocated to core mission.

Additional Information: This measure depicts the utilization rate of available FAM days for the core mission activity -- flight coverage -- as opposed to training and field office days.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: Federal Law Enforcement Training Center

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	FLETC's mission statement and a Memorandum of Understanding signed by 76 partner organizations clearly outline the Center's role and responsibilities.	FLETC Strategic Plan; Memorandum of Understanding between FLETC and its Partner Organizations.	20%	0.2
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The post-September 11th growth in Federal law enforcement highlights the need for law enforcement training and reinforces the core management principle that training is necessary to carry out and improve job performance.	All newly hired law enforcement personnel must receive firearms and other training before they are commissioned as officers.	20%	0.2
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Although state academies and private vendors could provide a portion of training, FLETC would still be necessary to facilitate the training schedules of the 76 partner organizations and establish standards by which training is delivered.	Program data confirm that almost every Federal agency receives training at non-Federal locations. FLETC is working to accredit training programs, instructors and facilities to ensure consistency regardless of where training is delivered.	20%	0.2
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	No	Largely as a result of unrequested earmarks, there are numerous independent, often redundant, Federal training facilities.	There are a minimum of 25 Federal training facilities. There are also a number of state-run facilities available for expanded Federal use.	20%	0.0
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Efficiencies are presumably possible through maximized use of capacity at existing Federal facilities (i.e. economies-of-scale). Inefficiencies are created when independent facilities are developed. FLETC, however, can not mandate that agencies exclusively use their facilities.	FLETC has no statutory control over the development of independent training facilities.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					100%	80%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
-----------	------	-------------	---------------	-----------	----------------

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	No	There are major goals and outcomes but they do not have clear time frames and targets to improve these goals (see Section II, question 7 for steps taken to date).	Goals: 1) All FLETC graduates possess the skills and knowledge needed to perform their law enforcement functions effectively and professionally; 2) Significantly expand the access to and availability of quality law enforcement training. See FLETC Strategic Plan.	18%	0.0
2 <i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	Despite a lack of specific targets for long-term performance outcomes, annual measures such as student and partner organization satisfaction with training indicate progress towards achieving long-term goals.	Goals: 1) Maintain a minimum 90% rating on the Student Quality of Training survey; 2) Maintain a minimum 80% rating on the Partner Organization satisfaction survey; 3) Maintain a minimum 90% rating on the Student Quality of Services survey	18%	0.2
3 <i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	Students are queried frequently to gauge the application and relevance of training as performed in the field. FLETC also convenes interagency symposia to address common problems in the law enforcement community that can be addressed and improved through training.	Surveys of basic training programs completed by FLETC graduates and partner organizations.	18%	0.2
4 <i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	FLETC is leading an interagency effort to establish standards by which training is delivered. Partners include training officials at DOJ, Interior and Energy.	OMB is a member of the task force overseeing this effort.	15%	0.2
5 <i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	No	Neither the Treasury OIG nor GAO issue "regular" reports on FLETC programs.	Non-independent assessments are conducted regularly by FLETC's Research and Evaluation Division.	5%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	No	There is no direct nexus between the budget structure and program goals. Funding decisions have a greater impact on the number of students FLETC can accommodate than on the quality of the training. Further, funding issues often arise when partner organizations receive unrequested personnel increases (see Section III, question 5).	Annual budget requests.	10%	0.0
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	FLETC has made strides in improving its long-term and annual performance goals. Although the annual goals are much improved, its long-term goals still lack specific targets and timeframes.	FY 2004 Budget Submission, President's Management Agenda discussions	18%	0.2
Total Section Score					100%	68%

Section III: Program Management (Yes, No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	FLETC performance measures include annual surveys of partner organizations and students. FLETC uses the feedback to reconfigure course material, as appropriate.	FLETC Partner Organization survey and Student Quality of Training and Services surveys	20%	0.2
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	No	FLETC does not use performance measures to evaluate SES or mid-level managers. (See Sec III, question 7 for steps taken to date).		10%	0.0
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	FLETC rarely lapses Salaries and Expenses funds, but often accrues balances in no-year construction funding before committing resources. This is common practice for capital expenditures, however.	Treasury Annual Report; Budget Execution reports	10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	No	Although FLETC has such procedures in place for IT projects, competitive sourcing and unit cost targets are not yet in place. For instance, FLETC is unable to compare its training costs with those at other Federal and non-Federal facilities. (See Sec III, question 7 for steps taken to date).	Annual Exhibit 53 submissions required by OMB Circular A-11	10%	0.0
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	No	Agencies pay for travel, food, lodging and "advanced" training costs. FLETC's budget is predicated on agency workload projections and includes facility maintenance and "basic" training tuition costs. When an agency receives unrequested personnel increases from Congress, FLETC often has difficulty accommodating the increment. Although cancelled classes provide some relief, an alternative funding scenario could potentially alleviate some of these problems (i.e. 100% reimbursable program).	Memorandum of Understanding between FLETC and Partner Organizations	15%	0.0
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	There are no financial management related weaknesses at FLETC.	Treasury Accountability Report	15%	0.2
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	FLETC is working within the context of the President's Management Agenda to improve budget/performance integration, competitive sourcing and SES performance evaluation.	Treasury quarterly PMA Submissions	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					100%	65%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	No	FLETC is in the process of revising its long-term goals and targets.	Congressional Justifications	40%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Long-Term Goal I: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:			Measures under development.		
	Long-Term Goal II: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:					
	Long-Term Goal III: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:					
2	<i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Yes	FLETC has met its targets for its current annual performance goals, but is working to improve the measures and targets.	Budget Submissions, Congressional Justifications	40%	0.4
	Key Goal I: Performance Target: Actual Performance:		Partner organization satisfaction rate of law enforcement training. New targets under development.			
	Key Goal II: Performance Target: Actual Performance:		Student satisfaction rate of law enforcement training. New targets under development.			
	Key Goal III: Performance Target: Actual Performance:					
	Footnote: Performance targets should reference the performance baseline and years, e.g. achieve a 5% increase over base of X in 2000.					
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	No	FLETC does not have any means to measure improved efficiencies.	FLETC is improving in this area and expects to include unit costing in the FY 2005 Budget submission.	15%	0.0
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	NA	There are no common measures to facilitate a comparison of FLETC with other law enforcement trainers. Further, no independent analyses or evaluations exist that compare FLETC with other training organizations (see Section I, question 5).	FLETC expressed a willingness to work with OMB and other law enforcement training agencies to develop common measures.	0%	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	No	Although GAO is currently reviewing FLETC's performance, there are no studies currently available that indicate program effectiveness.	See section II, question 5.	5%	0.0
Total Section Score					100%	40%

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	68%	65%	40%	Demonstrated

Measure: Average number of months to process benefit applications (data in months; 2001-2002 data for naturalization applications only; 2003-2004 data for all benefit applications; 2003 target under development)

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001			
2002			
2003			
2004			

Measure: Partner organization satisfaction rate of law enforcement training (New measure, targets under development)

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001			
2002			
2003			
2004			

Measure: Student satisfaction rate of law enforcement training (new measure, targets under development).

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	68%	65%	40%	Demonstrated

2004

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: FPS has a clearly defined and well articulated Strategic Mission. Its mission is to reduce the vulnerability to federal facilities and tenants by providing a safe, secure environment to tenants and the visiting public in a cost-effective manner. Last year, FPS has been transferred to Department of Homeland Security (DHS). FPS supports the following mission areas and strategic objectives of DHS: Reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, Prevent terrorist Attacks within the US, Minimize the damage from potential attacks, Ensure functions not directly related to homeland security are not diminished and monitor and sever connections between illegal drug trafficking and terrorism. Within this strategic framework, FPS complies with the National Strategies for Homeland Security, Combating Terrorism, and The Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets. All FPS functions and initiatives are derived from the aforementioned Acts, Regulations and Authorities.

Evidence: With the establishment on the Department of Homeland Security in Public Law 107-296, FPS has been transferred to DHS. FPS Strategic Plan

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program need to be addressed is the increasing threat against federally controlled facilities from domestic and foreign inspired terrorists. In FY 2005, our efforts will be concentrated on 1). Providing law enforcement response to potential crimes and/or threats against Federal property, employees and visitors. 2). Provide nationwide communications and dispatching services along with alarm system monitoring capabilities, including managing radio frequency programs. 3). Administer the contract guard program to control access at Federal facilities, including training, testing and weapons qualification. 4). Conduct physical security surveys to assess risk and vulnerability of Federally controlled properties. 5). Expand existing WMD First Response and K-9 bomb detection initiatives nationwide, 6). Conduct criminal investigations of crimes committed on Federal properties, and 7). Provide special operations support for agencies (and their facilities) subject to damage by demonstrations or terrorist activities. Within the GSA Building inventory, there are 8800 buildings in which the Federal Protective service provides Mobile Patrol, Guard Service, Security Equipment and Maintenance, Control Center communications for alarms and emergencies, Criminal Investigations, and Security Risk Assessments of our buildings.

Evidence: FPS Strategic Plan

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: NO

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Although FPS has a unique responsibility dedicated specifically for all Law Enforcement and Security related activities on federally controlled space, we have found that many agencies have their own federal security - DoD, Secret Service, DoJ, Treasury, and USPS (for example) provide their own protection.

Evidence: FPS Strategic Plan

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	Effective

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: FPS is currently undergoing change in the transition to the Department of Homeland Security. The mission has yet to be established clearly. Also, is there central guidance in place for protecting buildings and facilities from the Interagency Security Committee.

Evidence: FPS is well organized to perform its mission, but economies of scale and supporting functions enhancements are currently under review in the transition to DHS.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: FPS has seven program levels which resources are completely dedicated to protection of federally controlled facilities and the request match the needs. There are seven program levels within the Federal Protective Service as follows: Mobile Patrol, Guard Service, Maintenance and Repair of Security Equipment, Mega Centers, Law Enforcement Security Officers Program and Physical Security Specialist, Criminal Investigations and Administrative Services. Each of these areas are budgeted separately within the overall request and are provided FTE levels within the overall program structure. FPS utilizes a measure for tracking cost recovery and funding distribution in proportionate to the aforementioned program levels. All areas tie directly to the strategic objectives listed in 1.1. FPS requests funding in a manner that would provide the best utilization of taxpayer funds.

Evidence: GSA Financial and Reporting System (PEGASYS)

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Federal Protective Service's long term goal is to achieve a 40% overall measurable reduction to the threat of Federal facilities. The data supporting this measure is captured in the conduct of Facility Security Risk Management (FSRM) surveys conducted periodically on all FPS controlled buildings. Because the Regional Threat Assessment (RTA) measures both outcome and output, it is ideally situated to service as the guiding document for the illustration of performance initiatives attained with the Federal Protective Service. The Threat index focuses on three key elements: Real or perceived reason to attach US government facilities or their tenants, vulnerabilities provided by circumstances, time and place, a demonstrated capabilities for violence or resources to carry out a violent or disruptive act at the facilities.

Evidence: GSA Performance Measures on FPS Regional Threat Assessment - 2003. The data supporting the measure is captured in the conduct of Facility Security Risk Management (FSRM) surveys.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: FPS has identified annual performance measures which would lead to the long term goal of reducing the threat to Federal facilities.

Evidence: Long term performance measurement is part of the 1993 Government Performance Results Act. GSA Performance Measures on FPS Regional Threat Assessment - 2003

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	Effective

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The Federal Protective Service has three annual measures: The reduction to threat of Federal facilities, the Cost Recovery and Customer Satisfaction. While the implementation is relatively new and may need more time to focus on the best approach for threat levels, tackling the most serious threats first seems like a sound idea.

Evidence: GSA Performance Measures on FPS Regional Threat Assessment - 2003

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: FPS established a baseline in FY 2000 for this program.

Evidence: GSA Performance Measures on FPS Regional Threat Assessment - 2003

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: FPS partners with every agency in Federally controlled space. FPS also works with other Federal Agencies (U.S. Marshals, FBI, etc.) to obtain and share criminal intelligence.

Evidence: FPS has Building Security Committees established for 8800 facilities. This committee reviews the Risk Assessment completed within the building and approves the countermeasures recommended. FPS has criminal investigators as part of the Joint Terrorism Task Forces in every geographic area.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: FPS has received an independent verification/validation of the Regional Threat Assessment performance measures (long-term and annual). ASIS determined that the Regional Threat Assessment is a viable performance measurement tool. ASIS leads the way for advanced and improved security performance. The Customer Satisfaction surveys are accomplished by an independent organization - Gallop, Inc. FPS

Evidence: GSA/FPS Performance Measure - Regional Threat Assessment includes The American Society for Industrial Security International, Inc. (ASIS) Report - 2003. GSA/FPS Performance Measures on Customer Service has summary reports dated from 1997 - 2003.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The FPS budget reflects program objectives. The annual budget request is derived from estimates of what is needed to accomplish both the near-and long-term performance goals.

Evidence: FPS Limited Budget Calls and Business Plan

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	Effective

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: FPS is transitioning into the Department of Homeland Security within the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the strategic planning of FPS' expanded role needs to be undertaken

Evidence: The current strategic plan of FPS under GSA worked well, but as a security agency within a Real Estate organization, FPS was often an after thought in the process. Since transitioning to the Department of Homeland Security, our strategic plan under the Bureau of Immigrations and Customs is being developed at this time.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: FPS collects performance information on a monthly basis to ensure that annual and long range goals are met.

Evidence: FPS Monthly Regional Updates

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Using the Monthly Regional Updates, managers are held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results.

Evidence: FPS Monthly Regional Updates

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: FPS has Monthly Regional Updates that tracks spending within the programs

Evidence: FPS Monthly Regional Updates

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Although FPS has critical management procedures in place to appropriate program execution, there are no cost effectiveness measures in place that track program execution.

Evidence: FPS Strategic Plan and FPS Guidelines For Procurement Practices and Performance Improvements.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	Effective

-
- 3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%
- Explanation: FPS works closely with other Federal, state and local law enforcement entities
 Evidence: FPS Strategic Plan and FPS Guidelines For Procurement Practices
- 3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%
- Explanation: FPS currently uses GSA's financial management system and will transfer to a DHS financial management system.
 Evidence: GSA Financial and Reporting System (PEGASYS)
- 3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%
- Explanation: In recent years, and particularly after the bombing of the Federal Building in Oklahoma City, FPS has taken significant steps to improve security services at Federal buildings. Currently, FPS is transitioning into the Department of Homeland Security within the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement with the purpose of further improving the management of FPS.
 Evidence: With the move to DHS, our management plan under ICE is being developed in FY03.
- 4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:30%
- Explanation: FPS has shown movement towards the long range goal of reducing threats to federal facilities, federal personnel and the public.
 Evidence: GSA /FPS Performance Measures for Threat Assessment, Customer Satisfaction and Cost Recovery
- 4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:30%
- Explanation: In the past two years, FPS has exceeded the goals on all performance measures, the Regional Threat Assessment, the Customer Satisfaction measure and through the Cost Recovery process. FPS is working towards improving these goals as we transition to DHS.
 Evidence: GSA /FPS Performance Measures for Threat Assessment, Customer Satisfaction and Cost Recovery
- 4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: YES Question Weight:20%
- Explanation: Since FY 2001, FPS has continuously reduced the Threat to Federal facilities through the Risk Assessment survey process. This is a key factor in meeting long-term and annual performance measures. FPS has also been effectively controlling their costs to ensure that Cost Recovery shows improvement.
 Evidence: GSA/ FPS Performance Measures for Threat Assessment, Customer Satisfaction and Cost Recovery

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	Effective

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Due to the broad range of services provided by FPS, there are no entities that provide all the same services for comparison. Although state and local law enforcement offices could be compared to our law enforcement programs, the Officers within our structure are responsible for additional duty items such as providing for risk assessments. At the same time, there may be private companies that provide for risk assessments, but their personnel do not have law enforcement duties. With these organizational structure issues the comparisons would be skewed.

Evidence:

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: FPS has received an independent verification/validation of the Regional Threat Assessment performance measures (long-term and annual). The Customer Satisfaction surveys are accomplished by an independent organization - Gallop, Inc. ISC GAO report tasked FPS with setting guidance and monitoring agency compliance. According to GAO, the ISC has made limited progress.

Evidence: GSA/FPS Performance Measure - Regional Threat Assessment includes The American Society for Industrial Security International, Inc. (ASIS) Report - 2003. GSA/FPS Performance Measures on Customer Service has summary reports dated from 1997 - 2003.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	Effective

Measure: Reduction of Risk Factor for Federal Facilities - The Federal Protective Service's long term goal is to achieve a 40% overall measurable reduction to the threat of Federal facilities.

Additional Information: This measure provides FPS decision makers a means of identifying and evaluating threats to the Federal Workplace, and of assessing program efficiency in reducing these threats to an acceptable level. The data supporting the measure is captured in the conduct of Building Security Assessment (BSA) surveys conducted periodically on all PBS controlled buildings. These surveys, then form the basis of the Regional Threat Assessment, which focuses on and quantifies motive, opportunity and means such workspace may provide outside groups or individuals. A threat index is calculated for each building surveyed, and the buildings within a Region are prioritized in descending order. A Regional composite threat index is then developed by summing the values of the 10 buildings with the highest indices. An evaluation of the percentage change in a Region's composite threat index indicates program accomplishment. During the new two to three years, as the database of BSA surveyed buildings is developed, the measure will mature and the accuracy of the indicators will substantially increase. Baseline for this measure was established in FY 2000.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2001	>40%	27.46%	
2002	>40%	30.26%	
2003	>40%		
2004	>40%		

Measure: Biannual Customer Satisfaction Survey of Federal tenants

Additional Information: This measure takes into account the Federal personnel within the buildings and their view of security and the security practices that have been implemented by FPS. The baseline for the targets is the 1997/1998 survey. Please note that this is a 2 year baseline cycle but may be moved to a 3 year cycle.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	Effective

Measure: Annual Reduction of Risk Factors for Federal facilities. (Measures progress toward long-term outcome goal of reducing threat levels at Federal facilities by measuring outputs of different security efforts)

Additional Information: This measure is an annual measure of the progress made to the Long Term measure of identifying and evaluating threats to the Federal workplace, and of assessing program efficiency in reducing these threats to an acceptable level. The strategies used in this performance measure are 1). Identify and implement countermeasures aimed at reducing the Impact of Loss and Vulnerability to high-threat facilities. 2). Increase the quality and quantity of criminal intelligence information via full-time participation in the FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Forces. 3). Increase contact and criminal intelligence exchange with state and local security and law enforcement personnel. 4). Concentrate fiscal and human resources in areas with the highest threat. 5). Enhance the effectiveness of the Criminal Intelligence Sharing Program through increase numbers of well-trained Criminal Investigators and Law Enforcement Security Officers, and 6). Provide special operations support for agencies (and their facilities) subject to damage by demonstrations and potential terrorist attacks.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	>2.5%	27.46%	
2002	>20%	38.57%	
2003	>20%		
2004	>20%		

Measure: Percentage of Security Costs Recovered in Rent

Additional Information: This measure is an annual measure of the progress made to work towards full Cost Recovery for the security services provided. This measure is based on cost recovery targets using a standardized cost recovery calculation model. The Cost Recovery process is based on charging Federal tenants for the security costs of their building. FPS receives rent from Federal Agencies based on the 1). Basic Security Rate and 2) Building Specific costs for Contract Guards (who control the entrances and egress of the building) and for the Maintenance of the Security Systems within the buildings. The Basic Security Rate is approved by OMB and the Building Specific rent is based on the actual costs of both programs listed. The RENT received partially funds FPS for the next year. Base year for this measure is FY 2001.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
1999	0%	31%	
2000	0%	55%	
2001	0%	72%	
2002	81%	83%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	Effective

2003

85%

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The DHS and FEMA Strategic Plans both contain language that serve to clearly define the mission, function and purpose of the Response Program. The purpose of the Response Program is clearly stated in the Future Year Homeland Security Program (FYHSP) documentation and planning as an "established, comprehensive Federal response program that quickly, efficiently and effectively provides direct and early support to our Federal response teams as well as State, Tribal and local partners in the event of a natural or manmade major disaster, emergency or terrorist event." The Stafford Act and Homeland Security Act are similarly clear regarding the intent of Congress to establish an effective and cohesive federal response to disasters.

Evidence: DHS Strategic Plan; FEMA Strategic Plan; see also Section 5170b(a)(3) of the Stafford Act; Section 502(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 ("The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Emergency Planning and Response, shall . . . provid[e] the Federal Government's response to terrorist attacks and major disasters, including -- . . . coordinating other Federal response resources in the event of a terrorist attack or other major disaster."); GAO-04-72, "SEPTEMBER 11 -- Overview of Federal Disaster Assistance to the New York City Area" (Oct. 2003), at 6-7.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The federal government has been and is faced with the challenge of implementing various response plans involving many different teams, and the associated need for closer coordination of assets, resources and logistics capabilities to save lives and property in the event of a disaster, whether natural or manmade.

Evidence: Each year, the federal government responds to various natural or manmade disasters, emergencies and fires, as well as potential acts of terrorism. In 2003, for example, more than \$1.69 billion in FEMA funds were expended to help people and communities respond to and recover from a variety of natural disasters, including winter storms, floods, fires, tornadoes, hurricanes and tropical storms. According to FEMA data, the expenditures were in response to 56 major disasters and 19 emergencies declared by President Bush, involving 37 states and the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Micronesia, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. In addition, the agency authorized 48 fire management grants to help fight wildfires in 12 western states and Hawaii. See <<http://www.fema.gov/news/newsrelease.fema?id=10112>>. In addition, Section 502(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-296, states that the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness and Response, is responsible for "providing the Federal Government's response to terrorist attacks and other disasters, including -- (A) managing such response; (B) directing the Domestic Emergency Support Team [DEST], the Strategic National Stockpile [SNS], the National Disaster Medical System [NDMS], and . . . the Nuclear Incident Response Team [NIRT]; [and] (D) coordinating other Federal response resources in the event of a terrorist attack or major disaster." See also GAO-01-15, "COMBATING TERRORISM -- FEMA Continues to Make Progress in Coordinating Preparedness and Response" (Mar. 2001), at 10.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

1.3 **Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Response becomes involved in events that exceed the response capabilities of State and local governments. There are various specialized capabilities available from among our federal agency and voluntary partners. The Response Program acts as the manager of federal response efforts in order to avoid redundancies in federal response programs. Under the Stafford Act, Homeland Security Act and HSPD-5, Response coordinates many specialized response teams that are both internal and external to DHS. Under FEMA, Response has the capability of assigning missions to, and deploying, various federal assets in the course of disaster response activities, to avoid duplicative response efforts. Moreover, with the implementation of the Federal Response Plan, National Response Plan and National Incident Management System, Response's role is clearly defined as a central point of coordination, direction, command and control.

Evidence: See Section 5170b(a)(3) of the Stafford Act; Section 502(5) and (6) of the Homeland Security Act ("[FEMA Response responsibilities include] building a comprehensive national incident management system with Federal, State, and local government personnel, agencies, and authorities, to respond to . . . attacks and disasters; [and] consolidating existing Federal Government emergency response plans into a single, coordinated national response plan."); HSPD-5 at paragraphs (14)-(16).

1.4 **Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Response takes an all-hazards approach to readiness for response activities. This approach allows program managers to anticipate and prepare for various types of hazards and response needs. Because every response effort is unique to the situation, geography and population affected, this flexibility allows for a more robust capability and a more efficient approach to response planning. Rather than reinventing response plans for each event, the program is able to utilize standard pre-designed structures such as the National Response Plan and Federal Response Plan. The flexibility and standardization inherent in these established regimes prevent major flaws from occurring in Response efforts. In some cases the Response program may face the legal issue of not being able to fully use its assets due to the lack of a Disaster Declaration under the Stafford Act.

Evidence: See Sections 507(a)(2), (b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002; the Federal Response Plan at 13 ("The FRP describes the structure for organizing, coordinating, and mobilizing Federal resources to augment State and local response efforts under the Stafford Act and its implementing regulations . . . The FRP may also be used in conjunction with Federal agency emergency operations plans developed under other statutory authorities as well as [MOUs] among various Federal agencies."). See also the FEMA Annual Performance & Accountability Report Fiscal Year 2001 at 34-35.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Stafford Act dictates that response efforts be coordinated with the States as they request disaster declarations and services. The Response Program is designed to ensure that State/local resources are not overtaxed following disasters and that a source of funding is available to speed resources, equipment and responders to the scene. Yet, the Response Program is not optimally designed because many of the resources that FEMA has can not be deployed without a Stafford declaration. So, there may be situations in which resources that the government has invested in can not be used. The opposite also occur. Resources may used in support of a community that should not be receiving federal aid. The basic qualification criterion for a disaster declaration (\$1.11 of impact per capita) sets a low hurdle, so some localities may receive aid even when it is within their means to respond without assistance.

Evidence: FEMA's IG (I-02-99) reports that "the \$1 per capita does not reflect a State's economic health and its ability to raise public revenues to cover the cost of a disaster." FEMA's IG suggests using an alternative indicator, such as 'Total Taxable Resources' ". . . [that] would ensure that States with a weaker fiscal condition are treated fairly while States with a stronger fiscal condition become more accountable for their disaster welfare." The preamble to the Stafford Act, Sec. 101, directs FEMA to encourage ``individuals, States, and local governments to protect themselves by obtaining insurance coverage to supplement or replace governmental assistance."

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Through the FYHSP process, the Response Program has established an overall long-term goal both yearly (through 2010), and quarterly (in the executable year) via milestones. In order to measure the effectiveness of these activities, the Response Program has established eleven comprehensive long-term performance measures that reflect the purpose of the program and measure progress toward the long-term goal of establishing fully operational response teams with established response times and capabilities. Some examples of these measurements are "Number of evacuees for whom intermediate emergency housing can be provided;" "Average logistical response time to provide essential services to an impacted community;" and "Percentage of Disaster Medical Assistant Teams (DMAT) with appropriate WMD capability" (see "Measures" tab for full list).

Evidence: See FYHSP documents and planning

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight 15%

Explanation: The Response Program measures demonstrate an ambitious reach towards the long-term goal of the Response division. Performance and efficiency are measured by response times (48 hour increase in efficiency) and numbers of people (99,400 increase over five years) served through the effective application of the program. To ensure cohesion and that common management practices are applied to the various response teams and elements among the combined DHS legacy areas, in-place measures for team evaluations, readiness, remedial action and average established response times (60 hour increase in efficiency over five years) are consistent and challenging. Medical readiness is likewise measured through consistent, performance-enhancing benchmarks including "Percentage of NDMS teams and hospitals trained and exercised in large-scale patient and mass-casualty evacuations;" and "Percentage of NDMS teams with full WMD capability."

Evidence: See FYHSP documents and planning as described immediately above; see also various recent FEMA annual performance reports and performance plans (required by the GPRA of 1993) published between 1998 and 2003, all of which contain numerous performance measures and goals by which FEMA measures itself.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:15%

Explanation: The Response Program was reconfigured in FY03 due to the dissolution of the Response and Recovery Directorate as part of the formation of, and FEMA's transition into, DHS. Under this process, the program has been redesigned to meet the current mission and needs of DHS for response efforts. Performance goals have been established for each fiscal year through 2010. Because FYHSP planning contains corresponding milestones and activities for each year, goals are clearly linked to performance.

Evidence: See the FYHSP documents and planning for Response as described in Section 2.1 above. See also GAO/RCED-00-210R -- "FEMA's FY 1999 Performance Report and FY 2001 Performance Plan" (explaining how such annual performance reports and plans, which contain stated performance measures and goals, are required by the GPRA of 1993),

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Because the Response Program was reconfigured in FY03 during the formation of DHS and the program's (and FEMA's) incorporation into that new Department, the FY03-04 period has been, of necessity, largely devoted to program assessment, enhancement and redesign. Also, several new program components have come to Response/FEMA/DHS, as operational components, from other agencies; these components include the National Disaster Medical System (NDMS), Domestic Emergency Support Team (DEST) and Nuclear Incident Response Team (NIRT). Therefore, the Response Program's FY03-04 capabilities have been used as the baseline from which all current and future measurements are taken. The targets for annual measures consistently increase in both expectations and accountability, and serve to bring all the combined elements of Response together under the umbrella of common objectives and goals.

Evidence: See FYHSP documents and planning as cited in Section 2.1 above; see also various recent GPRA-required FEMA annual performance reports and plans as described above.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The Response Program includes all participating partners and teams in achieving established goals and measures. The long-term goals for the program are shared with all partners directly involved in achievement and responsible for milestones. For instance, NDMS teams are required to submit work plans and spending plans based on achievement of milestones, and priorities set by the Under Secretary and Program leadership. The NDMS system is comprised of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Defense, which have the primary responsibility for hospital facilities and evacuation capabilities which are being measured under measures 6-8. The State Pre-Positioned Disaster Supplies Program mandates that state partners sign MOUs requiring them to both participate in reporting and comply with response logistics standards of operation. Regional offices' contractors are being held accountable to support Response in meeting deadlines for milestones and yearly measurement goals. Regional response divisions are required to submit work plans and spending plans for funding based upon milestones, goals and meeting measurements for the fiscal year.

Evidence: PPDS MOU example, NDMS partners MOU example, NDMS Administrative Officer's Handbook, NDMS AO Training Materials, NDMS Work Plan Development Guidance, Regional Response Division Work Plan Guidance. See also GAO-01-15 (Mar. 2001)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The current components of the Response Program have had numerous independent evaluations conducted, which identified problems that are currently being addressed. The DHS IG conducts audits of every major disaster response and publishes findings in regular reports. Likewise, GAO has periodically performed reviews of the Response Program and issued reports. FEMA maintains a standard remedial action program for every disaster operation, where representatives from other agencies, State and local partners who interact with our response operations can provide feedback, through after-action reports, that is used to improve processes and services. State agencies periodically review disaster operations and provide reports on Response Program activities in disaster operations. The Center for Naval Analyses completed a study on the effectiveness and shortfalls of the NDMS system, based on which changes are being implemented. The D'Araujo Report was commissioned by FEMA management in 2002 to evaluate the disaster workforce program, which is currently being enhanced based on those and other comments. Additionally, the NDMS Team Leader and Administrative Officer training and budget preparation relates goals and achievement to work plans and spending plans.

Evidence: IG reports; GAO reports; CNA Report; D'Araujo report, Bland Report

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The Response Program utilizes the DHS Planning, Programming and Budgeting System whereby all budget requests begin with detailed multiyear planning, the program derives its budget from a number of sources throughout the agency. The link between performance and budget request is not transparent in the budget. Additionally, one of the sources of the Response budget is the Disaster Relief Fund (DRF) The DRF request is based on a five year average of disaster costs, not any performance data.

Evidence: FYHSP planning documentation. FY 2004 Budget Request

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: During the year of execution, Response conducts internal quarterly evaluations of its achievement of milestones and measures, and reports to the Under Secretary on the status of each element, subprogram and priority. Color codes are assigned to performance based on percentages of milestone achievement (i.e., 0-60% completion = red; 60-80% = yellow; and 80-100% = green). Where red elements are reported, a four-part remedial action plan is developed to determine a course of action to correct the deficiencies (both internal and external). The Response Program has only been in existence in its present form for one year. However, at the end of FY03 the FEMA Performance and Accountability report reflected weaknesses in meeting established measures for logistical response times. Response immediately embarked on a redesign of strategic planning and milestones for the logistics subprogram, and developed clear and achievable milestones to establish a Pre-Positioned Disaster Supplies Program, in order to alleviate this deficiency and meet the established measure for FY04. All of the current eleven performance measures for the Response Program were developed in the last year in order to bring many different components (brought into DHS from multiple agencies) under a single plan. The newly introduced DHS Strategic Plan, President's Management Agenda, Clay Johnson High Level Goals, and other milestones and measures have all been integrated into Response Program planning.

Evidence: Executive Summary of PPDS; Quarterly Review Example; FYHSP planning documentation.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The Response Program regularly reviews the status of all milestones and priorities on a quarterly basis. This information is collected at the individual employee, team, section, branch and Division level. The data are entered into a project tracking program wherein each element, subprogram and priority is assigned a color code (red, yellow or green) to reflect the percentage of completion thus far for the year. Every milestone is tracked until 100% completion is achieved. If any area is designated as red (60% completion or less), a detailed plan of action is developed to remedy the deficiency. In this way, resources can be redirected to complete priorities and external problems can be identified for remediation. The Domestic Emergency Support Team (DEST) (US Secret Service and other agency partners) and Nuclear Incident Response Team (NIRT) (Department of Energy and other agency partners) elements are two examples of areas where agency partners are required to participate in quarterly progress reviews. A system is being put into place for FY05 to hold NDMS and US&R teams to the same level of reporting and accountability. The Response Program collects timely and credible performance information on the planning and operational objectives of the organization. After every major disaster operation, an after-action report is developed with input from every partner agency involved in the disaster operation. This feedback is collected by the Preparedness Program and is used to provide suggested programmatic enhancements to Response through the Remedial Action Program. The Performance Accountability Report (PAR) is used to document annual progress and to recommend program redirection in areas of deficiency.

Evidence: FYHSP; Response Program Quarterly Performance Tracking; Quarterly Performance Report; Remedial Action Program

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 15%

Explanation: On a quarterly basis, each subprogram is required to report on the status of its appropriated funds. The milestones and priorities laid out at the beginning of the fiscal year are tracked to determine activity, progress and appropriate utilization of funding. Planning and programmatic changes are made throughout the year, based on progress and the efficiency of activities. In some cases, projects are curtailed and discontinued, and funding is reprogrammed to more critical and promising areas, when progress cannot be demonstrated. The milestones and priorities are considered to be workplans for the managers and are part of their regular performance evaluations. This information is reported to the Under Secretary on a quarterly basis, with certain priorities reported to the Secretary and to the President (through the FYHSP and Clay Johnson High Level Goals). Future funding allocations, planning and resources will be determined by performance.

Evidence: FYHSP; Response Program Quarterly Performance Tracking; Quarterly Performance Report; PPBS Training Presentation; NDMS Administrative Officer Handbook; NDMS MOU for partners; PPDS MOU

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:15%

Explanation: The annual plans for all subprograms contain a detailed schedule of milestones for expenditures, acquisitions and acceptance of goods and services. Long-term projects are planned using quarterly goals to ensure that appropriate timing and procedures are followed for acquisition processes. In the Resource Management subprogram element, goals and milestones are set regarding length of time and percentage of completed financial transactions. Every subprogram plans in order to complete most financial obligations in a responsible manner by the third quarter of the fiscal year. Each quarter, the subprograms report their financial information under the categories of spending plan amount, allocation, commitment, obligation, amount remaining in accounts and percentage remaining. This information is reported to the Under Secretary, CFO and COO to ensure that all funds are being utilized efficiently and appropriately in a timely manner. Partner funding is tracked in the same manner. Money allocated to US&R and NDMS partners is approved by the program and expended if acquisitions and activities are called for in spending plans and considered to be for appropriate uses.

Evidence: FYHSP; Quarterly Performance Report.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The Response Program is continuously working to identify efficiencies in cases where various components have introduced similar resources into the organization. For example, rather than preserving three separate deployment systems (FEMA, NDMS, US&R), the program has chosen the NDMS system and contracting mechanism to enhance operations for all response teams and cadres. Combining the logistical capabilities, warehouses and systems from all elements into a single system has both identified efficiencies in the supply system, and reduced overhead costs. Following lessons learned from Hurricane Isabel, the logistics branch has developed the Pre-Positioned Disaster Supply Program, which allots logistical resources to States for quick and efficient receipt of supplies during disasters, so as to eliminate ad hoc transportation expenses and permit more flexibility in supply utilization. After-action reports from disasters also serve to identify such efficiencies. Systems are being put into place at this time to strengthen controls on spending and create a unified structure for planning. Prior to FY03, there were no multi-year plans, milestones or long-term goals consistent across the current Response Program elements. The fact that all elements are now united under a common set of goals and vision is evidence of effectiveness in the short-term. Already, each element has shown progress towards meeting common goals that were established in May, 2003.

Evidence: See Remedial Action Management Program (RAMP) reports; Hurricane Isabel-specific RAMP report; Quarterly Performance Report.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The mission of FEMA and the Response Program is that of coordination and management. The Federal Response Plan and new National Response Plan require that disaster response be coordinated through the Emergency Support Team, Regional Operations Centers (10 nationwide), Regional Emergency Response Teams (10), National Emergency Response Teams (3), Incident Management Teams (four to be established in FY05) and other resources managed by FEMA. Mission assignments made by the Response Program to other agencies during disasters target resources to needs identified in State and local areas. Planning and working groups such as the Voluntary Agencies Active in Disasters (VOAD), Emergency Service Function Leader Group (ESFLG), Regional Interagency Steering Committee (RISC (10)), Catastrophic Disaster Response Group (CDRG) and others are utilized to coordinate and plan as partners. The NDMS coordinating group, made up of the Response Program (FEMA/DHS), VA and DOD, sets objectives and assesses progress within, and the milestones for, the NDMS system. This group has primarily coordinated operational planning and is now engaged in finding ways to meet the goals for the program through regular meetings and coordination. NDMS and US&R utilize working groups made up of teams and task forces (partners) to define goals and objectives for their systems.

Evidence: ESFLG documents and meeting minutes; RISC documents and meeting minutes; CDRG documents and meeting minutes; FRP; NRP; NDMS and US&R Working Groups Documentation; NDMS MOU

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The Response Program tracks its financial information through FEMA's Integrated Financial Management Information System (IFMIS). On a regular basis (sometimes daily), the Response Services Branch runs reports for each account to track expenditures, detect problems within the procurement chain and identify resources that can be reprogrammed or reallocated within the Agency. Every transaction is tracked from the original paperwork (Form 40-1) to the final procurement. Each transaction is tracked internally in a Response Program database that links expenditures to subprogram areas and organizational elements. This database is cross-checked with IFMIS to ensure that no human error has occurred between the Financial Management operation and the Response Program. Failsafe points are in place at every step to prevent against erroneous expenditures. The IFMIS system is a standard program for all FEMA programs and has passed audits from GAO. The information in IFMIS is updated with each transaction and is backed up daily.

Evidence: IFMIS Report Example; internal tracking report example; FYHSP Milestones.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The quarterly reviews are very useful in identifying management deficiencies. Each element is reflected in a report with the appropriate progress color coding. When certain elements are found to be deficient, the program manager requires a four-part explanation including the problems being faced, possible solutions, impacts of failure, and the pros and cons of possible solutions. This process allows employees at every level to offer suggestions for improving performance. This process has been successful in FY04 reviews, as certain initiatives were thereafter discontinued for the year or curtailed. The FY03 PAR identified fundamental flaws in logistical response times during Hurricane Isabel. This review process required managers to be held accountable for the shortfalls in performance, recommend corrective actions and implement changes. The outcome of the FY03 PAR was the creation of the Pre-Positioned Disaster Supply Program, accomplished by reprogramming resources from within the program budget, for more efficient logistical responses in the future.

Evidence: FY03 PAR; PPDS MOU; Quarterly Review Documents; PPBS Training Presentation.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 30%

Explanation: Upon formation of the Response Program in FY03, long-term performance goals were set and are tracked against corresponding annual performance measures. The overall long-term performance goal for Response is: By FY10, all multi-disciplinary teams in the Response Program will be consistently evaluated to achieve fully operational status and meet established average response times. Milestones have been set for each year (and have been broken into quarterly milestones for execution) and are regularly evaluated for status of completion. The FY04 mid-year review of the Response Program shows substantial and appropriate progress towards achieving the FY04 goals and measures, and that the Program is on track to achieve its overall long-term goal. This review of progress has included agency partners, interagency response teams (DEST, NIRT), regional response partners and state partners (PPDS).

Evidence: FY04 Mid-Year Review Report; FYHSP Documents

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 30%

Explanation: The FY04 Mid-Year review shows appropriate achievement of the annual goals for that year. Because planning has been broken into quarterly deliverables, measures can be tracked throughout the year as milestones are being completed.

Evidence: FY04 Mid-Year Review Report; FYHSP Documents; Response Program Quarterly Performance Tracking.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: There have been considerable management changes, such as the consolidation of warehouse facilities, NDMS business practices being reconfigured from HHS standards to DHS systems, and consolidation of all processes under one management structure. Efficiencies are already being achieved in the FY04 Program execution. In FY05, the Response Program will have more data available for comparison to demonstrate cost efficiencies from year to year. The Response Program has only existed for one year in its present configuration under DHS. Therefore, there has not been sufficient time to obtain quantifiable multi-year information. Systems are being put into place at this time to strengthen controls on spending and create a unified structure for planning. Prior to FY03, there were no multi-year plans, milestones or long-term goals consistent across the current Response Program elements. The fact that all elements are now united under a common set of goals and vision is evidence of effectiveness in the short-term. Already, each element has shown progress towards meeting common goals that were established in May, 2003. For example, rather than preserving three separate deployment systems (FEMA, NDMS, US&R), the program has chosen the NDMS system and contracting mechanism to enhance operations for all response teams and cadres. Combining the logistical capabilities, warehouses and systems from all elements into a single system has both identified efficiencies in the supply system, and reduced overhead costs. Following lessons learned from Hurricane Isabel, the logistics branch has developed the Pre-Positioned Disaster Supply Program, which allots logistical resources to States for quick and efficient receipt of supplies during disasters, so as to eliminate ad hoc transportation expenses and permit more flexibility in supply utilization. After-action reports from disasters also serve to identify such efficiencies.

Evidence: FY04 Mid-Year Review Report; FYHSP Documents; Response Program Quarterly Performance Tracking.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: There are no other programs of integrated emergency management and coordination that respond to domestic disaster contingencies. Because the Response Program is unique in nature, it cannot be compared to any other programs for performance evaluation. The Response Program is a culmination of specialties that may be present at State, local and voluntary levels in various agencies and levels of performance. It would not be cost-effective or feasible to compare the Program to the universe of response operations that FEMA supplements when called upon. Response becomes involved in those events beyond the capability of State and local governments to handle. The Response Program acts as the manager of response efforts in order to avoid redundancies and overlaps in federal response programs. Under the Stafford Act, Homeland Security Act and HSPD-5, Response coordinates many varying specialized response teams that are both internal and external to DHS.

Evidence: See generally Stafford Act; Homeland Security Act; HSPD-5.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The FEMA/DHS IG, and GAO, have completed reports of elements within the response program with no findings to indicate that the program is ineffective or lacks results. Audits have shown that the program remains effective despite other external problems. The effectiveness of the Response Program is clearly reflected in the GAO report on the federal response to the events of September 11, 2001. Likewise, the IG Semi-Annual report of 2003 did not recognize shortfalls in the effectiveness or results from response program operations. Reports consistently recognize the outcomes of the response program, including teams that respond when called, resources made available for disaster victims and communities, and effective coordination of activities through mission assignments to other agencies for direct response work.

Evidence: IG reports; GAO reports

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

Measure: Cumulative percentage of emergency teams and operations evaluated through at least one readiness evaluation or exercise (Four Year Cycle).

Additional Information: This annual goal tracks with the long-term goal of evaluating 100% of all response teams and operations within four years, and continuing that four year cycle in 2009. In FY08, the measurement calls for a completion of evaluations for all teams. Therefore, in FY09, the four-year evaluation cycle will continue beyond the 100% goal as teams will be reevaluated (hence the total being greater than 100%). In order to achieve the long-term goal for full team readiness, an aggressive evaluation, exercise and assessment schedule must be implemented to measure the capabilities of response teams.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	Baseline		
2005	25%		
2006	50%		
2007	75%		
2008	100%		
2009	125%		
2010	155%		

Measure: Number of evacuees for whom intermediate emergency housing can be provided.

Additional Information: This annual goal tracks to the long-term goal of providing housing to a population of 100,000 by 2009. The Response Program is responsible for providing intermediate housing to areas impacted by large disasters. Intermediate housing can be defined as emergency housing for an extended period of time, prior to the establishment of permanent or semi-permanent arrangements for victims. Traditionally, intermediate housing has consisted of travel trailers, campers, modular accommodations or even tents. This measure will track our capability to efficiently deliver intermediate housing units to field operations and service an increasing number of disaster victims in sanitary conditions.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	600		
2005	1200		
2006	3000		
2007	25000		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

2008	70000
2009	100000
2010	100000

Measure: Average logistical response time in hours to provide essential services to an impacted community of 50,000 people or less.

Additional Information: This annual goal tracks to the long-term goal of reducing average logistical response time to 24 hours by 2009. This measure is intended to track the average time it takes Response Logistics Teams to provide essential communication, materiel, medical and other supplies to impacted communities. Faster disaster response will be achieved through efficiencies in the logistical process; and the merging of various systems into one common structure that strategically aligns logistics centers, pre-positioned supplies and enhanced personnel training. This measure is a companion to measure #10, where increased efficiency in response times will permit faster delivery and assembly of housing stock to a larger population. Faster response, more housing capability and better responsiveness will in turn equate to more lives and property saved.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	72	64	
2005	64		
2006	60		
2007	48		
2008	36		
2009	24		
2010	24		

Measure: Average percentage of evaluated teams and operations achieving 'fully operational' or better status.

Additional Information: This annual goal tracks with the long-term goal of achieving 100% fully operational status for all evaluated response teams by 2010. This measure serves as a counterpart to measure #1. Although it is important to set a goal for the number of teams that are being evaluated, the Response Program has also designed a goal for the number of teams (of the evaluated subset) that are qualified as "fully operational." Fully operational status indicates that teams are meeting all of the prescribed training, equipment, physical and other requirements necessary to perform their missions.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	Baseline		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

2005	50%
2006	60%
2007	70%
2008	80%
2009	90%
2010	100%

Measure: Average percentage of evaluated teams rising one operational level in a year (considering four operational levels.)

Additional Information: This annual goal tracks with the 2010 long-term goal of having 100% of those teams found to be less than "fully operational" improving by one status level in a year. This is a companion measure to the previous two measurements. Considering that there are four established operational levels among response teams (fully operational being the top level), it is important to measure the progress of those teams not at fully operational levels toward achieving that goal. This gives every team a goal of four years to reach this level. This also measures the efficiency and effect of remedial action programs, training, equipment enhancements, exercises and procurements in achieving improvement in overall team performance through established evaluation standards. Because this measurement tracks improvement from previous years' evaluations, it will not be tracked until FY06, in order to capture data from teams that are to be evaluated in FY05.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	Baseline		
2005	Baseline		
2006	60%		
2007	80%		
2008	90%		
2009	100%		
2010	100%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

Measure: Average maximum response time in hours for emergency response teams to arrive on scene.

Additional Information: This annual goal tracks with the long-term goal of achieving, by 2009, an average maximum response time of 12 hours for all response teams to arrive on scene. This is a companion measure to the previous three measurements. In order to be truly effective in meeting the needs of communities and disaster victims, team response times must be both ambitious and achievable. This measurement tracks actual team response capabilities and improvements in efficient, timed deployments in relation to transportation improvements, geographic stationing and deployment practices and overall team readiness. A more efficient response time equates to more lives saved, property losses reduced, greater continuity of services and enhanced logistical capability.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	72	50	
2005	50		
2006	48		
2007	36		
2008	24		
2009	12		
2010	12		

Measure: Establishment of FEMA's four Incident Management Teams, now called Federal Initial Response Support Teams (FIRSTs).

Additional Information: This annual goal tracks to the long-term goal of establishing four fully functioning IMTs by 2005. Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD) - 5 directs DHS / Response Program to establish IMTs. Response has set a goal of establishing the four IMTs by the end of FY05.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	25%	25%	
2005	100%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

Measure: National Disaster Medical System (NDMS) teams and hospitals trained and exercised in large-scale patient and mass-casualty evacuations.

Additional Information: This measurement tracks the percentage of hospitals within the NDMS system that are trained and exercised in patient and mass-casualty evacuations. These hospitals are managed by VA, DOD and other agencies. This measurement is meant to track Response Program management of the overall readiness of the program, as well as that of NDMS partners and signatory agencies.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	Baseline		
2005	25%		
2006	25%		
2007	25%		
2008	25%		
2009	25%		
2010	25%		

Measure: Casualty treatment, evacuation and transportation capability of the national NDMS system (number of patients).

Additional Information: This annual goal tracks to the long-term goal of achieving a 100,000 patient treatment, evacuation and transportation capability by 2010. This measure serves as a counterpart to measure #6. This measure is meant to track the efficiency of hospitals and NDMS teams, and their increasing ability, through development of standardization and capability, to move and evacuate people during emergencies. Data will be collected from both exercises and actual events.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	200		
2005	1000		
2006	5000		
2007	20000		
2008	50000		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

2009	75000
2010	100000

Measure: Percentage of DMAT and DMORT teams with appropriate WMD capability.

Additional Information: This annual goal tracks to the long-term goal of achieving 40% WMD capability for appropriate teams by 2010. This measurement is meant to track the capability of Disaster Medical Assistance Teams and Disaster Mortuary Teams to complete their missions in areas affected by Weapons of Mass Destruction. Appropriate capability is determined by standards for Personal Protective Equipment, training and specialized skills.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	10%		
2005	15%		
2006	20%		
2007	25%		
2008	30%		
2009	35%		
2010	40%		

Measure: Number of highest-risk communities for which catastrophic plans have been completed per year.

Additional Information: The Response Program is working towards completing Catastrophic Disaster Plans for a number of the highest-risk communities in the country. The measure is meant to track the completion of catastrophic plans, at a rate of one per year. The outcome of this activity will be increased connectivity among federal, State and local response agencies during events in communities with plans. This added efficiency will in turn lead to more lives saved, property losses reduced, greater continuity of services and enhanced logistical capability.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	1		
2005	1		
2006	1		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: FEMA Response
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	80%	100%	40%	

2007	1
2008	1
2009	1
2010	1

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions (FP/FM) program's purpose is clearly defined in statute as follows: (1) to protect visiting heads of state, heads of government, and their spouses (HS/HG/S), and other distinguished visitors to the United States as directed by the President, and (2) to provide external security to foreign diplomatic embassies and missions in the Washington, DC area (and other limited areas, consistent with statute).

Evidence: Title 18 U.S.C., Sec. 3056(a)(5)(6). Dignitary Protective Division (DPD) functional responsibility statement. Title 3 U.S.C. Section 202 (5)(8)(9)(10), Public Law 91-217 (3/19/70) and legislative history. DPD and FMB program descriptions.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The FP/FM program meets the U.S. government's need to protect visiting HS/HG/S and foreign embassies/missions. The need for foreign countries to conduct business securely in the United States is based on statute, treaty, diplomacy, and reciprocity.

Evidence: Title 18 U.S.C. Sec. 3056; Title 3 U.S.C. Sec. 202, Public Law 91-217 and legislative history. The 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (required host countries to provide protection for United States diplomatic locations and personnel abroad, which necessitates reciprocity in this country). The need for the program is ongoing and relevant: HS/HG/S made a total of 579 visits to the United States in 2003; the total number of stops for which the Secret Service provided them protection was 1,849; the program currently protects 556 Washington-area foreign missions. Profile - Foreign Missions Branch.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The FP/FM program fulfills a unique role, as the Secret Service is the sole agency with the lead responsibility for the protection of HS/HG/S while in the United States. In this capacity, the FP/FM program exercises the Service's unique authority and capability to centrally coordinate logistics, advanced security surveys, intelligence analysis and dissemination, and other planning activities preceding actual HS/HG/S visits. Further, USSS is the only entity qualified and charged with providing HS/HG/S protection through the strategic placement of human and physical assets (e.g., agents, tactical support, technical security, explosives ordnance detection, WMD detection and countermeasures, specialized training) during visits. While other (Federal, state, and local) law enforcement, as well as foreign security assets, participate at various points in the overall security framework, the USSS FP/FM program occupies a necessary leadership role to coordinate complex security operations that involve multiple jurisdictions and functions. To avoid any duplication of efforts, the program employs a matrix methodology that clearly specifies the supporting role of other law enforcement agencies in the overall security framework. Similarly, the program has the sole statutory authority to provide a dedicated police presence and response to foreign missions/embassies. This population is served by other programs/entities (e.g. Metropolitan Police Department) only for surge capacity in limited circumstances such as demonstration control.

Evidence: Title 18 U.S.C. Sec. 3056. Title 3 U.S.C. Sec. 202, Public Law 91-217 and legislative history.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: With its 24-hour policing function (e.g., routine patrols, fixed posts, alarm response, demonstration control) and full-time protective details, the FP/FM program's design facilitates the provision of efficient and effective protection to foreign missions, and to HS/HG/S during their visits to the United States. The Secret Service's lead responsibility for foreign protection and foreign missions is statutory; thus, in operation, the FP/FM program is 'direct federal' and the Federal Government could not delegate associated responsibilities to state, local, or private entities through a 'grant' or 'regulatory' program design. In addition to being statutorily impermissible, either of these alternative program design structures would flaw the program's effectiveness and efficiency, because state, local, and private entities do not possess the expertise, resources, and proximity necessary to execute required program services, nor do they possess the access to State Department and intelligence sources necessary for their success. The FP/FM program is also adept at addressing changing field conditions associated with varying threat levels. The FP/FM program has evolved its dignitary protective methodology so that it efficiently and flexibly allocates human (e.g., number of detail staff, drivers) and physical (e.g., motorcade support, limos) assets based on unique security profiles associated with the protectee risk levels ('high,' 'medium,' and 'low'). At foreign missions, the program also operates a threat-based mix of 'fixed posts' and roving patrols based on their relative operational and cost effectiveness. To assist in advance planning and security operations, the program also leverages the resources of (a) existing USSS assets in strategically located field offices and (b) Federal, state, and local law enforcement entities.

Evidence: Brochure, "Secret Service Protection of Foreign Dignitaries." Various internal USSS training and operations manuals.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Consistent with 18 U.S.C. 3056, the program targets and provides protection only to visiting HS/HG/S. The program does not provide protection to other government officials traveling with HS/HG/S, or to any other unintended beneficiaries. Protection is also time-targeted to meet program purposes, never preceding dignitaries' entrance into the United States or extending beyond their exit of the country. Moreover, the USSS uses a risk-based methodology to determine the appropriate level of protection for authorized beneficiaries. Similarly, the program's clear mission, well-defined patrol routes, and proximity to foreign missions ensure that policing activities are targeted to provide a secure environment for the intended beneficiaries (foreign missions).

Evidence: Dignitary Protective Division functional responsibility statement. Various internal USSS training and operations manuals.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 15%

Explanation: The FP/FM program's long-term outcome goals are (1) to ensure the safety of HS/HG/S while under the protection of the USSS and (2) to ensure the security of foreign diplomatic missions in the Washington, DC metropolitan area (and other limited areas, consistent with statute). The program's long-term performance measures are (1) the Percentage of Instances Foreign Dignitary Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely and (2) the Rate of Reported Crimes Against Embassy Personnel and Property (NEW MEASURE).

Evidence: USSS Strategic Plan. Annual Performance Plans and Reports. Congressional budget submission. Future Years Homeland Security Program. Various internal USSS training and operations manuals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:15%

Explanation: Given the nature of the protective mission, targets for the FP/FM program's long-term performance measures can only be the complete safety of foreign dignitaries (100% instances of protectees' safe arrival and departure) and the complete security of foreign missions receiving USSS protection (rate of zero reported crimes against embassy personnel and property). Such ambitious targets promote continuous improvement, maximizing the protection of HS/HG/S and of diplomatic personnel and facilities. Anything short of the complete safety of dignitary protectees and the security of foreign missions is an unsatisfactory target.

Evidence: Congressional budget submission. Annual Performance Plans and Reports. Future Years Homeland Security Program.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:15%

Explanation: The FP/FM program's long-term goals are (1) to ensure the safety of HS/HG/S while under the protection of the USSS and (2) to ensure the security of foreign diplomatic missions in the Washington, DC metropolitan area. The FP/FM program's annual performance measures, which demonstrate progress toward achieving these goals, are (1) the Percentage of Instances Foreign Dignitary Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely and (2) the Rate of Reported Crimes Against Embassy Personnel and Property (NEW MEASURE). The FP/FM program's long-term and annual measures are identical. In addition, the Management and Organization Division is currently developing a comprehensive efficiency measure (an index that illustrates the change in unit cost from the base year to the current year), which will be available at the end of FY 2004. Answer 4.3 presents an interim efficiency measure for the program.

Evidence: Congressional budget submission. Annual Performance Plans and Reports. Future Years Homeland Security Program. Various internal USSS reports.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:15%

Explanation: The USSS collects and maintains historical protective data. The ambitious target for the Percentage of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely is always 100 percent (see Measures Tab for baseline data). The Service has collected baseline data and established annual targets (see Measures Tab for both) for the new measure, the Rate of Reported Crimes Against Embassy Personnel and Property. The targets reflect a downward trend against the baseline.

Evidence: Congressional budget submission. Annual Performance Plans and Reports.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 6%

Explanation: The Secret Service works in partnership with Federal, state, local, and international government partners to ensure the protection of visiting dignitaries and foreign missions. Through Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), Letters of Agreement (LOAs), and other general agreements, government partners provide an array of non-reimbursable support services (e.g. fingerprint records, planning, coordination, traffic assistance), the effect of which is to contribute to the physical protection of HS/HG/S and foreign missions. Assistance from external law enforcement organizations allows the FP/FM program to meet its ambitious goals in a more efficient and effective manner.

Evidence: Various internal USSS documents and interagency agreements.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 6%

Explanation: ' Independent statisticians and analysts in the Service's Quantitative Studies and Statistical Systems Branch use the Service's Workload Statistical and Reporting System to provide FP/FM managers with routine (at least monthly) reports containing input, output, and outcome indicators. This process ensures that USSS systematically obtains and uses feedback in order to evaluate and improve the FP/FM program's performance. The regularity of the data's dissemination is such that program effectiveness in terms of achieving its measurable outcomes is evaluated on a systematized and routine (vice ad-hoc) basis. ' Historically, other independent evaluations have "filled the gaps," answering questions not easily found in performance data. Such evaluations often focus on maximizing effectiveness through process improvement, organizational changes, or broader management considerations. Examples are: (1) An Analytical Support Branch study that resulted in the merger of the Dignitary Protective and Major Events Divisions. (2) An Interagency (including Treasury, OMB) Working Group Study of optimal Uniformed Division staffing. (3) A 'Blue Teaming' exercise in which Secret Service law enforcement personnel who operate independently of the Dignitary Protective Division sought to identify and propose actions to rectify any deficiencies in FP/FM's security plans for the upcoming G-8 Summit at which 27 HS/HG/S will be in attendance. (4) Interagency pre-event 'Table Top' exercises in which Federal, state, and local law enforcement participants in Secret Service-led security operations for major events with high HS/HG/S attendance (e.g., G-8 meetings, United Nations General Assembly meetings) test USSS operational plans for command and control and other dimensions critical to security outcomes. ' Finally, the program's parent division (Dignitary Protective Division) undergoes a thorough "Inspection" process every two years. Secret Service inspections assess effectiveness of operations; quality of management and supervision; and adherence to policies, regulations, and procedures. Inspectors are senior ranking criminal investigators independent of the program's and the division's chain of command.

Evidence: Various internal USSS statistical and reporting systems, training manuals, operations manuals, after-action reports, and management studies.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight: 15%

Explanation: The USSS organizes its budget into six program areas, of which FP/FM is one. Each program area represents a specific amount within the USSS base budget, linked to the performance measures present in each of the program areas. The Service aligns its FP/FM budget request with the appropriate departmental strategic goal, bureau strategic goal, bureau strategic objective, program performance goal, and program performance measure. [The FY 2005 budget request for FP/FM reflects the Service's estimate of what the program needs in the budget year to accomplish its goal, 100% instances of visiting HS/HG/S arriving and departing safely. With regard to funding, policy, or legislative changes, the FY 2005 budget request indicated that Uniformed Division positions associated with Foreign Missions and funded in the FY 2003 Emergency Supplemental would have to be annualized in the Budget Year in order for the program to maintain the level of services necessary to perform physical protection of foreign diplomatic missions and embassies.] Finally, the Service's budget request reflects the full cost of the FP/FM program, inclusive of indirect or 'overhead' costs (e.g., training, human resources, procurement support, finance and accounting) needed to attain program results. [The Service will update the above bracketed portion upon completion of its FY 2006 budget request.]

Evidence: Congressional budget submission. Explanation of methodology for allocating overhead costs to program budgets. Various internal USSS statistical and reporting systems.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:15%

Explanation: The Service has adopted both specific, ambitious long-term performance goals and annual performance goals demonstrating progress toward them (see answers 2.1 through 2.3). Though not required to do so by any external entity, the program's parent organization (the Dignitary Protective Division) also published a division-level strategic plan in FY 2003. This plan spans FY 2003 to 2005 and addresses various areas of improvement needed in the FP/FM program, including greater operational efficiency, enhanced fiscal responsibility, and improved communication with protective details and foreign missions. The division's strategic planning process emphasizes the proactive and continuous improvement (as opposed to reactive deficiency correction) that the program's constantly changing protective environment mandates. In light of that environment's demands, the division reviews its planning efforts on an ongoing basis, with a focus on strategic (a) logistical and (b) manpower planning.

Evidence: Various internal USSS planning documents and implementation reports.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The USSS systematically collects a wide range of performance information for all its core programs, including the FP/FM program. Automated systems that are integrated into normal business processes collect performance information that includes inputs (ex.-manhours), outputs (ex.-quantity of protectee 'stops'), and outcomes (ex.-number of crimes against embassies). Data dating back decades exist for baselining purposes. Independent statisticians and analysts in the Service's Quantitative Studies and Statistical Systems Branch provide program managers with statistical reports that assist them in managing the performance of protection for HS/HG/S and foreign missions. For instance, input data (manhours, overtime, hours out of district, etc.) are a key factor in program managers' allocation of resources (to ensure that manpower fatigue does not compromise program outcomes). Performance information is also useful in program managers' semi-annual office evaluations. Following every visiting HS/HG/S departure from the United States, the respective detail leader completes and submits a mandatory 'Detail Leader Summary Report' to the Special Agent in Charge (SAIC) of the Dignitary Protective Division. (See evidencesection for how these reports drive management actions). Similarly, pursuant to Presidential Decision Directive, USSS prepares 'After Action Reports' for National Special Security Events (NSSEs), including those NSSEs with high HS/HG/S attendance (e.g., G-8, U.N. General Assembly meetings).

Evidence: Various internal USSS training documents, operations manuals, statistical reports, and after-event reports.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Secret Service uses the USSS Senior Executive Service Performance Appraisal System to rate the performance of the Special Agent in Charge (SAIC) of the Dignitary Protective Division (FP/FM's parent division), as well as the Deputy Assistant Director (DAD) of Protective Operations and Assistant Director (AD) of Protective Operations to whom the SAIC reports. Under this system, USSS has incorporated program performance into executives' performance evaluation criteria. The system's Job Element I ('Organizational Results'), Job Element IV ('Safeguarding Against Waste, Fraud, and Loss'), Job Element VII ('Provides Support to Achieve Program Performance as Measured by the Secret Service Strategic Plan'), and Job Element VIII ('Improve Overall Secret Service Performance Based on the Measures and Targets Established in Accordance with the Secret Service's Government Performance and Results Act Performance Plan') hold the AD, DAD, and SAIC responsible for the cost, schedule, and performance of the FP/FM program.

Evidence: Secret Service Form 3241, Senior Executive Service Performance Appraisal . Position Description for SAIC of Dignitary Protective Division.

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: A portion of the FP/FM program's budget falls into those categories that the Service's Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and his Budget staff centrally manage; the CFO provides the balance of the program's funding to the Office of Protective Operations (OPO). The CFO's office ensures that all centrally-managed funds are obligated and outlayed in a timely manner (using the Department of Agriculture's National Finance Center as the Service's pay agent, executing rental obligations in accordance with the General Services Administration Schedule, etc.) Each year, the Assistant Director for Protective Operations prepares a prioritized spending plan based on his constituent programs' (including FP/FM) competing requirements for funds. The Service's CFO reviews the spending plan and provides OPO with annual funding to cover expense areas for which the office is responsible. The CFO's Budget staff uses 'status of funds' reports to ensure that OPO's programs enter into timely obligations for purposes consistent with the approved spend plan. OPO budget and finance specialists, in turn, monitor sub-allocations to FP/FM's parent division (Dignitary Protective Division) and other protective divisions/programs for which OPO is financially and operationally responsible.

Evidence: Various internal USSS financial reports.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The FP/FM program adopts new procedures to ensure the efficiency of its operations and routinely examines its business practices to ensure cost effectiveness. For example, the program has in some instances found that it can deploy canine assets, sophisticated IT and surveillance systems, etc. that result in savings of comparatively costly manpower assets while enhancing operational effectiveness. Additionally, the program utilizes the Service's Logistics Resource Center (LRC) to contain travel expenses, a primary cost driver in dignitary protective operations. Field personnel traveling for the purposes of protecting HS/HG/S receive assignments on the basis of the LRC's systematic 'city pair' cost analyses, which have reduced travel costs significantly. The Dignitary Protective Division's strategic plan makes the FP/FM program subject to evaluation on the efficiency and cost effectiveness of its operations; these evaluations have resulted in significant process improvements and cost savings. For example, as a result of recent efficiency reviews, the FP/FM program provides administrative support remotely for off-site foreign dignitary events from its Washington, DC headquarters, resulting in savings in manpower and infrastructure build-out costs while maintaining cohesive logistical support. Also, a recent feasibility study led to a consolidation of the Dignitary Protective and Major Events Divisions to, among other things, share critical services such as event credentialing and make more manpower available for HS/HG/S protection. Moreover, the Service's independent Quantitative Studies and Statistical Systems Branch provides program managers in FP/FM with labor unit costs for workload efficiency assessment. Also, the program utilizes strategic sourcing options in areas such as the acquisition of ammunition for the protection of visiting HS/HG/S and foreign missions.

Evidence: LRC major responsibilities and FAQ. Sample LRC analysis of DPD compliance with LRC procedures. Various internal USSS efficiency reports and studies.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Service provides protection to HS/HG/S throughout the entire United States; consequently, advances are necessary across the nation, based upon the itinerary of the visiting diplomat. A cornerstone of the program's approach to HS/HG/S protection is active consultation and coordination with Federal, state, and local law enforcement in the planning and execution of visit security; the Service's overall security plans incorporate the law enforcement authorities of these entities. Using intelligence-based risk assessment, the program expands the level of physical security provided to protectees by making use of available resources from local law enforcement. Similarly, in conducting activities associated with protection of foreign missions, the FP/FM program routinely coordinates with other law enforcement. Collaboration has a practical effect upon the management and allocation of resources, because state and local law enforcement's support to the program is non-reimbursable (e.g. 'outer perimeter' support that local agencies provide for HS/HG/S details, MPD's support for demonstrations, dignitary receptions.)

Evidence: List of (Federal, state, and local) law enforcement entities supporting Secret Service security plan for 2004 G-8 Summit. Various internal USSS training documents and operations manuals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The USSS issues an annual statement to DHS which "certifies" - through internally-conducted independent and alternative control reviews - that its financial systems and procedures are in compliance with Sec. 2 of the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) and Sec. 4 (financial management systems) of the Federal Financial Management Improvement Action (FFMIA). These actions review management controls to ensure, among other things, that divisions (including FP/FM's parent division [Dignitary Protective Division]), allocate resources effectively, avoid fraud and mismanagement, and prevent improper payments. Also, the ongoing financial statement audit by KPMG will ensure that payments are properly made, financial information is accurate and timely, and financial statements are clean and without material weaknesses. In the area of centrally-managed funds associated with the program, USSS has strong financial controls for recording, processing, and/or reporting. For example, USSS manages personnel compensation within its FTE ceiling through the use of a Position Identification Number system and utilizes an agency-wide gasoline tracking database system. In the area of funds allocated to the program(principally training and equipment funds), the Office of Protective Operations (OPO) monitors FP/FM's financial management; in turn, the office of the Chief Financial Officer monitors OPO's financial management. For instance, a formal system of 'Procurement Requests' and 'Training Requests' ensure that purchases are reviewed by FP/FM's parent division (Dignitary Protective Division) and parent office (Office of Protective Operations), as well as by the office of the Chief Financial Officer. This chain of reviews ensures expenditures support the program's goals and approved spending plans.

Evidence: FY 2003 Statement of Reasonable Assurance of Achievement of Management Control Objectives. 2003 Annual Administrative Control Report (Sec. 2 FMFIA). KPMG Financial Statement Audit. SSF 2041 (Procurement Request Form); SSF 182 (Training Request Form). Various internal USSS training documents and operations manuals. The Secret Service will move to a new - more modernized and efficient - financial management system in October 2004; this system (inclusive of line managers' direct access) will further strengthen all Secret Service programs' financial management practices.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:14%

Explanation: ' Protective elements undergo a thorough inspection process every two years to assess management performance and to recommend courses of action to address any deficiencies identified (inspectors are senior ranking criminal investigators). The most recent inspection of the FP/FM program's parent division (Dignitary Protective Division) did not identify any management deficiencies ("recommendations"). ' Service-wide, the FMFIA and FFMIA reviews annually ensure that efforts are made to address any management controls systems that exist. (These reviews identified no material weaknesses in FY 2003). Also, through the Office of Inspection and Management and Organization Divisions, a structured process exists to monitor and respond to open IG and GAO audit findings. ' Within the Dignitary Protective Division (DPD), a detailed system exists for identifying, recording, and correcting management deficiencies and other impediments to FP/FM program performance. Upon a foreign protectee's departure from the United States, the respective detail leader submits a mandatory 'Detail Leader Summary Report' to the Special Agent in Charge (SAIC) of DPD; DPD uses these reports to correct management deficiencies (see evidence). Similarly, pursuant to Presidential Decision Directive, USSS prepares 'After Action Reports' for National Special Security Events (NSSEs), including those NSSEs with high HS/HG/S attendance (e.g., G-8, U.N. General Assembly meetings).

Evidence: FY 2003 Statement of Reasonable Assurance of Achievement of Management Control Objectives. 2003 Annual Administrative Control Report (Sec 2 FMFIA). Management and Organization Division policy/procedure regarding audit follow-up. KPMG Financial Statement Audit. Various internal USSS training documents, operations manuals, statistical reports, and after-event reports.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 27%

Explanation: The FP/FM program continues to achieve its long-term performance goal for the protection of HS/HG/S; there have been no significant incidents related to HS/HG/S protection/safety. The FP/FM program continues to demonstrate progress in achieving its long-term performance goal for the protection of foreign missions; relative to baseline data, the rate of reported crimes against embassy personnel and property has decreased.

Evidence: Congressional budget submission. Annual Performance Plans and Reports.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 27%

Explanation: The Percentage of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely for foreign dignitaries was 100% for FY 2001 through FY 2003. According to baseline data, the Rate of Reported Crimes Against Embassy Employees and Property dropped 30.6 percent from FY 2001 to FY 2003.

Evidence: Congressional budget submission. Annual Performance Plans and Reports.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: YES Question Weight: 27%

Explanation: Between FY 2001 and FY 2003, foreign dignitary travel stops increased from 1,147 to 1,849, representing a 60 percent increase in protective activity. During this same period, resources devoted to HS/HG/S protection increased at a slower 55 percent rate, reflecting a small improvement in efficiency. Resources devoted to foreign missions security dropped 30 percent between FY 2001 and FY 2003. During this same period, there was a 30.6 percent improvement in the annual performance measure.

Evidence: Various internal USSS statistical reports.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Given the high profile of the individuals and facilities protected by the program, no comparable private sector programs exist. (Risk exposure is high due to the national and international prominence of the individuals [visiting HS/HG/S] and facilities [foreign missions] involved). Additionally, the sensitive nature of the program's protective operations is such that under no circumstances would the Secret Service share with private security firms the data and methods that would be necessary to facilitate a meaningful comparison. The program has not engaged in comparative analyses with other federal, state, or local law enforcement agencies' protective programs or elements. Just as the Secret Service is hesitant to share its data and methods with external entities, other agencies' operational security concerns would limit the availability of the data necessary to carry out a complete and reasonable comparison with similar programs. Lastly, it should be noted that security agencies and firms throughout the nation and the world view the Secret Service as a model for protective services and methods.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:10%

Explanation: ' Independent statisticians and analysts in the Service's Quantitative Studies and Statistical Systems Branch use the Workload Statistical and Reporting System to provide FP/FM managers with routine (at least monthly) reports containing input, output, and outcome indicators. These data alone demonstrate that the FP/FM program is effective and achieving (FP), or progressing toward achieving (FM), the results detailed in answers 4.1 and 4.2. ' While not needed to demonstrate the FP/FM program's effectiveness in achieving results, other, ad-hoc independent evaluations have impacted upon the program's efficiency (ex. ' Analytical Support Branch study that resulted in the merger of Dignitary Protective and Major Events Division; interagency study of optimal Uniformed Division (UD) Staffing that affected staffing in UD's Foreign Missions Branch). Other independent evaluations (Blue Teaming and Table Top exercises) enhanced subsequent program performance (at major events with large HS/HG/S attendance) by identifying and rectifying potential security weaknesses on a pre-event basis. ' Finally, the program's parent division (Dignitary Protective Division) undergoes a thorough "Inspection" process every two years. Secret Service inspections assess effectiveness of operations (see Evidence section for statement of aggregate results); quality of management and supervision; and adherence to policies, regulations, and procedures. Inspectors are senior ranking criminal investigators independent of the program's and the division's chain of command.

Evidence: Various internal USSS operations manuals, statistical reports, efficiency studies, and management analyses.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

Measure: Percentage of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely - Foreign Dignitaries

Additional Information: The security of protectees is the ultimate priority of the USSS. This measure represents the percentage of travel stops where the protectee safely arrives and departs. The performance target is always 100%. Anything under 100% is unacceptable.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	100%	100%	
2002	100%	100%	
2003	100%	100%	
2004	100%		
2005	100%		
2006	100%		

Measure: Travel Stops - Foreign Dignitaries, which represents increased risk and level of effort required to provide security

Additional Information: This measure represents the level of travel by protectees of the USSS. A stop is considered a city or other definable subdivision visited by a protectee. As a rule, risk and the level of effort required to provide security increases dramatically when a protectee is traveling. Because the number of stops in a given year is completely driven by protectees, the target given should be interpreted as an estimate.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	1,700	1,147	
2002	1,700	2,345	
2003	2,000	1,849	
2004	2,000		
2005	2,000		
2006	2,000		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

Measure: Rate of Reported Crimes Against Embassy Personnel and Property - Foreign Missions

Additional Information: This measure reports the rate (per 100 embassies) of known crimes directed at embassy personnel and property. (For security reasons, detailed data classified as law enforcement sensitive.)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001			
2002			
2003			
2004			
2005			
2006			

Measure: Foreign Protection/Mission Efficiency Index -- Measure Under Development

Additional Information: This measure will be a weighted index reflecting changes in efficiency compared to the base period.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2005			
2006			

Measure: Percentage of Instances Protectees (Foreign Dignitaries) Arrive and Depart Safely

Additional Information: The security of protectees is the ultimate priority of the USSS. This measure represents the percentage of travel stops where the protectee safely arrives and departs. The performance target is always 100%. Anything under 100% is unacceptable.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2001	100%	100%	
2002	100%	100%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Dignitary Protective Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	78%	

2003	100%	100%
2004	100%	
2005	100%	
2006	100%	

Measure: Rate of Reported Crimes Against Embassy Personnel and Property - Foreign Missions

Additional Information: This measure reports the rate (per 100 embassies) of known crimes directed at embassy personnel and property. (For security reasons, detailed data classified as law enforcement sensitive.)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2001			
2002			
2003			
2004			
2005			
2006			

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Formula Grant

Name of Program: Hazard Mitigation Grant

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	yes	The purpose of the program is to reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and to enable mitigation measures to be implemented in the immediate aftermath of a disaster.	This is the stated purpose of the program in the Stafford Act.	20%	0.2
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	yes	All parts of the nation are vulnerable to natural hazards including earthquakes, floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, and now terrorist attacks. Many people build, live, and work in areas at particular risk. This program helps adapt the built environment to these risks.	Historic disaster declarations since 1964 show that all parts of the nation have been impacted at one time or another by various types of disasters.	20%	0.2
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The program provides significant Federal resources for mitigation projects, since States can receive up to an additional 20% of FEMA disaster relief spending for HMGP projects. Further, the program requires a 25% non-Federal match, which leverages the Federal funding.	Overall, FEMA cost effectiveness data suggests that benefits of the program outweigh the costs by a factor of 2 to 1.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	This is the Federal government's largest and most comprehensive multihazard mitigation grant program. Other government programs address flood mitigation, but more so through structural (e.g., dikes, dams, levees, etc.) measures, while the HMGP's focus for flood-related projects is non-structural (e.g., home buyouts, relocations, etc.). However, it is not clear how a great a contribution this program makes relative to the efforts of state and local governments and the private sector, or whether HMGP duplicates some of those efforts.	Three Federal flood mitigation programs, including the HMGP, are being reviewed as part of the common performance measure cross cut.	20%	0.2
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	<p>The program allocates funds to States based on a formula rather than on need.</p> <p>The program sets a low hurdle for project eligibility determinations. By requiring that mitigation projects only just clear a benefit-cost threshold of 1:1, the program has no effective mechanism for ensuring that the limited spending available for mitigation is targeted to projects yielding the greatest benefits.</p> <p>The program reserves a significant portion of funds for projects for which FEMA requires no benefit-cost determination. Without assessing the benefits and costs, allocating spending to such projects inhibits an assessment of the effectiveness of the program.</p> <p>The post-disaster focus of the program takes advantage of the heightened awareness stemming from recent disasters to focus State/local attention on mitigation needs. However, a pre-disaster focus would target funding to areas of greatest risk.</p>	<p>Funding is based on a formula (15-20% of other FEMA disaster grant spending for each disaster), obscuring the alignment of funding with actual needs.</p> <p>An OMB review of projects funded from 1993-2000 showed a significant clustering of projects funded around the benefit-cost threshold of 1:1, although higher benefit-cost ratios for some projects pulled the overall average for all projects up to about 2:1.</p> <p>From 1993-2000, 24% of spending was exempted from benefit-cost review, including projects involving planning, hazard warning systems, and demolition of structures in special flood hazard areas.</p> <p>Using FEMA's HAZUS and other risk identification tools, the program could be optimized to target the highest risk needs and projects that would offer the greatest cost-benefit return.</p>	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					100%	80%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
-----------	------	-------------	---------------	-----------	----------------

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	No	FEMA does have a long term goal for the program that is tied to the dollar value of avoided property damage. Also, FEMA measures the dollar value of potential avoided property damage for most projects. Yet FEMA does not have a goal to optimize the program by striving to support the most highly cost effective mitigation projects. Failure to optimize the program hinders its effectiveness. (The common performance measures exercise for flood mitigation programs uses the benefit-cost ratio as a metric for assessment.)	<i>FEMA FY 2003-08 strategic plan goal 1.2: "By FY2008, \$10B in potential property losses and disaster costs will have been avoided."</i> HMGP will contribute \$2.45B of avoided losses to this goal. This assumes a 2:1 return on mitigation investments, though it is not clear that target is sufficiently ambitious. OMB review has found that HMGP projects in the past have benefit ratios averaging about 2:1.	14%	0.0
2 <i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	FEMA does have an annual performance goal for the program that is tied to the dollar value of avoided property damage. Also, FEMA measures the dollar value of potential avoided property damage for most projects. Even though FEMA's long term goal for the program is imperfect, the annual goal does demonstrate progress toward achievement of the longer term goal.	For FY2004, HMGP has an annual performance goal of reducing potential property losses and disaster costs by \$490 million. This contribution supports the agency's annual performance plan goal of reducing damage by disasters, as well as the longer term goal cited in Section II, #1, above.	14%	0.1
3 <i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	The Disasters Mitigation of 2000 (DMA2000) recently amended the Stafford Act to require that states and locals have FEMA-approved mitigation plans to receive HMGP funds. Other FEMA guidance to States reflects the HMGP's goals and strategies.	<i>Stafford Act (section 322)</i>	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	No	Different Federal agencies including the Corps of Engineers, USDA, and FEMA fund buyouts of structures from the floodplain. However, they each have different priorities, procedures, and requirements of local governments and stakeholders. These differences have been cited as impediments for local governments to undertaking mitigation projects.	<i>Proceedings: 24th Annual Conference, Association of State Floodplain Managers, A Uniform Buyout Program with Different Funding Sources</i>	14%	0.0
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	Yes	The IG and GAO routinely conduct studies, reviews, and audits of various aspects of the HMGP. In addition, the Multihazard Mitigation Council (MMC) is conducting a study on the costs & benefits of mitigation, as requested by congress in FEMA's FY 2000 appropriations language. However, some FEMA contracted studies were not designed to provide meaningful evaluations of gaps in knowledge about the program's performance (for the example the PWC study on benefit-cost ratios for exempted projects).	Various IG and GAO reports, including Hurricane Floyd Special Buyout Authority (2/01), Status of Funds (7/01) and Repetitive Loss (5/02). MMC study re: the costs & benefits of mitigation; FEMA grant close-out teams; summer 2002 grants guidance memos; documentation re: FEMA/state focus group on status of funds (9/02).	14%	0.1
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	No	Although the program is dependent on annual appropriations, by statute the program is essentially formula-funded. Following disasters, States receive up to an additional 20% of FEMA disaster relief spending for mitigation projects. This funding mechanism does not allow the agency to align budget requirements with performance goals.	The 2003 Budget proposes redesigning the program to make it a competitive grant program administered by FEMA. Top goals are to target known risks, such as repetitive loss properties, and to maximize the cost effectiveness of mitigation projects.	14%	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The 2003 Budget proposes to transform the program into create a competitive grant program, with the objective of enabling more effective strategic planning and targeting national mitigation priorities.	2003 Budget	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					100%	57%

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	Grantees are required to submit quarterly reports to FEMA documenting progress and funds expended on projects underway. FEMA uses this information to track program performance, and to identify States that need additional oversight or technical assistance from FEMA.	Quarterly reports from states; financial data reports	10%	0.1
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	Grantees are required to submit quarterly reports to FEMA, documenting progress and funds expended on projects underway. FEMA disaster close out teams also review the status of funds and can recommend deobligating funds that have no apparent use by the States.	Quarterly reports from states; financial data reports	10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	FEMA obligates awards in a timely manner, yet disburses funds very slowly. This is largely because FEMA has awarded mitigation funds to States even though they though they may lack the capacity to administer the grants. FEMA is making progress in this area after the IG published a critical report on this issue in July, 2001.	According to an IG report, as of April 2001, FEMA had disbursed only 48% of the \$2.5B it had obligated between 1989 and that year. As of June 2002, FEMA and the states have disbursed 64% of the HMGP funds made available to date. In addition, as of June 2002, FEMA has obligated 74% of allocated funds to the HMGP for outstanding disasters (OIG reported only 50% obligation rate as of April 2001).	10%	0.1
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	FEMA's authorization allows it to provide increased HMGP funding (from 15 to 20%) if States develop more detailed mitigation plans. This capability often corresponds with the capability to administer HMGP grants. Under the Managing States program, States can assume this administrative responsibility, which may potentially reducing Federal management costs. However, FEMA still does not require cost effectiveness determinations for all projects for which funding is allocated.	Data is needed to show efficiencies achieved from the Managing States program.	10%	0.1
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	No	Neither FEMA nor the Congress explicitly budget for this program since it is funded from the Disaster Relief Fund. FEMA funds project grants as well as overhead administrative expensive from the DRF, which is replenished periodically by annual appropriations and emergency supplementals.	2003 Budget	15%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	No	FEMA's IG reports that until its review in July 2001, FEMA has had "insufficient maintenance and oversight of pertinent financial and programmatic data." FEMA IG indicates the program continues to have significant deficiencies in the area of grants management, although the program has taken positive steps to improve performance.	<i>July 2001 IG Report: "Status of Funds Awarded the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program and Other project Management Issues."</i>	15%	0.0
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	Grants management problems persist, though FEMA has undertaken a number of management improvement initiatives including: use of financial management data & close-outs teams to monitor timely obligation & liquidation of funds; issuing new policy & procedures guidance to ensure more timely use of funds; updating training and technical assistance offered to states & communities; periodic reviews of state mitigation programs to ensure appropriate use of funds & strengthen program management; & establishment of a state/FEMA focus group to address grants management issues.	<i>OIG report on Status of Funds</i>	10%	0.1
8 (B 1.)	<i>Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?</i>	No	FEMA has improved its monitoring of the status of undisbursed balances, although improvement is needed in this area. Further, FEMA also excludes a large portion of projects from cost benefit analysis entirely, and FEMA allows states to flexibly interpret FEMA guidance when conducting benefit-cost calculations.	July 2001 IG Report: "Status of Funds Awarded the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program and Other project Management Issues." An August 1999 GAO report found, from its sample, that FEMA conducted cost benefit analyses on only 58% of projects (in terms of dollars). A subsequent OMB review of projects from 1993-2000 found a smaller, although still problematic, percentage of projects for which cost benefit data was not recorded.	10%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (B 2.) <i>Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?</i>	Yes	FEMA provides reports to the public on the program's performance as part of its annual performance report. However, FEMA will not begin to report on avoided property damage, a more meaningful measure than those reported in the past, until its 2003 annual performance report.	<i>Annual Performance & Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2001</i>	10%	0.1

Total Section Score	100%	60%
----------------------------	-------------	------------

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goals?</i>	No	In previous years, FEMA's long term goals for the program have not been insufficiently specific and outcome-focused. FEMA will begin reporting the value of avoided property damage starting in 2003.	<i>FEMA 2003 Strategic Plan</i>	25%	0.0

<p>Long-Term Goal I: By FY 2008, \$10B in potential property losses, disaster, and other costs have been avoided (of which \$2.45B will be contributed through the efforts of the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program).</p> <p>Target: \$2.45B in potential property losses, disaster, and other costs avoided by FY 2008</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal: N/A. Reporting to begin in 2003.</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal II:</p> <p>Target: _____</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal: _____</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal III:</p> <p>Target: _____</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal: _____</p>

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	<i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Small Exten	The program has achieved annual targets for performance goals established in the past. These goals and targets are insufficiently outcome-focused and provide, only to a small extent, an indication of progress toward long term desired outcomes. FEMA will begin reporting the value of avoided property damage starting in 2003.	FEMA, "Annual Performance & Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2001"	25%	0.1
<p>Key Goal I: <u>Increase community resistance to natural hazards and prevent future losses from hazards.</u></p> <p>Performance Target: <u>Reduce by 5,000 the number of lives at risk, reduce by 2,200 the number of structures at risk, reduce by 150 the elements of infrastructure at risk. Increase by 500 the number of communities where actions are taken to foster disaster</u></p> <p>Actual Performance: <u>For 2001, a reduction of 11,274 lives at risk, 10,528 structures at higher risk, 305 elements of infrastructure at risk; and an increase of 520 communities taking actions to foster disaster resistance.</u></p> <p>Key Goal II:</p> <p>Performance Target:</p> <p>Actual Performance:</p> <p>Key Goal III:</p> <p>Performance Target:</p> <p>Actual Performance:</p>						
Footnote: Performance targets should reference the performance baseline and years, e.g. achieve a 5% increase over base of X in 2000.						
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Small Exter	FEMA has taken some steps to improve its management practices. For example, FEMA has developed fast track acquisition projects and improved its technical assistance for establishing safe rooms, especially group shelters. However, the FEMA IG reports that the program still faces significant challenges in the area of grants management. Further, FEMA lacks data to demonstrate increased efficiencies that were achieved through improved management practices.	There are no data available about increased efficiencies or productivity.	25%	0.1
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	NA	For non-flood hazard mitigation, there are no comparable Federal programs. For flood mitigation programs, it is expected FEMA will compare well in terms of the average benefit-cost ratio of projects, which is the subject of a common performance measures exercise.	Data is under development.	0%	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Yes	An independent review has found that most projects have positive benefit-cost ratios, which suggests the program is effective overall. However, no comprehensive evaluations have considered the structure of the program, which inhibits its effectiveness.	FEMA data reveals that, historically, the average benefit-cost ratio for HMGP projects is 2.65. However, 44% of projects have benefit-cost ratios of 1.25 or less.	25%	0.3
Total Section Score					100%	42%

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: Immigration Services

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)					
Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Score
1 <i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	The Immigration Services program's mission is to provide immigration information and benefits for customers in a timely, accurate, consistent, courteous, and professional manner.	INS Mission Statement, Immigration Services Business Plan 2002 -- 2012, DOJ Strategic Plan Fiscal Years 2001 -- 2006.	20%	0.2
2 <i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	INS has the sole legislative authority to grant or deny immigration benefits. The Immigration Services Program addresses the particular need of administering laws and provides services related to people seeking to enter, reside and work in the United States.	Immigration Act, Immigration Reform Act, LIFE Act, NACARA, Appropriations Law, Applicable Executive Orders, Immigration Services Business Plan 2002 -- 2012, DOJ Strategic Plan Fiscal Years 2001 -- 2006.	20%	0.2
3 <i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The Federal impact in immigration benefits is significant since INS has the sole legislative authority to grant or deny immigration benefits. The Immigration Services Program is aimed at providing entitled applicants benefits quickly and accurately, and to inform and provide service to customers. Backlog reduction and business process reengineering initiatives help measure the impact of the INS role, and automation and online filing, enable INS to improve the efficiency, timeliness and quality of decisions and decrease the occurrence of fraud. While INS is accountable for immigration benefits, the Service does depend on data and actions of the Department of State and FBI in parts of it's process.	Immigration Services Business Plan 2002 -- 2012.	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Score
4 <i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	Since INS has the sole legislative authority to grant or deny immigration benefits, the program is not duplicative of other programs. Immigration Services Program includes: 1) Family-based petitions for permission for close relatives to immigrate, gain permanent residency, etc; 2) Employment-based petitions for permission for current and prospective employees to immigrate or stay in the United States temporarily; 3) Residence and status renewal, verification, and record-keeping for eligible persons; 4) Naturalization for eligible persons who wish to become United States citizens; 5) Special status programs such as Temporary Protected Status and Asylum in instances where the United States offers such status as a form of humanitarian aid to foreign nationals.	Immigration Act, Immigration Reform Act, LIFE Act, NACARA, Appropriations Law, Applicable Executive Orders, Immigration Services Business Plan 2002 -- 2012	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Score
5 <i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	Though INS has made a number of improvements in the last several years, INS is not yet designed to quickly respond to outside events (e.g. 9/11, background checks) or legislation/policies implemented to meet the needs of special populations that cause sudden increases in the workload. As the volume and variety of applications has risen dramatically, INS has been challenged to determine new ways to utilize and balance staffing and resources to address new programs in sufficient quantity and quality as well as handle expansion to existing programs. INS has made efforts to reduce the strain caused by backlogs and manage within the existing infrastructure as program improvements are introduced. INS is working to modernize and increase its capacity through reengineering of processes, development of new IT systems, and mechanisms to more proactively interact with customers. To systematically improve processes is one of the overarching strategies in the Immigration Services Business plan.	LIFE Act, Temporary Protected Status (TPS), Repercussions from 9/11, Executive Orders, National Security Entry Exit Registration System, Immigration Services Business Plan 2002 -- 2012. GAO and IG Reports.	20%	0.0

Total Section Score	100%	80%
----------------------------	-------------	------------

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	Yes	The President's plan is to provide \$500 million for the next five years to reduce processing times to six months or less for all immigration benefit applications. Performance goals are to maintain processing times of 6-months or less for all application types; establish quality procedures for form types; create a culture of customer service as an integral component of benefits application processing. INS Services business plan includes specific long term outcome goals with measures and intermediate goals across four key objectives.	DOJ APP FYs 2003 and 2004, Presidential Initiative	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Score
2 <i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	The Backlog Elimination Plan is based on a set of milestones to achieve the President's goal of a six month or less processing time for all immigration benefit applications. Goals include Average Case Processing Time (Naturalization and Adjustment of Status); Level of compliance with NQP (and baseline Adjustment of Status); and Expand electronic filing efforts.	DOJ APP FYs 2003 and 2004.	14%	0.1
3 <i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	Contract support partners include data entry and mailroom staffing at the Service Centers, customer service representatives at the National Customer Service Center, and fingerprint technicians at the Application Support Centers. As part of performance based contracts, contractors agree to the goals of the program and structure work to achieve them. Numerical and processing time goals established through the INS program plans and Backlog Elimination Plan provide Regional and District-level targets. The Backlog Elimination Plan targets are updated semi-annually to reflect changing receipt levels, actual accomplishments and changes in priorities.	DOJ APP FYs 2003 and 2004, Immigration Benefit Application Backlog Elimination Plan, Immigration Services Business Plan 2002 -- 2012, Relevant Performance Based Contracts w/ goals included.	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Score
4 <i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	INS coordinates with the Department of State and Department of Labor in the data-share initiative to electronically share traveler visa and application information to improve the issuance process and improve identification of fraudulent visas. The Student and Exchange Visitors program is directed by INS in partnership with the Department of State and Department of Education. INS is participating in the Department of Transportation-led initiative for On-line Rulemaking and the SBA-led initiative to provide one-stop services to small businesses in support of the Presidential initiative to provide citizen one-stop service delivery integrated through Firstgov.gov, cross-agency call centers, and offices or service centers. INS is also participating on Intergovernmental e-gov initiative with DOL on deploying E-grants.	DataShare Initiative, E-gov initiatives, SEVP	14%	0.1
5 <i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	Yes	GAO and DOJ's Office of Inspector General conduct performance and program reviews of INS Services through regular audits (including financial) and special reviews of particular portions of the program. INS' Office of Internal Audit conducts adjudication reviews at the District Offices (INSpect). The first large-scale quality assurance program within immigration benefits was the Naturalization Quality Procedures (NQP) which was designed in response to specific concerns regarding the integrity of the naturalization program. NQP reviews are conducted by INS' Quality Assurance Analysts, an internal group that performs periodic evaluations.	INSpect Review Guide District Adjudication Program, Immigration Services Business Plan 2002 -- 2012. INS Backlog Elimination Plan	14%	0.1
6 <i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	No	Although INS' budget structure is generally aligned by program and account and identifies services versus enforcement programs, support and administrative costs are still budgeted separately. In FY 2004, INS will improve upon this structure by further collapsing programs and account structures to better align the program budget with program goals. The Immigration Service Business Plan also envisions an integrated strategic planning and budget process.	FY 2003 President's Budget; Immigration Services Business Plan 2002 -- 2012, FY 02 Appropriations Law, backlog elimination initiative.	14%	0.0
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	INS undertook a significant strategic planning and business process improvement effort. Immigration Services Program Business Plan 2002 -- 2012 and the Backlog Reduction Plan address deficiencies previously identified.	Immigration Services Business Plan 2002 -- 2012 and the Immigration Benefits Application Backlog Elimination Plan	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Score
Total Section Score				100%	86%

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?	Yes	INS used a comprehensive, uniform workload analysis to develop the initial backlog elimination plan. In order to achieve the performance goals, INS works with field offices and contractors to establish production plans. INS uses these plans both to monitor office progress toward the backlog reduction milestones and to plan for future activities. INS identifies and resolves obstacles specific to individual offices to increase production. Also, INS has developed a production management course for field managers. The course provides managers with new and significant tools to help them address continuing production challenges, and moves II offices toward increased efficiency. In addition, INS uses review teams to conduct on-site studies of immigration benefit application processing at essential field offices. These reviews help identify constraining factors as well as promulgate best practices. Also, Production Management Division (PMD) monitors, assesses and verifies case completion data. In coordination with the PAS management office, PMD adjusts counts as necessary and works with field offices to revise procedures to prevent future errors.	Management Discussion & Analysis Section of DOJ Accountability Reports; Immigration Benefits Application Backlog Elimination Plan. Bi-monthly meetings w/ Community Based Organizations, Performance Based Contracts w/ goals included.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Score
2	Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?	No	At this time, INS managers are not held accountable. Immigration Services will implement performance incentives in FY 2003. The program will steer employee performance toward the achievement of plan goals rather than on historical performance. Under the performance incentives program, INS will distribute awards to the staff of offices based on a variety of measures, including achievement of backlog reduction milestones and maintenance of quality assurance standards. To ensure that the program does not reward production over quality, offices that meet or exceed backlog reduction milestones will not be eligible for awards if they fail to maintain quality assurance standards. INS utilizes performance-based contracts at Service Centers in support of INS goals. The work of the Service Centers relates to about 70% of the entire benefits workload. The performance based contracts include both goals and incentives for contract employees. Immigration Services is also developing a human resource management program that will ensure Immigration Services Program staff are available, and motivated to work together to achieve the Program's performance objectives.	Immigration Services Business Plan 2002 -- 2012, Congressional Reporting, Commissioner's Monthly Report, Performance-based contracts	14%	0.0
3	Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?	No	In a GAO study, it was reported that INS was not making timely deposits of application fees pursuant to Treasury guidelines. Steps have been taken to address the problem. INS now requires Service Center data entry contractors to deposit fees timely in line with Treasury guidelines. Also, INS is moving forward with lockbox operations which assures real-time deposits of fees. However, no audit has been undertaken to verify that INS is now in compliance with Treasury guidelines. INS does have a detailed operating plan which identifies how the funds will be used to meet performance targets.	GAO Report (GAO/GGD 00-185); Detailed INS Operating Plans, Lockbox procedures, Quarterly Financial Reviews, Reprogrammings.	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Score
4	Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?	Yes	INS' IT Investment Management (ITIM) process was designed to be consistent with DOJ guidelines and meet GAO maturity model requirements. The ITIM process also provides a structured management methodology to standardize and facilitate oversight of IT activities for both proposals and approved projects. The Immigration Benefits Portfolio Manager updates the IT 300s for major systems to justify IT proposals and manage investments once funded. Where feasible, Immigration Services lets performance based or firm-fixed price contracts to achieve cost efficiencies. Currently, the Service Centers and NCSC have performance based contracts in place; the STARS vehicle is a modified version of cost plus award.	IT Investment Management (ITIM) Overview, Immigration Services Business Plan, Performance Based Contracts for key functions & systems.	14%	0.1
5	Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?	No	INS is required by law to review fees every two years to ensure that it is recovering the full cost of processing immigration benefit applications. INS must recover full costs in order to process immigration benefit applications in a timely and quality manner. The INS Services Budget, however, does not currently have all administrative and support costs in it. That integration is planned for FY 2004.	Fee Reviews; fee regulations; appropriations law.	14%	0.0
6	Does the program use strong financial management practices?	No	INS has a standing material weakness on automated systems for case processing. Current systems do not allow INS to compute/report deferred revenue. Manual inventories are required. However, INS received unqualified opinions on both the FY 2000 and FY 2001 financial statements and is working to remedy the problem.	FY 2000 & FY 2001 DOJ Accountability Reports	14%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Score
7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?	Yes	INS has a system for identifying, correcting, and following up on deficiencies. INS' Office of Internal Audit (OIA) independently reviews and evaluates the efficiency and effectiveness of INS programs and operations and analyzes trends to identify patterns of deficiency or other weaknesses that may warrant investigative or audit follow-up. OIA performs this function through comprehensive INSpect reviews of all field offices over a 2-year period and through other special reviews. Recommendations are provided to senior headquarters and field management. OIA also tracks and follows up on all corrective actions in response to OIG, GAO, and DOJ/JMD audits. INS is also working to remedy specific deficiencies. Work is well underway to incorporate service wide inventory functionality into the National File Tracking System in FY 2003 to produce real-time data for pending applications and completions. During FY 2004, the INS expects to begin to deploy a new benefits case management and tracking system to provide "stage of completion" data that will support more refined earned revenue information, as well as performance efficiency and effectiveness.	INSpect Adjudications Review Guide, schedule of planned visits to INS facilities, INSpect Alerts, Office of Internal Audit bulletins, Special Review Reports, and Naturalization Quality Assurance Reports.	14%	0.1

Total Section Score **100%** **43%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	Large Extent	INS has reduced processing times for naturalization and adjustment of status cases over the last several years. A comprehensive plan to reduce all applications to a processing time goal of six months or less began in FY 2002.	Annual Performance Plans; Backlog Elimination Plan; Monthly Backlog Elimination Plan Report	20%	0.1

Long-Term Goal I: Eliminate backlog of applications and maintain 6 month processing time for all applications.
Target: Nationwide average by end of FY 2003. Individual Field Offices by end of FY 2004
Actual Progress achieved INS has successfully reduced processing times for Naturalization and Adjustment of Status cases over the last several years. As of June toward goal: 2002, Naturalization and Adjustment of Status case processing times were 12 & 11 months, respectively. A comprehensive plan to reduce all applications to a processing time goal of six months or less began in FY 2002.

Long-Term Goal II: Introduce Electronic Filing for Applications Process
Target: All Approved Forms Available Online. Two Form/Applications that can be Filed Online by close of FY 2002, Ten by close of FY 2003.

Actual Progress achieved INS achieved 85% (97 of 113) of forms available online in FY 2001. The constant change in regulations and forms precludes INS from toward goal: achieving 100% at any given point. INS E-filing is delayed. The Service now needs to issue proposed regulations on electronic signatures instead of an interim-final rule.

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Score
2 <i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Large Extent	In FY 2001, INS achieved its average case processing time goals for Naturalization and Adjustment of Status applications. Increases in some processing times occurred in FY 2002 due to the requirement to do background checks on applicants. In addition, an unexpected inflow of change of address forms has created a new backlog.	FY 2001 DOJ Performance Report.	20%	0.1
<p>Key Goal I: FY 2001 Naturalization Average Case Processing Time Performance Target: 9 months (baseline: 27 months) Actual Performance: 9 months</p>					
<p>Key Goal II: FY 2001 Adjustment of Status Average Case Processing Time Performance Target: 14 months (baseline: 27 months) Actual Performance: 14 months</p>					
<p>Key Goal III: Level of Compliance with Naturalization Quality Procedures (NQP) Performance Target: 99% Actual Performance: INS has achieved this goal for the past three fiscal years (FYs 1999, 2000, & 2001).</p>					
Footnote: Performance targets should reference the performance baseline and years, e.g. achieve a 5% increase over base of X in 2000.					
<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Large Extent	INS has reduced processing times for naturalization and adjustment of status cases over the last several years. INS monitors efficiency via completions per hour for all applications as part of its backlog elimination plan. On average, completions per hour have increased 13% from FY 2001 through July 31, 2002.	Backlog Elimination Plan; Performance Analysis System; Workload and Staffing Model	20%	0.1
3 <i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Small Extent	INS has benchmarked with other agencies such as SSA, IRS, VA and Patent & Trademark that are involved in Service provision or that award financial benefits. INS is examining areas where differences were noted, e.g., customer and employee satisfaction measures. INS continues to address customer service as a component of benefit processing. As of September 2002, applicants can now check case status online and INS will post reports with processing time data on the Internet as well.	Immigration Services Business Plan 2002-2012 and INS Commissioner's Monthly Performance Report.	20%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Score
4 <i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Small Extent	INS has consistently struggled with an inability to provide immigrants with timely decisions on their applications for such benefits as naturalization and legal permanent residence. INS continues to experience problems managing its application workload. Automation improvements have helped. INS also continues to make improvements in the internal controls of the naturalization process and has reduced the risk of incorrectly naturalizing an applicant. In addition, the DOJ/OIG reviewed INS's Telephone Information Service and found: "customer service representatives, with few exceptions, provided correct answers to our questions, answered the questions promptly, and provided us with professional assistance."		20%	0.1
5				100%	53%
Total Section Score					

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Inspection Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	38%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: As the guardian of America's borders charged with to safeguarding the homeland at beyond and the borders, CBP has developed and deployed a layered systems approach of integrated and advanced technologies to focus on high-risk and priority interdiction and enforcement issues which allows for balancing protection of our Nations' economic security through lawful international trade and travel with addressing threats to our security from terrorists and the instruments of terror. Inspection technology includes any device, machine, automated system, or information technology that enhances the capability of CBP personnel to conduct activities associated with the anti-terrorism mission to include the inspection of cargo, mail, conveyances or passengers, the collection and screening of electronic cargo and passenger information for high risk transactions, and/or the reporting of results and the tracking of operational efficiencies.

Evidence: CBP's Mission Statement clearly defines our purpose: We are the guardians of our Nation's borders. We are America's frontline. We safeguard the American homeland at and beyond our borders. We protect the American public against terrorists and the instruments of terror. We steadfastly enforce the laws of the United States while fostering our Nation's economic security through lawful international trade and travel. We serve the American public with vigilance, integrity and professionalism.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Technology is used to increase advanced data regarding incoming and outgoing people, conveyances and goods; to improve targeting; and, to modernize automated processing systems, in order to facilitate the movement of legitimate trade and people efficiently without compromising security. Inspection Technology programs support both the President's Management Agenda and Agency and Departmental Strategic Goals.

Evidence: CBP's mandate requires investment in and implementation of innovative strategies. Layered Inspection Technology in this analysis includes: Non-Intrusive Inspections (NII), the Automated Targeting System (ATS) used to target high risk travelers and cargo and dramatically enhances the ability of CBP to inspect conveyances and cargo for weapons of mass destruction, terrorist activities, narcotics, undeclared currency and contraband; IDENT (the automated Biometric Identification System - used in the US VISIT program), SENTRI (a voluntary, fee-based system to facilitate low-risk travelers), QMVRs (Queing Measurement Vehicle Recognition System that targets and tracks vehicles entering the U.S.), CAOS (Customs Automated Operations System) which schedules random enforcement operations to combat smugglers' surveillance, BSDP (Border Security Deployment Project) which provides monitored surveillance systems 24/7 at Ports of Entry (POEs), the AES (Automated Export System) which provides information to target exports, ENFORCE (Enforcement Case Tracking System) which processes cases and management functions in a single system, and APIS (Advanced Passenger Information System) which provides data on all inbound passengers and crew.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Inspection Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	38%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Inspection Technology is designed to facilitate mission achievement by developing and implementing secure systems and an information technology infrastructure that enhances information flow to stakeholders, as well as by partnering with homeland security and law enforcement agencies. No other government agency or private sector organization offers the layers of inspection technology capabilities and performance to provide cargo and passenger information and meet security requirements. CBP is the only agency responsible for the safety of our borders, etc. No other federal, state or local agencies are at the borders inspecting cargo and targeting travelers for anti-terrorist stuff and CBP is the only agency that checks and can allow or not allow a traveler into the country.

Evidence: Several examples of CBPs efforts to minimize to potential for redundant systems is in ATS access granted to personnel from other government agencies such as Department of Commerce, Bureau of Industry and Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of State, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Food and Drug Administration. These agency personnel meet systems security requirements, have positively adjudicated background checks, and a "need to know" concerning the information in ATS. Another example is the AES, which is the only system in either the government or private sector, that collects statistical information on exports. The BSDP provides monitored surveillance systems enhancing the security infrastructure for all POEs on the Northern and Southwest borders by remote video equipment and intrusion detection systems providing 24/7 monitoring and alert procedures in cases of detection of intrusion, reducing the need for personnel and overtime expenditures while increasing information.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: For each of the Inspection Technology systems in this analysis, the systems and their implementation are free of major flaws that could impede their effectiveness.

Evidence: Both regularly scheduled and random reviews are part of all of the inspection technology programs. These reviews evaluate specific system processes and identify major and minor flaws and provide direction to make the appropriate corrections to improve the program or make the necessary adjustments.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Inspection Technology program is targeted so resources directly address the program's purpose by increasing the overall efficacy of Inspection programs, facilitating CBP Officers' efforts and efforts allowing them to maximize their time and focus. By using technology and automation as force multipliers, CBP is able to focus its resources on higher-risk cargo and passengers. The additional level of analysis facilitates timely processing of legitimate travel and trade.

Evidence: One example is the installation of the BSDP at non-24 hour POEs. Once fully operational, the staff that has been operating 24/7 at the non-24 hour POEs are able to resume to its original state prior to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. This frees up obligated staffing resources to be deployed elsewhere. BSDP's goal is to provide this 24/7 video surveillance coverage at all non-24 hour POEs. Another example is the ENFORCE program which has improved standardization and simplification of booking apprehended individuals and has increase consistency in data reporting. Targeting expedites legitimate trade and travel which benefits to the public and trade world by keeping costs lower and having goods more readily available.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Inspection Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	38%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The programs included in Inspection Technology have several specific long-term performance measures and strategic goals that focus on outcomes. Many/Most of the Inspection Technology programs have recently completed or are currently completing a Business Case evaluation which specifically identifies long term performance measures, goals, outcomes, costs, and other evaluative factors. The BSDP has a number of log-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program to deter attempts at the Northern Border by potential terrorists and/or smugglers at non-24 hour POEs during the hours the POE is closed and unmanned.

Evidence: For example. Long-term performance measures focusing on outcomes include the Targeting Selectivity efficiency rate (TSR) in ATS, which is measured by (incidental + positive personal searches/total of all personal searches {positives+negatives+incidentals}). Another measure is to maintain 100% ATS processing of APIS data received. An annual output measure being used in ATS is the number of shipments related to the targeting mode that scored over the targeting score threshold. Baseline measures are being set in for this target in sea cargo, border trucks, and rails. Once the baseline is set this year, the target is set to an annual 10% increase. Goals for ATS are projected from the current baseline measures through 2011.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Each Inspection Technology component has a series of targeted measures of success towards specific goals with delineated timeframes for longterm goals. Most of the programs have completed an OMB 300 Business Case with numerous specific performance and outcome goals, annual targets measured against baseline measures.

Evidence: Some measures reflect the maturity of the system, and may change from year to year. If a finite performance goal is met, that measure may not be carried over to the following year. Performance measures in the APIS include: processing 100% inbound APIS manifests, process APIS manifests within 20 minutes, process 100% APIS data from the government of Mexico, implement a web based application to collect and transmit APIS manifests, eliminate duplicative reporting requirements with the Coast Guard.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Each of the programs has annual performance measures that demonstrate progress in reaching long-term goals, many of which are outlined the individual programs' Business Case.

Evidence: For measures that remain in place over several years, yearly targets move to progressively higher performance. Some measures are as simple as increasing targed participation in programs to facilitate legitimate trade and travel by a certain level - which serves to reduce workload and increase service to lawful commerce and travel; others are more complex.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Inspection Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	38%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Each of the Inspection Technology programs has taken baseline measures on which its annual targets are based when linked to the program goals. Some of the programs have historical records on which to base projected targets; others are new or are in the implementation phase and are currently collecting and setting baseline measures.

Evidence: For example, in CAOS, one of the long-term goals is to remove obstacles to efficient management of all CBP operations, especially efforts to meet the terrorist threat. Annually, for 4 years there are specific measures, targets, and procedures to evaluate the success in meeting the target and make necessary adjustments to the process.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Partners of all the Inspection Technology programs are diverse, ranging from other inter-dependant CBP programs, to other DHS agencies, other US agencies, for programs such as ATS, foreign partners in programs such as SENTRI, and contractors for programs such as BSDP. In all cases, the partners' needs are considered and they are committed to achieving programatic goals.

Evidence: Baselines, timelines, start/end dates, duration, costing, and funding agency information are maintained and updated on a regular basis for all Inspection Technology programs.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: CBP partipates in several levels of review including agency internal Investment Review Board (IRB), for whom the Business Cases are prepared and presented, and/or the Office of Information Technology (OIT) and their contractors, and reviews by the Department of Homeland Security and the Office of Management and Budget.

Evidence: Most of the programs in Inspection Technology have either recently completed an extensive Business Case review or are in the process of such a review. These evaluations, conducted regularly, result in refining strategic goals and redirect planning directions. A contractor is currently evaluating BSDP to ensure the program is achieving expected results and is performing effectively. Baselines, timelines, start/end dates, duration, costing, and funding agency information are maintained and updated on a regular basis.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Inspection Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	38%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Clear links are made between funding levels and performance. Budgets are closely scrutinized by the Program Office to ensure performance requirements and targets will be met and clearly identified in the budget request. Budget requests are explicitly tied to accomplishments of the annual plan and the five-year strategic plans. Resource needs presented in a complete and transparent While maintenance funding maintains the targeting system and ongoing operational efforts utilize the system to meet performance goals, additional funding is requested to fulfill additional, specific targeting objectives. This funding can be linked to these objectives.

Evidence: Additional targeting requirements is fulfilled through system enhancements and increased targeting operations can be linked to targeting statistics. Examples include a contractor for SENTRI who provides both monthly and annual delivery of statistics on program enrollment and lane use with the goal of adding an enforcement component to the program. For ENFORCE, independent contractors monitor response time and accuracy. Deficiencies are reported and analyzed and corrective actions are taken.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Programs are modified and corrections are made when needs change, such as after 9/11, or to modify strategic direction.

Evidence: An example is AES. This system was originally designed to collect statistical information for the Census Bureau as a means of reducing paperwork cost for CBP. Post 9/11, the program was modified to improve strategic enforcement of US export controls such as the International Traffic in Arms Regulations and Export Administration Regulations by using Shipper's Export Documents (SEDs) to target exported shipments for compliance. Another example is the adjustments made to the BSDP to accommodate constant wildlife traffic in certain locations so the detection of intruders is not mis-identified. In the BSDP, the cameras installed at one location were not working as expected, so testing was done to find a camera that could be used for that specific area.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Business Cases (OMB 300) for Inspection Technology Programs are regularly updated. Performance measures are compared with targets and adjustments are made in procedures as indicated.

Evidence: Port Directors and DFOs regularly review CAOS reports in assessing enforcement activities to determine such performance variables as efficacy of efforts by the time of day and/or the durations of activities, and then adjust the allocation of enforcement efforts and resources accordingly. For ATS, the Business Case and the Investment Technology Investment Portfolio System are used to record planned cost, schedule and performance of the project and actual results. An earned value management system (EVMS) will be used to monitor cost, schedule and performance results. For the BSDP, measures of system reliability, such as false positive alerts are targeted for reduction by performing a credible threat assessment by capturing and reporting on high-risk POE incidents on a regularly scheduled basis.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Inspection Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	38%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: A variety of program partners, including (including contractors (such as SENTRI, BSDP) cost-sharing partners (ENFORCE and ICE), and other government partners(QMVRS and GSA; ATS and many other federal partners) are held accountable for costs and scheduling. Performance results are used to measure and achieve efficiency and cost effectiveness in program execution.

Evidence: In ATS, the Business Case and the Investment Technology Investment Portfolio System are used to record planned cost, schedule and performance of the project and actual results. An earned value management system (EVMS) will be used to monitor cost, schedule and performance results. For ENFORCE, the current contract structure is cost plus award fee, giving the contractor incentive to perform well, in cost, schedule, and performance.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Funding is periodically reviewed. All budget requests contain exact information as to the requirements and specifications. Requests require organizational approval before funding is approved.

Evidence: For direct funds, funds are obligated in a timely manner through the coordination of affected offices. For contractor programs such as the SENTRI program, funds are paid directly to the contractor. Since SENTRI is a fee-based program, funds are directed back to the program to offset expenses such as fingerprinting costs. For example, BCBP-AES showed a planned cost of work scheduled as \$8,990,939 as of 7/31/2003. The Planned cost of work actually performed was 5,317,000 with an expected completion date of 9/30/2005.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: A variety of procedures, including competitive sourcing/cost comparisons (SENTRI), IT improvements (ATS, NII), appropriate incentives (BSDP) are used to measure and achieve efficiency and cost effectiveness in program execution. Specific IT improvements include automation of passenger information which facilitates legitimate travelers and allows for additional scrutiny of passengers identified as high-risk.

Evidence: BSDP effectively uses contractors to design, deploy, and maintain the surveillance and intrusion detection systems. Outsourcing for this program has provided comparatively lower costs and improved performance. ATS is a cost-reimbursable, time and materials contract. Much of the work is research and development, and incentives are used based on superior performance. Each task in the contract has one or more specified deliverables that are required before the task is considered complete. Milestones and control gates are established within the project to ensure that the overall schedule is maintained. When contractors achieve efficiencies and superior performance, financial incentives in the form of awarding option years are available.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Inspection Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	38%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Internally, the AES program collaborates with other Outbound programs, such as EXODUS, the manifest compliance program, and ATS-AT (anti-Terrorism), by providing information on SEDs as requested. CBP also grants access to personnel from other government agencies such as Department of Commerce, Bureau of Industry and Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of State, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Food and Drug Administration. These personnel meet systems security requirements, have positively adjudicated background checks, and a "need to know" concerning the information in ATS.

Evidence: CBP conducts joint targeting efforts using the ATS with Food and Drug Administration Personnel. CBP subject matter experts have also worked extensively with Canada Customs and Revenue Agency and other foreign governments working to develop similar systems.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Prior to the beginning of the fiscal year, project implementation plans are proposed based on completions from the previous year, review of possible reprioritization of the projects, including costs and schedules.

Evidence: A priority list is presented with a schedule and cost for review, modifications and/or approval. The SOWs include sections to determine the programs' cost effectiveness. As an example, the ENFORCE program currently uses earn value management methodologies to ensure strong financial management practices and is evaluated monthly for areas of improvements or reallocation of resources.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Steps are taken to address management deficiencies through involving the appropriate partners and stakeholders on a regular basis to review current procedures, concerns and program status.

Evidence: In each of the performance measures, management deficiencies are examined when performance targets are not met.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Most of the Inspection Technology programs have made significant progress in achieving their long-term performance goals. In the Measures section examples are given of efficiency measures evaluating the time taken to process passengers and cargo. These measures have been met. More ambitious targets are set when measures are met.

Evidence: AES has met or exceeded achieving its performance goals for the automated collection of export trade statistical data for the past six years. ATS performance measures go back to 2002. ATS met or exceeded 3 of 5 performance measures for years 2002 and 2003. SENTRI was able to complete an enrollment process in weeks instead of the months that were targeted by hiring additional staff and electronic transmission of fingerprints to the FBI.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Inspection Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	38%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Most of the Inspection Technology programs meet their targets in achieving their long-term performance goals. Others are working towards meeting their annual performance goals by evaluating where their performance did not meet the desired targets and making adjustments in the way work is performed.

Evidence: For SENTRI, completing enrollment goals, the program can now focus on expanded enrollment and opening new lanes and/or sites.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Inspection Technology programs have allowed the government to achieve significant cost savings in comparison to the previous methods.

Evidence: Cost Benefit and Alternatives Analysis are part of the Business Case presentations and each contains a component which examines cost effectiveness in achieving programmatic goals.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Inspection technology programs compare favorably to other programs in both the government and private sectors.

Evidence: As an example, AES's collection of export data available through commercial or government sources. The program performs comparably or better than similar automated programs within the government. CBP has documented in its Office of Management and Budget ATS Business Case that ATS was developed because no private sector organization or other government agency offers a system with the same capabilities and level of performance combined with the cargo and passenger information under CBP's statutory and regulatory authority.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: CBP has historically conducted internal reviews using agency subject matter experts to protect the integrity of the classified anti-terror missions and external peer and contractor-evaluated reviews for other programs.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Inspection Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	38%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

Measure: Automated Targeting System - Target Selectivity Efficiency Rating (TSR) nationwide for passenger Secondary inspections.

Additional Information: $TSR = \frac{\text{Incidental} + \text{positive personal searches}}{\text{Total of all personal searches (positives+negatives+incidentals)}}$

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	Baseline	0.55	
2004	0.55	0.55	

Measure: BSDP - Reduce overtime costs associated with staffing all non-24 hour POEs by at least 20%.

Additional Information: Sufficient deployment/installation of remote video surveillance equipment. (total FTE overtime costs per non-24 hour POE)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2004	2004		

Measure: QMVRS - Target waiting vehicles within 3% of the actual number.

Additional Information: During the prototype demonstrations at the Mariposa POE (in Arizona) vehicle typing accuracy was at 99% - above the 90% target rate.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	2004		

Measure: NII - Achieve 100% inspection of all target containers.

Additional Information: Statistics will be collected by the Cargo Enforcement Reporting and Tracking Sub-System (CERTS).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2004	2004		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Inspection Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	38%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

Measure: ENFORCE - Web-enabling Target - Including IDENT/IAFIS

Additional Information: ENFORCE and the IDENT/IAFIS functionality that resides on ENFORCE are key operational systems that capture biometric and biographical information . When queried at the POEs, these systems increase the identification of criminal aliens by 8.5%.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term:
2004-2005	15%	baseln '04	Long-term

Measure: SENTRI - Increase enrollment of low-risk travelers and number of lanes available to participants.

Additional Information: Complete extensive background investigations more efficiently.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term:
2004	2004		Long-term

Measure: CAOS - 50% of Enforcement Operations to use Random or Random within Category time selection options.

Additional Information: Port Records are being reviewed by each Field Office with CAOS and note percentage change in operations selected as required.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term:
2004-2006	50%		Annual

Measure: Automated Targeting System - Expand use of ATS-Anti-Terrorism in Outbound.

Additional Information: Use measured by the number of ATS-AT logons at FLETC and Port Sites

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term:
2001	Baseline		Annual
2002	25%	162%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Inspection Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	38%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

Measure: ATS-Narcotics queries completed within 1 minute
Additional Information: Goal to was to maintain % of queries completed within one minute

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002	Baseline	68%	
2003	68%	83%	

Measure: APIS - Process 100% of all Mexican API data received by end of FY 2004
Additional Information: CBP began receiving Mexico APIS on February 13, 2004. Once live data is received, a measure can be reported.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	2004		

Measure: Process outbound Advanced Passenger Information System (APIS) data from commercial air carriers within 5 minutes.
Additional Information: Intercept high risk traveleres while expiditing low risk travelers.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2001	baseline	87%	
2002	100%	99%	
2003	100%	100%	
2004-2006	100%		

Measure: Process outbound APIS data from commercial air carriers within 4 minutes.
Additional Information: Reduce business reporting burden by reducing the number of duplicate transmittions from carriers.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2007			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Inspection Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Customs and Border Protection
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	38%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

Measure: Maximize the number of small carriers using APIS in lieu of developing their own systems. Measure under development.
Additional Information: The goal is to reduce the reporting burden on small carriers while increasing the information available by reducing the API system costs.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term:
2006			Long-term

Measure: AES -Mission and Business Results Law Enforcement Property Protection.
Additional Information: Increase state licence violations seizures to 800

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term:
2005			Long-term

Measure: AES - Customer Results Service Accessibility Access 95%
Additional Information: Assures that the electronic input transactions from the Export Trade community are processed by AES in under 30 seconds, more than 95% of the time.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term:
2005	2005		Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	89%	100%	73%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The MEP Program prevents oil and hazardous materials from entering navigable waters. If the oil or hazardous materials do enter the water, the MEP Program seeks to remove them.

Evidence: * Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA) (33 USC 1321) as amended by Oil Pollution Act (OPA 90)* Port & Tanker Safety Act of 1978 (33 USC 1223-1232)* Coast Guard Publication 1* United States Coast Guard Strategic Plan* Roles & Missions Study - 1999

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The MEP program began as a result of numerous environmental disasters of the 1960's, including the massive oil spill from the Torrey Canyon in 1968 and the Cuyahoga River Fire in 1969. Pollution from oil and hazardous substances, however, continued to be a problem and compelled Congress to pass several pieces of legislation to strengthen environmental protection. While the overall trend in spills has decreased as a result of the MEP program, recent spills like the T/V Prestige off the coast of Spain and the Tank barge 120 spill in Buzzards Bay highlight the risks and argue the continuing need for a vigilant marine environmental protection program. More recently, aquatic nuisance species such as the zebra mussel have been recognized as a threat to US waters.

Evidence: * National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) * Clean Water Act of 1972* Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980* Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986* Oil Pollution Act (OPA) of 1990* National Invasive Species Act of 1996

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Coast Guard and EPA share responsibility for responding to oil and hazmat spills, but have divided jurisdictions into an Inland Zone (EPA) and Coastal Zone (US Coast Guard) to avoid duplicative efforts. To clearly define each jurisdiction, the Coast Guard and EPA mutually agreed on the boundary between coastal and inland areas. These boundary agreements are contained in the Regional Contingency Plans. The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan also establishes the National Response System to coordinate federal, state and local preparedness and response efforts to oil and hazmat spills. As a result, all key agencies and organizations are involved in resolving key issues (such as setting protection priorities for environmentally sensitive areas). This system also aids in preventing redundant or duplicative efforts as the system enables agencies to work together to delineate responsibilities.

Evidence: * National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (40 CFR 300)* Regional Contingency Plans, Area Contingency Plans, Facility Response Plans, Vessel Response Plans, State/Local Plans, and Federal Agency Internal Plans

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	89%	100%	73%	Effective

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Oil Pollution Act of 1990, the statute underlying MEP regulations, is not designed to maximize net benefits. In several cases, the law requires regulations when the costs clearly outweigh the benefits. Coast Guard has used the flexibility in the law to maximize benefits where possible, and has sometimes used its cost-benefit analyses to try to convince Congress to change the law to improve efficiency.

Evidence: * Oil Pollution Act of 1990* Tank Level Pressure Monitoring regulation

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Coast Guard uses a risk assessment matrix to ensure that the program focuses inspections on major contributors to pollution risk. The Port State Control Program tracks deficiencies by ship type, history, class, flag, and owner, and uses the data to set boarding priorities.

Evidence: * Risk assessment matrix* Port State Control program and Annual Report* Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program has long reported two performance measures: oil spilled per million gallons shipped, and marine debris per mile of shoreline surveyed. The long-term goals are a 20% reduction in each over five years. For internal agency reporting, Coast Guard also tracks the total number of oil and chemical spills, while the Port State Control program reports the number of foreign-vessel pollution ticket cases.

Evidence: * USCG FY 2003 Report; FY 2002 Performance Report* Port State Control program and Annual Report

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program's long-term goals of a 20% reduction on each measure over five years are broken down into ambitious annual goals.

Evidence: * USCG FY 2003 Report; FY 2002 Performance Report

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program has annual goals for its two performance measures that demonstrate progress toward the long-term goals. It is also working on new measures for ballast water management.

Evidence: * USCG FY 2003 Report; FY 2002 Performance Report

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: MEP targets are based upon achieving a 20% reduction in the current baseline over 5-years.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	89%	100%	73%	Effective

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The USCG works formally with partners such as American Waterways Operators (AWO), Passenger Vessel Association (PVA), and International Council of Cruise Lines (ICCL); and also with organizations such as: Baltic & International Maritime Council (BIMCO) and The International Association of Independent Tanker Owners Association (INTERTANKO).

Evidence: * MOUsAWO: <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/nmc/ptp/pdf/awo.pdf> ICCL: <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/nmc/ptp/pdf/iccl.pdf> BIMCO: <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/nmc/ptp/pdf/bimco.pdf> INTERTANKO: <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/nmc/ptp/pdf/intertnk.pdf>

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: While numerous studies have considered aspects of the MEP program, there have been no comprehensive, independent analyses of its effectiveness. Coast Guard is in the early stages of initiating a study with the Center for Naval Analyses that they hope will provide for a plan of regular evaluations.

Evidence:

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The Coast Guard uses a performance-based budgeting system. This methodology ties funding levels directly to performance goals and targets. Additionally, the Coast Guard's Mission Cost Program model provides comprehensive cost information for individual programs, including overhead and other indirect costs, as well as direct costs. Budget requests are explicitly tied to strategies adopted because they link to the accomplishment of long-term performance goals.

Evidence: * Regional Strategic Assessment Process* Marine Safety, Security & Environmental Protection Areas of Emphasis* Leadership Council Management Agenda* Action-Resource Process* Quality Management Board

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: To correct Coast Guard-wide deficiencies identified in earlier PARTs, Coast Guard has initiated a study with the Center for Naval Analyses that they hope will provide for a plan of regular evaluations.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	89%	100%	73%	Effective

2.RG1 **Are all regulations issued by the program/agency necessary to meet the stated goals of the program, and do all regulations clearly indicate how the rules contribute to achievement of the goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Coast Guard regulation development follows a program that requires a review of regulation projects for alignment with program goals. The instrument used to ensure this alignment is the work plan. Initiating a regulatory project requires that it meet the goals of the program and that relevant statutory requirements be vetted through the work plan review and approval process. The CG's Marine Safety Council provides oversight by the most senior leadership in the Coast Guard and ensures agreement with stated program goals.

Evidence: * Oil Pollution Act of 1990; proposed rules for salvage and fire fighting and dispersants for oil spills <http://dms.dot.gov>, docket # 3417* Maritime Transportation Security Act; pending interim rules * National Invasive Species Act of 1996; proposed rules on penalties for non-reporting and mandatory ballast water management <http://dms.dot.gov>, docket # 13147

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The National Response Center and MISLE record data for all reported oil and hazardous substance discharges. This data is used to develop annual and semi-annual performance metrics and used by programs to determine needs for new initiatives. Through its National Ballast Water Information Clearinghouse (physically located at the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center) the Coast Guard receives and analyzes information and data regarding nationwide compliance with ballast water reporting requirements and ballast water management practices. The results of these analyses have led to refinements of field operations, expanded education and outreach efforts, as well regulatory initiatives aimed at meeting the intent of the federal aquatic invasive species laws. Annual Port State Control evaluations provide timely and credible performance information.

Evidence: Information collected by the National Ballast Information Clearinghouse demonstrated that the voluntary ballast water management program was not effective, leading Coast Guard to develop regulations that would make the program mandatory.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The Coast Guard has launched a Leadership Council Management Agenda (LCMA) to keep senior officials focused on key projects. For each program, the LCMA identifies the lead officials, the desired end-stage, and executable segments of the project, including timetables and resources. The leads report to the Commandant at Leadership Council meetings, while the Chief of Staff tracks their progress between meetings.

Evidence: * LCMA Update Process

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	89%	100%	73%	Effective

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The Coast Guard obligates substantially all (over 99%) operating funds each year. Virtually all capital acquisition funds are obligated prior to expiring. Funds are obligated in a timely manner in accordance with the resource proposals process and monies disbursed for the intended purpose. Dedicated budget officers perform periodic reviews to ensure that all funds are obligated and spend down rates are properly executed. In the obligation of dedicated funding sources, such as those received by the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, tight controls and reviews are in place to ensure that these funds are obligated for the intended purpose within the timeframes allowed.

Evidence: * Resource proposal process* Spend plans

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The Coast Guard is continuously developing procedures and technologies to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness such as: utilization of Personal Data Assistants to input inspection comments and to obtain real-time access to voluminous laws, regulations, and policies; prototyped implementation of Activities Based Cost Management; implementation of a comprehensive suite of risk assessment and management tools; and the successful streamlining of the administratively intense legal prosecution of pollution violations in the form of an on-the-spot ticketing program.

Evidence: Two examples: PDAs. The use of electronic Personal Data Assistants is being prototyped at several Coast Guard commands to improve efficiency with documentation of mission performance and entry of information into the Marine Information System for Law Enforcement (MISLE). This evaluation of technology to improve efficiency stemmed from the results of an Activity Based Costing study regarding the large amount of time being spent on documentation. Concurrently, the Coast Guard is developing a master activity list and integrating Activity Based Costing with risk-based decision making to ultimately link resource allocation, operational activities, and impact (cause/effect) to assess the value or utility our actions have in relation to mission performance. TICKET PROGRAM. The Civil Penalty Process used for oil spills includes a multi-layered review process. The Marine Pollution Notification of Violation, "Ticket", program streamlines the process for the many smaller oil spills. The program uses a Notice of Violation/Settlement Offer at the scene of the oil spill to immediately notify the alleged violator of the proposed penalty. The program reduces Coast Guard time spent processing the violation. The program allows direct payment to the Treasury without any involvement by the Coast Guard or the hearing officer.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The Coast Guard coordinates preparedness and response efforts under the National Response System. The MEP program also coordinates with other agencies and organizations through MOUs. At the national level, under the National Response System, the Coast Guard coordinates with EPA and other federal, state, local and industry stakeholders through the National Response Team (a 16 member agency committee chaired by EPA and vice-chaired by the Coast Guard) to develop national response policy. At the regional level, the Coast coordinates its activities through the Regional Response Team. At the local level, the Coast Guard coordinates its activities through local Area Committees.

Evidence: * National Response Plan* MOUs:AWO: <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/nmc/ptp/pdf/awo.pdf>ICCL: <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/nmc/ptp/pdf/iccl.pdf>BIMCO: <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/nmc/ptp/pdf/bimco.pdf> INTERTANKO: <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/nmc/ptp/pdf/intertnk.pdf>

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	89%	100%	73%	Effective

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The Coast Guard is a leader in both financial and managerial accounting among large, multi-mission agencies within the government, employing systems and techniques that meet or exceed the requirements of the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board. This is evidenced by four consecutive clean audits under the Chief Financial Officers Act and cost accounting techniques for management reporting on asset, mission and performance goal costs that substantially exceed the requirement of Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standard number 4.

Evidence: * Audits, 1999-2002

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The MEP office has established two levels of management boards to address organizational change management and direction. It also has undertaken a major project (Project Benkert) to review the management and performance of the marine safety, security, and environmental protection programs.

Evidence: * Directorate Executive Steering Committee* Quality Management Board* Project Benkert

3.RG1 Did the program seek and take into account the views of all affected parties (e.g., consumers; large and small businesses; State, local and tribal governments; beneficiaries; and the general public) when developing significant regulations? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: In promulgating rules, Coast Guard often goes beyond statutory requirements to seek public comment. In many cases, the rules are substantially changed based on views expressed by the regulated community. For example, Coast Guard dramatically cut the scope of the the "Fire-Suppression Systems and Voyage Planning for Towing Vessels" due to industry comment: the cost of the rule dropped from \$116 million to \$19 million over the period of analysis (2003-2015). Also, although the Maritime Transportation Security Act specifically exempted Coast Guard from the statutory requirement to seek comments, they held seven public meetings around the country anyway to gather information for the interim rules.

Evidence: * NPRM for Salvage and Fire Fighting: Comment period May 10-Oct 18, 2002; 4 public meetings <http://dms.dot.gov>, docket # 3417* Maritime Transportation Security Act

3.RG2 Did the program prepare adequate regulatory impact analyses if required by Executive Order 12866, regulatory flexibility analyses if required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and SBREFA, and cost-benefit analyses if required under the Unfunded Mandates R Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Coast Guard's regulatory analyses are considered by OMB to be among the best in government.

Evidence: * 2 OPA 90 related NPRMs: Rule for Salvage and Fire Fighting - Reg Assessment and Dispersants Rule - regulatory assessment <http://dms.dot.gov>, docket # 3417* Penalties for Non-submission of Ballast Water Reporting Forms - regulatory evaluation <http://dms.dot.gov>, docket # 13147 * Maritime Transportation Security Act interim rule cost/benefit analysis

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	89%	100%	73%	Effective

3.RG3 Does the program systematically review its current regulations to ensure consistency among all regulations in accomplishing program goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Systematic regulatory reviews are conducted every 5 years. Where legislation such as OPA 90 and NISA 96 require performance reviews, they are conducted and regulations promulgated according to statutory requirements.

Evidence: * 1995 Regulatory Reform project, Streamlining initiative and institution of the Alternate Compliance Program. * 2001 programmatic regulatory assessment of OPA 90 regulation suite.

3.RG4 Are the regulations designed to achieve program goals, to the extent practicable, by maximizing the net benefits of its regulatory activity? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Regulations are prevention-focused with enforcement provisions designed to reduce the need for response. Coast Guard looks carefully at each component of a draft regulation, using incremental analysis to maximize benefits across the entire rule. Only where specific solutions are dictated by statute are benefits not maximized.

Evidence: * The Oil Pollution Act of 1990 regulation suite includes construction and equipment provisions paired with vessel and facility response planning. Compliance expenditures are highest for parties analyzed to have the greatest risk of spilling oil. * National Invasive Species Act rules require the highest cost and highest level of compliance in the Hudson River and Great Lakes, where the economic impacts of ballast water-introduced invasive species are most severe. Lower cost compliance options will be available when the mandatory program is implemented nationwide. <http://dms.dot.gov>, dockets # 13147 and #3423

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Coast Guard's MEP program has contributed to a steady decline in the combined total of all chemical and oil spills, and resulting volume of marine pollution. The programs' long-term targets to reduce oil spills and debris were first set in 1996, and were based on a five-year average. The targets were periodically reevaluated and lowered as the programs showed increased effectiveness. Coast Guard met its long-term goal in 2001 and is on track to reach its 2009 goal.

Evidence: * Annual Performance Reports* Compendium of Oil Spills* Ocean Conservancy report of Marine Debris

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program has shown consistent year-to-year improvement in the five-year average of spills and oil spill volume. Marine debris has also shown improvement over the past several years. All measures have indicated performance better than target.

Evidence: * Annual Performance Reports* Compendium of Oil Spills* Ocean Conservancy report of Marine Debris

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	89%	100%	73%	Effective

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Over the past five years the MEP program has exhibited a steady decline in oil spills and chemical discharge incidents with little additional program growth.

Evidence: * Annual Performance Reports* Compendium of Oil Spills* Ocean Conservancy report of Marine Debris

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: No other similar programs exist.

Evidence:

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: This program has not had comprehensive, independent evaluations of its performance.

Evidence:

4.RG1 Were programmatic goals (and benefits) achieved at the least incremental societal cost and did the program maximize net benefits? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: A 2001 Programmatic Regulatory Analysis of the major rules promulgated to implement OPA 90 estimated that they would result in a 67% reduction in total oil spilled between 1996 and 2025. Subsequent data has suggested the 67% estimate to be reasonably accurate so far. The analysis also showed that the rules cost \$8,657 per barrel of oil not spilled. As a rule of thumb, \$10,000 or less per barrel of oil not spilled is considered cost-effective. The answer is not "Yes" because the statute required Coast Guard to regulate in several areas that are not cost-effective. For example, the double-hull regulation has an estimated marginal cost of \$68,079 per barrel of oil not spilled.

Evidence: * Regulatory analysis of May 2001 <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/regs/prs/>* Oil Pollution Act of 1990

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	89%	100%	73%	Effective

Measure: Gallons of oil spilled per million gallons shipped

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	4	3.4	
2002	2.5	0.6	
2003	2.4		
2004	2.3		

Measure: Number of vessel-generated marine debris items per mile of shoreline surveyed

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	44	31	
2002	43		
2003	41		
2004	40		

Measure: Five-year average number of chemical discharge incidents and oil spills greater than 100 gallons per 100 million tons shipped

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	39.6		
2006	39.6		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	89%	100%	73%	Effective

2007	38.1
2008	36.6

Measure:
Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------------------

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS)

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	The MMRS program is designed to improve local health and medical capabilities to respond effectively to a mass casualty incident, including a terrorist use of a weapon of mass destruction.	Authorized by Title IV of the Defense Authorization Act of 1997	20%	0.2
2 <i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	In response to mass casualty events, including biological or chemical attacks, coordination at the local and regional level is among the most basic keys to success.	Call for improved coordination in several studies/reports, including: (1) GAO-02-160T, Homeland Security: Challenges and Strategies in Addressing Short- and Long-Term National Needs (p. 21) (2) GAO-01-1158T, Homeland Security: A Framework for Addressing the Nation's Efforts (3) GAO-01-915, Bioterrorism: Federal Research and Preparedness Activities	20%	0.2
3 <i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Through a contract mechanism, this program requires that cities have clear plans for responding to mass casualty events, have clear plans for managing the health consequences of a bioterrorist event, clear plans for responding to a chem/rad/nuclear/explosive event, plans for coordinated action with the National Disaster Medical System, plans for coordination with the local healthcare system - including hospitals, plans for establishing effective training requirements, and to have developed priority pharmaceutical and equipment lists with a procurement timetable and maintenance plan.	MMRS Contract - Section C - Description/Specification/Work Statement	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4 <i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	By negotiating contracts with designated local/regional areas, the program is a cooperative effort with local authorities, rather than duplicative of their work. HHS uses specified, negotiated products and milestones to ensure that state efforts are not duplicated. These federal funds do not focus on purchases, while some pharmaceutical and equipment purchases are allowed, but rather on planning to guide local responses in the case of an event, or purchases with state and local funding.	(1) MMRS Contract - Section C - Description/Specification/Work Statement	20%	0.2
5 <i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The use of contracts allows HHS to ensure that program milestones have been met, to review plans, procedures and pharmaceutical requests as each contractor develops its program. It also enables HHS to attempt ensure that each city's program is coordinated with state and federal efforts.	(1) MMRS Contract - Section C - Description/Specification/Work Statement	20%	0.2
Total Section Score				100%	100%

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	No	No outcome goal has been established.	The MMRS submission was "Ensure MMRS in 120 of the Nation's most populous cities" as recommended in Nunn-Lugar-Domenici, which is not an outcome goal.	14%	0.0
2 <i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	No	While each MMRS contract is written with 10 deliverables that are mandatory and closely tracked, HHS does not have a set of measures designed to track annual progress toward a long-term outcome goal.	MMRS Contract - Section C - Description/Specification/Work Statement	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	No	Contractors agree to provide monthly reports on the 10 deliverables mentioned above, but as no long-term goals exist - they have not committed to them.	MMRS Contract - Section C - Description/Specification/Work Statement	14%	0.0
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	OEP works with other agencies that have WMD related programs. Equipment and pharmaceutical lists, as well as other program activities are coordinated with and reviewed by an interagency group that includes FEMA, DOJ, VA and DOD. Intra-agency coordination continues with CDC, HRSA and other HHS agencies. One example of such intra-agency coordination was the coordinated release of FY 2002 ERF funds for MMRS with all other HHS state and local assistance.	(4) HHS announcement of state and local bioterrorism preparedness grants, found at: http://www.hhs.gov/news/press/2002pres/20020131b.html	14%	0.1
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	Yes	HHS recently contracted with the Institute of Medicine to produce a comprehensive report on appropriate evaluation tools for MMRS, both at the Federal and regional/local levels.	www.nap.edu	14%	0.1
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	No	It is unclear exactly what unit of preparedness or capacity each dollar added or removed buys or denies an MMRS contractor. This is due in part to the fact that each city starts at its own level of preparedness and capacity, and therefore requires different additional levels of planning, and targets their equipment purchases differently.		14%	0.0
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	Institute of Medicine Report commissioned to develop tools for evaluating MMRS, both at the Federal and local levels. This report developed 23 indicators of preparedness, and identifies a methodology for implementation of quality evaluations.	"Preparing for Terrorism - Tools for Evaluating the Metropolitan Medical Response System Program" Institute of Medicine, 2002.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					100%	43%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	OEP staff collect performance information on a regular basis, pursuant to the contract negotiated with each city. This information has been used to adjust program goals and methods a number of times since its inception.	Examples include: (1) In 1997, MMRS funding provided funding only for chemical preparedness, and medical strike teams. Based on input from contractees and revised need assessments, a biological preparedness component was added to create program as it currently exists. These funds were added to new cities, and to those who had received initial, non-bio allotments as well. (2) Before the National Pharmaceutical Stockpile existed, cities received pharmaceuticals directly. Once NPS was introduced, MMRS contracts were adjusted to include proper planning for NPS allotment distribution. (3) The MMRS statement of work was adjusted in 1999 to add pharmacists and mental health professionals to local steering committees.	14%	0.1
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	MMRS cities are held to milestones and schedules as laid out in the contract. Payments can be withheld if performance is not adequate.	MMRS Contract - Section C - Description/Specification/Work Statement	14%	0.1
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	Reports show timely award of contracts, and obligation of funds. Mandatory monthly reporting through the contract can be used to ensure that contractors spend funds for their intended purposes.	HHS Obligation Reports for MMRS	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4 <i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	No	MMRS cities are held to milestones and schedules, but are not rewarded due to excellence in attaining cost effectiveness or efficiencies.	MMRS cities receive set amounts for each phase of funding, and there is little to no Federal incentive for them to attain efficiencies with these funds.	14%	0.0
5 <i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	No	HHS has established phases of funding under the MMRS program that are intended to purchase the basic capacity to respond to a mass casualty event, or the capacity to respond to a bioterrorist event. However, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that an increase or decrease in funding would lead to any particular outcome other than number of cities funded.		14%	0.0
6 <i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	No	No audit information to justify a "yes" has been provided.		14%	0.0
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	No	No such steps have been identified.		14%	0.0
8 (B 1.) <i>Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?</i>	N/A	MMRS funds are administered through contracts.		0%	
9 (B 2.) <i>Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?</i>	N/A	MMRS funds are administered through contracts.		0%	
Total Section Score				100%	43%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score																		
1 <i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	No	None has been established.	The MMRS submission was "Ensure MMRS in 120 of the Nation's most populous cities" as recommended in Nunn-Lugar-Domenici, which is not an outcome goal.	20%	0.0																		
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Long-Term Goal I: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Long-Term Goal II: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Long-Term Goal III: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>						Long-Term Goal I: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:						Long-Term Goal II: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:						Long-Term Goal III: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:					
Long-Term Goal I: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:																							
Long-Term Goal II: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:																							
Long-Term Goal III: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:																							
2 <i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	No	Each city negotiates a time line in its contract to meet the required benchmarks. However, HHS has not established annual MMRS-wide performance goals.		20%	0.0																		
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Key Goal I: Performance Target: Actual Performance:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Key Goal II: Performance Target: Actual Performance:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Key Goal III: Performance Target: Actual Performance:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>						Key Goal I: Performance Target: Actual Performance:						Key Goal II: Performance Target: Actual Performance:						Key Goal III: Performance Target: Actual Performance:					
Key Goal I: Performance Target: Actual Performance:																							
Key Goal II: Performance Target: Actual Performance:																							
Key Goal III: Performance Target: Actual Performance:																							
3 <i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	No	While individual cities may achieve more with the same amount of funding, there is no evidence to indicate that all MMRS cities have, over time, achieved improved results with the same funding due to program changes or performance enhancements.		20%	0.0																		

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4 <i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Small Extent	Institute of Medicine study indicates that the program is performing well, and that it holds a somewhat unique place in the variety of federal efforts to assist disaster stricken communities, by merit of its proactive vs. reactive nature, and its capacity to bring multiple relevant players to the table for planning and coordination.	"Preparing for Terrorism - Tools for Evaluating the Metropolitan Medical Response System Program" Institute of Medicine, 2002.	20%	0.1
5 <i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Small Extent	Institute of Medicine study praised the MMRS program, stating that "the importance of the MMRS program effort is no longer equivocal, questionable or debatable. The enhanced organization and cooperation demanded by a well-functioning MMRS program will permit a unified preparedness and public health system with immense potential for improved responses not only to a wide spectrum of terrorist acts, but also to mass-casualty incidents of all varieties."	"Preparing for Terrorism - Tools for Evaluating the Metropolitan Medical Response System Program" Institute of Medicine, 2002.	20%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	13%

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: National Flood Insurance

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	The program has three purposes: 1) To reduce Federal expenditures for disaster assistance and flood control; 2) To reduce future flood damages through State and community floodplain management regulations; and 3) To better indemnify individuals for flood losses through insurance.	<i>National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973</i>	23%	0.2
2 <i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Flooding is one of the most common forms of disaster in the US, however, the private sector has been reluctant to offer flood insurance due to the often-catastrophic nature of flooding and adverse selection issues. The NFIP was created to address this problem, and to provide an alternative to direct Federal disaster assistance.	The GAO has concluded that insurance is the most efficient and equitable method of providing disaster assistance. <i>GAO Report, PAD-80-39.</i>	23%	0.2
3 <i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The NFIP has had a significant impact on reducing this Nation's flood losses. Prior to the creation of the NFIP, floodplain management as a practice was not well established, and only a few States and several hundred communities actually regulated floodplain development.	More than 19,700 communities in all 50 States participate in the NFIP. There are more than 4.3 million flood insurance policies in force, worth more than \$560B. FEMA reports that structures built to NFIP criteria experience 80% less damage through reduced frequency and severity of losses. The NFIP floodplain management requirements are estimated to save in excess of \$1B per year.	23%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4 <i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	The program does not duplicate other government programs or private insurance programs. Moreover, it is unique in making mitigation a condition for becoming eligible for financial assistance. A community must adopt and enforce a floodplain management ordinance to reduce future flood risk for new construction in floodplains before the Federal Government will make flood insurance available.	FEMA reports the private sector is not inclined to enter the flood insurance market.	23%	0.2
5 <i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	<p>In general, the NFIP is well designed to address the problem for which it was created by combining flood plain management and insurance protection. The program also encourages high risk properties to join the program by offering subsidized premium prices.</p> <p>However, some design issues inhibit the effectiveness of the program. For example, subsidized properties have led to a program that is not actuarially sound, meaning that the premium revenue is sometimes insufficient to cover losses. (While the program has always repaid Treasury borrowings, there remains some risk of catastrophic losses that could create a need to raise the statutory borrowing cap or inhibit the ability of the program to repay borrowings.) Also, a small percentage of subsidized properties experience multiple losses that have a disproportionate and detrimental impact on program payouts.</p>	<p>The GAO has concluded that insurance is the most efficient and equitable method of providing disaster assistance. <i>GAO Report, PAD-80-39.</i></p> <p>Because about 30% of properties are subsidized, overall premium income is insufficient to build reserves to meet future long-term expected flood losses. <i>GAO Testimony (GAO-01-992T).</i></p> <p>Although only about 1% of policies are subsidized repetitive loss properties, about 38% of claims paid historically relate to these policies. <i>GAO Testimony (GAO-01-992T).</i></p> <p>Of communities that have been mapped for flood hazards, 9% have been suspended or do not participate in the program. <i>GAO Testimony (GAO-01-736T).</i></p> <p>According to GAO, "The program is not actuarially sound because it does not collect sufficient premium income to build reserves to meet the long- term future expected flood losses." (<i>GAO-01-992T</i>)</p>	10%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Section Score				100%	90%

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	Yes	The NFIP has the following long term goal: By FY 2008, \$10B in potential property losses, disaster, and other costs have been avoided.	<i>FY 2004 FEMA Annual Performance Plan</i>	14%	0.1
2 <i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	The NFIP has annual performance goals for the long term goal listed above, including reducing the net cost of the NFIP Program by improving the income-to-expense ratio by 1%.	<i>FY 2004 FEMA Annual Performance Plan</i>	14%	0.1
3 <i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	For the insurance element of the program, its private sector insurance partners are directly involved in program planning. FEMA also meets with the insurance agents and the mortgage lending industry as well as with their regulators.	FEMA maintains contracts with its private insurance partners. Further, The NFIP provides funding to States under the Community Assistance Program State Support Services Element (CAP-SSSE) to provide floodplain management technical assistance and perform community monitoring and compliance activities.	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4 <i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	There are no other programs that share substantially similar goals and objectives. However, The NFIP collaborates with other FEMA mitigation programs as well as response and recovery programs. The program also regularly deals with other Federal agencies and has an interagency agreement with the Corps of Engineers to support FEMA Regional Offices in providing technical assistance to NFIP communities.	FEMA is a coordinating agency under Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, which requires that actions by Federal Agencies are consistent with NFIP floodplain management standards. FEMA advises other Federal agencies when they adopt or update E.O. 11988 implementing regulations and comments on activities undertaken by other agencies in floodplains. FEMA also participates in several interagency committees and task forces on floodplain management.	14%	0.1
5 <i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	Yes	There is a comprehensive independent evaluation of the NFIP now underway to assess the program's effectiveness and efficiency and provide alternatives to improve current operations. The six areas of inquiry of the evaluation are: 1) Occupancy and Use of Floodplains, 2) Costs and Consequences of Flooding, 3) Insurance Rating and Indemnity Functions, 4) Floodplain Management and Enforcement, 5) Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment and 6) Marketing and Communications. The evaluation will address questions of the greatest priority to the NFIP in each of these areas. The compilation of these questions is available for review.	In addition to the comprehensive program evaluation underway, many other independent evaluations of the NFIP are recently completed, in process or scheduled, or routinely performed. These include: the annual financial statement audits that go beyond the requirements of the OIG and OFM; the Deloitte & Touche examination of underwriting and claims; the biennial audits of the WYO companies; the Annual Rate Review; the biennial CRS evaluation; the GAO study of lender compliance; independent reviews of NFIP marketing and advertising campaigns; the Price-Waterhouse, Coopers subsidy study; the Heinz Center study of erosion and coastal construction; and frequent GAO reviews on the financial condition of the program.	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6 <i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	No	Core administrative functions, flood plain management activities, and flood mapping activities are supported by collections from a fixed fee that is attached to annual insurance premiums. Consequently, the program's operating budget is dependent on participation in the program. This funding structure undermines the program's ability to plan and to use performance goals to set its annual budget.	The FY 2003 Budget proposes making fee collections and spending from offsetting collections discretionary to provide more flexibility for budgeting for the program's operating budget.	14%	0.0
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	FEMA has undertaken a strategic planning effort that included a Call for Issues from its program stakeholders. The agency has also initiated a comprehensive multi-year program evaluation.		14%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	86%

Section III: Program Management (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	The program routinely collects and reconciles financial and statistical data for the insurance component. There is also regular oversight of community floodplain management, e.g., FEMA uses a computerized Community Information System to manage and track community eligibility and participation in the NFIP.	The Transaction Record and Reporting Processing Plan along with the Write Your Own (WYO) Accounting Manual are two pieces of documentation for insurance reporting. Data received are quality controlled, edited and reviewed. The same data are subject to independent audit. These data are used to examine trends and determine the impact of rate or other changes on growth, income and outlays.	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2 <i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	FEMA require its private insurance partners to commit to performance standards, and, with respect to program changes, these companies are actively involved in the development of the new Concept of Operations.	For example, see the FEMA " <i>Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement (Appendix A, Part 62)</i> "	14%	0.1
3 <i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	The greatest NFIP expenditure is for loss and loss-adjustment expenses. The time required for claims settlement by individual Write Your Own insurance companies and by the NFIP Servicing Agent are audited and monitored to assure that standards are met. There also is audit and monitoring as re-inspection of losses to assure policyholders are properly compensated. The remuneration for the WYO companies is subject to monthly reporting and reconciliation. Further, the Program is subject to an annual financial audit, performed by an independent auditor under the aegis of the Inspector General. Moreover, the scope of this audit has been expanded at FEMA request. There also is a requirement for independent Triennial Audits performed of the WYOs to assure periodic examination of all companies.	The NFIP received unqualified audit reports when separately audited.	14%	0.1
4 <i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	All of the major NFIP insurance operations contracts are performance based and contain standards for performance, surveillance methodology and incentives or disincentives) as appropriate. The WYO Arrangement with participating companies includes incentives for policy retention and Program growth. FEMA in collaboration with the WYO companies is now engaged in the development and implementation of a new concept of IT operations (CONOPS) designed to modernize the Program.	For example, see the FEMA " <i>Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement (Appendix A, Part 62)</i> "	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?	Yes	Full program costs are identified for presentation in the annual budget submission. However, while the program's budget is principally provided for from premium income, expenses occur coincident with flooding events and damage to insured properties. For any given year, the full program costs are not actually known until after the fact, including the extent of any Treasury borrowing to cover shortfalls in premium income against expenses.	FY 2003 Congressional Budget Justification	14%	0.1
6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?	Yes	Audited financial statements have been prepared for the Program's insurance underwriting operations since 1985. Beginning in 1991, audited financial statements were prepared for the whole Program. FEMA employs additional financial control mechanisms, including monthly financial to statistical reconciliation, and requires adherence to the Financial Control Plan and Accounting Manual for the WYO Program. Financial management exists for WYOs through independent public accounting firms.	The WYO Financial Control Plan and Accounting Manual	14%	0.1
7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?	Yes	A comprehensive NFIP assessment is being undertaken, in part, to identify alternatives that correct deficiencies and improve program efficiency. The strategic planning initiative, resulting in the report "Blueprint for the Future," was undertaken to realize a more effective and customer oriented program.	FEMA, Federal Insurance Administration, "Blueprint for the Future," 2000.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	100%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)					
Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	large extent	Based on data available now, the program is on track to achieve its long term goals.		25%	0.2
<p>Long-Term Goal I: By FY 2008, \$10B in potential property losses, disaster, and other costs have been avoided. Target: \$1B in avoided losses annually Actual Progress achieved toward goal: FY 2002 is \$1.102B and the estimate is \$1.166B for 2003.</p> <p>Long-Term Goal II: By FY 2008, all flood claim payments are provided within established performance standards (timeliness and proper scope of damages). Target: 90% of standard flood claims are processed within standards for proper scope of damages and timeliness. Actual Progress achieved toward goal: NA. Goal was established for FY 2004.</p> <p>Long-Term Goal III: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>					
2 <i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	large extent	Based on data available now, the program is mostly successful in achieving its annual performance goals.		25%	0.2
<p>Key Goal I: Through National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) insurance and floodplain management activities reduce potential annual flood losses. Performance Target: \$1B in avoided losses annually Actual Performance: FY 2002 is for \$1.102B</p> <p>Key Goal II: Reduce the net cost of the NFIP. Improve program's financial condition by addressing repetitive loss, subsidy reduction, and operations modernization. Performance Target: A calculated "bottom line" of 112.4% was established as a baseline in 2000/2001. The target is to increase the 112.4% by at least 1% on average by the end of FY 2007. Actual Performance: Progress against this new goal has not yet been directly calculated after the close of FY 2002.</p> <p>Key Goal III: Timeliness in disbursing funds Performance Target: NA. Goal was established for FY 2004. Actual Performance: NA. Goal was established for FY 2004.</p>					
3 <i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	large extent	FEMA has developed a new program efficiency measure, though it will not have final performance data until after the end of FY 2002.	FEMA "Initial Annual Performance Plan, FY 2004"	25%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4 <i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	NA	Results dependent on outcome of common measure exercise -- leave blank for now		0%	
5 <i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	large extent	The few reports and studies that have examined whether the program is achieving results indicate this is the case. For example, the program receives clean financial statement audits. The GAO study of lender compliance indicated there appears to be adherence to regulation in the loan origination process and FEMA is now focusing on the question of policy retention.	In many cases, FEMA has adopted independent recommendations for improving program performance. For example, the biennial audits for the WYO companies are reviewed for problems and trends and corrective action is taken. The examination of claims and underwriting identified and made recommendations concerning best practices and these have been implemented. Findings from the Price-Waterhouse, Coopers study have been incorporated into legislative proposals for subsidy reduction as well as rate changes. The Heinz Center study has provided the basis for proposals to change flood hazard mapping as well as, more immediately, changes in V-Zone (coastal velocity) insurance premium rates. BPATS reports, coupled with claims information resulted in the study of breakaway walls conducted with the National Science Foundation and in the current evaluation of some or all V-Zone construction requirements for certain other coastal flood zones.	25%	0.2
Total Section Score				100%	67%

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Office of Investigations
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration & Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	43%	53%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The OI Program enforces trade and immigration laws through the investigation of activities, persons, and events that may pose a threat to U.S. safety and security. In particular, it investigates and strives to prevent illegal trafficking in weapons (including WMDs and NBCR agents), narcotics and contraband smuggling, human smuggling and trafficking, money laundering and other financial crimes, fraudulent trade practices, child pornography, and child sex tourism. Its role is crucial in the prevention of terrorist attacks against the United States.

Evidence: *OI Mission Statement *DHS Strategic Plan 2004 *DHS Future Year planning/budget strategy

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: OI is focused on preventing terrorists and criminal organizations from exploiting the vulnerabilities of U.S. financial, national security, public safety, and immigration systems. OI also works to shut down the apparatus, pipelines, and infrastructure that foster and facilitate the development, growth, and sustainment of criminal organizations and criminal systems. Its investigations are strengthened through the use of multiple enforcement authorities including from Titles 8, 18 19, 21, and 31.

Evidence: *OI Mission Statement *DHS Strategic Plan 2004

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program does not duplicate other Federal, state, and local efforts. OI's mission is to prevent terrorist and other criminal activity that exploits vulnerabilities in the U.S. trade and immigration systems, endangering the safety and security of the U.S. In the Federal sector, the OI program is in many cases complementary to, but distinct from, other law enforcement agencies; where this occurs, OI works to define protocols with those agencies to avoid duplication and waste. For example, ICE has an MOA with FBI on terrorist financing and material support investigations, which identifies respective roles and mandates coordination, information sharing, and joint investigations, as necessary. The statutes OI enforces are Federal criminal and administrative violations that do not overlap with state and local authorities or efforts. Frequently, however, ICE works with state and local agencies on specific criminal task forces to maximize impact.

Evidence: *Titles 8, 18, 19, 21, and 31 *MOAs, MOUs and Interagency Agreements affecting OI [e.g., with FBI, National Center for Missing and Exploited (NCMEC), U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury, DOJ, Marshals Service, the State of Alabama]

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: OI has structured its program around three critical strategic areas of the Homeland Security National Strategy: (1) strengthen national security, (2) combat smuggling and promote public safety, and (3) secure the nation's economic system from terrorist and criminal exploitation. Each of these core operational divisions represents a consolidation of legacy authorities and expertise. Effectiveness and efficiency are enhanced through cross-training all agents.

Evidence: *HQ Functional Design Operational Components - May 22, 2003 *Field Design Document April 30, 2003 *Homeland Security National Strategy *SAC/RAC Template

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Office of Investigations
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration & Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	43%	53%	

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: OI continuously responds to shifting and evolving threats to effectively target the highest priorities. The National Security Investigations Division (NSI) recently partnered with the FBI to support its analytical "Fall Threat" initiative and, simultaneously, formed, funded and staffed "Operation Front Line," to address potential vulnerabilities in immigration and trade systems relative to the national security of the United States. In addition, OI has targeted resources to heightened threat such as airports (Operation Tarmac), nuclear power plants (Operation Glow Worm), human smuggling (Operation ICE Storm & the Arizona Border Control Initiative), and illegal money transfers (Cornerstone).

Evidence: *Operation Front Line*Cornerstone *ICE Storm *ABC Initiative *Operation Predator*Project Shield America

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The primary performance measure targets efficient investigative results that impact criminals and terrorists by measuring arrests, indictments, convictions, seizures, and fines against completed cases. A second measure, "Dollar value of monetary instrument seizures derived from and/or used to support criminal activity," directly measures the success of removing financial incentives for criminals and terrorists to operate.

Evidence: *DHS Performance Budget Overview (PBO) *Draft OI Strategic Plan

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: OI's primary long-term measure has an ambitious annual target for 2004 of 58.7% which is a 1.5% increase over FY 2003. This 2004 outcome target is particularly ambitious considering challenges such as combining agency budgets, personnel systems, and cross-training agents. With regard to the second measure mentioned in 2.1, the dollar value of monetary instrument seizures is ambitiously targeted for 2004 at \$269.1M with annual increases, compared to the FY 2003 baseline of \$256.3M. The FY 2004 total for the end of the 3rd quarter is \$173.5M.

Evidence: *DHS Future Year planning/budget strategy *DHS Performance Budget Overview

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: Both long-term measures have specific annual targets. The "real-time" TECS law enforcement database can track performance by the month or quarter, enabling fine tuned program adjustments as necessary. OI's progress towards its primary goal is requested and reviewed quarterly by ICE and DHS. All FY 2005 and 2006 budget requests have OI sub-program performance measures that tie 5 years of annual performance output targets directly to requested resource enhancements. Each law enforcement program within OI has its own output measure of success (such as "visitor over-stay lead resolution" or "visa application review") for management use, guiding investigative efforts, helping OI track towards its long-term goal.

Evidence: *ICE Performance Budget Overview *DHS Performance Accountability Report

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Office of Investigations
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration & Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	43%	53%	

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Annual targets were developed in FY 2003 based on data drawn from several sources. While OI is transitioning to a new consolidated data system in FY 2004, FY 2005 will be the first complete year of collecting data in a uniform manner and utilizing one system. Based on the legacy Customs historical average of \$250M/year, the OI secondary goal target of \$269.1M of "monetary instruments" seized is ambitious.

Evidence: *DHS Performance Budget Overview *Draft Report: Utilization of TECS and ENFORCE to Report All Enforcement Statistics for ICE Investigations

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Although the methods of criminal investigation OI uses to achieve its mission are similar to other law enforcement agencies, the objectives of closing vulnerabilities and preventing future terrorist attacks are distinct. OI works in partnership with numerous trade and financial private sector groups and with Federal, state, local, and tribal public sector agencies. In order to avoid duplication and wasted effort, OI uses a variety of mechanisms to influence its partners and secure commitment to annual and long-term goals. These mechanisms include Memorandums of Understanding and Memorandums of Agreement; co-location of OI agents with partner agencies (e.g., Terrorist Threat Intelligence Center); full-time liaison officers to partner agencies (e.g., TEOAF); and private sector partnership agreements. The results of these mechanisms are measured as contributing to the progress towards closing identified vulnerabilities.

Evidence: *MOUs/MOAs/Interagency Agreements (e.g., DOJ, Treasury, various DHS components, Alabama)
 *Arizona Border Control Initiative *ICE Liaison List*Cornerstone*Tarmac*ICE Storm*Shield America*Operation Predator*National Center for Missing and Exploited Children

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Since ICE was established in March 2003, GAO and the DHS OIG have started about 60 audits of OI and, including those begun before then, they have completed over 20 in final since 3/1/03. The scope of these audits has generally focused on the national conduct of program activity, with criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, performance, and identification of program weaknesses. While GAO/OIG do not share their audit schedule with OI, the volume of reviews demonstrates that OI is regularly audited by these independent reviewers. Recommendations identify areas for either correction or improvement; of the audits completed in final, only 8 had recommendations for OI, the majority of which were minor in nature. OI ensures that corrective actions are undertaken and completed both timely and substantively. The Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) is establishing procedures to conduct efficiency and effectiveness audits of SAC offices on a 3-year cycle and overseas offices on a 4-year cycle; the first inspection is expected by early fall of 2004.

Evidence: *GAO and OIG Audits and findings *OPR and MO Functional Statements*See answer to 4.5 for effectiveness

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Office of Investigations
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration & Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	43%	53%	

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: As a new agency, OI is currently in the process of developing baseline performance and resource data during the first full year of its existence, based on systemic vulnerabilities. These vulnerabilities will be defined based on intelligence and risk analysis; an Action Plan will be developed based on the vulnerabilities; progress in accomplishing the action items will be measured; and the cost of such progress will be quantified, thus linking the budget to outcome. As a result, budgets will be constructed based on the costs involved in achieving the desired outcomes, and performance measures will then become the mechanism for determining whether the outcomes are achieved and, if so, how efficiently.

Evidence: *OI's FY 2006 Budget Requests

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: OI has reviewed its planning efforts and taken the following corrective actions: drafted a Strategic Plan with broad participation from managers in various programmatic areas (to be finalized by the end of 4th quarter FY04); planning to revisit performance metrics with lessons learned during OI's transition year (FY05 will be the base year for measuring program success); developing a process improvement policy for TECS data entry, the main source of performance data reporting; completed threat assessments at each SAC office as a basis for strategic decision-making; and completed threat assessments of financial systems prone to abuse or exploitation (a corrective action recommended by GAO). Additionally, the potential for improved performance has been identified and realized in areas such as reducing violence related to human trafficking in the Arizona area (Operation ICE Storm and the Arizona Border Control Initiative); reducing the presence of aliens who are child sex predators (Operation Predator); and identifying financial system vulnerabilities (Cornerstone).

Evidence: *Draft OI Strategic Plan focuses on strategic direction *Operations resulting from management strategic needs assessment & planning (Operation ICE Storm, Arizona Border Control Initiative, Operation Predator, Cornerstone)

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: OI previously used two data collection systems - TECS/SEACATS and PAS. OI will have consolidated all reporting into TECS by the end of the 3rd quarter of FY 2004. Data from TECS is available in real-time and is continuously validated within OI. OI uses a variety of routine and ad hoc reports from TECS to measure efficiency and effectiveness. The current combination of data systems, primarily TECS, enables OI to measure all activity necessary to manage and improve performance.

Evidence: *Data Compendium based on TECS*Performance Tracking memo dated 1/29/04*Format for Financial Threat Assessments*Project Shield America weekly statistical report*Cornerstone March 2004 Performance Report*Leadtrac tracks assignment of leads to the field and the results of the resultant field investigations*Draft Report: Utilization of TECS and ENFORCE to Report All Enforcement Statistics for ICE Investigations

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Office of Investigations
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration & Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	43%	53%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: OI has deficiencies in this area but is moving to rectify these problems. As part of the MOU/MOA process, OI is striving to overcome current obstacles to smooth cooperation by setting goals and objectives for each program partner covered by these MOUs/MOAs. New SES and senior manager workplans are being created to address accountability for operational, financial, and other management areas. DHS has developed a Department-wide personnel system, including accountability and performance standards for employees. Until this system is fully implemented, OI is operating under legacy performance systems.

Evidence: *Draft SES annual performance plans in accordance with the new DHS HR system report *Quarterly (budget) Statement of work for contractor support to Executive Information Unit *CEE Capital Asset Plan & Business Case *Homeland Security Enterprise Architecture Project *MOUs/MOAs/Interagency Agreements (e.g., DOJ, Treasury, various DHS components, Alabama)

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: OI has difficulties in maintaining strong fiscal controls. Its current system relies on FFMS, a system with flaws that OI and ICE are working to resolve. In FY 2004, the ICE Office of Budget distributed funding to OI monthly. For all SAC offices, OI's Financial and Logistics Management Unit (FLMU) developed a cost model based on prior year expenses to distribute monthly financial plans. For Headquarters offices, financial plans were developed based on Deputy Assistant Director program estimates. Once financial plans were solidified, offices expended funding as given and provided obligations and expense reports to FLMU on a quarterly basis. This report is an Excel spreadsheet that provides obligations, expenditures, and funds available by object class codes at the division and SAC level and provides an explanation of the intended uses of unobligated balances. The FFMS is a 'real time' system and provides data as of the point in time that data is requested via the report functions. Therefore, it is possible to track obligations and expenditures on as frequent a basis as needed.

Evidence: *Allotments from ICE*Spending Plans*Field Obligation/Expenditures Reports

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Office of Investigations
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration & Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	43%	53%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: ICE is working aggressively with contractors to remedy shortcomings of FFMS, the financial management system of ICE, with the goal of putting robust capabilities in place for the start of FY 2005. Also, DHS is developing a Department-wide financial system, EMERGE2. Meanwhile, OI has developed ad hoc mechanisms to monitor cost efficiencies. OI Budget Execution, within the FLMU, gets monthly allocations from ICE Budget which are then distributed to the HQ and field units by object class codes. The HQ and field units are required to reconcile their local ledgers against FFMS and make quarterly reports to OI Budget Execution. This reconciling process serves to validate the local ledgers and to correct any missing or erroneous entries in FFMS. The current reconciliation requirements were determined based upon the expected needs of the FLMU. Quarterly reporting was implemented to prevent overtaxing the field offices. More frequent reconciliations are requested before providing additional funds for 'special' needs.

Evidence: *DHS investment review process requirements *OMB requirements
 *Exhibit 300 Light Guidance *CEE Capital Asset Plan & Business Case
 Performance Reference Model *Draft (IT)

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: As a new program, OI is negotiating protocols with related agencies to build effective collaboration (see #2.5). While OI has made significant progress in the last year, there remain certain areas where additional negotiation with other law enforcement and regulatory agencies, such as Treasury and DEA, is necessary. The following examples demonstrate effectiveness: The successful partnering of OI's Operation Predator and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has resulted in 3,247 arrests of child predators in the past year. ICE and CBP officers effected over 10,200 Intellectual Property Rights seizures valued at over \$159M over the past 18 months. In the 1st quarter of FY 2004, homicides decreased 30% in Phoenix due to Operation ICE Storm, an OI, federal, and state collaboration to combat violent crime by Human Smuggling organizations.

Evidence: *Examples of task forces: JTTF, OCDETF, HIDTAs, IBETs, ICE Storm, and the Arizona Border Control Initiative.
 *Liaison positions assigned full time to other Federal agencies, e.g., CIA, CBP, Department of State, FBI, FinCEN, ONDCP.
 *Multiple MOUs, MOAs, and Interagency Agreements. *Partnering with private sector, e.g., Project Shield America,
 Cornerstone, NCMEC. *Partnering with ICE's FAMS,
 etc. *National Money Laundering Coordination Center processes requests for DEA, FBI, & IRS and provides support to
 DOJ attorneys in Asset Forfeiture & Money Laundering section. *National Child Victim Identification Program*Human Smuggling & Trafficking Center.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Office of Investigations
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration & Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	43%	53%	

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: OI and its parent component, ICE, have not yet developed strong financial management practices. Its current practices are ad-hoc and rely on manual reconciliation. ICE is working to resolve the FFMS problems, but those problems still remain. Through the use of monthly and quarterly reviews that track by object class code, OI monitors the use of the funding allocated to the HQ and field units. The units are responsible for reconciling their accounts against the ICE FFMS, reporting any problems or issues that may occur. OI's FLMU provides a summary quarterly review of all of OI to the Director with analysis and recommendations. During the 4th QTR of the fiscal year, FLMU provides the Director weekly and then daily financial status reports. OI requires that all reprogramming of money must be approved through the FLMU which ensures that funds are directed and expended as intended. Financial management guidelines, as well as training on financial systems, are provided to the units.

Evidence: *Quarterly Reports*Procedures *Excel Tracking Report

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: OI's Management Oversight Unit (MO) has dedicated staff to participate in each GAO and OIG initiative from start to finish, including the response to findings & recommendations. (Since ICE was 'stood up,' about 60 audits have been started and over 20 are final.) MO staff ensure that corrective actions are undertaken and completed both timely and substantively. (Comparable effort will be directed to the OPR audits - with their 30-60 day followup on identified deficiencies - when initiated.) An example of corrective action taken is the implementation of a threat assessment program to target money laundering, in response to a recommendation in GAO Report 03-813. OI has a cooperative relationship with OPR, working closely to help develop a protocol for OPR's Self-Inspection Program, which is expected to begin by mid-fall and will identify deficiencies/areas for improvement. Additionally, OI's Executive Information Unit regularly conducts data quality analyses and ensures that corrective actions are taken where problems are identified.

Evidence: *OI Organization Chart MO
 *Data Quality Handbook
 *Cross-training Plans
 *GAO Report 03-813 and Corrective Action
 *Annual Data Quality Report
 *SAC/RAC Templates
 *Draft OI Strategic Plan
 *Functional Statements for OPR and
 *Standardized Reports & Data Analysis

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:20%

Explanation: The annual target for OI's 2004 primary long-term performance goal is 58.7%. As of the end of the 3rd quarter of FY 2004, the annual goal status is 43.7%. The target was set based on multiple legacy forms of data collection which were not totally consistent. Consequently, the target was set too high. Despite that, OI's current performance is 74% of the target level, and increasing quarterly. The dollar value of monetary instrument seizures target for 2004 is \$269.1M. The FY 2004 total seizures for the end of the 3rd quarter is \$173.5M.

Evidence: *TECS Reports
 *Performance Budget Overview (PBO).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Office of Investigations
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration & Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	43%	53%	

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: **SMALL EXTENT** Question Weight **20%**

Explanation: As a new program, OI is making progress toward meeting its annual performance goals and refining its methodology for measuring performance. The percentage of cases that result in an enforcement consequence and the dollar value of seizures of monetary instruments derived from and/or used to support criminal activity remain the capstone performance measures. Significant achievements in addressing vulnerabilities in financial, trade, intellectual property, human smuggling, and critical infrastructure protection have occurred. (See #s 1.5, 2.5, 2.8, and 3.5.)

Evidence: *TECS Reports *Draft OI Strategic Plan *Draft ICE Strategic Plan *DHS
 planning/budget document *Performance Budget Overview (PBO).

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: **LARGE EXTENT** Question Weight **20%**

Explanation: Since inception, OI has been integrating its human resources, financial, and IT systems. OI has made significant achievements to that end: consolidating law enforcement reporting into TECS, an investigative case management database; consolidating to a standard single financial database; through purchases of standard equipment; national contracts for services; integration of law enforcement training; and refinement of the SAC office structure. The SAC Management Template Initiative proposes a realignment of field office personnel realizing a savings of \$1.8M. Single systems and uniform data entry procedures save special agent time and increase investigative efforts. Merging the law enforcement training academies and reducing the agent basic training course from 14 to 12 weeks allow agents trained in both customs and immigration law to graduate and conduct OI operations 2 weeks earlier. Agency-wide purchases of equipment and services has reduced management and maintenance costs and improved operating efficiency for standard use, operator training, and repair.

Evidence: *TECS: Now the Consolidated "One-Source" Investigative Database*
 OI SACs, entitled "TECS II and SEACATS Training Plan" *SAC Management Template Initiative *August 15, 2003, memorandum to
 "Mandatory Use of Law Enforcement Systems for Investigations" *January 20, 2004, memorandum to OI SACs, entitled
 "Additional Guidance for the Mandatory Use of Law Enforcement Systems" *January 27, 2004, memorandum to OI SACs, entitled
 7, 2004, memorandum to OI SACs, entitled "Special Agent Cross Training" *January
 Curriculum *ICE Special Agent Training (ICESAT)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Office of Investigations
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration & Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	43%	53%	

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: LARGE Question Weight 20%
 EXTENT

Explanation: OI has a combination of legal authorities unique in Federal law enforcement, investigating violations of Titles 8, 18, 19, 21 (as cross-designated DEA agents), and 31 of the US Code and other customs and immigration related laws. OI is the only Federal law enforcement agency charged with investigating both customs and immigration laws. In addition, OI conducts fruitful partnerships with the private sector, such as with the financial and banking industry and with the FBI in JTTF terrorist financing investigations, to share trends and patterns in money laundering activity. Such partnerships are complementary and build on respective skills and expertise.

Evidence: *OI works closely with other federal law enforcement agencies such as DEA, FBI, TSA, USCG, and ATF, as well as with other Federal, state, local, and foreign law enforcement agencies. For example, OI is an active participant in several highly effective task forces, including the OCDETFs, HIDTAs, and JTTFs. *OI also has several MOUs, MOAs, and Interagency Agreements with other Federal agencies, e.g., the MOU between the DEA and USCS regarding Title 21 and the MOU between ICE and the FBI concerning terrorist-related financial investigations.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE Question Weight 20%
 EXTENT

Explanation: GAO and OIG have completed over 20 audits since ICE began. Although Audits tend to focus on weaknesses and deficiencies, findings and recommendations generally support a rating of "mostly effective" (See ICE OPR assessment); for example, OIG-04-17, reviewing ICE's Drug Enforcement efforts, noted that "there are no known material weaknesses" in funds accountability. GAO-03-165, on Combatting Terrorism Overseas, remarked that the new strategies, including OI's, were a positive step in combatting terrorism. In addition to GAO and OIG, the ICE OPR is preparing to initiate Management Inspections of OI offices and programs, as well as instituting a Self-Inspection Program for all field and headquarters offices.

Evidence: *GAO/OIG Completed Audits *OPR Functional Statements*OPR & OI assessment of OI's effectiveness

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Office of Investigations
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration & Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	43%	53%	

Measure: Percent of completed cases which have an enforcement consequence (arrest, indictment, conviction, seizure, fine or penalty)

Additional Information: This is a quality Federal law enforcement measure that demonstrates the effectiveness and efficiency of investigative casework by comparing completed cases with tangible results.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2004	58.7%	43.8%	
2005	Baseline		
2006	TBD		

Measure: Dollar value of monetary instrument seizures derived from and/or used to support criminal activity

Additional Information: Removal of financial support is a key crime inhibiting factor. The higher the volume of tangible criminal resources, the higher the enforcement interference into criminal activity.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2004	269 million	225 million	
2005	283 million		
2006	297 million		
2007	300 million		

Measure: Percent of completed cases which have an enforcement consequence (arrest, indictment, conviction, seizure, fine or penalty)

Additional Information: This long-term measure also has defined annual targets that demonstrate measurable progression towards goal accomplishment.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	58.7%	43.8%	
2005	Baseline		
2006	TBD		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Office of Investigations
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration & Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	43%	53%	

Measure: Dollar value of monetary instrument seizures derived from and/or used to support criminal activity
Additional Information: This long-term measure also has defined annual targets that demonstrate measurable progression towards goal accomplishment.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Passenger Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	34%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The purpose of the Passenger Screening Technology Program is provide the technology necessary to effectively carry out a statutory mandate to prevent the entry of firearms, explosives, and other dangerous weapons on aircraft through inspection of passengers as well as carry-on baggage.

Evidence: Section 110(a) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act of 2001 requires that TSA: "shall provide for the screening of all passengers and property, including United States mail, cargo, carry-on and checked baggage, and other articles, that will by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation..."

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Aviation remains one of the primary focuses of Middle East and other terrorist organizations for actions against U.S. citizens, and the airport passenger screening function constitutes the front lines of preventing aircraft contraband that can assist in terrorist and other criminal acts intended to harm passengers, aircraft and other persons and property.

Evidence: Transportation Security Administration Transportation risk assessments and audits, classified intelligence/threat data collections and reports, and security oversight inspections, checkpoint arrests, dangerous item confiscation levels at airports.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: This program is the only effort that electronically screens passengers and carry on baggage before boarding commercial passenger aircraft.

Evidence: Section 110(a) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act of 2001 requires that TSA: "shall provide for the screening of all passengers and property, including United States mail, cargo, carry-on and checked baggage, and other articles, that will be carried aboard a passenger aircraft operated by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation..."

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Current passenger screening technology deployed may not be sufficient to address all security needs, such as adequate screening for explosives. Management infrastructure of TSA's capital programs needs to be strengthened.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?

Answer: NA

Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Screening checkpoint technology can only directly serve the screening purpose and the intended beneficiary -- air carriers and the flying public. Therefore, this question is not relevant to this program.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Passenger Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	34%	Demonstrated

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: TSA has specific long term performance measures under development related to efficiency and reliability outcomes.

Evidence: Primary measures under development include the level of machine efficiency and reliability.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Most measure targets are under development.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: TSA has specific annual performance measures under development related to effectiveness, efficiency, and reliability outcomes.

Evidence: Primary measures under development include the level of machine effectiveness, efficiency, and reliability.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Most measure targets are under development.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The annual and long-term goals of the program are aligned with partners such as maintenance contractors, support contractors, general contractors etc. The statements of work, task and delivery orders, and schedules of the contracts that support the program have direct input into achievement of programmatic goals.

Evidence: Chief Technology Officer (CTO) Programmatic Documentation: Contractor Statements of Work, Scopes of Work, Schedules, CTO Program Plans, CTO Acquisition Plan. Each contain sections that require work towards the long-term and/or annual goals of the CTO.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Passenger Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	34%	Demonstrated

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The Passenger Screening Technology Program has not yet received independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality. TSA should establish and implement an evaluation agenda to assess and validate key aspects of its program such as the checkpoint equipment architecture, equipment maintenance, lifecycle management plans and strategies, and acquisition management/contractor oversight. TSA will complete an evaluation plan by November, 2004.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Passenge technology for airport checkpoints is uniquely idenfied in the TSA Budget requests and performance goals and targets are tied to the funding level.

Evidence: All checkpoint technology funding is differentiated in the Budget justifications and the justifications are organized in a performance based structure.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: TSA's primary strategic planning deficiencies include the lack of clearly defined performance outcome goals and targets, as well as a comprehensive screening technology capital plan supporting technology investment decisions. Outcome goals and targets are under development. TSA has not yet developed a capital plan.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.CA1 **Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: TSA is in the process of performing an alternatives analysis and cost benefit analysis in accordance with OMB Circular A-94.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: TSA does not currently collect and utilize adequate performance information from its primary equipment contractors that supply, install, and maintain passenger screening equipment. However, TSA is in the process of implemeting improved management information systems.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Passenger Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	34%	Demonstrated

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Key program partners such as maintenance contractors, support contractors, general contractors, etc. are responsible for achieving results in accordance with TSA performance goals. The DHS IG has found that TSA did not in the past hold its primary equipment service provider accountable for performance. In response, TSA is in the process of improving its future contracts in this area.

Evidence: Current and planned contract documentation such as statements of work, scopes of work, schedules, etc., currently or will include performance targets which tie to program goals. Contractors are required to have earned value management systems.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Program funds are obligated consistently with the overall program plan. The schedule for obligations is established and meets the resource needs of the program. Procedures exist for reporting actual expenditures.

Evidence: Monthly obligations reports.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: While TSA is developing efficiency performance measures and a comprehensive capital plan to help guide efficiency/effectiveness technology decisions, these efforts are not yet sufficiently mature.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The program collaborates with the Baggage Screening Technology, Screener Workforce, and Training programs, as well as commercial airports, in allocating passenger screening equipment, and for decisions on checkpoint reconfigurations. The program also coordinates with Aviation Operations in areas such as workforce performance.

Evidence: In 2003, TSA completed an internal "Passenger Screener Performance Improvement Study" which developed a coordinated action plan in each programmatic area affecting screener performance. Action plans included technology improvements. Screener workforce allocations by screening checkpoint are coordinated with the specific technologies deployed.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: While TSA received a clean audit opinion, it received material weaknesses in internal control, including property management. Property management is substantially related to the Passenger Screening Technology Program.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Passenger Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	34%	Demonstrated

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Notable management deficiencies currently include the lack of a detailed screening technology capital plan guiding management decisions, the lack of an effective and cost-effective plan and contract strategy for managing equipment maintenance, inadequate program management training of TSA staff, and the lack of adequate program management information systems. All of these areas are being actively addressed.

Evidence: TSA will produce a detailed capital plan by the end of 2004; current equipment maintenance strategies are being revised and a new contract approach developed; all equipment program managers are receiving program management training and will become Level III certified; a new management information system is being implemented.

3.CA1 Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?

Answer: NO

Question Weight:13%

Explanation: TSA has prepared an Acquisition Plan that has not yet been approved. Current services contracts were awarded under FAA, prior to TSA, and are not performance-based. Equipment contracts are firm-fixed price, with schedules for deliverables. FAA contracts are expiring during FY '04 and will be upgraded in early FY '05.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?

Answer: NO

Question Weight:17%

Explanation: TSA has not yet established targets and timeframes for its long term performance goals.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?

Answer: NO

Question Weight:17%

Explanation: TSA has not yet established targets for its annual performance goals.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: NO

Question Weight:17%

Explanation: While TSA is currently re-competing all services contracts to increase program efficiency and lower costs, in this case primarily with respect to technology maintenance, it cannot yet demonstrate efficiency and cost effectiveness improvements. Efficiency performance targets are still under development.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Passenger Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	34%	Demonstrated

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: While some checkpoint screening technology is used across a wide swath of public and private organizations in the United States, and TSA uses the same or better technological approach, nothing adequately compares in the overall size and scope of TSA's operation for the purposes of a comparative analysis. TSA should determine how it can compare checkpoint technological enterprise performance with overseas aviation security operators, both public and private. TSA should include such an analysis in its future evaluation plans.

Evidence: Magnetometers, hand wands, and x-ray systems form the basis of checkpoint screening for most public and private organizations with security screening operations, including TSA. The same systems are offered by vendors to each entity.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: While the Checkpoint Technology Program has not been subject to an independent evaluation of sufficient quality and scope, broad evaluations of screening system performance by GAO and the Inspector General have raised few significant problems with the checkpoint screening technology architecture, or the specific equipment. The September 11th Commission highlighted a security performance concern with respect to the inadequacy of checkpoint technology in the area of screening for explosives.

Evidence: GAO and the IG have centered concerns to date on the issue of accelerating the deployment of Threat Image Projection (TIP) technology for testing screeners at operating checkpoint x-rays. TIP has now been fully deployed.

4.CA1 Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: Budgeted cost and schedule targets changed several times in 2003 for passenger screening technology primarily because of policy changes with respect to capital deployments and ongoing planning negotiations with airports. Consequently, adhering to original schedules proved difficult. It is expected that long term capital planning efforts started in FY 2004 will foster improvements in execution of both acquisition and sustainment activities.

Evidence: Different cost and schedule deployment plans indicate intent and ability to abide by originally-proposed cost and schedule goals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Passenger Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	34%	Demonstrated

Measure: Level of machine effectiveness Measure Under Development

Additional Information: This measure will indicate the performance of systems operating in the field that are tested at startup to determine ongoing ability to detect threat objects at acceptable levels.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

Measure: Level of machine efficiency

Additional Information: This measure is the screening checkpoint capital cost per person screened with respect to walk-through metal detectors, carry on item x-ray machines, and explosives trace detection devices.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	Baseline		
2005			
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Passenger Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	34%	Demonstrated

2010

Measure: Level of machine efficiency Measure Under Development

Additional Information: This measure is the screening checkpoint capital cost per person screened with respect to walk-through metal detectors, carry on item x-ray machines, and explosives trace detection devices.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010			

Measure: Level of machine reliability Measure Under Development

Additional Information: This measure reflects the level of down time versus operation for screening checkpoint equipment including walk-through metal detectors, carry on item x-ray machines, and explosives trace detection devices.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

Measure: Level of machine reliability

Additional Information: This measure reflects the level of down time versus operation for screening checkpoint equipment including walk-through metal detectors, carry on item x-ray machines, and explosives trace detection devices.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Passenger Screening Technology
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	44%	50%	34%	Demonstrated

Measure: Level of equipment deployed.

Additional Information: The measure depicts the total number of expected x-ray, metal detector, and trace explosive devices deployed for that year.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2005	53		
2006	55		
2007	57		
2008	59		
2009	62		
2010	64		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of the Protective Intelligence (PI) program is to minimize the risk of harm to persons, property, and events protected by the United States Secret Service (USSS). The program achieves this purpose through three primary means: (a) receives, evaluates, disseminates, and maintains information concerning subjects (individuals and groups) and activities that pose a known, potential, or perceived threat to persons, property, and events protected by the Secret Service; (b) investigates those subjects and activities; and (c) conducts intelligence 'advances' preceding protectee travel.

Evidence: Protective Statutes (includes 18 U.S.C. 3056, which lists persons, property, and event categories protected by the Secret Service). Various internal USSS training documents and operations manuals.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Secret Service meets the Federal government's need to provide a secure environment for our Nation's leaders (at home and abroad), visiting foreign dignitaries, and National Special Security Events (NSSEs). Meeting this need requires an intelligence program wholly dedicated to assessing and mitigating threats to these individuals and events; the PI program provides USSS law enforcement personnel with the timely and relevant information needed to carry out their associated protective operations. The historical importance of an aggressive PI program has only increased given the sustained elevated threat environment following the September 11th attacks on our Nation.

Evidence: (1) National and world history demonstrates that terrorism, political dissent, mental health, and other factors motivate various individuals and groups to attempt to assassinate, kidnap, or otherwise harm nations' leaders. Protecting our Nation's leaders is an ongoing homeland security imperative. (2) The need for world leaders to be able to conduct business securely in the United States is based on statute, treaty, diplomacy, and reciprocity. (3) The vulnerability of large, public, visible events to terrorist attack is such that the Secret Service is required by Presidential Decision Directive-62 to plan and implement security designs for NSSEs.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: While the intelligence community is composed of various entities that specialize in intelligence related to various populations or facilities (e.g. troops overseas, air travelers, immigrants, Federal installations), the Secret Service is the sole entity responsible for receiving, evaluating, disseminating, maintaining, and investigating information concerning subjects and activities that pose a threat to our Nation's highest leaders and visiting foreign dignitaries. By design, the program receives raw intelligence from other agencies in the intelligence community. This is not a duplication of effort; rather, as a consumer of other agencies' human (HUMINT), signals (SIGINT), and other intelligence, the USSS PI program leverages partners' collection capabilities to meet the robust intelligence needs of USSS operations with only a modest investment (\$67.5 million in FY 2005). The PI program's analysis, dissemination, and field investigative use of intelligence collected by other agencies is consistent with the findings of the Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy (the 'Warren Commission' Report).

Evidence: 18 U.S.C. 3056. Excerpts from the Warren Commission Report. Excerpts from Congressional Budget Submission. Various internal USSS operations manuals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

1.4 **Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The USSS responsibility to protect our Nation's leaders, visiting dignitaries, and NSSEs is statutory; therefore the PI program is 'direct federal' and the Federal Government could not delegate associated responsibilities to state, local, or private entities through a 'grant' or 'regulatory' program design. The program's structure (which is heavily reliant on agents in the field to perform intelligence advances and investigate intelligence cases) is not only effective (see Section 4) but also efficient: field resources (primarily focused on investigating counterfeiting and other financial crimes) are re-directed to intelligence activities based on protectees' travel itineraries, NSSEs' venues, and variances in national and regional threat levels. The 'surge capacity' of the field to perform intelligence functions, and then revert to financial investigations, makes the PI program far more efficient than if it were to locate intelligence-dedicated personnel in every USSS field office, or deploy intelligence advance agents out-of-district in support of every protectee stop. Also, the program's focus on the analysis and investigation (versus collection) of intelligence effectively leverages other agencies' collection activities to attain mission-required intelligence support for a modest investment.

Evidence: 18 U.S.C. 3056. Various internal USSS workload statistics.

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Consistent with 18 U.S.C. 3056, the PI program devotes intelligence resources only to intended beneficiaries (our Nation's leaders, visiting foreign dignitaries, and NSSEs). Moreover, the program employs intelligence advances to determine the appropriate level of operational resources needed for protectee visits; intelligence advance agents' determinations as to the nature and scope of the local threat environment drive the allocation of resources (e.g., manpower, communications, equipment) in protective operations. Within the Intelligence Division (ID), program resources surge and contract (both within and across geographic and functional areas) in response to such factors as protectee travel destinations, NSSE venues, variance in national threat levels, and/or crisis management scenarios.

Evidence: 18 U.S.C. 3056. Various internal USSS training documents and operations manuals.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight 13%

Explanation: The PI program's long-term outcome goal is to minimize the risk of harm to persons, property, and events protected by the Secret Service. The program's primary long-term performance measure is the Number of Known Subjects Who Approach Protectees or Protective Events (NEW MEASURE). In addition, the program directly contributes to the Secret Service's overarching long-term protective measure, the Percentage of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely.

Evidence: Congressional Budget Submission. Annual Performance Plans and Reports. Future Years Homeland Security Program. Various internal USSS training documents and operations manuals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Given the critical nature of the protective mission, the PI program strives to completely eliminate risks associated with individuals and groups that pose a threat to persons, property, and events protected by the Secret Service. Anything short of their complete safety is unsatisfactory; therefore, the targets for the PI program's long-term measures are: (1) zero known subjects approaching protectees or protective events and (2) 100% instances of protectees' safe arrival and departure. Such ambitious targets promote continuous improvement, maximizing the safety of protected persons, property, and events. The activities associated with the PI program are given the highest priority by the Secret Service.

Evidence: Congressional Budget Submission. Annual Performance Plans and Reports. Future Years Homeland Security Program.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The PI program's long-term outcome goal is to minimize the risk of harm to persons, property, and events protected by the Secret Service. The PI program's annual outcome measures, which demonstrate progress toward achieving this goal, are (1) the Number of Known Subjects Who Approach Protectees or Protective Events (NEW MEASURE) and (2) the Percentage of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely. The PI program's long-term and annual outcome measures are identical. In addition, the following annual output measures demonstrate progress toward the program's long-term goal: (1) Volume of Intelligence Assessed, (2) Number of Protective Intelligence Advances Completed, and (3) Number of Protective Intelligence Cases Completed. Additionally, the Management and Organization (M&O) Division is currently developing a comprehensive efficiency measure (an index that illustrates the change in unit cost from the base year to the current year), which will be available at the end of FY 2004. Answer 4.3 presents an interim efficiency measure for the PI program.

Evidence: Congressional Budget Submission. Annual Performance Plans and Reports. Future Years Homeland Security Program. Sample internal USSS operational statistics.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Given the critical nature of the protective mission, the PI program strives to completely eliminate risks associated with individuals and groups that pose a threat to persons, property, and events protected by the Secret Service. Anything short of their complete safety is unsatisfactory; therefore, the targets for the PI program's annual outcome measures are: (1) zero known subjects approaching protectees or protective events and (2) 100% instances of protectees' safe arrival and departure. Such ambitious targets promote continuous improvement, maximizing the safety of protected persons, property, and events. See Measures Tab for outcome measures' baselines. Baseline data are also available (see Measures Tab) for the program's output measures (Volume of Intelligence Assessed, Number of Protective Intelligence Advances Completed, and Number of Protective Intelligence Cases Completed). However, "targets" for the program's output measures are actually "estimates" (versus targets), because they are entirely driven by factors external to the program's control (protectees' travel itineraries, volume and severity of threats received, DHS NSSE designations, etc.).

Evidence: Congressional Budget Submission. Annual Performance Plans and Reports.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The PI program recognizes the importance of and relies upon partnerships. Furthermore, the Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy (the 'Warren Commission' Report) established the need for information sharing between the Secret Service and other agencies. The program works in partnership with numerous agencies in the law enforcement and intelligence communities to achieve its goal of minimizing the risk of harm to persons, property, and events protected by the Secret Service. Through Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), Letters of Agreement (LOAs), and other general agreements, government partners provide an array of non-reimbursable support, such as SIGINT and HUMINT feeds that impact upon the program's mission. In addition, the program utilizes medical and mental health professionals for case consultation, field-based training, and professional liaison; whether provided contractually or through mutually cooperative associations, these services assist the program in evaluating individuals who could pose a threat to USSS protectees.

Evidence: Excerpts from the Warren Commission Report. Various internal USSS documents and interagency agreements.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 6%

Explanation: Independent statisticians and analysts in the USSS Quantitative Studies and Statistical Systems Branch use the Workload Statistical and Reporting System to provide the PI program's managers with routine (at least monthly) reports containing performance indicators. This process ensures that the Secret Service systematically obtains and uses feedback in order to evaluate and improve the PI program's performance. The regularity of the data's dissemination is such that program effectiveness is evaluated on a systematized and routine (vice ad-hoc) basis. 'Historically, other independent evaluations by the USSS M&O Division have "filled the gaps," answering questions not easily found in performance data. Such evaluations often focus on maximizing the PI program's effectiveness through process improvement, organizational changes, or broader management considerations. Examples include three M&O studies that: (1) validated the adequacy of the staffing and the relevance of the structure of key ID activities, (2) recommended methods for increasing the efficiency of ID's Duty Desk, and (3) verified the efficiency and effectiveness of the process for sharing intelligence information among originating units, ID, and field agents working PI investigations and advances. Note that the USSS Management and Organization Division (inclusive of the Quantitative Studies and Statistical Systems Branch) exists outside the PI program's chain of command. 'Finally, the program's parent division (Intelligence Division) undergoes a thorough "Inspection" process every two years. Secret Service inspections assess effectiveness of operations; quality of management and supervision; and adherence to policies, regulations, and procedures. Inspectors are senior ranking criminal investigators independent of the program's and the division's chain of command.

Evidence: Various internal USSS training documents and operations manuals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Secret Service organizes its budget into six program areas, of which PI is one. Each program area represents a specific amount within the USSS base budget, linked to the performance measures present in each of the program areas. The Secret Service aligns its PI budget request with the appropriate departmental strategic goal, bureau strategic goal, bureau strategic objective, program performance goal, and program performance measure. [The FY 2005 budget request for PI reflects the USSS estimate of what resources the program needs in the budget year to accomplish its goal, to minimize the risk of harm to persons, property, and events protected by the Secret Service. The FY 2005 President's Budget requested no funding, policy, or legislative changes relative to the PI program.] Finally, the USSS budget request reflects the full cost of the PI program, inclusive of indirect or 'overhead' costs (e.g., training, human resources, procurement support, finance and accounting) needed to attain program results. [The Secret Service will update the above bracketed portion upon completion of its FY 2006 budget request.]

Evidence: Congressional Budget Submission. Various internal USSS reporting materials.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The PI program has both specific, ambitious long-term performance goals and annual performance goals demonstrating progress toward them (see answers 2.1 and 2.3). External factors affecting the PI program's ability to meet its goals include the advancement of information technology useful to the criminal element, the need for enhanced information sharing within and across agencies, competition for analytical support personnel, and the increasing sophistication of the terrorist threat. ID's parent office (the Office of Protective Research [OPR]), although not required to do so by any external entity, is in the process of publishing a strategic plan (currently in draft form) containing objectives and strategies addressing these critical areas of intelligence strategic planning. While the PI program funds the manpower costs of non-OPR personnel's conduct of intelligence advances and investigation of intelligence cases, these employees' critical role in the PI program is also addressed and captured by the OPR Draft Strategic Plan, which substantially addresses information technology improvements needed to enhance communication and PI case management between headquarters and the field. This strategic plan spans 2004-2008.

Evidence: Internal Secret Service planning documents.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: ' First, the Secret Service systematically collects a wide range of performance information for all of its core programs, including the PI program. Automated systems that are integrated into normal business processes collect statistics such as manhours dedicated to PI, number of intelligence cases closed, etc. Using these systems, independent statisticians and analysts in the USSS Quantitative Studies and Statistical Systems Branch provide program managers with statistical reports that assist them in managing the performance of the PI program. Program managers use these statistical reports, as well as statistical data maintained within ID (such as protective intelligence advances completed) to make resource allocation decisions, particularly manpower determinations for PI advances and PI investigations. Performance information is also useful in program managers' semi-annual office evaluations. Data dating back decades exist for baselining purposes. ' Second, following every protectee trip, the lead PI advance agent completes and submits to the Special Agent in Charge (SAIC) of ID a mandatory 'Trip Return' report. This reporting requirement is a systematic means for recording and maintaining PI advance agents' observations concerning critical factors that impact performance. The SAIC reviews reports for observations relevant to managing PI performance as it pertains to intelligence advances for particular protectees or venues, or to the program in the aggregate. ' Third, PI program managers also improve program performance using the results of surveys that solicit feedback from the program's customers (USSS protective details). Every two years ' as part of the USSS inspection cycle ' USSS protective details complete surveys pertaining to ID's performance. In 2002-2003 and independent of the inspection cycle, PI program managers surveyed USSS protective details concerning the program's operational and threat assessment services. Management actions taken in response to these surveys included improvements in the timeliness of incident notifications.

Evidence: Internal Secret Service workload reporting documents. Internal Secret Service workload analysis reports.

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Secret Service uses the USSS Senior Executive Service (SES) Performance Appraisal System to rate the performance of the SAIC of ID, as well as the Deputy Assistant Director (DAD) of Protective Research and Assistant Director (AD) of Protective Research to whom the SAIC reports. The Secret Service also uses the USSS SES Performance Appraisal System to hold the Office of Investigations' SAIC, DADs, and AD accountable for field agents' timeliness and performance in carrying out PI investigations. Under this system, the Secret Service has incorporated program performance into executives' performance evaluation criteria. The system's Job Element I ('Organizational Results'), Job Element IV ('Safeguarding Against Waste, Fraud, and Loss'), Job Element VII ('Provides Support to Achieve Program Performance as Measured by the Secret Service Strategic Plan'), and Job Element VIII ('Improve Overall Secret Service Performance Based on the Measures and Targets Established in Accordance with the Secret Service's Government Performance and Results Act Performance Plan') hold the ADs and DADs of OPR and Investigations and the SAICs of ID and Investigations responsible for the cost, schedule, and performance of the PI program.

Evidence: Secret Service Form 3241, Senior Executive Service Performance Appraisal.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: ' A portion of the PI program's budget falls into those categories that the USSS Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and his Budget Staff centrally manage (this primarily includes, but is not limited to, personnel compensation.) The CFO also provides a portion of the program's funding to OPR. ' The CFO's office ensures that all centrally-managed funds are obligated and outlayed in a timely manner (using the Department of Agriculture's National Finance Center as the USSS pay agent, executing rental obligations in accordance with the General Services Administration Schedule, etc.). Each year, the AD for Protective Research prepares a prioritized spending plan based on his constituent divisions' (including ID's) competing requirements for funds. The USSS CFO reviews the spending plan and provides OPR with annual funding to cover expense areas for which the office is responsible. The CFO's Budget Staff uses 'status of funds' reports to ensure that OPR's divisions enter into timely obligations for purposes consistent with the approved spending plan. OPR budget and finance specialists, in turn, monitor sub-allocations to ID and other divisions for which OPR is financially and operationally responsible. ' The PI program's budget funds all compensation for ID personnel. Also importantly, where field or (non-ID) headquarters personnel dedicate a portion of their work-year to conducting intelligence advances or investigating intelligence cases, the PI program's budget funds the corresponding portion of their compensation; this is accomplished using a 'manhours' system that accounts for human resources by activity, including protective intelligence. Capturing field and other manhours associated with the PI program ensures that the full-cost of the program to the Secret Service and the taxpayer is known.

Evidence: Obligation rates spreadsheets ' FY 2002, FY 2003.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The PI program has adopted appropriate procedures to ensure the efficiency of its operations and routinely examines its business practices to ensure cost effectiveness and identify opportunities for savings. These include: (1) the institutionalization of field capacity to perform 'surge' intelligence functions as needed; (2) systematic containment of PI advance agents' travel cost expenditures; (3) investments in information technology (IT) to improve efficiency and program effectiveness; (4) strategic sourcing; (5) a regionalized structure of mental health experts; (6) cross-program and inter-agency coordination on IT issues; and (7) aggressive timing targets for the completion of PI cases and assessments. The evidence document 'Narrative Justification/Explanation for Question 3.4' contains detailed evidence for each of these 7 points.

Evidence: Various internal USSS training documents and operations manuals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The PI program is a consumer of intelligence generated by other intelligence agencies and is therefore dependent upon effective relationships with those agencies. The PI program's commitment to effective coordination and collaboration with related programs is best evidenced by its established array of 'detailee' and 'liaison' arrangements with a number of the Intelligence Community's member agencies and centers. The Secret Service has detailees and/or full-time liaisons to the DHS 'Homeland Security Center' (HSC), Directorate of Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection (IAIP), Terrorist Threat Integration Center (TTIC), and Terrorist Screening Center (TSC); the White House's National Security Council (NSC) and Situation Room; the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and FBI-led National Joint Terrorism Task Force (NJTTF); and the Central Intelligence Agency's (CIA's) Counter Terrorism Center. These detailee and liaison positions demonstrate the PI program's willingness to devote a portion of its most critical asset (its human resources) to the endeavor of collaborating and coordinating with related programs in order to achieve program goals. As opposed to the alternative of ad hoc interactions with partner agencies, the daily nature of detailees' and liaisons' physical presence at partner agencies ensures that day-to-day program management occurs on a systematically collaborative basis. ' In addition, since 2003, ID has transmitted intelligence information to DHS' Homeland Security Operations Center (HSOC) on a daily basis. As appropriate, the HSOC incorporates ID-provided intelligence into the 'Homeland Security Intelligence Report' and 'Homeland Security Intelligence Report ' Restricted;" these reports are a tool for the Secretary of Homeland Security's resource allocation and other management actions with regard to preventing and responding to terrorism.

Evidence: Joint Hearing Before the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Homeland Security: Terrorist Threat Integration Center (TTIC) and Its Relationship with the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security. Various internal USSS training documents, operations manuals, interagency agreements, and reports.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Secret Service issues an annual statement to DHS which "certifies" - through internally-conducted independent and alternative control reviews - that its financial systems and procedures are in compliance with Section 2 of the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) and Section 4 (financial management systems) of the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act (FFMIA). These actions review management controls to ensure, among other things, that divisions (including ID), allocate resources effectively, avoid fraud and mismanagement, and prevent improper payments. Also, the ongoing financial statement audit by KPMG ensures that payments are properly made, financial information is accurate and timely, and financial statements are clean and without material weaknesses. In the area of centrally-managed funds associated with the program, the Secret Service has strong financial controls for recording, processing, and/or reporting. For example, the Secret Service manages personnel compensation within its FTE ceiling through the use of a Position Identification Number system and utilizes an agency-wide gasoline tracking database system. In the area of funds allocated to the program, OPR monitors ID's financial management; in turn, the office of the CFO monitors OPR's financial management. For instance, a formal system of Procurement Requests and Training Requests ensures that purchases are reviewed by ID and its parent office (OPR), as well as by the office of the CFO. This chain of reviews ensures expenditures support the program's goals and approved spending plans.

Evidence: FY 2003 Statement of Reasonable Assurance of Achievement of Management Control Objectives. Annual Administrative Control Report (Sec. 2 FMFIA). KPMG Financial Statement Audit. Secret Service Form 2041, Procurement Request. Secret Service Form 182, Request for Training. Various internal Secret Service training documents, operations manuals, and reports.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Protective elements undergo a thorough inspection process every two years to assess management performance and to recommend courses of action to address any deficiencies identified (inspectors are senior ranking criminal investigators). Recent inspections have revealed no management deficiencies ("recommendations") associated with the PI program. Program managers also address customer-identified deficiencies using the results of Office of Inspection-conducted surveys that precede the inspection process. Secret Service-wide, the FMFIA and FFMIA reviews annually ensure that efforts are made to address any weaknesses in management control systems. (These reviews identified no material weaknesses in FY 2003). Also, through the Office of Inspection and the M&O Division, a structured process exists to monitor and respond to open Inspector General and General Accounting Office audit findings. Within the PI program, a detailed system exists for identifying, recording, and correcting management deficiencies and other impediments to performance that exist at the program level; following every protectee trip, the lead PI advance agent completes and submits to the SAIC of ID a mandatory 'Trip Return' report. Deficiencies noted by PI advance agents are reviewed by the SAIC in order to improve future program performance both in the aggregate, and as it pertains to intelligence advances for particular protectees and venues.

Evidence: Sample customer satisfaction survey conducted by Inspection Division. Annual Administrative Control Review (Sec 2 FMFIA). KPMG Financial Statement Audit. Various internal USSS training documents, operations manuals and reports.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:29%

Explanation: The PI program continues to achieve its long-term performance goal of minimizing the risk of harm to persons, property, and events protected by the Secret Service (see Measures Tab). The number of known subjects who approached protectees or protective events has been zero on a sustained basis. The percentage of instances protectees arrived and departed safely has been 100% on a sustained basis.

Evidence: Congressional Budget Submission. Annual Performance Plans and Reports.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:29%

Explanation: The PI program achieves its annual performance goals. During FY 2001, FY 2002, and FY 2003, the Number of Known Subjects Who Approached Protectees or Protective Events was zero and the Percentage of Instances Protectees Arrived and Departed Safely was 100%. Between CY 2001 and CY 2003, the Volume of Intelligence Assessed increased by 13 percent. From FY 2001 to FY 2003, the Number of Protective Intelligence Advances Completed increased by five percent, and the Number of Protective Intelligence Cases Completed decreased by 25 percent. Please see answer 2.4 for an explanation of annual targets (goals) versus estimates. Also, the decrease in the Number of Protective Intelligence Cases Completed is not an indicator of decreased program performance, as factors external to the Secret Service affect this number substantively. For example, the scope and complexity of protective intelligence cases following September 11, 2001 is such that a number of cases remain open longer in the interest of national security.

Evidence: Congressional Budget Submission. Annual Performance Plans and Reports. Various internal USSS reports and analyses.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 29%

Explanation: The PI program has shown improvement in efficiency. Human resources devoted to the analysis of intelligence did not change between FY 2001 and FY 2003, while intelligence traffic increased six percent over the same time period. The M&O Division is currently developing a more comprehensive efficiency measure (an index that illustrates the change in unit cost from the base year to the current year), which will be available at the end of FY 2004.

Evidence: Annual Performance Plans. Various internal USSS operations reports.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy (the "Warren Commission" Report) recognized the unique role the Secret Service plays in protecting our nation's leaders, and encouraged the Secret Service to use other agencies' intelligence in order to carry out these "special duties." As part of the protective process, the Secret Service (1) receives, evaluates, disseminates, and maintains information concerning subjects (individuals and groups) and activities that pose a known, potential, or perceived threat to persons, property, and events protected by the Secret Service; (2) investigates those subjects and activities; and (3) conducts intelligence "advances" preceding protectee travel. The agencies with which the Secret Service partners for intelligence collection focus largely on gathering and disseminating information. The PI program, conversely, specializes in analyzing this information while mitigating threats to protectees by investigating intelligence leads and conducting intelligence advance visits to sites before protectee travel. Because of the high profile of the Secret Service's protectees, and because of the unique statutory authority the Secret Service can exercise to use this intelligence to prevent attacks on the nation's leaders and visiting foreign dignitaries, comparisons with other intelligence gathering operations are difficult, if not impossible. Simply put, there is no other government agency with the same integrated focus on intelligence analysis, threat mitigation, and protection of high-risk individuals.

Evidence: Excerpts from the Warren Commission Report. Various internal USSS training documents and operations manuals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: 'Independent statisticians and analysts in the USSS Quantitative Studies and Statistical Systems Branch use the Workload Statistical and Reporting System to provide PI program managers with routine (at least monthly) reports containing performance indicators. These data demonstrate that the PI program is effective and achieving results. 'While not needed to demonstrate the PI program's effectiveness in achieving results, other, ad-hoc independent evaluations have impacted upon the program's efficiency. For example, the M&O Division's activity analysis of ID validated ID's intelligence analyst staffing requirements and the adequacy of ID's organizational structure. As an independent evaluation, the M&O study also offered recommendations for improvement. PI program managers heeded many of these recommendations, as evidenced by OPR's Draft Strategic Plan, which shows how ID activities support program goals, identifies employee retention as a goal, and identifies technology as a key driver in improving information flow. The M&O study of ID's Duty Desk validated that it has a unique function and should not be merged with another division's duty desk. To improve efficiency and effectiveness of the ID Duty Desk, however, the study recommended providing greater access to other database sources; ID heeded this recommendation, as evidenced by the associated section of the OPR Draft Strategic Plan. In addition, other PI process and structural improvements to more efficiently facilitate threat assessment and response are currently under management consideration as a result of M&O's review of counter surveillance information sharing processes. 'Finally, the program's parent division (Intelligence Division) undergoes a thorough "Inspection" process every two years. Secret Service inspections assess effectiveness of operations (see Evidence section for statement of aggregate results); quality of management and supervision; and adherence to policies, regulations, and procedures. Inspectors are senior ranking criminal investigators independent of the program's and the division's chain of command.

Evidence: Various internal USSS training documents, operations manuals, statistical reports, and strategic planning documents.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

Measure: # of Known Subjects Classified as a Threat Who Approach Protectees or Protective Events

Additional Information: This measure represents the number of known subjects classified as a threat who have approached a protectee or protective event. The performance target is always zero. Anything other than zero is unacceptable.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	0	0	
2002	0	0	
2003	0	0	
2004	0		
2005	0		
2006	0		

Measure: Number of Protective Intelligence Cases Completed

Additional Information: This measure represents the total number of intelligence cases completed by agents assigned to field operations. These cases generally represent an assessment of individuals or groups who have threatened or exhibited an unusual direction of interest in a protectee of the Secret Service. The target given should be interpreted as an estimate.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	8,500		
2002	6,000		
2003	4,000		
2004	4,500		
2005	4,000		
2006	4,000		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

Measure: Number of Protective Intelligence Advances Completed

Additional Information: This measure reports the total number of protective intelligence advances completed in support of protectee travel. Because the number of advances in a given year is completely driven by protectees, targets should be interpreted as estimates. Annual targets (estimates) are being established for FY 2005 and beyond.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001			
2002			
2003			
2004			
2005			
2006			

Measure: Volume of Intelligence Assessed

Additional Information: This measure reports the intelligence message traffic assessed in support of the protective mission. For security reasons, detailed data is law enforcement sensitive.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001			
2002			
2003			
2004			
2005			
2006			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

Measure: Protective Intelligence Efficiency Index -- Meaure Under Development
Additional Information: This measure will be a weighted index reflecting changes in efficiency compared to the base period.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2005			
2006			

Measure: Percent of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely
Additional Information: The Security of protectees is the ultimate priority of the Secret Service. This measure represents the percentage of travel stops where the protectee arrives and departs safely. Anything under 100% is unacceptable.* *See "Notes" tab for discussion.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	100%	100%	
2002	100%	100%	
2003	100%	100%	
2004	100%		
2005	100%		
2006	100%		

Measure: Known Subjects Who Approach Protectees or Protective Events
Additional Information: This measure represents the number of known subjects classified as a threat who have approached a protectee or protective event. The performance target is always zero. Anything other than zero is unacceptable.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2001	0	0	
2002	0	0	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Protective Intelligence
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: USSS/Intelligence Division
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	90%	

2003	0				0
2004	0				
2005	0				
2006	0				

Measure: Percent of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely

Additional Information: The Security of protectees is the ultimate priority of the Secret Service. This measure represents the percentage of travel stops where the protectee arrives and departs safely. Anything under 100% is unacceptable.* *See "Notes" tab for discussi

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2001	100%	100%	
2002	100%	100%	
2003	100%	100%	
2004	100%		
2005	100%		
2006	100%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recovery
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: FEMA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	86%	33%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Recovery Program's purpose is clearly defined as ensuring that individuals affected by disasters of all sizes, including catastrophic and terrorist events, are able to return to normal function with minimal suffering and disruption of services. The disaster assistance is provided to individuals as well as to general communities, though supporting the provision of community services such as utilities. The Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act is the primary defining legislation.

Evidence: Both the Stafford Act and FEMA regulations provide for the types of assistance provided by FEMA.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: FEMA's Recovery Program is specifically designed to provide specific assistance for identified disaster needs. For example, IHP is specifically designed to be an emergency supplemental program, when individuals impacted by major disasters and/or emergencies lack other resources to meet the need. Implementation of IHP is contingent upon the President's declaration of a major disaster or emergency for an identified incident. For PA, The program funds the reconstruction of public facilities and facilities of certain non-profits damaged or destroyed by natural and man-made disasters, as well as debris removal and certain emergency operations.

Evidence: In FY 2003, there were 52 Presidentially declared major disaster with Individual Assistance (IA) designations, which includes IHP. Under IHP, FEMA awarded \$681 million to address housing and other than housing needs of 544,343 applicants. For PA, FEMA provides \$1.5 billion to 6,500 applicants for 29,300 projects each year.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The nature of disaster relief and recovery assistance is such that resources routinely are applied from a variety of sources in helping individuals and communities recover. While many authorities for disaster relief and assistance are concentrated in the Stafford Act, administered by FEMA, a wide variety of other federal agencies and authorities come into play. In addition, insurance and assistance from non-governmental organizations play a significant role in relief and recovery efforts. All of FEMA's recovery programs are carefully designed such that there is a sequence of delivery of assistance that integrates in the appropriate order the assistance available from other sources, such as insurance or other federal agency programs, before assistance is made available for FEMA recovery programs.

Evidence: Section 408 and 312 of the Stafford Act, FEMA's Federal Register Notice: January 23, 2002 (Volume 67, Number 15), Disaster Assistance; Federal Assistance to Individuals and Households; Proposed Rule and 44 CFR 206.110(h). FMAGP is derived from Section 420 of the Stafford Act. 44 CFR Part 204.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recovery
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: FEMA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	86%	33%	

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: While the implementation of the Recovery program may be free of major design flaws, the trigger for use of the program is flawed. The program may be used in states after a Presidential declaration is declared. While this program is on the discretionary side of the budget, once a declaration is made, states, individuals and families are eligible for a number of categories of assistance.

Evidence: Stafford Act

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: In general, the Recovery Program is effectively targeted to provide supplemental assistance to State/local governments when an event is beyond their capabilities and resources. IHP only provides emergency supplemental housing and other assistance in the designated area of Presidentially-declared events. FMAGP is effectively targeted to State and local governments that incur costs for eligible wildland firefighting activities, as the only entities eligible for assistance. The PA Program is designed to ensure that State/local resources are not overtaxed following disasters and that a source of funding is available to finance debris removal, certain emergency operations, and public infrastructure rebuilding. Yet, the PA Program is not optimally designed because (1) the basic qualification criterion (\$1.11 of impact per capita) sets a low hurdle, so some localities may receive aid even when it is within their means to respond without assistance and (2) localities with uninsured public facilities remain eligible for assistance--a disincentive to adequately insure against disaster hazards.

Evidence: Through the registration/inspection processes, IHP verifies that applicants are in fact the intended beneficiaries through various screening criteria, including means testing for the Small Business Administration disaster home loan program. The evaluations ensure assistance is only provided to individuals and households who lack other resources to meet their disaster related housing or other needs. FEMA's IG (I-02-99) reports that "the \$1 per capita does not reflect a State's economic health and its ability to raise public revenues to cover the cost of a disaster." FEMA's IG suggests using an alternative indicator, such as "Total Taxable Resources" ". . . [that] would ensure that States with a weaker fiscal condition are treated fairly while States with a stronger fiscal condition become more accountable for their disaster welfare." The preamble to the Stafford Act, Sec. 101, directs FEMA to encourage "individuals, States, and local governments to protect themselves by obtaining insurance coverage to supplement or replace governmental assistance."

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: FEMA's Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS) establishes program goals, milestones, and a limited number of performance measures that focus on identified priorities. For example, to develop a catastrophic disaster recovery plan that is built on a scalable recovery capability within IHP and PA to address all-hazards (of all sizes) in support of the National Response Plan. FEMA also set performance measures that target customer satisfaction within the IHP and PA Programs and established measures that target reductions in program delivery costs and application processing cycle time.

Evidence: FY 2004-2009 Multi-Year Sub-Program Element Worksheets

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recovery
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: FEMA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	86%	33%	

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The PPBS process establishes targets and timeframes (milestones) for performance measures over a five-year planning period. The established targets and milestones are separated by fiscal year, building upon each other to accomplish long-term program goals, contingent upon appropriate funding levels. For example, the IA Program established targets and milestones that will build to a 25 percent reduction in IA processing cycle time by FY10.

Evidence: FY 2006-2010 Program Planning and Budget document (available upon request).

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: FEMA established specific annual performance measures that program managers utilize to evaluate/demonstrate progress toward achieving long-term program goals. These goals are evaluated and adjusted as warranted to reflect current budgetary conditions or changing priorities. For example, FEMA identified customer satisfaction goals for both the IHP and PA Programs and internal performance measures for the PA program that address FEMA's timeliness in obligating assistance. (However, FEMA does not measure the speed with which States liquidate funds--actually spend the money--obligated to them by FEMA.)

Evidence: FY 2006-2010 Program Planning and Budget document. FEMA internal performance measures include: obligate 50% of funding for each disaster within 90 days of declaration; obligate 80% of funding for each disaster within 180 days of declaration; and close 90% of disasters within two years of declaration. Program Evaluation and Customer Satisfaction Survey, FY 2001 Annual Report, March 2002.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: In many cases, the PPBS process identifies baselines and ambitious targets for annual performance measures. However, the newness of certain types of assistance we provide (IHP and FMAGP) has limited our ability to develop ambitious targets until we can develop baseline information on our performance. For example, the IHP assistance has been utilized for only an 18-month period. Thus, historical data is limited so we are only beginning to develop management baselines for the program. This is also true for FMAGP, where we lack a complete dataset that would enable us to develop a baseline.

Evidence: FY 2006-2010 Program Planning and Budget document.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recovery
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: FEMA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	86%	33%	

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: FEMA's partners are committed to our long-term goals and we utilize different means of ensuring their commitment. For example, IHP partners, such as the State, are required to include performance measures in their operational plans, including those that ensure that assistance is meeting the identified needs, compliance with Federal and State statutes, and congruence with IHP's long-term performance goals. For FMAGP, the long-term and annual performance measures are new. Thus, we are exploring ways to implement performance requirements, and are looking at several vehicles to accomplish this task, including inclusion of performance requirements in the FEMA-State Agreement or State Administrative Plan for FMAGP. For PA, FEMA helps States select projects, develop cost estimates, and establish scopes of work, though the administration of PA grants is essentially a State responsibility, with oversight and guidance provided by FEMA. The States are responsible for administering FEMA grants funds, including all subgrants made by States for disaster response and recovery operations.

Evidence: FY 2006-2010 Program Planning and Budget document. Section 408 of the Stafford Act.44 CFR 206.110-120. PA Program Description (October 1998). The PA Program is based on a partnership of FEMA, State and local officials. FEMA's role has changed from inspection and enforcement to customer service and assistance. FEMA provides information about the program in various media both before and after a disaster strikes, and technical assistance in the development of damage descriptions and cost estimates after the disaster.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: For PA, FEMA IG and GAO reports provide independent program review and evaluation of PA Program effectiveness. The IG performs audits of every major disaster and publishes findings in semi annual reports. However, to date, no independent evaluations of the effectiveness of IHP or FMAGP assistance has been conducted because these are newer programs. IHP has been utilized for only 18-month period; as such, historical data to determine if the program is effective and achieving results is limited to internal customer satisfaction surveys. The FMAGP is still relatively new and we do yet have a complete dataset upon which to base an independent evaluation. Once we have one or two years of complete data, we will explore the costs and benefits of conducting an independent evaluation.

Evidence: OIG Audit Reports and Quarterly Reports. Also, the IG's annual Management Challenges letter to the FEMA Director.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recovery
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: FEMA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	86%	33%	

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The PPBS approach requires explicit linkage between FEMA's budget requests and the accomplishment of annual and long-term performance goals, specifically tying the resources needed to specific individual goals. As an example, the IHP's administrative (fixed) costs are explicitly linked to both annual and long-term performance goals. The costs are an element of the overall budget submissions for the Individual Assistance programs. However, while FEMA's PPBS process specifically breaks out the various types of assistance within th the Recovery program, this same level of detail is not included in the Budget. The Budget request is derived from using the five year average of costs to the Disaster Relief Fund, which is made up in large part of the Recovery program, but is not exclusive to that program.

Evidence: FY 2006-2010 Program Planning and Budget document. FY 2004-2009 Mulit-Year Sub-Program Element Worksheets. For PA, FEMA Justification of Estimates, FY 2004.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Recovery program has implemented a new five-year planning process in conjunction with the development of the DHS' Five-Year Homeland Security Plan (FYHSP). This PPBS process significantly improves FEMA's ability to conduct strategic planning. To ensure that FEMA accomplishes its strategic goals, quarterly performance reviews are conducted to ensure that performance remains on track to meet annual and longer-term strategic goals. FMAGP and the PPBS system are still too new to determine what strategic planning deficiencies exist. As the program matures and complete datasets of information become available to us, we will begin to identify those areas of strength and those in need of improvement, including strategic planning deficiencies.

Evidence: FY 2006-2010 Program Planning and Budget document. FY 2004-2009 Mulit-Year Sub-Program Element Worksheet. For PA, reference Section III: Program Management below.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: As part of the PPBS process, FEMA collects performance information on a quarterly basis that is reviewed by program managers as part of the quarterly performance reviews. Managers are required to color code their progress in meeting performance measures and to explain any shortfalls in performance. Identified solutions for the performance shortfalls are a required part of the quarterly reviews. Key program partners report on their performance. For example, IHP requires reporting from its partners in contracts or as part of their administrative plan. These program reports include, but are not limited to: number and dollar amount of applications approved, amounts of assistance disbursed; number of inspections performed and number of appeals received. Program managers use these reports to manage IHP and improve the program's performance. For the PA Program, reporting is required, though not always timely.

Evidence: Section 408(f)(1)(A) of the Stafford Act, 44 CFR206.120 (a) and OMB Collection No. 1660-0018. For PA, the FEMA IG reports that in audits of 11 out of 13 of grantees, required reports were not always filed or were not filed in a timely manner.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recovery
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: FEMA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	86%	33%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation:

Evidence: FEMA's Inspection Services Contract. For FMAGP, FEMA performance evaluations. 44 CFR Part 204. For PA, IG audits of FEMA's management of disaster grants for 17 States.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: IHP utilizes FEMA's financial management system, the Integrated Financial Management Information System (IFMIS) for all funding and disbursement activities. IHP obligates the Federal share of grants to the State using the basic standard in accordance with Treasury regulations at 31 CFR part 205. In addition, IHP encourages its partners, through contracts and administrative plans, to obligate and spend funds appropriately. FMAGP is primarily a reimbursement program. As such, FMAGP is based on actual costs, not estimated costs, and does not carry unliquidated funds. Approved program funds are obligated consistently and drawn down and expended by the Grantees in accordance with Federal law and regulation. We are provided with annual financial reports as well as final financial reports and the findings of any single audit applicable to FMAGP. For PA, FEMA's IG reports that funds are obligated in a timely manner at the Federal level, though the OIG has not performed any audits on how quickly FEMA partners are obligating PA funds.

Evidence: FEMA's Financial Acquisition Management Division Annual Performance & Accountability Reports and 44 CFR part 13. For FMAGP, NEMIS. IFMIS. SF 272s. For PA, IG audits of FEMA's management of FEMA disaster grants for 17 States.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: IHP makes use of the competitive sourcing/cost comparisons guidance provided by FEMA's Financial Acquisition Management Division (FAMD). The disaster contracting aspects outlined by FEMA's Accounting Division is the basis for all IHP contract support costs. From a management perspective, FMAGP is working to develop procedures to improve the internal operation and administration of FMAGP, such as identifying the requirements for a web-based declaration module. Since they share the cost of a PA grant (typically 25%), States or their subgrantees have an incentive to achieve efficiencies and cost savings. Furthermore, FEMA competitively bids its Technical Assistance Contracts, and FEMA requires subgrantees to competitively bid repair and replacement work and verify work was done and costs were reasonable. FEMA publishes guides, cost codes, published policies, and digests for grantees.

Evidence: FEMA's Financial Acquisition Management Division Annual Performance & Accountability Reports. For FMAGP, Identification of declaration requirements for a web-based system. For PA, competitive procedures are required in all program documents. Cost share arrangements and program documentation are available.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recovery
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: FEMA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	86%	33%	

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Following disasters, FEMA coordinates the Federal Government's recovery efforts by utilizing partnerships among local and State governments, voluntary organizations, non-profit organizations, and other Federal agencies to coordinate the sequence of federal disaster assistance. This coordination and collaboration allows FEMA to ensure that disaster assistance and recovery efforts are not duplicated and that disaster victims are made award of all possible disaster aid. FEMA also collaborates internally. For example, FMAGP collaborates and coordinates effectively with other related programs, such as the Public Assistance Program, which is designated under a Presidential Major Disaster or Emergency declaration when a fire or fires results in significant loss of life and/or property.

Evidence: 44 CFR 206.191 highlights coordination requirements. In addition, FEMA coordinates closely with various national voluntary organizations and non-profit organizations active in disasters. For PA, to ensure applicants receive appropriate federal assistance following major disaster declarations FEMA maintains memorandums of agreement with EPA, HUD, SBA and USACE. Examples of cooperative agreements include the September 1998 MOA with EPA (hazardous materials), the March 2001 MOA with HUD (public housing authorities), and the 1986 MOA with USACE (flood control works and debris removal operations).

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: FEMA demonstrates strong financial management practices through using the agency's financial management systems (IFMIS, SMARTLINK, NEMIS) which allow submitting allocations and process obligations from which States draw down and expend approved funds, and through contract management and oversight. For example, IHP monitors contracts and grants and provides technical assistance on financial reporting requirements to program contractors and grantees, and encourages partners, through contracts and administrative plans, to utilize financial management practices comparable to FEMA's. The PA Program utilizes (1) a lengthy review process for all projects by experienced and trained local, state, and Federal staff before any PA funding is obligated, (2) grantees provide a quarterly Financial Status Report on funding and a progress report on project status which are reviewed in the Regions.

Evidence: IFMIS, SMARTLINK, and NEMIS. For IHP, see the Inspection Services Contract and State Administrative Plans. For PA, in FY 03, FAMD initiated regional assessments designed to evaluate financial grant management practices, including the PA Program. Initial analysis indicates that the regions have better financial controls in-place. FEMA continues to improve in the financial monitoring of PA grants. Recent audit reports indicate that improvement is occurring. We continue to provide training to regional staff on reviewing and reconciling quarterly financial status reports. Additionally, each region has implemented a grants monitoring plan as of FY 03 and a national workshop on grant monitoring was conducted in FY 03.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Management deficiencies are assessed on a continuous basis in the aftermath of disaster operations to identify strengths, weaknesses, and best practices and the results are used to identify potential program changes. A number of mechanisms are utilized for this purpose including FEMA's Remedial Action Management Program (RAMP). FEMA is taking action on identified deficiencies. For example, in response to OIG (Report I-02-96) and GAO (GAO/RCED-96-113) reports on PA, FEMA re-engineered the program, updated regulations, documented policies, and widely disseminated program eligibility criteria. The FEMA IG reports that FEMA has acknowledged that major improvements are needed in grants management and has begun an effort to correct long-standing issues.

Evidence: Remedial Action Management Program (RAMP). For PA, in January 25, 2002, IG memorandum on Management Challenges, Grants Management section.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recovery
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: FEMA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	86%	33%	

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: In the FY04 second quarter performance review, the Recovery Program met almost all of its identified milestones, remaining on track to meet its long-term performance goals.

Evidence: FY 2005-2009 Program Planning and Budget System documents.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: In the FY04 second quarter performance review, the Recovery Program (including partners) met almost all of its identified milestones, remaining on track to meet its annual performance goals. Any milestones that were not met in the second quarter are expected to be met by the end of the year.

Evidence: FY 2005-2009 Program Planning and Budget System documents.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Through the PPBS process, performance measures have been established for the FY 2005-2009 period that address percentage reductions in program delivery cost and processing cycle time.

Evidence: FY 2005-2009 Program Planning and Budget System documents.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: There are no other programs with a similar purpose or goal that can be compared with FEMA's disaster assistance. For example, there are no other programs of integrated public facility infrastructure recovery from domestic disasters which FEMA provides through its Recovery Program.

Evidence: The Stafford Act defines the disaster assistance provided by FEMA.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The Recovery program has received independent evaluations from the Office of the Inspector General. For example, the OIG reported that PA audits revealed that the program, grantees, and subgrantees indicate that the program is achieving results. Independent evaluations of the IHP and FMAGP programs have not been conducted due to the newness of these programs.

Evidence: OIG Audit Reports and Quarterly Reports. In the IG's latest "Annual Challenges" letter to the FEMA Director, the IG notes that "FEMA's disaster response and recovery program has been and continues to be the cornerstone of FEMA's emergency management program . . . FEMA's public image can be directly attributed to the success of FEMA's disaster response and recovery system."

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recovery
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: FEMA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	86%	33%	

Measure: Percent of customers satisfied with Individual Assistance Recovery assistance
Additional Information: Customers are surveyed regularly after disasters to examine their satisfaction levels.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2004	90%	90%	

Measure: Percent of customers satisfied with Public Assistance Recovery assistance
Additional Information: Customers are surveyed regularly after disasters to examine their satisfaction levels.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	87%	89.2	

Measure: Percentage reduction in Individual Assistance program delivery cost
Additional Information: The unit cost of IA disaster assistance is being determined.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	TBD	NA	

Measure: Percentage reduction in Individual Assistance processing cycle time
Additional Information: The Individual Assistance processing cycle time is being determined.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	TBD	NA	

Measure: Percentage completion of a catastrophic disaster recovery plan (focused solely on preliminary housing strategy development)
Additional Information: FEMA is developing a catastrophic disaster recovery plan that includes components such as emergency disaster housing and debris removal.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	30%	30%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Training
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	86%	13%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: The TSA Screener Training Program provides the training and support necessary to provide a capable screening workforce at the Nation's airports and to also meet the statutory requirements of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (ATSA).

Evidence: The program mission statement: "To design, develop, deliver, and manage workforce performance improvement and organizational development solutions that enable the workforce to achieve optimum efficiency and effectiveness in meeting agency mission and strategic objectives".

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: Screener training is the primary element of screener worker preparation and ongoing preparedness. Aviation screening requires specialized skills in a variety of areas such as technology, threat recognition, search procedures, and personal interaction with travelers.

Evidence: 49 USC 44935 requires TSA to provide initial basic, equipment specific, periodic refresher training, and annual proficiency evaluations for all security screening personnel.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: TSA has sole responsibility for the provision of screener training either through the direct delivery of training services or through authorized contractors. Therefore, there is no redundancy or duplication of other government or privately provided services.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: The delivery of TSA's screener training through a combined approach of in-house, contractor, and on-the-job training has not been questioned. Statutory training requirements are generally sound. Over the last year TSA has largely addressed design flaws identified through internal and external reviews. TSA increased the level and scope of supervisory training, instituted processes to identify and remediate screener skills gaps, enhanced and standardized remedial training, and improved access to training courses through an Online Learning Center.

Evidence: GAO provided testimony on both February 14, 2004 (GAO-04-440T) and April 22, 2004 (GAO-04-505T) and reported that TSA was actively addressing training program design issues. Corrective actions are now fully implemented. TSA is beginning a transition away from a centralized training system to one that is based locally and under the control of each airport Federal Security Director. The DHS IG evaluated TSA's training programs (OIG-04-045) and had concerns with the program's structure, including the availability of appropriate equipment for locally-based training and a disconnect between staffing levels and an internal requirement of 3 hours of weekly recurrent training per screener. However, these are generally not issues that will have a significant effect on the program's performance measures.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Training
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	86%	13%	

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Since training program only provides services to screeners, as intended, this question is not applicable.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: TSA has two long term outcome measures related to the primary functions of the training program. The measures address long term improvements in the results of initial screener and annual certification training.

Evidence: The measures are (1) level of training course evaluation performance and (2) level of screeners scoring 85% or better on annual performance recertification on the first attempt.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The long term targets for key outcome goals appear ambitious as they both seek to approach very close to the maximum score possible.

Evidence: The long term target on training course evaluation performance is 4.8 out of a possible score of 5.0, while the target for annual recertification performance is 97.5% out of a 100% score.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: TSA's primary annual measures are the same as the two primary long term outcome measures. In addition, the efficiency measure under development is the cost variance of local TSA-Approved Instructors versus Specialized Security Training Contract training.

Evidence: The primary annual measures are (1) level of training course evaluation performance and (2) level of screeners scoring 85% or better on annual performance recertification on the first attempt.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The annual targets show steady, often ambitious, annual progress towards meeting the long term targets.

Evidence: The increase in FY05 from the baseline FY04 level is 17% for the level of screener recertification performance, and 2% for the level of training course evaluation performance.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Training
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	86%	13%	

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: While TSA uses performance incentives with a contractor, these do not relate adequately to the program's qualitative performance outcome goals; specifically, screener performance after initial training and at recertification.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Despite being a relatively young program, several independent audits have been performed by GAO and the Inspector General that touch on, or directly assess, aspects of the screener training programs. The audits have supported program improvements in concert with internal studies and analysis. TSA will implement a program evaluation plan that will include training programs. Areas of evaluation may include, among other areas, training protocols and administration, performance goals and targets, and contractor oversight.

Evidence: The DHS Inspector General issued a comprehensive report in September/2004 (OIG-04-045) on TSA's training and testing program. The IG found that TSA has improved training programs substantially, though further refinements are needed. In addition, the IG believes that baggage screeners need more hands-on training on the specific machines they will operate before being put on the job. GAO reports (GAO-04-592T, GAO-04-440T) issued this year found that TSA had strengthened its basic and recurring training requirements, as well as remedial training. It also has established leadership and technical training. It found that despite these improvements, managers had difficulty ensuring screeners received all required training because of either staffing shortages or connectivity issues.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Screener training is uniquely identified in the TSA Budget requests and performance targets are tied to the funding level.

Evidence: All screener training funding, except for small amounts in headquarters, is differentiated in the Budget justifications as "screener training" and the justifications are organized in a performance based structure.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The primary strategic planning deficiencies have been the absence of a steady state training infrastructure, development and dissemination of an annual training plan; development and dissemination of a TSA Training Strategic Plan; and the development and dissemination of long term organization and annual program performance measures. All of these areas have been addressed, or are in the process of being addressed.

Evidence: TSA has developed a Training Draft Strategic Plan, a Human Capital Draft Strategic Plan, a Passenger Screener Performance Improvement Study (July 2003), a Short Term Screener Performance Improvement Plan (October 2003), and conducted a Workforce Performance and Training Program Review (March 2004).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Training
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	86%	13%	

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: TSA collects a large amount of timely and credible data from a number of sources to facilitate effective management decisions for screening operations, including training. Certain performance data is collected dynamically, such as TSA's internal audit testing of screening stations, and is used to make immediate management decisions. Other data, such as confiscations of banned items, is collected over time intervals to allow for comparison and analysis. This data is analyzed with customer satisfaction and quality assurance results to drive training performance improvements.

Evidence: TSA's Performance Measurement Information System (PMIS) provides a variety of training performance data including training course assessments, post-training performance data, screener survey results, and on-the-job training certification evaluation reports.

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: As part of TSA's strategic and performance plan, TSA has established a permanent performance management system that defines standardized performance agreements for TSA programs. Employee and management performance agreements and contractual quality assurance plans jointly bind the involved parties to the performance outcomes.

Evidence: The GAO Report 'Transportation Security Administration, Actions and Plans to Build a Results-Oriented Culture (January 2003)' found that TSA 'has made an impressive start in implementing practices' in among other things 'leadership commitment to creating a high-performing organization' and performance management to promote accountability for results.' The TSA Human Capital Plan ties executive evaluations to program performance results.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: All evidence suggests training resources are spent for the intended purpose and in a timely manner.

Evidence: Training budget execution data indicate appropriate spending patterns.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Training
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	86%	13%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: TSA Training manages resource execution in accordance with Federal and internal financial management directives to assess planned schedule and resource usage against actual execution. TSA completed a training cost comparison with several other Federal agencies to assess if our training costs were in line with other training functions and found that the cost of training is comparable or less than other Federal agencies. Additionally, the Training contractor is required to provide monthly cost performance reports to allow program managers to assess spend rates and financial performance. Additionally, an activity based cost (ABC) model is under development for all training and workforce development programs so that total cost and expenditure information are available to assess the cost effectiveness and cost performance of the various components of the screener training (and other) program. Contractor performance bonuses are based on satisfactory execution of contractor requirements.

Evidence: TSA and TSA Training budget execution reports and resource performance analysis, and contract mandated Monthly Cost Performance Reports. Substantiating data reflects a reduced basic screener training cost by 60% compared with 2002 data. Further, since mid-FY2003, TSA is currently 20% less in the total contract expenditure rate than original projections.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: TSA monitors and assesses screener performance holistically, meaning that all aspects including training are considered in determining program direction including training, technology, standards, operating procedures, and staffing requirements. Each aspect actively coordinates with the others to produce unified screener performance outcomes. However, some issues have been identified. For example, the DHS IG has determined that TSA's ongoing remedial training standard may not connect sufficiently to what can be accomplished given screener staffing levels.

Evidence: TSA developed high level screener and screening system performance goals that are directly affected by the specific screener training goals. In 2003, TSA completed an internal "Passenger Screener Performance Improvement Study" which developed a coordinated action plan in each programmatic area affecting screener performance. The training program is directly connected with TSA's covert testing red teams to ensure adequate and appropriate followup remedial training after problems are identified.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: While TSA received a clean audit opinion, it received material weaknesses in internal control, including payroll and personnel security systems, and records retention management.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Training
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	86%	13%	

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: TSA has identified management deficiencies in the screener training program and is taking steps to resolve these issues.

Evidence: TSA lacked specific project management skills in the screener training program office. It now has in place a contract in place to bring in certified project management professionals to assist with designing, developing and implementing project management techniques for more effective management of the program. TSA has also hired two permanent FTE to staff the screener training program with this type of expertise. The training office also lacked clearly defined roles and responsibilities, as well as validated staffing requirements. A contractor is now conducting a formal staffing study for the office to be completed in the first quarter of FY 2005.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Insufficient time has elapsed to determine if TSA has made adequate progress in meeting its long term performance targets.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Insufficient time has elapsed to determine if TSA has achieved its annual training performance targets.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: TSA is not able to definitively show that it is operating training programs efficiently or is achieving greater efficiencies.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:20%

Explanation: While there are no training programs of a similar nature and scope in the Federal and private sectors in the area of security screening, TSA may in the future be able to comprehensively assess performance between Federal and contract screener training. Limited data indicate that performance is comparable between contract and Federal screening airport locations.

Evidence: BearingPoint "Private Screening Operations Performance Evaluation Report," April 9, 2004, comparison study between federalized and privatized screener workforces found comparable performance in areas such as security effectiveness and cost to government.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Training
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	86%	13%	

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: SMALL
EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Limited independent evaluations conducted on this program indicate the program is achieving results.

Evidence: The DHS Inspector General issued a comprehensive report in September/2004 (OIG-04-045) on TSA's training and testing program. The IG found that TSA has improved training programs substantially, though further refinements are needed. A March, 2004 GAO report (GAO-04-592T) noted that "TSA has taken steps to enhance its training programs for screeners', and positive results from recent covert testing and annual recertification failure rates provides support for this report's conclusion.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Training
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	86%	13%	

Measure: Level of training course evaluation performance.

Additional Information: Measure utilizes a 5-point Likert scale measurement of Levels I & III of the Kirkpatrick training evaluation model that covers program effectiveness and post-training performance.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	Baseline	4.46	
2004	4.51		
2005	4.56		
2006	4.60		
2007	4.64		
2008	4.68		
2009	4.73		
2010	4.78		

Measure: Level of training course evaluation performance.

Additional Information: Measure utilizes a 5-point Likert scale measurement of Levels I & III of the Kirkpatrick training evaluation model that covers program effectiveness and post-training performance.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010	4.78		

Measure: Level of training programs and projects within 10% of program plan.

Additional Information: This is a percentage level of projects and programs which have output results of cost, schedule, and performance within 10% of plans.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	Baseline	25	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Training
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	86%	13%	

2004	55
2005	73
2006	84
2007	90
2008	94
2009	96
2010	98

Measure: Level of training programs and projects are within 10% of program plan

Additional Information: This is a percentage level of projects and programs which have output results of cost, schedule, and performance within 10% of plans.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010	98		

Measure: Level of screeners scoring 85% or greater on annual performance recertification on the first attempt.

Additional Information: This is a percentage level of screeners that are recertified on the first testing attempt. All screeners are retested annually with respect to skills, knowledge, and abilities.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	Baseline	67.4	
2005	78.8		
2006	86.2		
2007	91.0		
2008	94.2		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Training
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	86%	13%	

	2009	96.2
	2010	97.5

Measure: Level of screeners scoring 85% or greater on annual performance recertification on the first attempt.
Additional Information: This is a percentage level of screeners that are recertified on the first testing attempt. All screeners are retested annually with respect to skills, knowledge, and abilities.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010	97.5		

Measure: Cost variance of local TSA-Approved Instructors versus Specialized Security Training Contract training Measure Under Development
Additional Information: This measure will depict the cost difference between local providers of training and national TSA contractor training.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Workforce
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	75%	86%	20%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: The purpose of the Screener Workforce Program is provide the human capital necessary to carry out a statutory mandate to prevent the entry of firearms, explosives, and other dangerous weapons on aircraft through inspection of passengers as well as carry-on and checked baggage.

Evidence: Section 110(a) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act of 2001 requires that TSA: "shall provide for the screening of all passengers and property, including United States mail, cargo, carry-on and checked baggage, and other articles, that will be carried aboard a passenger aircraft operated by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation..."

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: Aviation remains one of the primary focuses of Middle East and other terrorist organizations for actions against U.S. citizens, and the airport passenger screening function constitutes the front lines of preventing aircraft contraband that can assist in terrorist and other criminal acts intended to harm passengers, aircraft and other persons and property.

Evidence: Transportation Security Administration Transportation risk assessments and audits, classified intelligence/threat data collections and reports, and security oversight inspections, checkpoint arrests, dangerous item confiscation levels at airports.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: This program is the only effort that physically and/or electronically screens passengers and baggage before boarding commercial passenger aircraft.

Evidence: Section 110(a) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act of 2001 requires that TSA: "shall provide for the screening of all passengers and property, including United States mail, cargo, carry-on and checked baggage, and other articles, that will be carried aboard a passenger aircraft operated by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation..."

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: TSA has addressed, or is aggressively addressing past design flaws including inappropriate staffing levels, poor distribution of screeners among airports, the segmentation of screeners between passenger and baggage functions, and the inordinate use of full time over part time screeners. TSA has also committed to explore addition contract screening operations under the permissible authorities of law. However, the continuing lack of an extensive operational history to provide continuous "feedback loops" to improve program design is a challenge, as is the fact that there generally is insufficient development time to fully incorporate local/field management input on workforce matters.

Evidence: TSA completed both a preliminary workforce realignment effort in the Summer of 2004 as well as a detailed screener modeling effort. About 20% of screeners are part time employees at the end of FY 2004, compared with 5% at the end of FY 2003. About 15% of all screeners had been cross trained to perform both passenger and baggage screening by the end of FY 2004. Current contract screening operations have been extended and will expand depending on the interest of each airport.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Workforce
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	75%	86%	20%	Demonstrated

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The screening workforce activity can only directly serve the screening purpose and the intended beneficiary -- air carriers and the flying public. Therefore, this question is not relevant to this program.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: TSA has a number of specific long term performance measures either in place or under development related to security and efficiency outcomes. However, these measures are generally new and should be assessed and validated by an independent entity with respect to appropriateness and adequacy.

Evidence: The primary measures include index outcome measures from covert testing of screener performance, and measures reflecting the cost per passenger and per bag screened.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Most measure targets are under development.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: TSA has a number of primary annual performance measures either in place or under development related to security and efficiency outcomes. However, these measures are generally new and should be assessed and validated by an independent entity with respect to appropriateness and adequacy.

Evidence: The primary measures include index outcome measures from covert testing of screener performance, and measures reflecting the cost per passenger and per bag screened.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Most measure targets are under development.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Workforce
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	75%	86%	20%	

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Screening workforce activities are undertaken by TSA employees at all but five contract locations. At those five locations, current evidence indicates that each contractor is working toward the program's performance goals.

Evidence: An initial independent study of the five contract screening locations completed this year by Bearing Point indicates comparable security effectiveness and cost performance of the private screening workforces to that of TSA. The study results are an early indicator of shared commitment by the contractors and local airport authorities to the performance success of the Screener Workforce Program.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: TSA's Screener Workforce Program has been assessed on an ongoing basis through independent analysis of sufficient scope and quality by multiple sources including Inspector Generals of DOT and DHS, GAO, and TSA Internal Affairs. Most reviews focused on the basic elements of program start up and screener performance using raw data such as actual threat object capture rates and wait times, ensuring sufficient rigor. Analyses conducted thus far are of sufficient independence, quality and scope, but won't be for the long term. TSA should establish and implement a long term evaluation agenda in areas such as screener compensation, screener performance outcomes, part time/full time utilization, workforce health/safety concerns, human factors, and overall Federal Security Director human resource management control. TSA will complete a an evaluation plan by November, 2004.

Evidence: Undercover testing audit by the DHS Inspector General completed in March, 2004 (classified); undercover testing audit of the TSA Office of Internal Affairs and Program Review completed in April, 2004 (classified); "Improvement Still Needed in Federal Aviation Security Efforts" (GAO-04-592T) found that TSA faces challenges in hiring and deploying proper screener levels; "TSA: Actions to Build a Results-Oriented Culture (GAO-03-190)" found that TSA had begun taking actions to develop results-oriented practices in areas that include screener performance oversight.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: While the Screener Workforce annual and long-term performance goals have been in place for some time and are, to some extent, inherently obvious, specific, measurable performance targets that could be linked to budget requests (levels of funding to achieve certain levels of measurable performance) have to date not existed. As these performance targets and measures are now in place going forward, they will be able to be more explicitly linked to budget requests in FY 06. As for past budget requests, the costs of the Screener Workforce program have been entirely transparent (e.g. Personnel, Compensation & Benefits Costs, other screening support costs such as screener uniforms, screening operations "consumables," moblie screener force travel expenses, etc.)

Evidence: TSA Annual Budget Requests

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Workforce
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	75%	86%	20%	Demonstrated

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Screener Workforce Program's primary strategic planning deficiency has been the lack of adequate performance goals, measures, and targets. TSA now has established goals and measures, but is still developing baselines and targets. The agency plans to implement specific targets in early 2005. In addition, the program completed an evaluation of its contract workforce, which will improve planning for contract workforce expansion. Finally, TSA completed an updated workforce modeling effort which will help the organization more effectively plan workforce distribution and responsiveness to air system changes.

Evidence: The current PART includes performance goals and measures; Private Screening Operations Performance Evaluation Report, BearingPoint, March/2004 -- TSA developed program guidance for expanding contract screening operations; Regal Decision Systems project, provides a model to determine optimal screener staffing levels at each airport; TSA has developed a draft Human Capital Plan to help guide strategic decisions on a wide range of workforce matters.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: TSA collects a large amount of timely and credible data from a number of sources to facilitate effective management decisions for screening operations. Certain performance data is collected dynamically, such as TSA's internal audit testing of screening stations, and is used to make immediate management decisions. Other data, such as confiscations of banned items, is collected over time intervals to allow for comparison and analysis. This data is analyzed with customer satisfaction and quality assurance results to drive training performance improvements.

Evidence: TSA's Performance Measurement Information System (PMIS) analysis outputs; Internal TSA Audit Recommendation Reports; and TSA TIPS and other Training testing, evaluation, and quality assurance outputs.

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: As part of TSA's strategic and performance plan, TSA has established a permanent performance management system that defines standardized performance agreements for TSA programs. Employee and management performance agreements and contractual quality assurance plans jointly bind the involved parties to the performance outcomes.

Evidence: The GAO Report 'Transportation Security Administration, Actions and Plans to Build a Results-Oriented Culture (January 2003)' found that TSA 'has made an impressive start in implementing practices' in among other things 'leadership commitment to creating a high-performing organization' and performance management to promote accountability for results.' GAO connected these findings specifically to passenger and baggage screening. The TSA Human Capital Plan ties executive evaluations to program performance results.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Workforce
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	75%	86%	20%	Demonstrated

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Program funds are obligated consistently with the overall program plan. As payroll costs are the vast majority of the Screener Workforce Program, significant financial controls exist to effectively manage the program funding process.

Evidence: TSA payroll, time and attendance and budget execution reporting indicate appropriate spending patterns.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: While TSA has been working aggressively to put in place procedures, systems, and processes to measure cost effectiveness and achieve efficiencies, most are not yet sufficiently in place. Some of these include an activity-based costing study, a screener staffing level modeling effort, checkpoint information technology connectivity that will help monitor screener performance, an automated time and attendance system, and efficiency performance measures related to staff costs. Each is in differing stages of development/deployment/use.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Screener Workforce Program effectively collaborates with all related functional programs, such as Screener Technology, Screener Training, as well as with the complementary "layers" of TSA's aviation security protocols such as the prescreening system, the Federal Air Marshal (FAM) program, and the Federal Flight Deck Officer program (FFDO). TSA worked closely with other DHS organizations to spearhead the "Air Exit" portion of the US-VISIT program at airports with international flights. Moreover, TSA coordinates with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officials on all relevant checkpoint incidents.

Evidence: Security screening protocols are actively coordinated between the prescreening system and screeners on the front lines; Screener performance assessments have resulted in coordinated improvement plans between the separate screener training, technology, workforce, and internal affairs red team programs.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Screener Workforce program appears to manage financial resources properly.

Evidence: TSA FY 2003 "clean audit" opinion with no material weaknesses. Although the audit had material weaknesses in internal control, most did not relate directly to the Screener Workforce program.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Workforce
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	75%	86%	20%	Demonstrated

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: TSA's primary focus since its inception has been on passenger and baggage screening. It continues to devote significant management attention to this area, and plans are being developed to address existing management deficiencies.

Evidence: Meaningful actions have been taken to substantially reduce excess screener staffing; improve screener performance; complete screener background checks that were found in many cases to be incomplete; and refine screening procedures where they were found to be excessive and unnecessary. Technology is being deployed to enable more efficient screener scheduling, performance oversight, and management control.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: TSA has not yet established targets and timeframes for most long term performance goals.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: TSA has not yet established targets and timeframes for most annual performance goals.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: TSA cannot yet demonstrate efficiency and cost effectiveness improvements, and efficiency performance targets are still under development.

Evidence: No evidence necessary.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Early study results between the Federal screening workforce and contract screeners under a pilot program indicate very similar security effectiveness and cost performance.

Evidence: BearingPoint "Private Screening Operations Performance Evaluation Report," April 9, 2004, comparison study between federalized and privatized screener workforces found comparable performance in areas such as security effectiveness, cost to government, and customer satisfaction.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Workforce
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	75%	86%	20%	Demonstrated

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: A variety of independent evaluations and analysis find that screening workforce performance has improved since September 11th, though the results have been mixed. While the workforce excels in its professionalism and confidence provided to the traveling public, limited security performance outcome analysis indicate that results may not be sufficient (though improvement has been steady). The full extent of workforce performance needed is difficult to determine due to the lack of useful baseline data and set performance targets. Ultimately, to determine screening workforce effectiveness, TSA needs to rapidly validate its performance goals, and implement targets. Until then, it will be difficult for any evaluation to determine with certainty the adequacy of screening workforce outcomes.

Evidence: Undercover testing audit by the DHS Inspector General completed in March, 2004 (classified); undercover testing audit of the TSA Office of Internal Affairs and Program Review completed in April, 2004 (classified).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Workforce
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	75%	86%	20%	Demonstrated

Measure: Percentage of screeners scoring above the national standard level of Threat Image Projection (TIP) performance Measure Under Development
Additional Information: All passenger screening x-ray machines are equipt with technology which periodically projects false threat images and measures screener response to the image. TSA is establishing a standard level of TIP performance, and the measure will reflect the percentage of screeners performing above the standard.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
FY 2004			
FY 2005			
FY 2006			
FY 2007			
FY 2008			
FY 2009			
FY 2010			

Measure: Level of baggage screening covert test results Measure Under Development
Additional Information: This will be a measure of screener performance on baggage covert testing data.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
FY 2004			
FY 2005			
FY 2006			
FY 2007			
FY 2008			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Workforce
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	75%	86%	20%	Demonstrated

FY 2009

FY 2010

Measure: Level of the Baggage Screening Covert Test Results
Additional Information: This will be a measure of screener performance on baggage covert testing data.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
FY 2010			

Measure: Level of the Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI-A) for Aviation Operations
Additional Information: The CSI -A is a composit index incorporating data on security confidence, passenger surveys, and compliments/complaint data on screener performance.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
FY 2003	78	78	
FY 2004	79		
FY 2005	80		
FY 2006	81		
FY 2007	82		
FY 2008	83		
FY 2009	84		
FY 2010	85		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Workforce
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	75%	86%	20%	Demonstrated

Measure: Level of the Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI-A) for Aviation Operations
Additional Information: The CSI -A is a composit index incorporating data on security confidence, passenger surveys, and compliments/complaint data on screener performance.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
FY 2010	85	85	

Measure: Cost per passenger screened
Additional Information: This measure will suggest the system-wide human resources cost of screening a person based on activity based costing information at a sample of airports.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
FY 2004			
FY 2005			
FY 2006			
FY 2007			
FY 2008			
FY 2009			

Measure: Cost per passenger screened Measure Under Development
Additional Information: This measure will suggest the system-wide human resources cost of screening a person based on activity based costing information at a sample of airports.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
FY 2010			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Workforce
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	75%	86%	20%	Demonstrated

Measure: Cost per bag screened

Additional Information: This measure will suggest the system-wide human resources cost of screening a bag based on activity based costing information at a sample of airports.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
FY 2004	Baseline		
FY 2005			
FY 2006			
FY 2007			
FY 2008			
FY 2009			
FY 2010			

Measure: Cost per bag screened

Additional Information: This measure will suggest the system-wide human resources cost of screening a bag based on activity based costing information at a sample of airports.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
FY 2010	Baseline		

Measure: Level of the Passenger Screening Covert Test Results

Additional Information: This measure will be a composite measure of screener performance of passengers based on covert testing data from checkpoints of carry on baggage (i.e., carry on probability of protection) and persons (i.e., person probability of detection).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
FY 2004	Baseline		
FY 2005			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Screener Workforce
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Transportation Security Administration
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	75%	86%	20%	Demonstrated

FY 2006

FY 2007

FY 2008

FY 2009

FY 2010

Measure: Level of the Passenger Screening Covert Test Results

Additional Information: This measure will be a composite measure of screener performance of passengers based on covert testing data from checkpoints of carry on baggage (i.e., carry on probability of protection) and persons (i.e., person probability of detection).

Year
FY 2010

Target

Actual

Measure Term: Long-term

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: Search and Rescue (SAR)

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	Authorizing language states that CG shall operate SAR facilities and may render aid to distressed persons and save property in U.S. seas and waters. One of the CG's five missions is to save lives and property at sea.	14 U.S.C. 2, 88, and 141; Coast Guard Strategic Plan.	20%	0.2
2 <i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The problem is people drowning and property lost in U.S. seas and waters.	In 2001, there were 39,000 search and rescue cases in the U.S., over 700 lives lost, and over \$400 million in property lost. http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-o/g-opr/SAR%20Sum%20Stats%2064-01.htm	20%	0.2
3 <i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	CG's role is pre-eminent in conducting SAR in coastal and Federal waterways. It is responsible for SAR across state boundaries and acts as SAR coordinator for multiple Federal, state, and local authorities. No state, local, or private entity has the 24-7 capability or responsibility for SAR of the Coast Guard.	http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-o/g-opr/sar.htm	20%	0.2
4 <i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	No other entity provides comprehensive maritime SAR services. To the extent that other agencies and entities can contribute, their efforts are coordinated and leveraged by CG.	http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-o/g-opr/nsarc/nsp.htm (UNITED STATES NATIONAL SEARCH AND RESCUE PLAN)	20%	0.2
5 <i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	SAR is conducted by CG personnel and vessels also engaged in inherently governmental functions, such as law enforcement (drug and migrant interdiction). CG infrastructure costs are mostly fixed, regardless of SAR activity.	It is more efficient to use CG resources, which are already deployed for border patrol, etc., than to provide additional funds for a contractor or grantee to deploy separate vessels and personnel for SAR.	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Section Score				100%	100%

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	No	CG does have a long-term goal; however, there is no clear time frame for accomplishing it. This question's weighting was lowered because CG faces pressure to maintain an unrealistic long-term goal.	CG's long-term performance goal is to save all mariners in imminent danger. FY 2004 Budget request to OMB.	15%	0.0
2 <i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	SAR has clear annual performance goals.	CG's annual performance goals are: save 85% of all mariners in distress; save 93% of mariners in distress after CG has been notified. FY 2004 Budget request to OMB; DOT 2004 Performance Plan.	25%	0.3
3 <i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	N/A	No program partners.	—	0%	
4 <i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	CG acts as SAR coordinator for multiple federal, state, and local SAR authorities.	CG has established partnerships with all state and local SAR authorities, as well as with private companies engaged in commercial towing, salvage, and other marine assistance. http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-o/g-opr/nsarc/nsarc.htm ; http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-o/g-opr/sarpart.htm .	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 <i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	Yes	In 2001, the DOT IG issued an audit of the Small Boat Station Search and Rescue Program. The report focused on readiness.	http://www.oig.dot.gov/item_details.php?item=585	20%	0.2
6 <i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	Yes	CG's Mission Cost Program model provides comprehensive cost information for individual programs, including overhead and other indirect costs as well as direct costs.	FY 2004 Budget request to OMB; CG Mission Cost Program model	20%	0.2
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	No	CG has not taken steps to address the deficiencies identified in the first PART review of this program in June, i.e. no real long-term goal and no evaluations.	FY 2004 Budget request to OMB.	0%	0.0
Total Section Score				100%	85%

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	CG collects SAR data from all units and conducts a mid-year and end-of-year analysis. Through this analysis, adjustments are made to program priorities and resource reallocations.	SAR Summary Statistics with Performance Measures report. http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-o/g-opr/U_S_%20Coast%20Guard%20SAR%20Statistics%20Introduction.htm#Scope	17%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2 <i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	No	Personnel decisions regarding individuals are not directly determined by whether the program achieves its goals.	CG believes measurements are resource arguments and not personnel performance assessments.	17%	0.0
3 <i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	99% of operating expenses are obligated in the first year. Virtually all acquisition, communication, and improvement funds are obligated prior to expiring.	1) Estimated obligations by quarter in apportionments. 2) Actual obligations by quarter.	17%	0.2
4 <i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	The program uses competitive sourcing strategies in the area of SAR planning and response and in its capital acquisitions.	Current contracts for products include response boats and locator beacons; contracts for services include development of the new Computer-Assisted Search Planning Program.	17%	0.2
5 <i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	Yes	CG uses an activity-based costing model developed by KPMG that significantly exceeds the requirements of the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board. The system is based on reliable cost data that is reconciled to CG's audited financial statements.	Coast Guard activity-based costing model.	17%	0.2
6 <i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	The program has no internal control weaknesses.	Three consecutive CFO audits. http://www.oig.dot.gov/show_pdf.php?id=713 http://www.oig.dot.gov/show_pdf.php?id=211	17%	0.2
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	N/A	No significant management deficiencies were identified in the June PART review of SAR.	---	0%	
Total Section Score				100%	83%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
-----------	------	-------------	---------------	-----------	----------------

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	No	CG's long-term goal of saving 100% of mariners is not realistic. SAR's performance is based on many factors far outside CG's control. Also, success of other CG programs to prevent maritime accidents can drive down SAR performance by leaving only hard cases.	FY 2004 Budget request to OMB; OST Office of Performance Planning. http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-o/g-opr/92-01summary.htm	20%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Percent of all mariners in imminent danger rescued 100% 2000: 83%. 2001: 84%.
Long-Term Goal II: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	
Long-Term Goal III: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	

2 <i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Large Extent	CG has set ambitious goals for SAR. The goals have been reached or very nearly reached in recent years.	FY 2004 Budget request to OMB; OST Office of Performance Planning. http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-o/g-opr/92-01summary.htm	30%	0.2
--	--------------	---	--	-----	-----

Key Goal I: Performance Target: Actual Performance:	Percent of all mariners in imminent danger rescued 85% (every year) 2000: 83%. 2001: 84%.
Key Goal II: Performance Target: Actual Performance:	
Key Goal III: Performance Target: Actual Performance:	

3 <i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Yes	National Distress Response System Modernization Project (Rescue 21) is currently being implemented to improve communication and information-sharing for Coast Guard and its SAR partners.	http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g%2Da/ndrsmpl/de script.htm	25%	0.3
--	-----	---	---	-----	-----

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4 <i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	N/A	No other programs have similar purpose and goals.	---	0%	
5 <i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	No	The IG audit of the small boat program identified "serious staffing, training, and equipment problems in the SAR program."	http://www.oig.dot.gov/item_details.php?item=585	25%	0.0
Total Section Score				100%	45%

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Standards
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	84%	45%	

Missing 2nd Program Type Research and Development

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Standards program mission is to develop and coordinate the adoption of National standards and appropriate evaluation methods to meet Homeland Security mission needs

Evidence: The Homeland Security Act of 2002; Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8, Sections 14 and 15

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: There is an urgent need to develop and implement standards, and test and evaluation protocols for technology used to support the homeland security mission (i.e., technology used for detecting, mitigating, and recovering from terrorist attacks in support of, or used by state and local stakeholders).

Evidence: The Homeland Security Act of 2002; Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8, Sections 14 and 15

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: One of the mission objectives of this program is to coordinate standards development with other Federal agencies, US Standards committees, and international partners.

Evidence: DHS Management Directive for Standards Process (defining interagency and intragency standards coordination) in Clearance Stage, American National Standards Institute Homeland Security Standards Panel (ANSI HSSP); American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Homeland Security Applications Committee activities, Interagency Task Force on Bacillus Anthracis

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Strong emphasis is placed on the integration of activities at the Federal, State, and Local level. The standards portfolio expands its impact by leveraging on resources of other US government entities including the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Department of Defense (DoD), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Department of Energy (DOE). In addition the standards portfolio leverages on the resources of the private sector by using the voluntary consensus standards process mandated by OMB. The program is designed to coordinate activities at all levels (federal, state, local) and to leverage on existing available resources

Evidence: OMB Circular 119, National Technology Transfer Act of 1995, Three DHS management directives.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Standards
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	84%	45%	

Missing 2nd Program Type Research and Development

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight:20%

Explanation: The Standards program as structured ensures the active engagement of federal, state, and local first responders. Engagement is critical in developing effective standards for equipment and systems that detect, protect, prevent, respond, and aid in recovery, and attribution. This program provides consistent and verifiable measures of effectiveness of homeland security-related technologies, operators, and systems in terms of basic functionality, interoperability, efficiency, and sustainability. The development of guidelines is performed in conjunction with both users and developers.

Evidence: Three DHS management directives govern the process and establish homeland security standards working groups in key homeland security subject areas. ANSI Standards and Test and Evaluation Protocols for Radiological/Nuclear Detection ; American Association of Analytical Chemists (AOAC) Performance and Official Methods for Detection of Bacillus Anthracis using hand-held immunoassays, Adoption of National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) respiratory protection standards, Adoption of International Committee for Information Technology Standards (INCITS) Facial Photograph standards for DHS US VISIT Program.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Establish an integrated infrastructure for determining and developing standards, and test and evaluation protocols for technology used for detecting, mitigating, and recovering from terrorist attacks and also to support other Departmental components' technologies. Provide consistent and verifiable measures of effectiveness of homeland security-related technologies, operators, and systems in terms of basic functionality, interoperability, efficiency, and sustainability. Facilitate the development of guidelines in conjunction with both users and developers.

Evidence: Current program area descriptions (PAD) for standards development in a number of areas including biological countermeasures, chemical countermeasures, high explosives, radiological/nuclear countermeasures, cyber security, emergency preparedness and response, borders and transportation security, personal protective equipment, critical infrastructure protection, and training, strategic planning templates, DHS Future years Homeland Security Performance Measures, Ongoing work within ANSI HSSP and ASTM Homeland Security Applications Committee

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The standards portfolio has defined targets and timeframes for long term measures to include establishing technical standards and test/evaluation protocols for all current and future CBRNE detection and decontamination technologies and analysis tools. In addition, the standards program will adopt or develop standards to meet the current and future needs of operational directorates within DHS including biometric standards, critical infrastructure protection standards, training standards, interoperability standards, and personal protective equipment standards

Evidence: Current program area descriptions (PAD) for standards development in a number of areas including biological countermeasures, chemical countermeasures, high explosives, radiological/nuclear countermeasures, cyber security, emergency preparedness and response, borders and transportation security, personal protective equipment, critical infrastructure protection, and training, strategic planning templates, DHS Future years Homeland Security Performance Measures, Ongoing work within ANSI HSSP and ASTM Homeland Security Applications Committee

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Standards
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	84%	45%	

Missing 2nd Program Type Research and Development

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The standards portfolio has specific annual performance measures outlined in the PADs and Execution Plans in a number of homeland security areas. Technical standards and test/evaluation protocols will be established for WMD decontamination technologies and analysis tools. For FY05, "Consumer's report" on radiation and bioagent detection devices for federal, state, and local users will be published. For FY2006, establish and accredit a network of private/public labs to perform testing, evaluation, and certification of WMD emergency response technologies to allow effective procurement and deployment of technologies that will substantially reduce risk and enhance resiliency of the federal, state, and local response capability.

Evidence: Unconstrained and constrained Science and Technology strategic planning templates, PADs, DHS FYHSP

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The Standards program is in the process of developing annual performance measures as part of the current Science and Technology Strategic Planning Activities. In addition, the standards portfolio has outlined through its execution plans ambitious targets (such as developing and adopting standards in eleven critical homeland security areas.

Evidence: Science and Technology strategic planning templates. Exeuction Plans, PADs, Future Year HSP performance measures

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The Standards program has an intra-agency integrated product team (IPT) which develops long term goals for the program. In addition, the standards program has established a number of interagency working groups and advisory groups that provide input into long and short term planning. Grantees, contractors, and cost-sharing partners are aware of and agree to the standards long term goals as specified in the execution plan, statement of work, quarterly reports, etc.

Evidence: S&T Stragetig Planning Templates, Execution Plans, Statement of Work documents, Management Directives, Quarterly reports. Examples of partners committed to and working towards our annual and long term goals include the Task Force for Bacillus Anthracis (representatives from EPA, FDA, DoD, OSTP, HHS, DHS, etc.) which is supporting the method validation of hand-held immunoassays for the detection of anthrax. Other examples include the Consequence management subcommittee, chartered by the Subcommittee on Standards, to develop standardized approach to consequence management after a Radiological Dispersal Device or Improvised Nuclear Device incident.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Standards
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	84%	45%	

Missing 2nd Program Type Research and Development

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: As part of the standards vetting process, a Homeland Security Standards Advisory Council looks at the scope and quality of the standards portfolio and advises whether the program is meeting the evolving mission requirements of the S&T Directorate and the department. In addition, the program will undergo an annual independent program review as part of the S&T directorate's STAR Program Review Process

Evidence: Homeland Security Standards Advisory Council as defined in the management directives, STAR Program Review Process

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The Standards budget is developed through a strategic planning process that requires program mission to be linked to specific program objectives which are tied to program goals and objectives. In addition, the Future Years Homeland Security Performance Measures are tied to budget requests

Evidence: Standard's Strategic Planning Templates, DHS Planning, Programming & Budgeting System process

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The Standards program is currently participating in the Science and Technology strategic planning activities.

Evidence:

2.RD1 If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The standards portfolio has an established process for coordinating with similar standards programs in both the government and private sector as defined in the management directive. In a similar manner the program is continually comparing and contrasting other similar efforts and expanding its impact by leveraging on resources of other US government entities including the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Department of Defense (DoD), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Department of Energy (DOE). In addition the standards portfolio leverages on the resources of the private sector by using the voluntary consensus standards process mandated by OMB. The program is designed to coordinate activities at all levels (federal, state, local) and to leverage on existing available resources.

Evidence: All federal agencies have a standards executive and the standards portfolio director has been designated as the standards executive for DHS. The standards executive works closely with the standards executives from all other federal agencies to coordinate, compare, and leverage existing efforts. In addition the standards portfolio has set up working groups with key players from other similar programs contributing to input. Examples of other similar programs include the EPA's Environmental Technology Verification Program, Department of Justice, Office of Law Enforcement Standards. Evidence includes management directives, OMB Circular 119.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Standards
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	84%	45%	

Missing 2nd Program Type Research and Development

2.RD2 Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: As part of the standards vetting process, working groups of subject matter experts that include broad agency representation develop prioritized lists of standards requirements with appropriate budget estimates. A standards steering committee that includes representation from the portfolio managers in S&T combines the lists and determines priorities for funding.

Evidence: Management Directives, Strategic Planning Templates, Program Decision Memorandum, DHS Planning, Programming & Budgeting System process

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:17%

Explanation: Intramural and extramural procurement requests require collection of performance data , additionally, DHS collects performance information in their Future Year Homeland Security Program database. The S&T program includes and provides performance information on the Standards program in every update.

Evidence: Intramural and extramural procurement requests, quarterly reports, monthly reports to the Office of Research and DevelopmentDHS Future Years Homeland Security Program database (FYHSP).

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:17%

Explanation: All portfolio managers are required to be accountable for cost, schedule, and performance results.

Evidence: Quarterly reports, STAR Program Review Process

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:17%

Explanation: The funds for the standards portfolio are directed to National and Federal laboraboraty partners and to private sector standards development organizations. These funds have enabled fast track development of standards for radiation and biological agent detectors as well as personal protective equipment standards.

Evidence: Obligation rates, quarterly reports, Adopted Standards

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight:17%

Explanation:

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Standards
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	84%	45%	

Missing 2nd Program Type Research and Development

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:17%

Explanation: The department is using the American Voluntary Consensus Standards (VCS) process mandated by OMB to develop standards in concert with other State and Federal agencies and the private sector. This move to leverage the resources of the private sector is more efficient and cost effective than developing standards using only Federal employees. In addition, the standards portfolio has a clear process for collaborating and coordinating with other related programs in both the federal and private sectors as stated in the management directives

Evidence: Management Directives, American National Standards Institute Homeland Security Standards Panel, Task Force on Baccillus Anthracis, SoS Subcommittee on CMS - for RDD/INDD,

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The Science and Technology Directorate is a new directorate within DHS. Processes for developing financial management activities are currently being developed.

Evidence:

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The Science and Technology Directorate is a new directorate within DHS. Processes for developing financial management activities are currently being developed.

Evidence:

3.RD1 For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality? Answer: YES Question Weight:17%

Explanation: Implementing project management process based upon the Project Management Book of Knowledge (PMBOK).

Evidence: Guidelines to Develop FY04 S&T ORD Execution Plans dated 10 Oct 03

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:34%

Explanation: Standards and test programs have been developed and deployed to the public.

Evidence: 8 Respiratory Protection Standards have been adopted (5 NIOSH, 3 NFPA), 4 Radiation Detection Device Standards Developed and Adopted, 4 Radiation Detection Test and Evaluation Protocols approved; Equipment meeting the standards are currently being procured and put into use. Developing and revising protective clothing standards to address CBRN threats.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Standards
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Science and Technology
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	100%	84%	45%	

Missing 2nd Program Type Research and Development

Measure: Consumer's Report on radiation and bioagent detection devices
Additional Information: the primary goal of the standards portfolio is to develop and adopt homeland security standards.

Year Target Actual **Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Establish and accredit a network of private/public lasbs to perform testing, evaluation and certification of WMD emergency response technologies.
Additional Information: the primary goal of the standards portfolio is to develop and adopt homeland security standards.

Year Target Actual **Measure Term:** Annual

Measure:
Additional Information:

Year Target Actual **Measure Term:**

Measure:
Additional Information:

Year Target Actual **Measure Term:**

Measure:
Additional Information:

Year Target Actual **Measure Term:**

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Homeland Security Act of 2002, Sec. 430(c) gives the Office for Domestic Preparedness "primary responsibility within the executive branch of Government for the preparedness of the United States for acts of terrorism including...directing and supervising terrorism preparedness grant programs of the Federal Government (other than those programs administered by the Department of Health and Human Services) for all emergency response providers." The State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) provides financial assistance directly to each of the states, territories, and the District of Columbia to enhance their capabilities for incidents of terrorism including those involving weapons of mass destruction. The FY2004 SHSP provides funds for homeland security and emergency operations planning; the purchase of specialized equipment to enhance the capability of state and local agencies to prevent, respond to, and mitigate incidents of terrorism involving the use of chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive (CBRNE) weapons and cyber attacks; for costs related to the design, development, and conduct of state CBRNE and cyber security training programs and attendance at ODP-sponsored CBRNE training courses; for costs related to the design, development, conduct, and evaluation of CBRNE and cyber security exercises; and for costs associated with implementing State Homeland Security Assessments and Strategies. Although the FY2004 Application Kit allows for a consolidated application that includes SHSP, the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, and the Citizen Corps Program, this PART Review applies only to the SHSP grant program which was created in FY1999. The program, originally designed, provided funds to "ensure municipal fire and emergency services departments are provided with appropriate equipment necessary to respond to incidents of terrorism involving the release of chemical, biological, and radiological agents, as well as improvised or manufactured explosive devices. The only allowable use for the funds available for the program through FY2001 was for the purchase of equipment. Additional purposes have been added each year beginning in FY2002, to include planning, training, exercises, and cyber terrorism.

Evidence: 1. Homeland Security Act of 2002, Sec 430; FY99-04 Grant Program Totals; FY 1999-2004 Appropriations Language related to program; 2. Fiscal Year 2004 Homeland Security Grant Program - Program Guidelines and Application Kit. 3. Pursuant to section 1014 of the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001. 4. Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 P.L.104-132, Key sections are 819, 820, and 821.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program addresses the critical need for federal assistance to states to prepare the nation to prepare, prevent and respond to acts of terrorism. The problem of global terrorism is in the headlines everyday. In 2002, the federal government implemented the largest reorganization of the federal government since the creation of the Department of Defense after World War II by establishing the Department of Homeland Security to fight terrorism. ODP moved into the new Department on March 1, 2003 along with 21 other agencies from across the executive branch.

Evidence: 1. Homeland Security Act of 2002; 2. State of the Union Address, 2004; Two White House Press Releases, 'President Bush Signs Homeland Security Act', and 'President Discusses War on Terrorism'

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

1.3 **Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) is not redundant or duplicative of other programs. However, there are a number of federal programs that contribute to an comprehensive approach to enhancing preparedness and ODP has implemented a number of important measures to ensure that coordination. With few exceptions, such as New York City that had been the target of previous terrorist attacks, state and local governments did not have programs for terrorism preparedness prior to the establishment of the SHSP. State and local programs are currently implemented primarily with federal funds. As detailed in GAO Testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security, Committee on the Judiciary on "Reforming Federal Grants to Better Meet Outstanding Needs" there are a number of federal programs that provide resources to fight terrorism and/or crime and emergency response.

Evidence: 2. Homeland Security Act of 2002 3. Letter from Secretary Ridge forming a "one-stop shop" of DHS grants at ODP. 4. Fiscal Year 2004 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidelines and Application Kit; 5. Fiscal Year 2003 and 2004 Urban Areas Security Initiative Grant Program: Program Guidelines and Application Kit; 6. State Homeland Security Assessment and Strategy Program; 7. Bureau of Justice Assistance Report to Congress on Terrorism Prevention and Response Training for Law Enforcement and Other Responders 8. ODP's Emergency Responder Guidelines 9 GAO report, GAO-02-547T, entitled, 'Intergovernmental Partnership in a National Strategy to Enhance State and Local Preparedness,'

1.4 **Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The State Homeland Security Grant program is confined in its ability to respond to changes in the threat environment by a minimum level of grant funding that must be given to each state, which was set in the PATRIOT Act. The Department's goal is to help support a minimum level of preparedness for all states, but it would prefer to have the flexibility to decide what that level should be.

Evidence: PATRIOT Act

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: 1. The program funds are awarded to the states on the basis of a formula defined by Congress. Within the states, the funds are distributed in accordance with the state homeland security strategy that is developed based on a comprehensive risk and needs assessment conducted at the state and local levels. Through the assessment process state and local agencies identify the planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercises needed to safely and effectively respond to a terrorist incident. Based on the risk assessment, the agency/jurisdiction identifies the number of personnel that are available at each response level and the number currently equipped and trained to perform at those levels. The difference between what is needed and currently capacity is used to define the needs. States use this information to develop their state homeland security strategy and to allocate grant funds. The States are required to obligate 80 percent of their funding to local jurisdictions and in most states, jurisdictions that do not participate in the assessment are not eligible for funds. 2. A recent Inspector General's Audit on Distributing and Spending "First Responder" Grant Funds explored concerns that had been expressed about the time it has taken to get the funds to the local response agencies. Early in the program, the delay was caused to allow time for the states to conduct assessments and develop a strategy which serves as the blueprint for the allocation of funds. To address this issue, the FY2004 Appropriations includes language that requires ODP to make awards within 15 days after receiving an application and the states to make subaward within 60 days of receiving an award. ODP complied with this timeframe and will monitor compliance at the state level with the 60 day deadline. To further ensure that the funds reach the intended beneficiaries in a timely manner, Secretary Ridge has established a Funding Task Force to review the issues associated with funding bottlenecks at the state and local level. This task force is looking at a number of issues, and has enlisted the assistance of eleven states and one territory in answering a funding survey to drill down on what is happening to funding at the local level.

Evidence: 1. State Homeland Security Assessment and Strategy Program: State Handbook; 2. Sample state strategy. 3. Office of the Inspector General - An Audit of Distributing and Spending "First Responder" Grant Funds, March 2004. 4. FY2004 Appropriations Language

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of the program is to enhance the preparedness of states and local jurisdictions to prepare for, prevent and respond to a terrorist attack. The primary long term performance measure will be the number of jurisdictions in various populations groups that can perform critical homeland security tasks as demonstrated through exercises. This long-term performance measure is directly linked to DHS/ODP's HSPD-8 Implementation Concept Plan. On Page 37 of this plan under National Preparedness Assessment and Reporting System, one of DHS/ODP's milestones is to 'Coordinate development of quantifiable performance measurements for DHS in the areas of training, planning, equipment, and exercises for Federal Preparedness to support the goal and submit to SECDHS for adoption', This milestone is set for 3/15/05.

Evidence: 1. Fiscal Year 2004 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidelines and Application Kit; 2. FY1999 Formula Grant Application Kit 3. HSPD-8 Implementation Concept, Page. 37.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: ODP will begin reporting results in FY 2006. This is a very ambitious timeframe to define an evaluation methodology to measure performance, to define the range of probable threats to be addressed, to develop a universal list of critical tasks, to define metrics to measure performance of the critical tasks, and to implement it through federal, state and local agencies that perform homeland security tasks. The military has spent over 10 years developing its task list and performance measures. Unlike the military, states and local jurisdictions are not controlled by a single command structure. Most state and local homeland security personnel have many responsibilities in addition to those related to homeland security. Many are volunteer and have difficulty devoting needed time to training and exercises. ODP has developed the methodology to evaluate performance as demonstrated through exercises and an initial set of critical tasks and evaluation criteria. ODP has trained over 200 of its exercise support contractors and has just completed training 480 state and local representatives on the HSEEP exercise evaluation methodology. States were asked to bring multidisciplinary teams to the training. States are being provided with instructor packages so they can train local agencies within their state. ODP has the lead responsibility for implementing HSPD 8, issued by the President in December 2003. Implementation of HSPD will enhance ODP's ability to achieve its long range performance measures by setting a National Preparedness Goal and preparedness measures. The Homeland Security Council has developed a Suite of Scenarios (15) that addresses the range of threats and will be used to develop a universal task list for federal, state and local response to the Scenarios. The universal task list will complete the list of critical tasks that will be used under HSEEP. ODP recently awarded a contract to obtain assistance in defining performance metrics and developing a preparedness rating model. Though ODP has a good measure for program performance, it will take much work on the part of the HSPD-8 implementation team to ascertain what the proper targets are for measuring performance.

Evidence: 1. Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program - Volume II: Exercise Evaluation and Improvement; 2. Information Bulletin inviting states to HSEEP training with training schedule; 3. Suite of Scenarios (not released for distribution); 4. HSPD 8: National Preparedness; 5. Metrics contract solicitation

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: As mentioned above, ODP has the lead responsibility for implementation of HSPD 8, which will serve to identify a national preparedness goal. Annual performance measures will be developed to measure progress toward establishing and testing the evaluation methodology, the performance metrics, and the preparedness rating model. At this time, though ODP does not have enough information to develop meaningful targets for its long term goals. Therefore, it is difficult to set annual goals in support of the long term goals.

Evidence: 1. Long-term and annual performance measures 2. HSPD 8; 3. Initial Strategy Implementation Plan (ISIP): User's Guide.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Through the HSPD-8 implementation, ODP will collect data to define baselines and annual performance data for jurisdictions around the country.

Evidence: HSPD-8 implementation strategy

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The states and local jurisdictions that receive ODP funds are required to comply with HSEEP which support ODP's long-term goal of measuring performance of critical homeland security tasks through exercises. Compliance with HSEEP is required through the Program Guidelines and Application Kit. ODP exercise support contractors that provide support to state and local agencies, are required by their contract to comply with and assist with implementation of HSEEP. As discussed in question 2.3, contractors and states have been trained in the HSEEP exercise evaluation and improvement methodology and states are being provided with an instructor package to train their subgrantees. Several states have asked for advance copies of the instructor package and have begun training. Also, ODP has transitioned to a new type of reporting for grants in FY 2004 and beyond. This approach is not just output-based, but rather, shows the progress made towards the goals and objectives noted in the State Homeland Security Strategies. ODP has instituted The initial Strategy Implementation Plan (ISIP) to report these results. Local jurisdictions conduct assessments, upon which states crafts strategy plans. State agencies and local jurisdictions must spend in accordance with state homeland security goals and objectives. Additionally all direct resources provided for training, exercises, equipment, planning, and other technical assistance support complement each other in addressing statewide goals and objectives.

Evidence: 1. Fiscal Year 2004 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidelines and Application Kit, page 34; 2. ISIP guidelines.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: This programs progress and planning for addressing definciencies is highly scrutinized. While there have not been many reports, a recent GAO report outlines some of the current issues and we can be sure the program will be revisited.

Evidence: GAO report

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The budget requests for the last few fiscal years that have resulted in billions of dollars for this program was orionally based on a FEMA estimate of preparedness needs done post 9/11. It is the hope of the Department that one of the end results of the HSPD -8 implementation is that the budget a resources will be allocated based on the long term goals and the achievement of short term goals.

Evidence: . HSPD-8 and HSPD-8 Implementation Plan, GAO Report , GAO-03-170.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: ODP has taken a number of important steps to address issues related to its strategic planning to include: 1. The assessment tool and strategy development process first used in 1999/2000 was substantially enhanced for the second round completed in 2003/2004 (See State Handbook, pgs. xiii-xxiv). 2. The FY2000-2002 appropriations language required the grant funds be distributed on the basis of approved strategies. Because homeland security responsibilities were generally new to state and local governments, the initial assessments and strategies took more time than anticipated to complete. As a result, the program was criticized for the delay in the distribution of funds. The FY 2004 appropriations language required that ODP act within 15 days of receipt of an application or of an updated State Plan, whichever is later, and that the states make subawards within 60 days of receiving an award. See discussion in the Office of Inspector General Report, March 2004. 3. Because the section of the initial strategies related to exercises were generally fairly weak, ODP required that the states conduct exercise planning workshops with assistance from ODP exercise managers and contractors and develop a 3-year Exercise Plan. 4. ODP has implemented a new requirement that states develop an Initial Strategy Implementation Plan (ISIP) to capture information on planned projects and funding allocations related to the achievement of the strategic goals and objectives outlined in the State's strategy.

Evidence: 1. State Homeland Security Assessment and Strategy Program: State Handbook; 2. FY2004 Appropriation; 3. DHS Office of Inspector General Report - An Audit of Distribution and Spending "First Responder" Grant Funds, March 2004 4. Sample Exercise Plan; ODP Initial Strategy Implementation Plan (ISIP) User's Guide

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:20%

Explanation: 1. As described in previous responses, ODP requires that the states develop a statewide homeland security strategy, based on local assessment data. ODP has instituted an Initial Strategy Implementation Plan and Biannual Strategy Implementation Report to tie the strategy goals to the distribution of funds and to monitor progress on implementation. 2. ODP required that states to develop a 3-year exercise plan following an Exercise Planning Workshop with state and local homeland security representatives to define exercise needs and approaches. 3. ODP requires the states to provide copies of exercise after action reports using a standardized format defined in HSEEP - Volume II. 4. ODP uses the above performance information to monitor and facilitate program implementation. The following are a few examples of how ODP has used this information to better manage the program and improve performance: a. ODP develops State Assistance Plans in response to the state strategies that define federal assistance available to the state. b. ODP has made several changes to the Authorized Equipment List in response to needs identified by the states. c. ODP, through appropriations language and administrative decisions has expanded the allowable uses for the grant funds. d. ODP has developed a system for states to schedule training to improve their ability to address training needs identified in their strategy. e. ODP has developed a system for states to schedule exercises and request exercise support and is developing a system to collect and manage exercise performance data. f. ODP has developed new training courses in response to needs identified by the states. g. The Exercise Planning Workshop and Plan were in response to inadequate detail on exercise needs in many of the first state strategies.

Evidence: 1. State Homeland Security Assessment and Strategy Program: State Handbook; 2. Initial Strategy Implementation Plan: User's Guide; 4. Information on Exercise Planning Workshop; 5. HSEEP - Volume II; 6. Sample State Assistance Plan; 7. Changes in Authorized Equipment List. 8. Changes in allowable uses of funds; 9. Information on training scheduling system; 10. Information on exercise scheduling system; 11. ODP Training Course Catalogue

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: 1. HSPD-8 requires the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to develop a National Preparedness Goal and to report to the President on progress toward meeting that goal. Since ODP has been designated the lead on the implementation of HSPD-8, the Federal managers within ODP, as well as its grantees, subgrantees, and contractors will be held responsible for cost, schedule and performance results. 2. ODP has instituted the Initial Strategy Implementation Plan and Biannual Reports to hold the states and their subgrantees responsible for implementation of the strategy. 3. ODP has put together Grant Monitoring Guidance, Policy Directive No. 2 to articulate general guidelines for ODP grant monitoring activities beginning in calendar year 2004. ODP Preparedness Officers are responsible for conducting monitoring activities for the grant programs they manage. Office-based monitoring includes file reviews and telephone conversations with the state or other identified grantee. This activity occurs annually and precedes on-site visits to grantees. On-site monitoring involves travel to the state for review of documentation and meetings with state officials. On-site visits occur annually for each state. 4. The HSEEP exercise evaluation and improvement process requires states and local jurisdictions that use grant funds or support for exercise must evaluate performance of critical homeland security tasks, prepare an after action report (AAR), and develop an improvement plan that is incorporated into the AAR. The improvement plan defines for each recommendation: the specific action steps the jurisdiction will take to implement it, who will be responsible for implementation, and the timeline for completion. ODP will follow-up, through the state, with the jurisdiction at regular intervals to get a status report on implementation of the improvement plan. Where appropriate, ODP will provide technical assistance to assist the jurisdiction to make needed improvement.

Evidence: 1. HSPD-8; 2. Initial Strategy Implementation Plan (ISIP): User's Guide 3. HSEEP - Volume II: Exercise Evaluation and Improvement, pgs 35-37 and Appendix D. 3. Policy Directive No. 2 Grant Monitoring Guidance

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: 1. The grant Program Guidelines and Application Kit spells out in considerable detail the allowable uses of the grant funds, to include a list of allowable equipment. The expenditure of grant funds must be tied to the goals and objectives defined in the state strategy. ODP monitors the implementation of the strategy and the expenditure of the funds through regular reports from the states and through on-site monitoring visits. 2. As mentioned in question 2.8, the appropriations language requires ODP to make awards within 15 days after receiving an application from a state and states are required to subaward the funds within 60 days of receiving an award.

Evidence: 1. Fiscal Year 2004 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidelines and Application Kit 2. Categorical/ Discretionary Assistance Progress Report Format 3. ODP Monitoring Manual 4. FY2004 Appropriation

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: YES

Question Weight:10%

Explanation: ODP is committed to achieving efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution through automation. ODP has invested significantly in IT improvements and continues to explore and develop new applications to improve efficiency and to enhance data available for program management and evaluation. In the summer of 2003, ODP establish an internal Information Management System Working Group with representatives from all of the program divisions within the agency. The Working Group was charged with defining ODP's current and future system needs and developing a plan to develop a fully integrated and efficient system to meet those needs. The work of that group will be integrated and/or coordinated with the work of the Assessment and Reporting Integrated Concept Team established under HSPD-8 Implementation Plan. Examples of system improvements that have been implemented or are planned to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of the grant and state strategy implementation include the following. 1. All grant applications and reports are submitted on-line. 2. The ODP Online Data Collection Tool is used for the development and submission of the assessment and state homeland security strategy. The tool was enhanced in FY2003 to respond to a number of recommendations from the states. 3. ODP recently implemented a Scheduling, Training, and Exercise Secure Portal to enable states to schedule ODP-sponsored training and state and local exercise on-line. 4. States are able to request through ODP surplus radiation detection and other equipment available from the Departments of Energy and Defense under the HDER Program. 5. ODP is developing an Exercise Management System for the reporting of results of federal, state and local exercise and the tracking of the status of improvement actions. In response to recommendations from the states, ODP is working with its federal partners to define a standard set of data to be collected and a uniform after action report format. The participating agencies are exploring the possibility of designing a single reporting system for all homeland security exercise programs. 6. ODP provided guidance to the States in the FY04 Homeland Security Grant Program, Appendix E, for the Development of Interoperable Communications Plans.

Evidence: 1. Memo establishing the Integrated Information Management System (IIMS) Working Group and IIMS White Paper; HSPD-8 Implementation Plan; Fiscal Year 2004 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidelines and Application Kit - Appendix A; 2. State Homeland Security Assessment and Strategy Program: State Handbook; 3. Fact Sheet on ODP Scheduling, Training and Exercise Secure Portal Program Information; 4. Fact Sheet on HDER Program; 5. Agenda for Exercise Data and Reporting Standardization Meeting. 6. Appendix E, FY04 Homeland Security Grant Program

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:20%

Explanation: ODP collaborates and coordinates with other federal agencies involved in homeland security activities at the state and local levels. The following are a few examples: 1. ODP worked with several federal agencies including the FBI, TSA, USDA, CDC and FEMA on the development of the State Homeland Security Assessment and Strategy Program. The FBI is notified of all threat assessment ratings above a certain level. 2. The risk and needs assessments involve the active participation of state and local agencies from 10 disciplines (see page 6 of State Handbook). The FBI is generally involved in the local threat assessments, and other federal agencies participate in the assessment process. 3. The list of equipment authorized for purchase with grant funds is derived from the Standardized Equipment List which is developed by the Interagency Board (IAB) for Equipment Standardization and Interoperability. ODP serves in the IAB and worked with other agencies to refine the list to address state and local homeland security needs (see page 15-31 of State Handbook). 4. ODP works with the Departments of Energy and Defense under the Homeland Defense Equipment Reuse (HDER) Program to provide states with surplus radiological detection instrumentation and other equipment to help the states with strategy implementation. 5. ODP has put together an Intra-Departmental Strategy Review Board to assist ODP in reviewing each homeland security strategy and making recommendations as to whether it should be approved. Agencies participating on this Board are as follows: EP&R, BTS, S&T, Secret Service, Coast Guard, IAIP, and Office of State and Local Government Coordination. 6. Multiple federal agencies, through grant programs and/or regulation require that government agencies or private organizations conduct homeland security exercises. ODP encourages states to design grant-funded exercises that meet multiple requirements and are supported from multiple funding sources. ODP and other federal agencies work jointly to provide technical support to these exercises.

Evidence: 1. State Homeland Security Assessment and Strategy Program: State Handbook, pgs vii-ix; 2. State Handbook, pg 6; 3. State Handbook, pgs 15-31; 4. Homeland Defense Equipment Reuse Program Fact Sheet; 5. Memo on forming a DHS Strategy Review Board

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: ODP's grant financial management continues to be provided by the Office of the Comptroller, Office of Justice Programs, and Department of Justice. The Office of the Comptroller consistently receives clean audits for financial management of the grant programs. The Program Guidelines and Application Kit requires grantees and subgrantees to maintain financial records in accordance with applicable OMB circulars, to submit quarterly financial status reports, and to conduct financial and compliance audits in accordance with U.S. General Accounting Office Government Auditing Standards and OMB Circular A-133. ODP and the Office of the Comptroller monitor for financial and programmatic compliance.

Evidence: 1. OJP Financial Guide; 2. Audit of OJP Office of the Comptroller; 3. OJP Circular A-133. 4. Monitoring Manual Guidelines

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	50%	100%	8%	

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The OIG Audit report identifies a number of management issues that ODP has addressed or is addressing. 1. Require more meaningful reporting by states for ODP can track progress more accurately and assist states when necessary. As discussed in the responses to several other questions, ODP has enhanced its reporting requirements with Initial Strategy Implementation Plan and Biannual Report (BSIR) and with the reporting that is required on performance as demonstrated through exercises. 2. Seek a legislative change to revise or eliminate the 45-day transfer rule to allow more time for planning. The requirement was changed in FY2004 to 60 days. 3. Identify and publish best practices that result in faster and more efficient grant processing and spending. This recommendation is being implemented by ODP's Technical Assistance Branch and lessons learned will be shared through ODP's Lessons Learned Information Sharing system and through direct communication with the states. 4. Accelerate the development of federal guidelines for first responder capabilities, equipment, training, and exercises. ODP has been working on all of these issues but will accelerate development and implementation under the requirements for HSDPD-8. 5. Published program monitoring guidance and ensured that states report their progress in achieving program and performance goals and objectives. ODP have developed and published its Monitoring Manual. The ISIP and BSIR address the second part of this recommendation. 6. Monitor state oversight of local jurisdiction compliance with grant requirements, and develop performance standards. ODP monitors state oversight of local compliance with grant requirements through its on-site monitoring visits (see Monitoring Manual). ODP has enhanced its monitoring process and methodology to more effectively monitor the implementation of the state strategies and the use of the grant funds. As discussed in the response to earlier questions, the second part of the recommendation related to performance standards is being addressed through the HSEEP Manuals, the Metric Contract, and HSPD-8.

Evidence: 1. Office of the Inspector General: 'An Audit of Distributing and Spending 'First Responder' Grant Funds', March 2004; 2. Initial Strategy Implementation Plan (ISIP): User's Guide and Biannual Strategy Implementation Report; 4. ODP's Monitoring Manual Guidelines. 5. HSEEP Vol. II, 6. Metrics Contract Solicitation, 7. HSPD-8

3.BF1 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: While, ODP has established a planning and reporting requirements and system to assist the states the developing and implementing an effective homeland security strategy and to ensure that ODP has sufficient knowledge of grantee activities to manage the program and provide assistance where needed, very little monitoring is done after the grant is awarded. According to the IG, ODP has no formal grant monitoring process, nor do they perform frequent field visits to grant recipients. The IG recommended more meaningful reporting by the states was necessary.

Evidence: 1. State Homeland Security Assessment and Strategy Program: State Handbook; 2. Initial Strategy Implementation Plan: User's 3. Fiscal Year 2004 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidelines and Application Kit; 4. ODP Monitoring Protocol; 5. Guidance on Exercise Plan and/or sample plan; 6. Information on training and exercise scheduling system 7. OIG Report, "An Audit of Distributing and Spending 'First Responder' Grant Funds".

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

3.BF2 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: ODP collects grantee performance data from its grantees through the state strategies, semi-annual performance reports, exercise After Action Reports. Where appropriate this information is made available through the Lessons Learned Information Sharing System and ODP's secure portal to homeland security professionals. Information on lessons learned and best practices is generally made available without identifying the state or local jurisdiction. For security reasons, data on performance of specific states or local jurisdictions cannot be made available to the general public.

Evidence: 1) H.R. 5005, Homeland Security Act of 2002, 2) FOIA, under the FY04 Grant Application Kit, Page, A-1.

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Although ODP is not able to provide data on performance of critical homeland security tasks, at this point, ODP has data from the state grant applications, on-site monitoring reports, and progress reports which document enhancements to preparedness. It will take several years to fully implement the system to evaluation performance of critical tasks, a small investment in time for data that will be required to fight the war against terrorism that will be with us for many years or decades. Since FY 1999, states have been utilizing ODP domestic preparedness grant funding to increase the number of first responders trained, the number of WMD incident response exercises conducted, and the amount of equipment purchased for use during WMD incident response. Grant funding has been utilized to develop specialized response teams, and to develop or update emergency operations plans and terrorism incident annexes. The following are a few of the many specific examples of enhanced preparedness from several states: 1) Colorado indicated in its Categorical Assistance Progress Report (CAPR) that they recently used ODP funding to conduct a virtual tabletop exercise that involved approximately 400 responders across all 64 counties. The exercise tested county emergency operations plans and recent upgrades to the statewide Health Alert Network. Since July 2002, Colorado has conducted over 24 tabletop and field exercises to reach their goals of improving the ability of responders to respond to a terrorist incident involving explosive and chemical agents, as well as hoaxes and suspicious packages. Colorado has distributed approximately 88% of FY 1999-2002 grant funding to local communities (states are mandated to distribute 80% of funding to local entities). 2) Prior to 1999, Wyoming had no operational WMD response teams with explosive device capabilities; due in part to ODP grant funding, they now have four teams with EOD capabilities. All of Wyoming's 2,700 law enforcement officers are now equipped to Level C capability so they can protect themselves while establishing perimeters for a WMD incident. Approximately 10% of Wyoming's total training needs identified in the FY 1999 assessment process have been met. In the state of Georgia, over 7,866 responders have been trained utilizing ODP training support. 3) In Wisconsin, ODP funding has promoted the development of eight regional HazMat teams and bomb squads. Wisconsin is also improving its communications capabilities; approximately 35% of FY 1999-2002 equipment funding was used to purchase computer-integrated systems and multi-channel encrypted radios. Additional information regarding state equipment expenditures, training and exercise program development, and progress towards identified domestic preparedness goals and objectives can be found in the attached supporting documentation.

Evidence: Categorical Assistance Progress Reports, State Profiles, Budget Detail Worksheets, Program Narratives, and Monitoring Visit Reports for Ohio, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Colorado, and Georgia

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 25%

Explanation: ODP has also engaged a contractor to refine the performance tools to incorporate more objective performance metrics and to develop a preparedness rating model. HSPD-8 will greatly enhance these efforts by establishing a National Preparedness Goal and providing interagency collaboration on the development of performance measures/standards and reporting systems. Under HSPD-8, a Universal Task List (UTL) will be developed to respond to the 15 scenarios developed by the Homeland Security Council. The Assessment and Reporting Integrated Concept Team will use the UTL to develop/refine the performance measures and/or standard and to develop a uniform reporting format and system.

Evidence: 1. HSEEP Volume II: Exercise Evaluation and Improvement; 2. Metrics Contract Solicitation; 3. HSPD-8;

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 25%

Explanation: ODP has implemented a number of measures that have resulted in improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness which include: 1. While ODP expands to take on new responsibilities, ODP analyzes which functions can be accomplished with contract support and where federal personnel resources are needed. ODP makes extensive use of contractor support. 2. ODP now provides a firm due date for the submission of the state strategies and other reporting requirements. With the first strategy process, states were told that they were not eligible for grant fund until they submitted their strategy. Because the process was new and required the bringing together of representative from many disciplines and units of government, the holding of the funds proved not be sufficient incentive for timely strategy submissions. 3. ODP has reduced its time for review of applications and award of funds from 58 days in FY02 to 15 days in FY2004. 4. ODP developed a training scheduling system to allow the states to schedule needed training directly rather than working through ODP's Centralized Scheduling Desk. This process has reduced the time devoted to the scheduling process and resulted in more timely training. 5. ODP, in conjunction with the Departments of Energy and Defense has implemented the HDER Program to provide surplus radiation detection and other equipment to states. It has resulted in the transfer of equipment valued at over \$3.2M ;6. ODP is working with its federal partners, both within and outside of DHS to develop a uniform set of performance metrics for evaluating exercises, a single after action report format, and a unified reporting format for collecting this information from the states and localities. This would reduce the burden of having to prepare several reports if funds from different federal agencies are used. These coordination issues will be addressed by the Assessment and Reporting Integrated Concept Team under HSPD-8. 7. In the summer of 2003, ODP established an internal Management Information System and Reporting Working Group to define ODP long-term system needs and develop a plan for implementation. ODP still receives some system support from the Office of Justice Programs in DOJ, but it is not sufficient to meet ODP's growing responsibilities and need for program and performance data. An initial needs analysis has been drafted. Much of this work will be addressed by the Assessment and Reporting Integrated Concept Team under HSPD-8.

Evidence: 1. List of staff vs. in-house contractor support as well as outside contractor support; Information on strategy submissions (1st and 2nd); 3. Grant application review process times; 4. Information on ODP training scheduling system (any comments or data of time to schedule/satisfaction?); HDER Information and data; 6. Management System Needs Report from Kerry

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NO Question Weight 25%

Explanation: Independent evaluations are not able to show how federal funding has increased prepedness and response capabilities.

Evidence: IG Report "An audit of Distributing and Spending 'First Responder' Grant Funds.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

Measure: Percent of exercises conducted in accordance with Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) guidelines for threat-and performance-based exercises.

Additional Information: ODP will begin reporting results in FY 2006. ODP is establishing a system to collect information on homeland security exercises conducted with ODP support to include information about the type of threat scenario and the critical tasks that were tested.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Percent of jurisdictions over 100,000 that demonstrate performance of at least 90 percent of critical tasks within the expected range in exercises using the DHS/ODP suite of scenarios.

Additional Information: ODP has developed a methodology and tools for the evaluation of exercises. These tools will be refined over the next two years resulting in the ability to measure performance of critical tasks. The level of performance will be described in the exercise After Action Reports.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------------------

Measure: Percent of jurisdictions over 50,000 that demonstrate performance of at least 90 percent of critical tasks within the expected range in exercises using the DHS/ODP suite of scenarios.

Additional Information: ODP has developed a methodology and tools for the evaluation of exercises. These tools will be refined over the next two years resulting in the ability to measure performance of critical tasks. The level of performance will be described in the exercise After Action Reports.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------------------

2010	10%		
------	-----	--	--

PART Performance Measurements

Program: State Homeland Security Grants
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: ODP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	50%	100%	8%	Demonstrated

Measure: Percent of jurisdictions over 500,000 that demonstrate performance of at least 90 percent of critical tasks within the expected range in exercises using the DHS/ODP suite of scenarios.

Additional Information: ODP has developed a methodology and tools for the evaluation of exercises. These tools will be refined over the next two years resulting in the ability to measure performance of critical tasks. The level of performance will be described in the exercise After Action Reports.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------------------

Measure: Percent of recommendations from state and local exercises that are implemented.

Additional Information: Recommendations and improvement steps will be extracted from After Action Reports and entered into the Exercise Scheduling and Evaluation System.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	20%		
2006	30%		
2007	40%		
2008	50%		
2009	50%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Threat and Vulnerability, Testing and Assessment (TVTA)

Agency: Department of Homeland Security

Bureau: Science and Technology

Type(s): Research and Development

Missing 2nd Program Type

Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	100%	63%	26%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of the program is to provide and develop capabilities that enable the creation, application and dissemination of threat and vulnerability information to prepare for, anticipate, detect, and prevent terrorist activities and help restore the Nation's operational capabilities

Evidence: This program has been developed to support the Homeland Security Act of 2002, Section 302(2); National Strategy for Combating Terrorism; Official requests from other agencies for assistance; PDDs 39 and 41.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: TVTA provides technology and information to DHS, IAIP, the Intelligence Community, Federal, State and Local government by addressing their needs for: Forecasting; Information Sharing; System Optimization; Simulation; Threat Assessment; Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Assessment; Nuclear Assessment Program; Advanced Scientific Computing; Threat and Vulnerability Information Systems R&D and Prototyping; Biometric (Border Safe).

Evidence: This program has been developed to support the Homeland Security Act of 2002, Section 302(2); National Strategy for Combating Terrorism; Official requests from other agencies for assistance; PDDs 39 and 41.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: TVTA provides unique technologies and knowledge services to DHS, Federal, State, and Local agencies creating enhanced capabilities to share information and expand and create new technology

Evidence: Intelligence Technology Innovation Center participation; Steering Group; National Strategy; (Detailees)-informal vetting of incoming R&D/DHS wide efforts

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: NO

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: There exist legal limitations as to information sharing and Privacy Issues

Evidence: Statutory and Constitutional limitations

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Resources have been strategically balanced to meet Statutory and Policy requirements, specific end user needs, urgency and rapid application of technologies taking into account other related, complementary efforts being performed in other agencies, and Cost/Benefit impacts on National Security.

Evidence: Strategic Planning process documents end user requirements

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Threat and Vulnerability, Testing and Assessment (TVTA)

Agency: Department of Homeland Security

Bureau: Science and Technology

Type(s): Research and Development

Missing 2nd Program Type

Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	100%	63%	26%	Demonstrated

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: TVTA's long-term performance measure is: Provide measurable advances in information assurance, threat detection and discovery, linkages of threats and vulnerabilities and capability assessments and information analysis required by Departmental missions to anticipate, detect, deter, avoid, mitigate and respond to threats to US homeland security.

Evidence: Strategic Planning Documents; FYHSP; Documentation provided to OMB

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Ambitious technology capabilities and information sharing efforts with multiple federal, state, and local agencies have been identified in TVTA's FY 05 - 10 Strategic Planning efforts; TVTA's performance measure is: Improvement in the National capability to assess threats and vulnerabilities to terrorist attacks

Evidence: Strategic Planning Documents; FYHSP; Documentation provided to OMB

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Performance measures that can demonstrate TVTA's progress in meeting its strategic objectives have been developed as part of TVTA's Strategic Planning efforts. TVTA's performance measure is: Improvement in the National capability to assess threats and vulnerabilities to terrorist attacks

Evidence: Strategic Planning Documents; FYHSP; Documentation provided to OMB

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: End-item deliverables for each identified need have been prioritized, timelined and tied to performance measures and strategic goals as stipulated in the strategic planning documents

Evidence: DHS FYHSP database

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The TVTA portfolio functions through an Integrated Product Team (IPT). All the IPT members contribute to developing plans and executing actions to accomplish the 5 strategic program objectives.

Evidence: Strategic Planning Documents; IPT execution documents, statement of work; contracts; ORD Interagency Procurement Request

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Threat and Vulnerability, Testing and Assessment (TVTA)

Agency: Department of Homeland Security

Bureau: Science and Technology

Type(s): Research and Development

Missing 2nd Program Type

Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	100%	63%	26%	Demonstrated

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Independent evaluation are currently being conducted on selected programs

Evidence: Independent evaluation of Nuclear Assessment Program; S&T Directorate STAR Program Review Process; Broad Agency Announcements

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The TVTA IPT mission statement is supported by specific strategic objectives that are tied to goals and capabilities.

Evidence: Strategic Planning Documents

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Strategic Planning efforts in progress

Evidence: Strategic Planning Documents

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: TVTA provides a unique Federal government program to predict and project the threat environment.

Evidence: TVTA briefing to the S&T Corporate Review Board; interactions with other agencies; HSAAct statutory requirements

2.RD2 **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Methodology for prioritization: Statutory and Policy requirements; Constitutional limitations; End-user requirements; Urgency of user needs; Rapid application of technologies; balanced delivery of capabilities; build logic/sequencing; Performance status of ongoing projects; other similar work ongoing in other agencies; alignment with DHS,ST, and portfolio missions and goals; and cost/benefit considerations on National Security are all considered in relation to one another through an exhaustive internal review process. Consultations with outside experts in subject areas is done frequently. Finally, all HSPD and presidential priorities as evinced from directives and budget documents inform the prioritization process .

Evidence: Strategic Planning Documents

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Threat and Vulnerability, Testing and Assessment (TVTA)

Agency: Department of Homeland Security

Bureau: Science and Technology

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	100%	63%	26%	Demonstrated

Type(s): Research and Development

Missing 2nd Program Type

Research and Development

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Specific performance information is required for each Statement of Work

Evidence: Monthly performance reports from Laboratories

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Performance reports and progress payments are reviewed on a monthly basis prior to acceptance.

Evidence: Monthly performance reports from Laboratories

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Statement of Work specify purpose, reporting requirements, and performance measurements

Evidence: Monthly performance reports from Laboratories

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation:

Evidence:

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Our mission is to support knowledge discovery for DHS, Federal, State, and Local agencies.

Evidence: National Strategy; Strategic Planning Process

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation:

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Threat and Vulnerability, Testing and Assessment (TVTA)

Agency: Department of Homeland Security

Bureau: Science and Technology

Type(s): Research and Development

Missing 2nd Program Type

Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	100%	63%	26%	Demonstrated

3.7	Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?	Answer: NO	Question Weight:13%
Explanation:			
Evidence:			
3.RD1	For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?	Answer: YES	Question Weight:13%
Explanation: In process of implementing project processes based on Program Management Book of Knowledge Standards, which is based upon the U.S. and international program management standard ANSI/PMI 99-001-2000. This is the global standard for program management practices and stresses a quality approach.			
Evidence: Guidelines to Develop FY 04 Office of Research and Development Execution Plans (10/10/03)			
4.1	Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?	Answer: SMALL EXTENT	Question Weight:20%
Explanation: Relatively new program which inherited existing programs			
Evidence: Enabling legislation is the Homeland Security Act of 2002; National Strategy; Strategic planning process			
4.2	Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?	Answer: SMALL EXTENT	Question Weight:20%
Explanation: Relatively new program, 1st annual performance measurements goals will be collected in 1st Quarter of FY 2005.			
Evidence: Enabling legislation is the Homeland Security Act of 2002; National Strategy; Strategic planning process			
4.3	Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?	Answer: SMALL EXTENT	Question Weight:20%
Explanation: Relatively new program, 1st annual performance measurements goals will be collected in 1st Quarter of FY 2005.			
Evidence: Enabling legislation is the Homeland Security Act of 2002; National Strategy; Strategic planning process			
4.4	Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?	Answer: SMALL EXTENT	Question Weight:20%
Explanation: TVTA is a unique Federal government program to predict and project the threat environment. Compares favorably to State/private programs.			
Evidence: Intelligence Community comparisons of similar efforts; MATRIX			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Threat and Vulnerability, Testing and Assessment (TVTA)

Agency: Department of Homeland Security

Bureau: Science and Technology

Type(s): Research and Development

Missing 2nd Program Type

Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	100%	63%	26%	Demonstrated

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: NO

Question Weight 20%

Explanation:

Evidence:

Measure: Improvement in the National capability to assess threats and vulnerabilities to terrorist attacks

Additional Information: 10 capabilities to be assessed

Year
2006

Target
10

Actual

Measure Term: Annual