Department of Homeland Security

Performance Budget Overview
Appendix B
Program Analysis Findings and Addressing Shortcomings

Fiscal Year 2006
Congressional Budget Justification

B. Program Analysis Findings and Addressing Shortcomings

This appendix presents summaries of representative analyses of program which contribute to achievement of DHS strategic goals, and were considered in preparation of the budget.   In the body of this appendix the analysis summaries are listed in alphabetical order by acronym of the name of the DHS organizational entity.   In the body of the Performance Budget Overview the programs were listed under strategic goals they most strongly align as shown below. Where the name of the analysis differed from the name of the program analyzed, the analysis name is also shown for ease of cross reference.

Goal 1. AWARENESS - Identify and understand threats, assess vulnerabilities, determine potential impacts and disseminate timely information to our homeland security partners and the American public.
- S&T – Science and Technology Directorate – Program: Biological Countermeasures
- S&T – Science and Technology Directorate - Program : Threat and Vulnerability, Testing and Assessments

Goal 2. PREVENTION - Detect, deter and mitigate threats to our homeland.
- CBP - Customs and Border Protection – Program: Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at POE's – Analysis Name: "Inspection Technology"
- ICE - Immigration and Customs Enforcement – Program: Office of Investigations
- TSA - Transportation Security Administration – Program: Screener Workforce
- TSA - Transportation Security Administration - Program: Screening Technology – Analysis Name: "Baggage Screening Technology"
- TSA - Transportation Security Administration - Program: Screening Technology – Analysis Name: "Passenger Screening Technology"
- TSA - Transportation Security Administration - Program: Screener Support – Analysis Name: "Screener Training"
- USCG – United States Coast Guard – Program: Migrant Interdiction

Goal 3. PROTECTION - Safeguard our people and their freedoms, critical infrastructure, property and the economy of our nation from acts of terrorism, natural disasters and other emergencies.
- OSLGCP – Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness – Program: State Formula Grants Program
- USSS – United States Secret Service – Program: Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions
- USSS – United States Secret Service – Program: Protective Intelligence

Goal 4. REPONSE - Lead, manage and coordinate the national response to acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies.
- EP&R – Emergency Preparedness and Response – Program: Response – Analysis Name: "FEMA Response"

Goal 5. RECOVERY - Lead national, state, local, and private sector efforts to restore services and rebuild communities after acts of terrorism, natural disaster, or other emergencies
- EP&R – Emergency Preparedness and Response – Program: Recovery

Goal 6. SERVICE - Serve the public effectively by facilitating lawful trade, travel and immigration.
- USCG – United States Coast Guard - Program: Ice Operations – Analysis Names: "The Coast Guard Domestic Icebreaking Program" and "The Coast Guard Polar Icebreaking Program"
- USCG – United States Coast Guard - Program: Ice Operations – Analysis Name: "The Coast Guard Domestic Icebreaking Program"

Goal 7. ORGANIZATIONAL EXCELLENCE - Value our most important resource, our people. Create a culture that promotes a common identity, innovation, mutual respect, accountability and teamwork to achieve efficiencies, effectiveness, and operational synergies.
- S&T – Science and Technology Directorate – Program: Standards

Ratings on program findings uses the Office of Management and Budget Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) classifications of programs being Effective, Moderately Effective, Adequate, Ineffective, or Results Not Demonstrated. A rating of Results Not Demonstrated means that a program does not have sufficient performance measurement or performance information to show results, and therefore it is not possible to assess whether it has achieved its goals. If the evaluation was a PART, the OMB rating is shown. If other than an OMB evaluation, the rating which best describes the results was used. Where analysis has resulted in recommendations of how they could be improved, actions to address shortcomings are identified.

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry	**CBP**	**Inspection Technology**	**OMB**	**2005**	**Results Not Demonstrated**
Summary findings:	The assessment found that the Inspection Technology program is unable to demonstrate results due to a lack of comprehensive, outcome-based performance measures or ambitious targets for performance goals. The majority of the performance measures for the Inspection Technology program are either "under development" or "new." There are no targets, goals, or actual data from previous years to use to measure future performance.				
Actions to address recommendations:	In response to these findings, the Administration will work to develop useful long-term performance and efficiency measures for this program and plan for regular evaluations. A similar component in CBP was evaluated in 2005 with parallel conclusions and has since developed a number of appropriate measures. The Inspection Technology program will follow this lead.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Response	EP&R	FEMA Response	OMB	2005	Adequate
Summary findings:	The assessment of the Department of Homeland Security's Response program found that the program has a clear purpose. It is designed to address an existing need, which is 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. The Response program was newly reorganized in FY 2004 due to the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security. While there is no long term information available on performance, the program seems to be achieving its quarterly goals.				
Actions to address recommendations:	EP&R will develop baseline information to be used to inform performance measurement.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Recovery	EP&R	Recovery	OMB	2005	Adequate
Summary findings:	The assessment of the Department of Homeland Security's Recovery program found that the program has a clear purpose and addresses an existing need. FEMA's recovery programs are carefully designed to avoid duplicative disaster assistance through sequencing the delivery of FEMA assistance with the assistance available from other sources, such as insurance or other federal agency programs. The assessment of the Department of Homeland Security's Recovery program found that the program has a clear purpose and addresses an existing need.				
Actions to address recommendations:	The program will determine a unit cost baseline for the Individual Assistance Program to track future reductions in the Program's delivery costs.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Office of Investigations	**ICE**	**Office of Investigations**	**OMB**	**2005**	**Adequate**
Summary findings:	The assessment found that the Office of Investigations has made significant progress in the integration of former customs and immigration service investigators, and has started to reap the benefits of additional investigative authorities.				
Actions to address recommendations:	In response to recommendations, the following actions will be undertaken: 1) Increase funding for the Visa Security Program, Homeland Security Data Network, and worksite enforcement. 2) Develop stronger financial control of resources and stronger internal control mechanisms to track expenditure of funds. 3) Continue to institute controls to hold managers accountable for performance results. 4) Increase cooperation with other Federal law enforcement agencies in order to prevent conflicting investigations and to utilize all resources in common investigative goals. 5) Ensure collection of critical performance data for the program's measures.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
State Formula Grants	**OSLGCP**	**State Formula Grants**	**OMB**	**2005**	**Results Not Demonstrated**

Summary findings:	State Formula Grants Program addresses the critical need of federal assistance to states and localities to prepare the nation to prepare, prevent, and respond to acts of terrorism. Findings of the evaluations are: 1) Funding is allocated by a formula that uses population as the sole risk factor, ignoring other threats and vulnerabilities. 2) The program's planning process is driven by the States and is somewhat disorganized. 3) Despite years of work, the program still lacks clear goals and measures. An effort to develop goals and measures under Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8, (HSPD-8) is proceeding fitfully. 4) While grant obligations have been timely, the actual expenditure and disbursement of funds has been slow. 5) Current reporting mechanisms focus on what has been planned and purchased with grant funds, not outcomes or accomplishments.
Actions to address recommendations:	In response to these recommendations from OMB, SLGCP's FY2006 Budget proposes to further restructure the grant allocation process, providing the Secretary with greater discretion to award funds based on risks, threats, and vulnerabilities. SLGCP will issue the FY06 State Homeland Security Grant Guidance in December 2005. SLGCP released the Target Capabilities List (TCL) on January 31, 2005 and will issue the National Preparedness Goal, once approved by the President, which includes the National Priorities to guide the Nation's efforts to achieve and sustain nationally accepted-risk based target levels of capability to prevent, respond to, and recover from major events, especially terrorism. SLGCP will submit an Annual Status Report of the Nation's level of preparedness one year from the date of approval of the National Preparedness Goal.

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Biological Countermeasures	**S&T**	**Biological Countermeasures**	**OMB**	**2005**	**Effective**
Summary findings:	This program ranked the highest of the three that were evaluated by the PART for Science and Technology Directorate. The Directorate was created as a new part of the Department of Homeland Security and has only now begun establishing performance measures and evaluating their progress toward reaching those goals. As such, at the conclusion of the one-year performance cycle, the Directorate can evaluate its progress toward those goals. 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 were delays in FY 2004 and FY 2005 budget execution. Task oriented execution plans are being aggressively carried out. While strategic planning and evaluation is currently underway, subsequent deficiencies have not been identified or remedied.				
Actions to address recommendations:	In response to these findings, the Administation considered the high achievements of this Program in its decision to continue funding the Portfolio. Therefore, related to the analysis and review findings, the Budget includes an increase. The Administration will await the results of the program evaluation and analysis process that the Directorate is developing. That process will evaluate the progress that each Portfolio makes toward achieving their respective goals and remedying any deficiencies.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Threat and Vulnerability, Testing & Assessments	S&T	Threat and Vulnerability, Testing and Assessment (TVTA)	OMB	2005	Results Not Demonstrated
Summary findings:	The Directorate was created as a new part of the Department of Homeland Security and has only now begun establishing performance measures and evaluating their progress toward reaching its goals. As such, at the conclusion of the one-year performance cycle, the Science and Technology Directorate can evaluate its progress toward those goals. Performance measures can demonstrate TVTA's progress in meeting its strategic objectives and some have been developed as part of TVTA's Strategic Planning efforts, but some fiscal and accountability controls were lacking. Strategic planning and evaluation is currently underway and subsequent deficiencies have not been identified or remedied. The program's score suffered in part from things outside its control such as the fact that outside evaluators have not had a chance to conduct plenary analysis and because legal impediments have hindered their success.				
Actions to address recommendations:	In response to these findings, the Budget included a decrease for TVTA. The Administration will await the results of the program evaluation and analysis process that the Science and Technology Directorate is developing. That process will evaluate the progress that each Portfolio makes toward achieving their respective goals and remedying any deficiencies. Once that process is complete, it is expected that this Portfolio will achieve an increased PART score once it is reassessed.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Standards	S&T	Standards	OMB	2005	Adequate
Summary findings:	The Science and Technology Directorate was created as a new part of the Department of Homeland Security and has only begun establishing performance measures and evaluating their progress toward reaching its goals. As such, at the conclusion of the one-year performance cycle the Directorate can evaluate its progress toward those goals. Annual Performance Goals for the program are defined in its strategic planning templates and in the Future Years Homeland Security Program performance measures. They include establishing the DHS standards prioritization, adoption and development process, and adopting and developing key standards in 11 subject areas including weapons of mass destruction countermeasures and operational directorates' needs. While strategic planning and evaluation is currently underway, subsequent deficiencies have not been identified or remedied. Independent evaluations of the standards program have not been accomplished to date, although the Homeland Security Standards Advisory Council will report on the FY 2004 program.				
Actions to address recommendations:	The program manager will develop a program evaluation and analysis process that evaluates the progress that each Portfolio makes toward achieving their respective goals and remedying any deficiencies.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Screener Workforce	TSA	Screener Workforce	OMB	2005	Results Not Demonstrated
Summary findings:	The assessment found that the Screener Workforce program, though making progress, is unable to demonstrate outcome-based performance results. TSA is addressing past design flaws including inappropriate staffing levels, poor distribution of screeners among airports, and the inordinate use of full time over part time screeners. TSA recently undertook a workforce realignment effort and developed a draft screener staffing model. 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. TSA has not yet established targets and timeframes for most annual and long term goals.				
Actions to address recommendations:	In response to these findings, the Administration will: 1) Include funding to sustain and improve the screener workforce. 2) Develop performance targets for new performance measures. 3) Undertake more comprehensive and thorough evaluations on workforce issues to better understand how to address workforce performance needs.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Screening Technology	**TSA**	**Baggage Screening Technology**	**OMB**	**2005**	**Results Not Demonstrated**
Summary findings:	The assessment found that the Baggage Screening Technology program was unable to demonstrate outcome-based performance results: 1) The baggage screening technology architecture is sound, although questions exist regarding the efficiency of its current deployment within airports. 2) The program now has strong performance measures, but targets are under development. The program has not yet undertaken an evaluation of sufficient scope and quality. 3) TSA is in the process of implementing better management information systems so that performance oversight of technology contractors is improved.				
Actions to address recommendations:	In response to these findings, the Administration will: 1) Include funding to maintain the checked baggage system, and begin upgrading systems with next generation technology. 2) Develop and implement performance targets for the new performance measures. 3) Complete a comprehensive capital plan that addresses long term system performance needs. TSA has developed a business plan and Strategic Plan and Quality Management System to address performance measurement deficiencies.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Screening Technology	**TSA**	**Passenger Screening Technology**	**OMB**	**2005**	**Results Not Demonstrated**
Summary findings:	The assessment found that the Passenger Screening Technology program was unable to demonstrate outcome-based performance results: 1) The passenger screening technology architecture is sound, although some shortcomings exist including the quality of screening for explosives. 2) The program recently developed strong performance measures, but targets are still under development. The program has not yet undertaken an evaluation of sufficient scope and quality. 3) TSA is in the process of implementing better management information systems so that performance oversight of technology contractors is improved.				
Actions to address recommendations:	In response to these findings, the Administration will: 1) Include increases in funding to deploy new passenger screening technology to ensure all higher risk passengers receive improved screening for explosives. 2) Develop and implement performance targets for the new performance measures. 3) Complete a comprehensive capital plan that addresses long term system performance needs. The CTO Strategic Plan was completed and approved by the CTO in September 2004. The draft Quality Manual was completed in October 2004.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Screener Support	**TSA**	**Screener Training**	**OMB**	**2005**	**Adequate**
Summary findings:	The assessment found that TSA has largely addressed design flaws identified through internal and external revies, and is working to improve overall performance. TSA increased the level and scope of supervisory training, instituted processes to identify and remediate screener skill gaps, standardized remedial training and improved access to training courses through an online learning center. Some important training issues still need to be addressed, including validating current remedial training standards and ensuring connection with the implemented staffing and operational constraints.				
Actions to address recommendations:	In response to these findings, the Administration will: 1)Include funding for additional technology infrastructure, which will improve TSA's ability to train employees and monitor performance; 2) Continue to address training system and performance shortfalls; 3) Ensure recently adopted performance measures and targets are effective for the long term for measuring training system performance.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Ice Operations	**USCG**	**The Coast Guard Domestic Icebreaking Program**	**OMB**	**2005**	**Effective**
Summary findings:	The PART review of this program determined that the Coast Guard domestic icebreaking program: 1) Addresses a market failure to provide commercial icebreaking services. 2) Has a robust performance measurement program, but performance targets that are not particularly ambitious at the outcome measure level (i.e., GPRA-reporting level). 3) Holds Coast Guard Officers accountable for achieving the program's mission. 4) Contributes to questions about sound financial management practices at the Coast Guard. 5) Incorporates a sufficient degree of independent analysis and review that shows significant economic benefit for continuing the program.				
Actions to address recommendations:	To address these findings, the Coast Guard will develop more ambitious performance targets.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Ice Operations	**USCG**	**The Coast Guard Polar Icebreaking Program**	**OMB**	**2005**	**Results Not Demonstrated**
Summary findings:	The OMB Program Analysis and Review of this program determined that: 1) Currently, scientific research programs are the primary beneficiaries of the Coast Guard's annual polar icebreaking operations. 2) Funding for the polar icebreaking program is not adequately aligned with the agencies that receive benefits, and that the Coast Guard ice breaking operation provides a de facto subsidy to the scientific community. 3) The program has neither long-term nor annual performance measures to gauge its effectiveness or efficiency, but is working to address this shortcoming. 4) Coast Guard Officers who manage this program are held accountable for achieving the program's mission. OMB recommended actions be taken to remedy shortcomings associated with the FY 2003 CFO Audit results, as well as work towards improving the program's performance metric framework.				
Actions to address recommendations:	In response to OMB's recommendations, action to address these matters will be taken.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Migrant Interdiction	**USCG**	**Migrant Interdiction Program**	**OMB**	**2005**	**Moderately Effective**
Summary findings:	The Migrant Interdiction PART review underscored the need for improvements to the Coast Guard's financial management system as identified during its FY 2003 CFO audit, and the Coast Guard is seeking to address these issues by implementing a financial management remediation plan. The PART also identified some concerns with the Coast Guard's ability to meet its long-term performance goals. The Coast Guard contracted with the Center for Naval Analyses (CNA) to conduct a 3rd party program evaluation of the Migrant Interdiction program. CNA subsequently studied the program's performance measurement framework in depth, and offered several improvement recommendations.				
Actions to address recommendations:	The Coast Guard is assessing the feasibility of implementing several of CNA's recommendations, including those related to performance measures improvements.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions	**USSS**	**Foreign Protectees/Foreign Missions**	**OMB**	**2004**	**Effective**
Summary findings:	The PART assessment found that this program effectively fulfills its mission. The program provides the capability to centrally coordinate logistics, advanced security surveys, intelligence analysis and dissemination, and other planning activities preceding actual protectee visits. The Service has adopted specific, ambitious long-term performance goals and annual performance measures demonstrating progress toward them. The strategic planning process emphasizes the proactive and continuous improvement that the constantly changing protective environment mandates. The program has not engaged in comparative analysis with other Federal, State, and Local law enforcement agencies' protective programs or elements, though many security agencies view the Service as a model for protective services and methods.				
Actions to address recommendations:	The Service continues to make progress achieving annual and long-term performance goals and has recently developed a Foreign Protection/Mission Efficiency index to demonstrate efficiencies.				

Program Name	DHS Entity	Name of Evaluation	By	Date	Rating on Program Findings
Protective Intelligence	**USSS**	**Protective Intelligence**	**OMB**	**2004**	**Effective**
Summary findings:	The PART assessment found that this program effectively fulfills its mission requirements. It provides Service personnel with timely and relevant information needed to carry out associated protective operations. Advance agents are able to determine the appropriate level of operational resources needed for protectee visits based on the provided intelligence. The program works in partnership with numerous law enforcement and intelligence agencies to achieve its ambitious annual and long term goals. The agency has recently developed a protective intelligence efficiency index which will demonstrate improved efficiencies.				
Actions to address recommendations:	Progress will continue to be made achieving annual and long-term performance goals while demonstrating improved efficiencies.				