

Department of Homeland Security

Performance Budget Overview Appendix B



Fiscal Year 2007
Congressional Budget Justification

Appendix B. Changes in Goals and Performance Measures Based on the Achievement of Goals in FY 2005.

The Government Performance and Results Act, Section 4 requires an evaluation of the performance plan for the current fiscal year relative to the performance achieved toward the performance goals in the fiscal year covered by the prior year Program Performance Report. As performance goals are finalized in the President's Budget submitted in February of the year following publication of the Program Performance Report in November, this discussion of the impact/changes in FY 2006 performance goals and performance measures based upon achievement of goals in the FY 2005 report is presented in this Annual Performance Plan / Performance Budget Overview.

Based on results reported in the FY 2005 Department of Homeland Security Performance and Accountability Report, the following adjustments were made to FY 2006 performance goal measures' targets.

Program - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry (POE's)
Component – Customs and Border Protection

Page in Performance Budget Overview – 4

Performance measure - Compliance rate for Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT) members with the established C-TPAT security guidelines”

Previous FY 2006 target – 98%

Present FY 2006 target – 90%

Evaluation - This performance measure indicates the percentage of C-TPAT members whose security procedures have been validated by CBP and found to be acceptable and meet the C-TPAT security guidelines. Fiscal year 2005 was the first full fiscal year for this measure. The FY 2005 target of 98% was based on the actual fourth quarter data from fiscal year 2004. The actual for the year was 97%. The target was not met due to an unexpected number of companies who were not in compliance with their submitted security commitment. The implementation of new-importer security criteria also affected the overall validation compliance rate. In consideration of the full impact of these factors in the future, the FY 2006 target was adjusted. Further evaluation of the target will be required as new C-TPAT security criteria are implemented for more C-TPAT enrollment sectors. C-TPAT will significantly increase the number of validations to be completed in fiscal year 2006 and implement a new system for measuring C-TPAT security validation performance.

Program - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at POE's

Component – Customs and Border Protection

Page in Performance Budget Overview – 4

Performance measure - The percentage of passengers in the vehicle environment who are in compliance with the Agricultural Quarantine Regulations

Previous FY 2006 target – 96.4%

Present FY 2006 target - 94.6%

Evaluation - The percentage of passengers in the vehicle environment who are in compliance with the Agricultural Quarantine Regulations is based on statistical sample. The target for compliance of border vehicle passengers for fiscal year 2005 was 96.4 percent whereas the actual was determined to be 93.68 percent. To mitigate this decline, for FY 2006 fully staffing high-risk ports with trained CBP Agriculture Specialists (CBPAS) will increase the Quarantine Material Interceptions (QMIs), which will improve compliance. QMIs are counted as compliant because corrective action is taken at the time of an interception. Analysis indicates that higher rates of interceptions occurred during shifts when Agriculture Specialists were available. The fiscal year 2005 graduation of 330 from the 43-day CBPAS Training Academy will provide resources necessary to reach actual performance goals. Additional training for CBPAS continues in port after placement. Cross training curriculums are now in place for CBP Officers to support the Agriculture Specialist at the ports. Targeting strategies and a methodology have been developed at the National Targeting Center to enhance our counter agro-terrorism capabilities. Agriculture Specialists have received Automated Targeting System training and risk management skills to focus on high-risk cargo, including the development of specific selectivity criteria.

Program - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry (POE's)

Component – Customs and Border Protection

Page in Performance Budget Overview – 4

(A) Performance measure – Percent of worldwide U.S. destined containers processed through Container Security Initiative (CSI) ports.

Previous FY 2006 target – 78%

Present FY 2006 target – 81%

(B) Performance measure – Number of foreign mitigated examinations waived through the Container Security Initiative.

Previous FY 2006 target – 14,000

Present FY 2006 target – 24,000

Evaluation - Performance measure (A) is the percent of worldwide containers destined for the United States (and their respective bills of lading) processed through CSI ports as a deterrence action to detect and prevent weapons of mass effect and other potentially harmful materials from leaving foreign ports headed to U.S. ports. Positive results were achieved in FY 2005 were due to the opening of Shanghai, Shenzhen and Kaohsiung (three high-volume ports) which added 8.61 percent, 6.68 percent, and 8.76 percent, respectively to the cumulative total.

Based on positive development in FY 2005 and future plans, the target for FY 2006 was increased by 3 percentage points to 81%.

Performance Measure (B) gauges the outcome of increased information sharing and collaboration by collocating Container Security Initiative (CSI) customs personnel at foreign ports. The measure is the number of examinations waived that are mitigated by foreign customs sources using their own knowledge of shippers, information from their sources/databases, and intelligence sources to make a decision that an examination is not necessary. The measure had a target of 10,000 for FY 2005, with an actual of 25,222. The increased collaboration of foreign and collocated CSI customs personnel at foreign ports reflected by this proxy measure improves on the goal of targeting, screening, and apprehending high-risk international cargo and travelers to prevent terrorist attacks, while providing processes to facilitate the flow of safe and legitimate trade and travel. Due to program success, the target for FY 2006 was able to be increased.

Program - Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry

Component – Customs and Border Protection

Page in Performance Budget Overview – 5

Performance measure – Border miles under operational control

Previous FY 2006 target – 175

Present FY 2006 target – 338

Evaluation - Operational Control, as defined in the National Border Patrol Strategy is the ability to detect, respond to, and interdict border penetrations in areas deemed as high priority for threat potential or other national security objectives. Operational Control will be achieved in a tactical zone when the level of border security (controlled, managed, monitored) in that specific zone matches the level of threat/risk (High, Medium, or Low). FY 2005 Results were 288 miles, thus exceeding the 150 mile target because prior to formal implementation of the Operational Requirements-Based Budgeting Program (ORBBP), the program was already working toward achieving Operational Control of targeted areas of the border. The majority of those targeted areas were urban areas such as San Diego and El Paso. Assessments, in accordance with the definitions of increasing levels of border security, validated that discernable mileage in these areas was already under Operational Control at the creation of ORBBP.

Program - Detention and Removal

Component – United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement

Page in Performance Budget Overview – 8

Performance measure - Number of aliens with a final order removed in a quarter/Number of final orders that become executable in the same quarter (demonstrated as a percent).

Previous FY 2006 target – 87%

Present FY 2006 target – 81%

Evaluation - With certain exceptions, an alien illegally in the United States is “removable” when issued a “final order of removal” by an immigration judge. Because the legal proceedings culminating in the judge’s final order can remain pending for years, illegal aliens are often released from Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) custody. While their cases remain pending, these aliens are not removable. When an alien violates the conditions of release from detention by failing to surrender when ordered to do so, Detention and Removal Operations must locate and apprehend the fugitive before effecting his/her removal. This measure indicates the number of aliens removed during a quarter as a fraction of those ordered “remove” during the same quarter—not necessarily the same people. The measure is an approximation that becomes meaningful only as the basis for comparing results from quarter to quarter. The removal rate of 65.6 percent fell far below the target for fiscal year 2005, which assumed a fully funded and staffed detention and removal program. Hiring restrictions, and attrition contributed to not meeting the target. Hiring restrictions reduced the number of fugitive operations teams active in fiscal year 2005. A fully operational team apprehends about 500 removable aliens annually. During a team’s formative, break-in period, 125 apprehensions are expected. During fiscal year 2005, 16 fully staffed fugitive operations teams supplemented by 2 teams in development constituted the DRO Fugitive Operations Program. With fewer teams than projected, that program could not meet its performance target. Fewer apprehensions of fugitives meant fewer fugitive removals from the United States. We anticipate no new hiring restrictions for fiscal year 2006 and out-years. The added staff should alleviate the problem and out-year targets will reflect this change. Targets for fiscal year 2006 and the out-years were adjusted based upon the effect of hiring restrictions and normal program attrition in fiscal year 2005. Concerning fugitive teams, fiscal year 2006 funding should allow for adding an additional 26 teams or a total of 44 teams.

Program - Mitigation

Component – FEMA (Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate in FY 2006 Performance Budget)

Page in Performance Budget Overview – 17

(A) Performance measure - Potential property losses, disasters, and other costs avoided (\$ Billions);

Previous FY 2006 target – \$2.072 Billion costs avoided

Present FY 2006 target - \$2.27 Billion costs avoided

(B) Performance measure - Percentage of national population whose safety is improved through availability of accurate flood risk data in Geographic Information System (GIS) format;

Previous FY 2006 target – 65% of the population whose safety is improved

Present FY 2006 target - 50% of the population whose safety is improved

(C) Performance measure - Number of communities taking or increasing action to reduce their risk of natural or man-made disaster.

Previous FY 2006 target – 500 communities taking or increasing action

Present FY 2006 target - 585 communities taking or increasing action

Evaluation - State and regional input received after the Mitigation Program set its targets for flood hazard data coverage caused funds to be reallocated toward less populated communities, thus impacting FY 2005 achievement against its targets. The program's single measure has three components from the FY 2006 plan which are disaggregated for presentation in the FY 2007 plan.

(A) is an estimate of costs from potential damages, losses and other costs that have been avoided as a result of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) floodplain management and mitigation grant activities in communities across the country. The FY 2005 actual was \$1.895 Billion, better than the \$1.757 target, and the FY 2006 target was increased.

(B) the cumulative percentage of communities covered by updated digital flood risk data, which replaces old-fashioned paper flood maps, as of the end of the fiscal year. The FY 2005 actual was lower than the target, 38.6% vs. 50% and the target was lowered.

(C) the total number of communities that have taken action or increased their efforts to mitigate against potential losses from natural or man-made hazards. FY 2005 actual was 1,286, substantially more than the 710 target, so the target was increased in the final FY 2006 plan.

Program - National Security

Component – FEMA (Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate in FY 2006 Performance Budget)

Page in Performance Budget Overview – 18

(A) Performance measure - Percentage of Federal Departments and Agencies with fully operational Continuity of Operations (COOP) capabilities

Previous FY 2006 target – 95%

Present FY 2006 target – 90%

(B) Performance measure - Percentage of fully operational Continuity of Government (COG) capabilities.

Previous FY 2006 target – 85%

Present FY 2006 target – 70%

Evaluation - FEMA works with Federal departments and agencies to develop and exercise plans that ensure the continuation of federal operations and the continuity and survival of an enduring constitutional government. FEMA collects the results of exercises and self-assessments to measure the percentage of departments and agencies that have in place the necessary plans and capabilities. In FY 2005, FEMA met target (A) COOP, but achieved a 20% against an 80% target for (B) COG. Changing and expanding requirements directed by the Homeland Security Council (HSC) have resulted in a revision of the fully-capable criteria for COG. While FEMA made great strides in achieving its COG goal in terms of training, due to the late release of funding in the third quarter of fiscal year 2005, development and implementation of key projects in support of the COG were delayed. This included a delay in efforts to enhance redundant, secure communication nodes, which limited the number of Federal departments and agencies that were able to meet the newly expanded COG criteria. On the positive side, FEMA conducted the first ever government-wide COG exercise in fiscal year 2005, which helped enhanced the ability of the Federal departments and agencies to carry out their COG responsibilities. In fiscal year 2006, FEMA will identify required systems and procure required equipment to support the HSC's initiative to improve government-wide COG capabilities. FEMA is also entering into an interagency agreement with the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) that will assist in the assessment, development and implementation of a secure communications package for all COG participants. Overall, in fiscal year 2006 FEMA will continue to assist Federal departments and agencies in enhancing their COG capabilities in order to ensure the survival of an enduring constitutional government, but increased requirements have necessitated slightly lowering the FY 2006 performance measure targets.

Program – Readiness (Rename of the Preparedness program)

Component – FEMA (Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate in FY 2006 Performance Budget)

Page in Performance Budget Overview – 17

Performance measure – Percent of respondents reporting that they are better prepared to deal with disasters and emergencies as a result of training.

Previous FY 2006 target – 82%

Present FY 2006 target - 80%

Evaluation - The measure was disaggregated from multifaceted measures in the FY 2006 Performance Budget Overview for Preparedness. It is one indicator of FEMA's success in assessing the nation's baseline emergency management capability - the training of the nation's firefighters, emergency managers and others with key emergency responsibilities. A significant percentage of respondents indicated they had had no opportunity to use the skills they had acquired through training, which may have skewed FY 2005 results of 84.3% against a target of 87%. Although the National Fire Academy and Emergency Management Institute will continue to provide training to first responders and emergency personnel, reduction of the target to a more realistic level for FY 2006 was warranted.

Program – Grants, Training, and Exercise (previously an aspect of State Formula Grants Program in the FY 2006 Performance Budget Overview)

Component – Preparedness (Previously an aspect of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness)

Page in Performance Budget Overview – 20

(A) Performance measure - Percent of jurisdictions demonstrating acceptable performance on applicable critical tasks in exercises using Grants and Training approved scenarios.

Previous FY 2006 target – 50%

Present FY 2006 target - 60%

Evaluation - This measure evaluates jurisdictions' performance on Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) critical tasks in homeland security exercises. Measuring improvements in jurisdictions' performance on critical tasks over time reflect the impact of preparedness activities on jurisdictions' overall preparedness levels. To measure preparedness levels, critical task analyses included in exercise After-Action Reports (AARs) are evaluated using HSEEP Exercise and Evaluation criteria to determine whether the jurisdiction's performance met expectations or required improvement. Jurisdictions' performance on each critical task is analyzed by comparing the results documented in the AAR to the expected outcome described in the Exercise and Evaluation criteria. In fiscal year 2005 exercises, 40 percent of jurisdictions demonstrated acceptable performance on applicable critical tasks, far exceeding the target of 23 percent.

(B) Performance measure - Percent of participating urban area grant recipients reporting measurable progress made towards identified goals and objectives to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks.

Previous FY 2006 target – 50%

Present FY 2006 target - 90%

Evaluation - This measure assesses jurisdictions' progress towards goals and objectives identified in individual State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies. Demonstrating progress towards identified goals and objectives illustrates improvements in the abilities of state and local homeland security grant recipients to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks. Measurement of progress towards identified goals and objectives is based on project implementation data as reported by grant recipients in Initial Strategy Implementation Plans (ISIPs) and Biannual Strategy Implementation Reports (BSIRs). In fiscal year 2005, 35 percent of state and local homeland security grant recipients demonstrated measurable progress, falling short of the 50 percent target. Because 2005 is the first year that data supporting this measure has been collected, the Program did not have baseline performance data to guide the creation of targets. Several other factors also contributed to the Program missing its target. The data available to support this measure is collected from a June 2005 data collection effort, and therefore covers only part of 2005, potentially skewing measurable progress downward. In addition, the FY 2005 data collection structure captured data only on completed grant recipient projects, which often does not reflect the phased implementation of grant-related projects over the Program's two-year period of performance. Lastly, the data did not include information from all grant recipients due to late reporting, and results may change once the complete set of data is available for analysis. The program evaluated the current target and adopted the present more ambitious target to better reflect FY 2006 expectations.

Program – State and Local Training

Component – Preparedness (Previously an aspect of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness)

Page in Performance Budget Overview – 20

Performance measure - Average percentage increase in Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and other knowledge skills, and abilities of state and local homeland security preparedness professionals receiving training from pre and post assessments.

Previous FY 2006 target – 20%

Present FY 2006 target - 38%

Evaluation - This measure evaluates improvements in state and local homeland security preparedness professionals' knowledge, skills, and abilities due to delivery of training. Measuring these improvements indicates the impact of training services on the Nation's preparedness level. The measure is calculated using student self-evaluations administered by preparedness training partners before and after delivery of training courses. State and local homeland security preparedness professionals demonstrated a 38.5 percent increase in weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and other knowledge, skills, and abilities in fiscal year 2005, exceeding the performance measure target of 37%. The FY 2006 target was increased accordingly.