

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

PART ASSESSMENTS¹

¹This document contains details of the most recent program assessments as of the date the 2005 Budget was published (February 2004). Programs originally assessed for the 2004 Budget were reassessed only where evidence showed an agency's rating was likely to change. Programs not reassessed are presented in this document in the form of reprints of the original worksheets and are footnoted "FY 2004 Budget".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Rating	Page
Aids to Navigation.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	3
Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	9
Aviation Passenger Screening Program.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	18
Border Patrol.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	24
Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement.....	Moderately Effective.....	34
Container Security Initiative.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	43
Detention and Removal.....	Moderately Effective.....	49
Disaster Relief Fund - Public Assistance.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	58
Drug Interdiction.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	66
Federal Air Marshal Service.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	72
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	81
Federal Protective Service.....	Moderately Effective.....	87
Hazard Mitigation Grant.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	95
Immigration Services.....	Adequate.....	105
Marine Environmental Protection.....	Moderately Effective.....	116
Metropolitan Medical Response System.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	126
National Flood Insurance.....	Moderately Effective.....	133
Search and Rescue.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	142

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 ouput 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																		
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:30%;">Long-Term Goal I: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</td> <td colspan="5"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Long-Term Goal II: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</td> <td colspan="5"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Long-Term Goal III: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</td> <td colspan="5"></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>	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																		
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:30%;">Key Goal I: Performance Target: Actual Performance:</td> <td colspan="5">DOT goal: Percentage of time waterways are available for commerce. 2004: 98% N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Key Goal II: Performance Target: Actual Performance:</td> <td colspan="5">CG goal: Total number of commercial vessel collisions, allisions, and groundings. 2001: 2,261 2002: 2,098 2003: 2,010 2001: 1,677</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Key Goal III: Performance Target: Actual Performance:</td> <td colspan="5"></td> </tr> </table>						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:					
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%

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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:

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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

- 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
- 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).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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

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		

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	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program

Agency: Department of Homeland Security

Bureau: Office for Domestic Preparedness

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
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		

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Aviation Passenger Screening Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: TSA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	68%	84%	0%	Demonstrated

- 1.1 Is the program purpose clear?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 25%
- Explanation: The purpose of the Aviation Passenger Screening Program is to prevent the entry of firearms, explosives, and other dangerous weapons on aircraft through physical inspection of passengers and carry on baggage.
- Evidence: Section 110(a) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act of 2001 requires that TSA: '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 the primary focus of Middle East 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 aircraft and passengers.
- Evidence: Classified intelligence reports, checkpoint arrests, confiscation levels.
-
- 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 screens passengers 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: At least two major design flaws are believed to exist which limit program efficiency: the lack of a substantial effort to reduce secondary, if not primary, physical screening for lower-risk passengers, and too few a proportion of part-time screeners in the workforce given the nature of airport screening and the ebbs and flows of airport traffic.
- 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 Aviation Passenger Screening Program is such that the entire flying public is intended to be the beneficiary of program resources. Therefore, this question is not relevant to this program.
- Evidence:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Aviation Passenger Screening Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: TSA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
75%	68%	84%	0%	

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 developed during the PART review for critical program areas including screener security performance, screening system security performance, cost of passengers screened, and customer satisfaction. However, these measures are all new and should be assessed and validated by an independent entity with respect to their appropriateness and adequacy.

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: Targets are currently 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 long term measures have been developed during the PART review for critical program areas including screener security performance, screening system security performance, cost of passengers screened, and customer satisfaction. However, these measures are all new and should be assessed and validated by an independent entity with respect to their appropriateness and adequacy.

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: Targets are currently 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: While the program is solely responsible for aviation passenger screening outcomes, the tangential partners which do exist -- airports, airlines, and contractors -- appear to work closely with the program to ensure their actions facilitate and do not inhibit passenger screening success.

Evidence: The American Association of Airport Executives, the Air Transportation Association (major air carriers) and the Department of Transportation all provide regular input into the Aviation Passenger Screening Program. Contractors bonuses are tied to outcomes.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Aviation Passenger Screening Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: TSA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
75%	68%	84%	0%	

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: While passenger security screening has existed for some time, the Aviation Passenger Screening Program within the Federal Government is relatively new. It is therefore not yet appropriate to assess the program on this basis.

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: While passenger security screening has existed for some time, the Aviation Passenger Screening Program within the Federal Government is relatively new. Most budget activity has been related to ramping up this new agency, and there has not yet been a regular budget cycle. It is therefore not yet appropriate to assess the program on this basis.

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 adequate performance goals, measures, and targets. Meaningful actions have been taken to address these deficiencies.

Evidence: As part of the PART review, the program has developed a set of acceptable performance measures. Performance goals and targets are under 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: 16%

Explanation: TSA collects timely and credible data from a number of sources to facilitate effective management decisions for aviation passenger screening. Certain performance data on the screening program is collected dynamically, such as Red Team (TSA's internal auditing team) 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 and drives performance improvements.

Evidence: TSA's Performance Measurement Information System (PMIS) is used to manage daily activities by illustrating trends in performance over time and provide intelligence for decision makers that can be used to improve products and services provided by the TSA. Red Teams provide unannounced and undercover testing of our security procedures throughout the nation. Red Team members typically immediately correct and train personnel following to address operational, procedural, or training shortfalls. Overall results are shared within the agency to continually improve our equipment, training, and operations. Threat Image Projection (TIP) technology, which eventually will be deployed to every screening lane, allows constant testing and evaluation of screening operations.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Aviation Passenger Screening Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: TSA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
75%	68%	84%	0%	

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: As part of TSA's strategic and performance plan, TSA has established a permanent performance management system that defines standardized performance agreements for groups of employees at all levels, including TSA screeners, supervisors and executives. Performance assessment will be on attainment of fiscal and other performance goals. Executive performance is reviewed annually.

Evidence: The GAO Report "Transportation Security Administration, Actions and Plans to Build a Results-Oriented Culture" 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, which has been the primary focus of TSA to date.

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 Aviation Passenger Screening Program has not been in existence long enough to assess obligations 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: NO Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: TSA has worked aggressively to outsource key administrative and management functions, but presently lacks comprehensive management systems and processes for managing passenger screening operations efficiently. TSA has management plans in place for improvements in these areas, particularly through the distribution of airport technology and the deployment of a modern scheduling system.

Evidence:

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The primary related program is the Computer-Assisted Passenger Prescreening System (CAPPS) program also within TSA, the mission of which is, in part, to alert passenger screeners to subject higher risk passengers to additional screening. These programs appear well coordinated.

Evidence: CAPPS provides input to the agency-wide Checkpoint Council on a regular basis and provides support to the Checkpoints team whenever necessary.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The Aviation Passenger Screening Program appears to manage financial resources properly.

Evidence: TSA received a clean audit for FY 2002 financial statements and no material weaknesses have been attributed to this program.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Aviation Passenger Screening Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: TSA
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
75%	68%	84%	0%	

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

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: TSA's primary focus since its inception has been on checkpoint passenger screening. It continues to devote significant management attention to this area, and it appears that plans are in place to address existing management deficiencies.

Evidence: Meaningful actions have been taken to substantially reduce excess screener staffing; 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: 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: NA

Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

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:

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:

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Aviation Passenger Screening Program
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: TSA

Measure: Level of completion of airport checkpoint reconfigurations.

Additional Information: Checkpoint reconfigurations are important to TSA success in reaching customer satisfaction and efficiency goals.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2007	100%		

Measure: Level of completion of airport checkpoint reconfigurations.

Additional Information: Checkpoint reconfigurations are important to TSA success in reaching customer satisfaction and efficiency goals.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003		56%	
2004	60%		
2005	70%		
2006	80%		
2007	100%		

Measure: Level of the Passenger Screener Performance Index.

Additional Information: The Index will track screener ability to analyze and detect prohibited items. It will be derived from a combination of initial and annual certification exams.

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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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.

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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	63%	86%	47%	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: 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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 cant give a YES answer for measures under development.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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

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		

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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 for 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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

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
2002	97.00%	97.30%	
2003	97.00%	97.03%	
2005	97.00%		
2005	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
2002	202	250	
2003	202	153	
2004	202		
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

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
2007	97.00%		
2008	97.00%		
2009	97.00%		

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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

Measure: Improved Targeting Rates (Under Development)

Additional Information:

Year

Target

Actual

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: More Cargo Screened (Under Development)

Additional Information:

Year

Target

Actual

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Additional Ports added to CSI (Under Development)

Additional Information:

Year

Target

Actual

Measure Term: Annual

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall 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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall 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 PlanSix-Year Business Plan

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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

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

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 PlanMonthly GPRA Reports (Custody Management)

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

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

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 AuditDOJ 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).

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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall 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 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

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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall 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 conferencing. 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)

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall 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)

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)

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Detention and Removal
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

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

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

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: Disaster Relief Fund - Public Assistance

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 PA program is not specifically identified in FEMA's regulations or authorization. Yet the Stafford Act is clear that the Congress intends for the Federal government to help local governments continue to provide services following disasters.	<p>The Stafford Act states, "It is the intent of the Congress, by this chapter, to provide an orderly and continuing means of assistance by the Federal Government to State and local governments in carrying out their responsibilities to alleviate the suffering and damage which result from such disasters."</p> <p>In addition, both the Stafford Act and FEMA regulations provide for the types of assistance under the program that has become known as the "Public Assistance" program.</p>	23%	0.2
2 <i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The program funds the reconstruction of public faculties and facilities of certain non-profits damaged or destroyed by natural and man-made disasters, as well as debris removal and certain emergency operations.	FEMA provides \$1.5 billion to 6,500 applicants for 29,300 projects each year. PA grants are cost shared with the states, who may share the non-Federal costs with local applicants. States often request adjustments to the cost share for large disasters.	23%	0.2
3 <i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	State and local governments are capable of responding to disasters up to a certain threshold. For larger disasters, Federal assistance is needed. FEMA encourages applicants to include mitigation measures in the repair of damaged public buildings/facilities to reduce future disaster expenditures. When funding projects, FEMA deducts insurance proceeds from eligible costs, and applicants must purchase insurance for insurable projects that FEMA funds as a condition for receiving the grant.	The president declares approximately 61 disasters and emergencies a year at a cost of over \$3.6 billion annually. <i>FEMA 2003 Budget Request to Congress.</i>	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 is intended to supplement local efforts for restoring, not enhancing, public buildings and facilities. Also, FEMA may not duplicate work of other Federal agencies where they have primary legal responsibility.	The Stafford Act.	23%	0.2
5 <i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	<p>The 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 program is not optimally designed, and could be modified to address some weaknesses.</p> <p>First, program incentives are not optimally designed. The basic qualification criterion (\$1.09 of impact per capita) sets a low hurdle. FEMA relies on other decision-making criteria, but there is no systematic process for evaluating them nor their relative weights. Thus, some localities may receive aid even when it is within their means to respond without assistance. Second, States/localities remain eligible for assistance whether or not they carry insurance for public facilities, which is a disincentive to adequately insure against disaster hazards. Congress has some concerns about requiring insurance. Still, a requirement that would make provisions for inadequate or unreasonably priced insurance would yield improvements.</p>	<p>GAO (GAO-01-837) has found that disaster declaration criteria are inadequate for ensuring that a disaster is beyond the capacity of States to respond before Federal aid is rendered. 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."</p> <p>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." Yet, the program does not encourage public entities to purchase property insurance before a disaster strikes. In addition, the IG reports (I-01-01) that requirements that public entities obtain insurance after receiving assistance</p>	10%	0.0
Total Section Score				100%	90%

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 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?	No	The program lacks a long-term outcome measure.	Neither the <i>FEMA Strategic Plan, 2003 - 2008</i> , nor the <i>Initial Annual Performance Plan, FY 2004</i> , identify long-term performance goals for the program.	14%	
2 Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?	Yes	FEMA's annual performance plan lacks goals specifically related to the PA program. However, FEMA's 2004 budget submission to OMB identifies a customer satisfaction goal. Also, FEMA maintains internal performance measures for the PA program concerning speed in obligating assistance. (FEMA does not measure the speed with which States liquidate funds--actually spend the money--obligated to them by FEMA.)	<i>FEMA Justification of Estimates, FY 2004</i> , identifies an annual performance goal for the program: "Increase to . . . 87 percent . . . Public Assistance surveyed customers' satisfaction with the provision of disaster assistance." FEMA internal management 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. <i>Program Evaluation and Customer Satisfaction Survey, FY 2001 Annual Report, March 2002.</i>	14%	0.1
3 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?	Yes	FEMA helps States select projects, develop cost estimates, and establish scopes of work. 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.	<i>PA Program Description (October 1998)</i> . 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.	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	Following disasters, FEMA coordinates the Federal Government's response and recovery efforts by building partnerships among local and State governments, voluntary organizations, and other Federal agencies.	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).	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	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.	<i>OIG Audit Reports and Quarterly Reports.</i> Also, the IG's annual <i>Management Challenges</i> letter to the FEMA Director.	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	<p>The PA program is one of multiple disaster relief programs funded through the Disaster Relief Fund (DRF). In its justification materials to OMB and Congress, FEMA does not distinguish between these programs in its description of the DRF, making it difficult to identify and segregate the unique budget requirements for PA.</p> <p>Program goals are not defined in such a way as to make measurable the impact of changes in funding on program outcomes. Further, program outcomes do not always align well with funding intent, which is to provide assistance when and where it is needed.</p> <p>The effects of statutory or regulatory design changes on the program's budget also are masked by larger factors including the unpredictable frequency and magnitude of disasters.</p>	<p><i>FEMA Justification of Estimates, FY 2004, and Initial Annual Performance Plan, FY 2004.</i></p> <p>The GAO found that because of unclear disaster declaration criteria, "federal funds may be provided for some disasters when they are not needed—a result that would be inconsistent with the Stafford Act's intent." <i>August 2001 GAO Report-01-837</i></p>	14%	

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	No	The PA Program was reengineered in 1998 to improve performance in several areas and recent customer satisfaction surveys indicate the program provides assistance more efficiently, effectively, and consistently. However, the lack of steps taken to address deficiencies in disaster declaration criteria and insurance requirements hinders the program's longer term strategic outcomes.	Reference <i>Section III: Program Management</i> below.	14%	
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>	No	FEMA requires quarterly reports from Grantees, though the IG has reported many instances of failure of the Grantees to report.	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.	14%	0.0
2 <i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, sub grantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	No	States and subgrantees certify costs incurred in performance of eligible work and certify the completion of the work. FEMA's regulations (44 CFR) require emergency work be completed in 6 months and permanent work in 18 months. However, the IG reports several problems that undermine accountability. For example, States often do not monitor and accurately report on subgrantee performance and financial activities, make payments or closeout projects in a timely manner, and/or file timely and correct financial status reports with FEMA. In addition, States do not always maintain adequate documentation supporting their share of disaster costs and other financial requirements.	IG audits of FEMA's management of disaster grants for 17 States.	14%	0.0

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	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.	IG audits of FEMA's management of FEMA disaster grants for 17 States.	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	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.	Competitive procedures are required in all program documents. Cost share arrangements and program documentation are publicly available.	14%	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	There is no separate breakout of the PA program in FEMA's budget, although the core program funds are budgeted for in the Disaster Relief Fund. It is not clear if the program is supported by accounts other than the Disaster Relief Fund. FEMA reports that there are no metrics in place to relate changes in program performance to changes in funding levels, though FEMA does budget for staff, contracts, printing, training, and other non-disaster specific costs of operation.	<i>FY 2003 FEMA Budget Justification and FY 2003 FEMA Annual Performance Plan FEMA Budget Requests.</i>	14%	0.0
6 <i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	No	The FEMA IG reports that financial management is a problem agency-wide, in that FEMA managers are not enforcing compliance by FEMA partners and grant recipients with Federal financial reporting requirements, and are not always performing reviews of financial reports. Those reviews that are done are inadequate, generally not discovering reporting problems, nor including any follow-up action on inaccurate or incomplete data reported. In addition, material weaknesses exists in internal controls over financial reporting.	January 25, 2002 IG Memorandum on Management Challenges; IG audits of FEMA's management of FEMA disaster grants 17 States.	14%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	In response to OIG (Report I-02-96) and GAO (GAO/RCED-96-113) reports, 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.	<i>January 25, 2002, IG memorandum on Management Challenges, Grants Management section.</i> For the FY 2002 Budget, FEMA agreed to reform the disaster declaration criteria and develop insurance requirements for a potential rule-making. However, these requirements have not been met.	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 goals?</i>	No	FEMA does not track long-term outcome goals for this program.	<i>FEMA Strategic Plan 2003 - 2008</i>	25%	0.0

<p>Long-Term Goal I: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal II: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</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>	Yes	FEMA has achieved its targets for customer satisfaction. However, standardized reporting information on timeliness of obligations is not readily available. Additionally, FEMA lacks data on the timeliness with which it liquidates funds.	<i>FEMA Report: Program Evaluation and Customer Satisfaction Survey, FY 2001 Annual Report, March 2002; Data from PA program office</i>	25%	0.3
--	-----	---	---	-----	-----

Key Goal I: Timeliness in obligating funds

					Weighted	
Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Score	
<p>Performance Target: Obligate 50% of funding for each disaster within 90 days of declaration; obligate 80% of funding for each disaster within 180 days of declaration.</p> <p>Actual Performance: For disasters declared in FY 2001, FEMA obligated 63% within 90 days and 84% within 180 days on average.</p>						
<p>Key Goal II: Timeliness in closing out a disaster</p> <p>Performance Target: Obligate 100% of funds within two years</p> <p>Actual Performance: For disasters declared in FY 2001, FEMA obligated 100% within two years on average.</p>						
<p>Key Goal III: Percentage of PA program grant recipients satisfied with FEMA disaster response and recovery assistance.</p> <p>Performance Target: For FY 2001, 87.2% aggregate satisfaction level in the following areas: overall program, PW process, cost estimates, eligibility criteria, restoration work, status of projects, and documentation.</p> <p>Actual Performance: 87.8% satisfied</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>	No	While FEMA is exploring numerous avenues for streamlining the program, it lacks data demonstrating efficiency gains from management reforms.	Data is needed to demonstrate efficiencies.	25%	0.0
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	N/A	There are no other programs of integrated public facility infrastructure recovery from domestic disaster contingencies.		0%	
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Yes	IG reports that audits performed of the program, grantees, and subgrantees indicate that the program is achieving results.	<i>OIG Audit Reports and Quarterly Reports.</i> 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."	25%	0.3
Total Section Score					100%	50%

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%

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
75%	68%	100%	0%	Demonstrated

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:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
75%	68%	100%	0%	

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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
75%	68%	100%	0%	

- 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:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
75%	68%	100%	0%	

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

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 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%		
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		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement

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
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%		

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%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Air Marshal Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement

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
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		

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%

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall 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

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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	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: 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

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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	Effective

- 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
- 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	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: 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.

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)

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	Effective

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

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:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
60%	88%	86%	80%	Effective

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

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
97/98	0	.81	
99/00	>85%	.85	
01/02	>85%	.87	
02/03	>85%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Protective Service
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement

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	0.31	
2000	0	0.55	
2001	0	0.72	
2002	0.81	0.83	
2003	0.85		

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.	<i>2003 Budget</i>	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 thought 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 reduce 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 expense 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.	<p><i>July 2001 IG Report: "Status of Funds Awarded the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program and Other project Management Issues."</i></p> <p>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.</p>	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

<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>

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					

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall 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 mollusk 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

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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	89%	100%	73%	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 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:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall 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:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall 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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall 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>

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall 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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall 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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Marine Environmental Protection
Agency: Department of Homeland Security
Bureau: Coast Guard
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall 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

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: 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		
2007	38.1		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Marine Environmental Protection

Agency: Department of Homeland Security

Bureau: Coast Guard

Measure: 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
2008	36.6		
2009	35.1		

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
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
---	---	----	----------------------------	--	-----	-----

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
---	--	----	--	--	-----	-----

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%

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%