



Performance Information

Part II

Introduction

The mission of the Department of Homeland Security is to lead the unified national effort to secure America while working to prevent and deter terrorist attacks, and protect against and respond to threats and hazards to the nation. In addition, the Department ensures safe and secure borders, welcomes lawful immigrants and visitors, and promotes the free flow of legitimate passengers and commerce. Our seven strategic goals - *Awareness, Prevention, Protection, Response, Recovery, Service and Organizational Excellence* - guide the Department in fulfilling its mission.

This section provides detailed descriptions of how the Department performed in support of its seven strategic goals during fiscal year 2006. The Department developed 118 specific program performance measures to assess results of our activities in achieving the goals in fiscal year 2006. While the information provided in this report provides insight into the Department's performance, it cannot within a single report present a complete view of the results achieved.

During fiscal year 2006, 81 or 68.6%, of established performance measures met their target. End of year results for eight performance measures are based on estimated data. Of those not met, there were seven (7) performance measures that did improve over their FY 2005 actuals. Where performance measures were not met, a detailed description and actions to resolve are provided in the tables that follow.

Program performance goals and measures are reported under the departmental strategic goal with which they most strongly support. As programs may support multiple Department strategic goals and objectives, all objectives a program supports are reported.

This section also addresses the completeness and reliability of performance measures data and summarizes key program evaluations conducted during fiscal year 2006. For performance measures where data are determined to be inadequate, we provided explanatory information and actions the Department will take to correct deficiencies. We also identify and report estimated results when actual results are not yet available. Estimated results are also identified in the program performance tables.

Additionally, this section reports on the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) evaluations conducted by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). During the fiscal year 2006, 19 PART reviews were completed. No Department program was found to be Ineffective. Three (3) programs were rated Effective, 6 were rated Moderately Effective, and 5 programs were deemed Adequate in achieving results. Five (5) programs were rated as Results Not Demonstrated. Each PART concludes with recommendations to strengthen programs. In this section we report upon those and other evaluation recommendations and progress in implementing them. The OIG summarized the major management challenges the Department faces in the Inspector General's Report included in Part I – Management Discussion and Analysis.

The results explained in this report began with planning conducted in the Department's Planning, Programming, Budgeting and Execution System (PPBES) that serves as the basis for developing the Department's *Future Years Homeland Security Program (FYHSP)*. In accordance with the provisions of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, the Department will submit the *FYHSP* to Congress annually. The PPBES is a cyclic process that ensures requirements are properly identified, programs are aligned with the Department's mission and goals, and outcome-based performance measures are established to include factors that are key to the success of the Department. The Department's Strategic Plan; *FYHSP*; and the PPBES together create a recurring cycle of program planning, budgeting, executing, measuring and reporting. This continuous cycle, along with our program assessment and evaluation process ensures the Department performs at the level necessary to defend the Homeland and protect the American people while providing proper stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

Completeness and Reliability

The Department continues to recognize the importance of collecting complete and accurate performance data, as this helps us determine progress toward achieving our goals. To make well-informed decisions, we have established performance measures and reporting processes to report performance with data collected that are reliable, accurate and consistent.

The Department headquarters has reviewed this document for conformance to the standard of completeness and reliability as specified for federal agencies in *OMB Circular A-136, Financial Reporting Requirements, Section II.3.4.4 Assessing the completeness and reliability of performance data*; and *OMB Circular A-11, Preparation, Submission and Execution of the Budget, Section 230.2 (e), Assessing the completeness and reliability of performance data*. In the following tables, we identify:

Completeness

Actual performance for every performance goal and measure in the fiscal year 2007 Performance Budget (performance plan), which included the final performance plan for fiscal year 2006, including preliminary data if that is the only data available, except as noted in this section on Completeness and Reliability. Where estimates have been provided, actual performance data will be provided in the fiscal year 2007 *Performance and Accountability Report*.

Reliability

Department Program Managers are responsible for the reliability of performance measurement information for programs under their cognizance. Program Managers classify performance information as either: Reliable, Inadequate or To Be Determined. The following tables provide a summary of the performance data we classify as other than reliable, that is, Inadequate or To Be Determined. FY 2006 performance data that are estimates as final information could not be collected in time for this report are also identified.

The Transportation Security Administration reports a material weakness in the process for measuring performance and reporting under the Government Performance and Results Act. However, the performance data reported in this report are complete and accurate. TSA is continuously making improvements in its performance data and internal processes.

With the exception of the performance data identified in the following tables, information contained within this report is reliable and complete in accordance with standards.

Strategic Goal 1 - Awareness

Reported results are complete and reliable

Strategic Goal 2 - Prevention

Program	Drug Interdiction United States Coast Guard
Performance Measure	Removal rate for cocaine that is shipped via non-commercial maritime means.
Explanation and Corrective Action	ESTIMATED DATA: Removal rate includes cocaine seized as well as that confirmed as jettisoned, sunk or otherwise destroyed. Jettison, sunk and otherwise destroyed cocaine data is verified through the consolidated counter-drug data base run by the United States Interdiction Coordinator. CG Seizure data continues to be tracked and verified by Federal Drug Identification Numbers. The non-commercial maritime flow data continues to be provided by the annual Interagency Assessment of Cocaine Movement report. Therefore, we are confident that the measure is accurate, materially adequate and the data sources are reliable. Data is reported as estimated because the maritime flow estimates are not available in time to calculate the removal rate for this report. When the flow rate becomes available the removal rate will be calculated and reported in the following Performance and Accountability Report (PAR).

Program	Migrant Interdiction United States Coast Guard
Performance Measure	Percentage of undocumented migrants who attempt to enter the U.S. via maritime routes that are interdicted or deterred.
Explanation and Corrective Action	ESTIMATED DATA: The numbers of illegal migrants entering the U.S. and the numbers of potential migrants are derived numbers subject to estimating error. Because of the speculative nature of the information used, and the secretive nature of illegal migration, particularly where professional smuggling organizations are involved, the estimated potential flow of migrants may contain error. That said, this measure has adequate reliability as the error is within acceptable tolerance. The FY06 performance data is estimated because the Maritime Migration and Human Smuggling Monthly Flow Report for September is not available yet. The performance actual will be updated in November or December and appear in next year's PAR.

Strategic Goal 3 - Protection

Program	Evaluation and National Assessment Program Preparedness
Performance Measure	Percent of recommendations made by reviewing authorities (i.e., IG, OMB, GAO) that are implemented within 1 year.
Explanation and Corrective Action	ESTIMATED DATA: Preparedness Grants & Training (G&T) continuously reviews recommendations made in independent evaluations for inclusion in this measure. G&T coordinates with its program offices to assess whether recommendations have been implemented, and whenever possible, G&T collects evidence (e.g. Inspector General review closeout letters) to confirm implementation of recommendations. Because recommendations are made by reviewing authorities throughout the fiscal year, data on the percent implemented within one year will not be fully available until the end of fiscal year 2007 and will be reported in the FY 2007 PAR report.

Program	State and Local Training Preparedness
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.
Explanation and Corrective Action	ESTIMATED DATA: Self - reported trainee evaluations are somewhat subjective but constitute an efficient method of collecting information on all trainees progress in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities. G&T collects self - assessments on 100% of the professionals enrolled in G&T training courses, improving data consistency and reliability. In addition, the risk of including clearly erratic or unreliable evaluation responses in the data set is mitigated through a review process. G&T supervisors review data tabulations performed by G&T analysts before releasing results. Data is estimated because partners are not required to submit data until 30 days after the end of the quarter and it takes 15 days to compile and verify the data for reporting. Actual results will be reported in the FY 2007 Performance and Accountability Report (PAR).

Program	Targeted Infrastructure Protection Grants Preparedness
Performance Measure	Percent of goals and objectives identified in Regional Transit Security Strategies addressed by grantee projects
Explanation and Corrective Action	INCOMPLETE: There is no data available to support this measure. The requirement that grantees meet goals and objectives identified in the Regional Transit Security Strategies was removed from the grant guidance sent out to applicants. This measure is unsupported in the absence of that requirement. DHS is in the process of replacing this measure. Given that the current measure is unable to be reported on, Grants and Training is in the process of establishing new performance measures for FY 2007 that will assess grant recipients efforts to improve their ability to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks.

Program	U.S. Fire Administration Preparedness
Performance Measure	Percent reduction in the rate of loss of life from fire-related events.
Explanation and Corrective Action	ESTIMATED DATA: Loss of life data from the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) are also compiled and reviewed by the National Fire Data Center. Statistical weighting and comparison of these data are done in conjunction with the National Fire Protection Association's data to check for accuracy. A comparison with these data to the NCHS mortality data is conducted for consistency and relative veracity. Because NCHS obtains this information through census data which is not takes considerable time to obtain and publish, data on the percent reduction in the rate of loss of life from fire-related events will not be fully available until April 2009 and will be reported in the FY 2009 Performance & Accountability Report.

Strategic Goal 4 - Response

Program	Marine Environmental Protection (MEP) United States Coast Guard
Performance Measure	The five-year average number of U.S. Coast Guard investigated oil spills greater than 100 gallons and chemical discharges into the navigable waters of the U.S. per 100 million short tons of chemical and oil products shipped in U.S. waters.
Explanation and Corrective Action	ESTIMATED DATA: This measure evaluates how well the Coast Guard prevents discharges of chemicals or oil into U.S. navigable waters by comparing the current period to those of previous periods. Information recorded in the Coast Guard's Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement database is generally complete when the database is accessed. Some incidents are never reported, however, and some information is delayed in reaching the Coast Guard. Performance data will be revised as U.S. Army Corps shipping volume data becomes available. Duplicate information may occasionally be entered or an incident inadvertently omitted or incorrectly coded. Formal verification procedures strive to rectify any errors, and program logic and comprehensive user guides have been developed to ensure that data is highly reliable. The revised performance data will be available at the end of FY07 and available in next year's Performance and Accountability Report.

Strategic Goal 5 - Recovery

Program	Public Assistance Federal Emergency Management Agency
Performance Measure	Percent of customers satisfied with Public Recovery Assistance
Explanative and Corrective Action	ESTIMATED DATA: Survey data are collected, analyzed and reported by outside contractors using methods that guarantee both validity and reliability. The final results of the Public Assistance Program Evaluation and Customer Satisfaction Survey that is conducted for calendar year of 2006 will not be available until February 2007, and will be reported in the 2007 Performance and Accountability Report.

Strategic Goal 6 - Service

Reported results are complete and reliable

Strategic Goal 7 - Organizational Excellence

Program	Office of the Secretary and Executive Management
Performance Measure	Percent of DHS strategic objectives with programs that meet their associated performance targets.
Explanation and Corrective Action	ESTIMATED DATA: Quarterly and annual data performance data for each program is validated through the Component's Planning offices, vetted through their leadership, and coordinated by the Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation. Data is indicated as estimated as some on the underlying data reported, of which this measure is a summary, was estimated. Year end results reported as estimates are due largely to the length of time it takes to collect actuals is longer than the 45 day time limit to issue the Performance and Accountability Report after the end of the fiscal year. When actual data is collected it will be reported in the following year's Performance and Accountability Report.

Strategic Goal 1 - Awareness

The focus of this strategic goal is to identify and understand threats, assess vulnerabilities, determine potential impacts and disseminate timely information to our homeland security partners and the American public. The objectives established by the Department to achieve this goal are provided below.

Objective 1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence.

Objective 1.2 - Identify and assess the vulnerability of critical infrastructure and key assets.

Objective 1.3 - Provide timely, actionable, accurate, and relevant information based on intelligence analysis and vulnerability assessments to homeland security partners, including the public.

Objective 1.4 - Develop a Common Operating Picture for domestic situational awareness, including air, land, and sea.

Detailed information concerning actual performance during fiscal year 2006 to achieve this goal is provided below.

Performance Goal:	Deter, detect, and prevent terrorist incidents by sharing domestic situational awareness through national operational communications and intelligence analysis.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of Federal, State and local agencies that maintain connectivity with the Homeland Security Operations Center (HSOC) via Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN) and participate in information sharing and collaboration concerning infrastructure status, potential threat and incident management information				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	Sensitive	Sensitive	Sensitive	Not Met
Description:	This measure calculates the percentage of targeted agencies that participate in the Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN). Participation involves both receiving and transmitting potential threat and incident management information.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	While the actual data is sensitive, Analysis and Operations (A&O) has made progress in broadening access to the HSIN. That said, Network access is not expanding at the rate A&O has targeted.				
Recommended Action:	A&O will re-double its efforts and reach out to an even wider array of homeland security partners in order to broaden access and use of the HSIN.				
Objective/s Supported:	1.3 - Provide timely, actionable, accurate, and relevant information based on intelligence analysis and vulnerability assessments to homeland security partners, including the public.				
Program:	Analysis and Operations Program - Analysis and Operations Component				

Performance Goal:	100 percent distribution of sensitive threat information relative to Department of Homeland Security / Transportation Security Administration components, field elements and stakeholders.				
Performance Measure:	Number of successful attacks resulting from mishandling or misinterpreting intelligence information received by TSA intelligence service.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	0	0	0	Met
Description:	This measure refers to any attack on the U.S. transportation system, which could have been prevented given viable resources, and was a result of TSA's intelligence program mishandling or misinterpreting intelligence information.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The results of this measure are indicators of how successfully the TSA Office of Intelligence program is performing its mission by minimizing analytical errors and maximizing intelligence provisioning to customers and stakeholders. The measure greatly reflects on the partnership with the DHS Intelligence and Analysis and the ability of the agency to communicate and operate within the Department. The public is well-served by preventing loss of life, property, and the financial burden otherwise incurred from failure.				
Objective/s Supported:	1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence.				
Program:	Intelligence - Transportation Security Administration				

Performance Goal:	Prevent known or suspected terrorist from gaining access to sensitive areas of the transportation system.				
Performance Measure:	Number of successful attacks to the transportation system that should have been prevented by the program.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	0	0	0	Met
Description:	Description: This measure refers to any successful attack that could have been prevented, given current resources, by the sub-programs within Transportation Vetting and Credentialing (Secure Flight, Crew Vetting, Transportation Worker Identification Credential ("TWIC"), Registered Traveler, HAZMAT Trucker Background Checks, and Alien Flight School Checks).				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	In FY 2006, there were zero reported attacks on our national transportation system. The programs and processes associated with vetting and credentialing met the requirements and objectives by ensuring that those individuals using our Nation's transportation system did not endanger or damage our national transportation system.				
Objective/s Supported:	1.3 - Provide timely, actionable, accurate, and relevant information based on intelligence analysis and vulnerability assessments to homeland security partners, including the public. 2.5 - Strengthen the security of the Nations transportation systems.				
Program:	Transportation Vetting and Credentialing- Transportation Security Administration				

Strategic Goal 2 – Prevention

The focus of this strategic goal is to detect, deter and mitigate threats to our homeland. The objectives established by the Department to achieve this goal are provided below.

Objective 2.1 - Secure our borders against terrorists, means of terrorism, illegal drugs and violations of trade and immigration laws.

Objective 2.2 - Enforce trade and immigration laws.

Objective 2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.

Objective 2.4 - Coordinate national and international policy, law enforcement, and other actions to prevent terrorism.

Objective 2.5 - Strengthen the security of the Nations transportation systems.

Objective 2.6 - Ensure the security and integrity of the immigration system.

Detailed information concerning actual performance during fiscal year 2006 to achieve this goal is provided below.

Performance Goal:	Improve the targeting, screening, and apprehension of high - risk international cargo and travelers to prevent terrorist attacks, while providing processes to facilitate the flow of safe and legitimate trade and travel.				
Performance Measure:	Advanced Passenger Information System (APIS) Data Sufficiency Rate. (Percent)				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	98%	98.6%	99.2%	78.9%	Not Met
Description:	Accurate transmittal of advance passenger information data for law enforcement queries facilitates decision making and targeting capabilities to identify high risk passengers prior to arrival.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Carrier compliance rates were substantially below the target. New APIS reporting requirements went into effect in FY 2006 that greatly increased the number of reportable data elements from 5 to over 20, including manually-provided data elements for home address, placing greater responsibility for accuracy at the embarkation point. All data elements on the passenger data record must be transmitted correctly in order for the record to be counted as a valid record.				
Recommended Action:	Carriers are having difficulty ensuring that legible and valid information is provided for advanced transmission in the manually prepared data fields. APIS Carrier Account Managers are working with the carriers to improve data collection procedures and input forms in order to improve the APIS rate.				

Performance Measure:	Border Vehicle Passengers in Compliance with Agricultural Quarantine Regulations (percent compliant).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	93.68%	94.6%	92.9%	Not Met
Description:	The measure shows CBP's success at maintaining a high level of security in the land border environment by measuring the degree of compliance rate with agricultural quarantine regulations and other mandatory agricultural product restrictions.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	CBP has shown significant success in achieving compliance over historical rates; however, the goal for compliance of land border vehicle passengers (94.6%) for FY 2006 was not met. High-risk land border environments are not yet fully staffed with trained CBP Agriculture Specialists. Keeping unwanted agricultural products from entering our borders helps improve the safety of our nation. Although we have maintained a high rate of compliance, we will continue to set higher goals for achievement. Currently, a lack of fully trained Agricultural Specialists is the root cause of us not achieving higher levels of compliance. Keeping unwanted agricultural products from entering our borders helps improve the safety of our nation.				
Recommended Action:	Analysis indicates that higher rates of interceptions occurred during shifts when Agriculture Specialists were available. Fully staffing high-risk ports with trained CBP Agriculture Specialists will increase the Quarantine Material Interceptions (QMIs), which will improve compliance. CBP should maintain its current mix of programs while continuing its emphasis on filling Agricultural Specialist vacancies, with a priority given to higher-risk ports, and providing additional specialized training to CBP Officers.				

Performance Measure:	International Air Passengers in Compliance with Agricultural Quarantine Regulations (percent compliant).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	97%	95.8%	97%	95.5%	Not Met
Description:	The measure shows CBP's success at maintaining a high level of security in the international air environment by measuring the degree of compliance rate with agricultural quarantine regulations and other mandatory agricultural product restrictions.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	CBP has shown significant success in achieving compliance over historical rates, however the goal for compliance of air passengers (97%) for FY 2006 was not met. Although we have maintained a high rate of compliance, we will continue to set higher goals for achievement. Keeping unwanted agricultural products from entering our borders helps improve the safety of our nation. Currently, a lack of fully trained Agricultural Specialists is the root cause of us not achieving even higher levels of compliance.				
Recommended Action:	Analysis indicates that higher rates of interceptions occurred during shifts when Agriculture Specialists were available. Fully staffing high-risk air environments with trained CBP Agriculture Specialists will increase the Quarantine Material Interceptions (QMIs), which will improve compliance. CBP should maintain its current mix of programs while continuing its emphasis on filling Agricultural Specialist vacancies, with a priority given to higher-risk environments, and providing additional specialized training to CBP Officers.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of active commissioned canine teams with 100% detection rate results in testing of the Canine Enforcement Team.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	99%	99%	100%	Met
Description:	The Canine Enforcement Program conducts semi-annual testing of the Canine Enforcement Teams to maintain an operating standard of full detection. To meet both new and existing threats, the CBP canine program has trained and deployed canine teams in a broad array of specialized detection capabilities. Any team exhibiting a weakness in detection capability for an area in which it has been trained must undergo additional training in order to bring it to a level of full detection.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The CBP canine program has been successful at maintaining the highest detection rates of any canine program in the country, even though it is the largest and most diverse. This is due primarily to high training standards and regular testing to identify deficiencies early, before they become serious problems. Well trained canine units help stop illegal drugs from entering our borders. CBP will continue to emphasize frequent testing and retraining in order to continue expanding detection capabilities while maintaining the highest detection rates possible.				

Performance Measure:	Number of foreign mitigated examinations waived through the Container Security Initiative.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	2416	25,222	24,000	30,332	Met
Description:	This proxy measure gauges the outcome of increased information sharing and collaboration by collocating 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.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The increased collaboration of foreign and collocated CSI customs personnel at foreign ports reflected by this proxy measure supports 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.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of worldwide U.S. destined containers processed through Container Security Initiative (CSI) ports				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	48%	73%	81%	82%	Met
Description:	This measure is the percent of worldwide U.S.-destined containers (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. Note: Processed may include any of the following: 1) U.S.-destined cargo manifest/bills of lading data reviewed using the Automated Targeting System (ATS) 2) further research conducted 3) collaboration with host country and intelligence representatives and 4) examination of the container.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Achieving the actual result - reviewing a higher percentage of U.S. destined cargo processed through CSI ports - increases the likelihood 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 from more foreign ports.				

Performance Measure:	Compliance rate for Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT) members with the established C-TPAT security guidelines.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	97.0%	90%	98%	Met
Description:	The percentage of validated C-TPAT companies found to meet security criteria or guidelines indicates the actual verified rate of compliance to C-TPAT security procedures.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	In FY 2006, CBP has increased the number of validations performed. Over fifty percent of all C-TPAT members have been validated by CBP. A high compliance rate indicates that a majority of C-TPAT members are committed to maintaining supply chain security standards and have the required level of supply chain security measures in place.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of Sea Containers Examined using Non-Intrusive Inspection Technology (NII)				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	5.2%	5.6% (corrected from 8.1% previously reported)	5.25%	5.25%	Met
Description:	The measure shows the progress towards increasing security by measuring the percent of sea containers arriving at seaports that were examined using NII technology.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The goal of this measure is to demonstrate improved efficiencies and therefore facilitate international trade and travel without compromising enforcement. NII systems provide a quick, safe, and effective method for screening sea containers for Weapons of Mass Effect (WME) and other contraband while facilitating legitimate cross-border traffic. Examinations are conducted to satisfy the requirement for 100% examination of all targeted high-risk containers (specifically, advanced targeting through Advance Targeting System (ATS) manifest reviews and Officer assessment) that have a higher risk profile and may pose a threat to our country. The higher the percentage of cargo screened using NII, the greater the likelihood of detecting potentially hazardous materials and preventing them from entering the United States. This technology provides a more efficient and effective alternative to 100 percent physical inspection of all targeted high-risk containers.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of Truck and Rail Containers Examined using Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII)				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	26.2%	28.9%	10.25%	32.80%	Met
Description:	The measure shows the progress towards increasing security by measuring the percent of truck and rail containers arriving at land border ports examined using NII technology.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The goal of this measure is to demonstrate improved efficiencies and therefore facilitate international trade and travel without compromising enforcement. NII systems provide a quick, safe, and effective method for screening truck and rail containers for Weapons of Mass Effect (WME) and other contraband while facilitating legitimate cross-border traffic. Examinations are conducted to satisfy the requirement for 100% examination of all targeted high-risk containers (specifically, advanced targeting through Advanced Targeting System (ATS), manifest reviews and Officer assessment) that have a higher risk profile and may pose a threat to our country. The higher the percentage of cargo screened using NII, the greater the likelihood of detecting potentially hazardous materials and preventing them from entering the United States. This technology provides a more efficient and effective alternative to 100 percent physical inspection of all targeted high-risk containers.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.1 - Secure our borders against terrorists, means of terrorism, illegal drugs and violations of trade and immigration laws. 2.4 - Coordinate national and international policy, law enforcement, and other actions to prevent terrorism. 6.4 - Facilitate the efficient movement of legitimate cargo and people.				
Program:	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry - Customs and Border Protection				

Performance Goal:	To gain operational control of the U.S. border in areas deemed as high priority for terrorist threat potential or other national security objectives.				
Performance Measure:	Apprehensions at checkpoints-effectiveness of checkpoint operations in apprehensions as they relate to border enforcement activities.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	6.2%	5%-10%	5.9%	Met
Description:	This measure examines the effectiveness of checkpoint operations in apprehensions as they relate to border enforcement activities and serves as one of the Office of Border Patrol's barometers for measuring operational effectiveness. Checkpoint activity levels correspond to overall border enforcement activities in most areas. The goal is to deploy a defense-in-depth strategy that strategically utilizes interior checkpoints and enforcement operations calculated to deny successful illegal migration into the United States.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The checkpoints serve as a component of the successful "defense in depth" strategy, which deny major routes of egress to smugglers intent on delivering people, drugs, and other contraband into the interior of the U.S. Through the development and utilization of the Checkpoint Activity Report, more accurate information has been collected on checkpoint operations, ensuring they have a strategic focus based on current threat levels and national and sector priorities. Tucson was the anomaly out of all Border Patrol sectors, therefore, apprehensions for this sector were not included in the apprehension average. While checkpoint apprehensions remained consistently indicative of overall apprehensions nation-wide in FY 2005 (5.3%), apprehensions in Tucson decreased from 5.2% in FY05 to 2.7% in FY06 due to an enhanced level of operations in Arizona with Operation Jump Start and Arizona Border Control Initiative, as well as severe weather conditions affecting the Tucson area of operations.				

Performance Measure:	Border Miles Under Control (including certain coastal sectors).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	288	338	449 Miles	Met
Description:	As the Border Patrol moves toward its ultimate goal of control of the border, gains made in improving border security are examined to measure levels of control. The Border Patrol is responsible for the 8,607 miles of land border shared with Mexico and Canada as well as the coastal border areas of the New Orleans, Miami and Ramey sectors. This measure depicts the Number of Border Miles Under Control where the appropriate mix of personnel, equipment, technology, and tactical infrastructure has been deployed to reasonably ensure that when an attempted illegal alien is detected, identified and classified, that the Border Patrol has the ability to respond and that the attempted illegal entry is brought to a satisfactory law enforcement resolution. As the Border Patrol continues toward its forward deployment efforts and resources are deployed based on risk, threat potential and operational need, the number of miles under control will increase.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Border Patrol exceeded its 338 mile target in FY2006 through the strategic deployment of resources in conjunction with improved intelligence collection, analysis and dissemination. In priority areas such as Tucson and El Paso Sectors, previously planned deployment of technology and infrastructure coupled with personnel increases resulted in more miles brought under control than expected. In other specific areas of Del Rio Sector, manpower was reallocated based on intelligence and in concert with improved prosecutions of illegal aliens resulted in appreciable gains in mileage under control. By deploying National Guard (NG) troops to perform non-law enforcement duties beginning in June 2006, Border Patrol agents returned to border enforcement activities along the southwest border, further advancing the miles under control. Improving border miles under control helps keep unwanted illegal activity from entering our borders making our nation more secure.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.1 - Secure our borders against terrorists, means of terrorism, illegal drugs and violations of trade and immigration laws. 2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry - Customs and Border Protection				

Performance Goal:	Improve the threat and enforcement information available to decision makers from legacy and newly developed systems for the enforcement of trade rules and regulations and facilitation of U.S. trade.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of internal population using ACE functionality to manage trade information				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	8%	14%	23%	Met
Description:	The number of Customs and Border Protection people using Automated Commercial Environment (ACE), compared to the targeted adoption rate shows that internal personnel have easier, timelier, access to more complete and sophisticated information than in the past.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Increasing the agency's ACE user base means advanced cargo information will be more widely available thus increasing the use of targeting information to pre-screen, target and identify potential terrorists, terrorist shipments and contraband. Our estimate of the expected population of CBP will be reevaluated regularly to verify it represents the personnel that will use ACE to manage trade information.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of trade accounts with access to ACE functionality to manage trade information				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	1%	4%	3.5%	Not Met
Description:	The number of Trade accounts established, as compared to the target number of accounts, over time demonstrates that the Trade community - shippers, carriers, brokers, etc. - are gaining the benefit of electronic forms and easier access to more complete information regarding shipments.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	ACE and its secure data portal feature offers unprecedented information integration and communication between CBP, the trade community and other participating government agencies through a single, on-line access point. Through September 2006, there are 3,737 ACE Trade Accounts. Growth in the number of ACE accounts is primarily attributable to the successful deployment of ACE cargo processing capabilities at land border ports.				
Recommended Action:	Future actions to increase participation include conferences and seminars; trade shows; and media advertising and interviews. Specifically, over 250 truck carriers and 350 importers and brokers attended the agency-sponsored ACE Exchange Conference in Chicago, Illinois in August 2006. The conference provided participants an opportunity to learn and discuss the latest status of ACE, including electronic truck manifest processing, Periodic Monthly Statement, and forthcoming Entry Summary, Accounts, and Revenue capabilities. Additionally, Southern Border outreach efforts include targeting over 1,700 Mexican transport companies. CBP targets these companies through Mexican associations, manufacturers, and brokers. Finally, our original estimate of the expected population of trade users is being revisited to better reflect the expected user base. Initial results indicate that the expected total number of trade accounts appears to have been overstated and FY targets will need adjustment.				

Performance Measure:	Percent (%) of time the Treasury Enforcement Communication System (TECS) is available to end users.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	96.15%	92%	98%	Met
Description:	TECS is a CBP mission-critical law enforcement application system designed to identify individuals and businesses suspected of or involved in violation of federal law. TECS is also a communications system permitting message transmittal between DHS law enforcement offices and other national, state, and local law enforcement agencies. TECS provides access to the FBI's National Crime Information Center (NCIC) and the National Law Enforcement Telecommunication Systems (NLETS) with the capability of communicating directly with state and local enforcement agencies. NLETS provides direct access to state motor vehicle departments. As such, this performance measure quantifies, as a percentage in relation to an established service level objective, the end-user experience in terms of TECS service availability.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	This performance measure quantifies, as a percentage in relation to an established service level objective, the end-user experience in terms of TECS service availability. Our team has put in place a robust set of procedures to ensure the end-user has access to the TECS system when they need it. Having a high availability rate provides a better probability of apprehending those involved in illegal activities.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Automation Modernization - Customs and Border Protection				

Performance Goal:	Deny the use of air, land and coastal waters for conducting acts of terrorism and other illegal activities against the United States.				
Performance Measure:	Percentage of no-launches to prevent acts of terrorism and other illegal activities arising from unlawful movement of people and goods across the borders of the United States.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	4.41%	<23%	7.5%	Met
Description:	In FY2006, all air assets of CBP were merged into CBP Air and Marine (A&M), creating the largest law enforcement air force in the world with enhanced mission support to A&M's primary customer, the Office of Border Patrol. The primary and most important outcome measured for A&M, or any air force, is its capability and/or capacity to launch an aircraft when a request is made for aerial support. The annual "no launch rate" shows the percent of all requests A&M was unable to respond to based on 3 factors: aircraft unavailable due to maintenance; correct type of aircraft needed for mission unavailable; correct type of aircraft available, but incorrect crew or crew-size unavailable to launch. There are numerous other reasons why aircraft do not launch, however these are the ones presently used to monitor progress.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	More air assets were realigned to the SW Border of the U.S. in support of Arizona Border Control Initiative (ABCI) Phase III, with increased operational tempo. Having appropriate aircraft resources available deters and reduces possible acts of terrorism as well as disrupts the supply and reduces the quantity of drugs entering the U.S. Although this operation has put a strain on the assigned aircraft, causing increased maintenance/ground time, A&M was able to launch aircraft in support of most missions. As air assets are relocated from other regions of the U.S., in some cases, insufficient aircraft may be available to support those requests for support. However, A&M has laid out plans to relocate assets and personnel permanently to the SW Border in support of CBP primary mission, acquire additional aircraft and unmanned aircraft, and hire additional personnel to achieve and maintain future projected no-launch targets.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.1 - Secure our borders against terrorists, means of terrorism, illegal drugs and violations of trade and immigration laws.				
Program:	CBP Air and Marine - Customs and Border Protection				

Performance Goal:	Develop the systems architecture, conduct all associated systems engineering, and develop technology roadmaps for risk areas in nuclear detection.				
Performance Measure:	Number of Architecture layers defined.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	9	9	Met
Description:	The DNDO performed an assessment of the existing global nuclear detection system, or architecture. This measure describes the analysis of existing U.S. nuclear detection capabilities. For the purpose of this report, the architecture was divided into nine layers of detection and reporting opportunities. This analysis defined and documented current U.S. Government efforts to detect and report nuclear or radiological threats in each of these layers as part of the initial baseline assessment of the architecture.				

Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	In FY 2006, the DNDO completed the first global nuclear detection architecture analysis and documented a baseline of nuclear detection capabilities across the U.S. Government. The analysis of this architecture identified and evaluated multiple detection layers, beginning with foreign origin of threats, continuing through multiple international and domestic pathways, and concluding with arrival at a target. The results of this analysis have led to several directed initiatives to address identified opportunities for improving overall probability of detecting and reporting threats.
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.
Program:	Systems Engineering and Architecture - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office

Performance Goal:	Incrementally design, develop, acquire, and support the deployment of a system capable of rapid and high-reliability detection and identification of special nuclear material with out restriction to commerce.				
Performance Measure:	Number of multi agency working group program reviews held for the Securing the Cities Program.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	3	3	Met
Description:	Detecting domestic nuclear or radiological threats requires strong cooperation across federal, state, local, and tribal levels. Regular program reviews by several agencies inside and outside DHS serve as one means of encouraging this cooperation. Participating DHS components include the Preparedness Directorate, Customs and Border Protection, United States Coast Guard, and Transportation Security Administration. Outside agencies include the Departments of Energy, Defense, Justice, and State. A memorandum for the record will be prepared and circulated after each meeting with descriptions of issues, assigned actions and due dates, and accomplishments.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	In FY 2006, the DNDO held several multi-agency working group meetings leading to the July 14 announcement by Secretary Chertoff that the New York City region had been selected as the first urban area for participation in the program. The DNDO is now working with state and local agencies in the region to develop an analytically-based nuclear and radiological detection strategy. The capability of rapid, highly reliable detection and identification of special nuclear material will enhance our nation's security.				

Performance Measure:	Number of next generation detection systems acquired.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	112	88	Not Met
Description:	<p>One of the cornerstones of protecting the U.S. from radiological or nuclear terrorism is detecting radioactive and nuclear materials at ports of entry. Radiation portal monitors serve as the primary piece of equipment used to conduct this mission. However, balancing this mission against requirements to maintain a free and efficient flow of commerce has proven difficult with currently available technologies. The Advanced Spectroscopic Portal (ASP) program provides next-generation systems with an improved probability of detection and lower false alarm rates (the rate at which the device incorrectly 'flags' a container that contains radiation, but no threat materials). By distinguishing between cargo with radiation of concern and innocent radiation sources, ASP systems provide the capability to continue to meet security needs without slowing the flow of goods and people. The DNDO plans to deploy this technology at the highest-traffic land border crossings, airports, and seaports.</p>				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	<p>In FY 2006, the DNDO procured the first 88 ASP systems, falling short of the stated goal. These portal monitors provide substantial improvements over current generation portals, particularly for reducing requirements for labor-intensive additional inspections caused by "nuisance" alarms due to innocent radiation sources. This initial equipment will be deployed to the busiest ports, where "nuisance" alarms have the biggest effects. These new systems will provide a higher level of security and better use of current personnel. Systems procured in FY 2006 will be thoroughly tested prior to a full rate production decision in FY 2007.</p>				
Recommended Action:	<p>Due to refinements in the overall deployment strategy, the decision was made in mid-FY 2006 to purchase relatively more current-generation systems to allow for additional testing of ASP systems prior to full-scale deployment. As testing is completed in mid-FY 2007, DNDO expects to return to original procurement schedules, with projected purchases of approximately 130 ASP systems in FY 2007 and more than 230 systems in FY 2008.</p>				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Systems Development and Acquisition - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office				

Performance Goal:	Develop the future nuclear detection technologies that will be capable of detecting all nuclear material entering the United States Homeland.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of proposals awarded.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	3%	18.75%	Met
Description:	<p>Part of the DNDO's mission is to encourage and bring about new concepts and ideas to detect, characterize, and identify nuclear materials to prevent them from being smuggled into the U.S. Investments will be made in basic and applied research. The DNDO will solicit proposals in a number of topic areas, with awards based on technical merit and relevance to the DNDO mission.</p>				

Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	In FY 2006, the DNDO selected 44 proposals from National and Federal Laboratories for Exploratory Research. These efforts are focused on providing fundamental research leading to future improvements to nuclear detection capabilities, reduced cost, increased performance and improved operability. Improved nuclear detection capabilities will improve national security.
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.
Program:	Transformational Research and Development - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office

Performance Goal:	Develop the tools and methodology for and to assess the Nation's domestic nuclear detection capabilities through a combination of developmental and operational test and evaluation, as well as active red-teaming exercises.				
Performance Measure:	Number of tests conducted annually to assess system capability.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	2	3	Met
Description:	The DNDO is responsible for providing the infrastructure and institutional experience necessary to conduct independent technical evaluations of nuclear detection technologies. The evaluations serve to provide the DNDO, as well as federal, state, local, and tribal partners, with the information to support technology transitions or acquisition and deployment decisions.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	In FY 2006, the DNDO conducted three test series in support of technology development efforts—radiation portal monitors, human portable and mobile detection systems, and personal radiation detectors. The results of each of these test series are now being used to inform competitive award processes and the development of performance specifications for next generation radiation detection systems. Improved specifications and requirements will improve our nuclear detection capabilities and enhance our security posture.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Assessments - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office				

Performance Goal:	Establish and maintain a real-time situational awareness and support capability for the national nuclear detection architecture, including information analysis, technical reachback, and the development of training and operational response protocols.				
Performance Measure:	Number of personnel trained in radiological and nuclear preventive detection skills.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	300	387	Met
Description:	The DNDO is responsible for providing radiological and nuclear detection training to state and local law enforcement personnel along with first responders. This measure is intended to specify the number of people who were trained in the DNDO-sponsored Preventive Radiological and Nuclear Detection Training Program in a given fiscal year.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	In FY 2006, the DNDO provided preventive radiological and nuclear detection training to 387 personnel in collaboration with the Office of Grants and Training. The courses train local law enforcement and first responders in methods of nuclear and radiological detection and interdiction, with an emphasis on prevention and pre-detonation detection. Having personnel skilled in radiological and nuclear preventive detection will improve national security.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Operations Support - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office				

Performance Goal:	Accredit all Federal law enforcement training.				
Performance Measure:	Total number of programs accredited and re-accredited through Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation (FLETA).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	2	5	7	Met
Description:	The number of federal law enforcement programs accredited through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation process. This process provides standards to ensure that graduates have the knowledge and skills to fulfill their responsibilities to prevent terrorism and other criminal activities against the U.S. and our citizens in a safe and proficient manner.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Having solid training programs that adhere to Department standards is important to our nation's safety and security. The Department met its goal by two programs. Programs Accredited: U.S. Dept. of State, Basic Special Agent Course; U.S. Postal Inspection Service, Basic Inspector Training and Postal Police Officer Basic Training; the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, Law Enforcement Instructor Training Program. Academies Accredited: U.S. Postal Inspection Service, Career Development Division; U.S. Air Force Special Investigations, U.S. Air Force Special Investigations Academy; and Federal Law Enforcement Training Center. The accreditation of a Federal Law Enforcement academy or program ensures that it voluntarily submitted to a process of self-regulation and successfully achieved compliance with a set of standards established within its professional community that demonstrates adherence to quality, effectiveness and integrity.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.4 - Coordinate national and international policy, law enforcement, and other actions to prevent terrorism.				
Program:	Accreditation - Federal Law Enforcement Training Center				

Performance Goal:	Provide the knowledge and skills to enable law enforcement agents and officers to fulfill their responsibilities.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of students that express excellent or outstanding on the Student Quality of Training Survey (SQTS).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	64%	66%	62%	Not Met
Recommended Action:	The Federal Law Enforcement Center is currently collaborating with the students and Partner Organizations to determine what we can do to improve training to ensure students receive the right skills and knowledge, presented in the right way and at the right time to prevent terrorism and other criminal activity against the US and our citizens.				
Description:	This measure, based on the student's feedback, is an indicator of the degree of training quality received. The SQTS is a formal means to identify opportunities for immediate improvements and updates to ensure that the student receive the right skills and knowledge, presented in the appropriate way and correct time. The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) biannually summarizes the feedback from graduates of the Center's basic training programs.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	FLETC established and maintained a robust process to examine law enforcement trends and emerging issues. FLETC collaborates with Partner Organizations to assess, validate and improve all programs as they are constantly evolving and being refined in response to emerging issues such as changes in the laws, mission emphasis, and Partner Organization's requirements. Although we did not meet our target of 66%, we will hold ourselves to continuously higher standards in the future. Training programs that meet the end-users needs are important to our nation's safety and security.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of Partner Organizations (POs) that express an agree or strongly agree on the Partner Organization Satisfaction Survey (POSS)				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	92.7	92.7%	82%	95%	Met
Description:	The percentage of federal agencies and organizations that indicate satisfaction with the law enforcement training and services provided by the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) to prevent terrorism and other criminal activity against the U.S. and our citizens.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	FLETC met its goal by achieving a 95% agree or strongly agree rating by its participants. Training programs that meet the end-users needs are important to our nation's safety and security. FLETC is committed to providing the best training possible to all law enforcement organizations that we serve by establishing and maintaining a robust process to examine law enforcement trends and emerging issues. We collaborate with our Partner Organizations to assess, validate and improve each program as they evolve and refine in response to emerging issues such as changes in the laws, mission emphasis, and Partner Organization's requirements. Through this collaboration with our Partner Organizations, FLETC is able to provide the agencies with law enforcement agents and officers, skilled in the latest techniques, to enforce laws and regulations, protect the Nation, and interact with the public with respect for individuals and civil liberty.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of federal supervisors that rate their FLETC basic training graduate's preparedness as good or excellent				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	73.4	90%	73%	71%	Not Met
Description:	The percentage of Federal law enforcement supervisors of basic training graduates of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC), who after eight to twelve months of observing their officers or agents, indicate via survey their employees are highly prepared with the right knowledge and skills to perform their entry-level duties and responsibilities to prevent terrorism and other criminal activity against the U.S. and our citizens.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The supervisors' feedback provides the FLETC with a continuous assessment and validation of our training programs. This helps to ensure that law enforcement officers and agents receive the right training to keep pace with the changing criminal and law enforcement environment. Through this collaboration with our Partner Organizations, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is able to provide the agencies with law enforcement agents and officers, skilled in the latest techniques, to enforce laws and regulations, protect the Nation, and interact with the public with respect for individuals and civil liberty. Although we did not achieve our goal and saw a significant decline from FY 2005, we are committed to continuously higher achievement standards.				
Recommended Action:	We are collaborating with our Partner Organizations to identify areas for improvement in our curriculum to ensure we provide them with basic graduates that are highly prepared with the right knowledge and skills to perform their entry-level duties and responsibilities to prevent terrorism and other criminal activity against the U.S. and our citizens.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.4 - Coordinate national and international policy, law enforcement, and other actions to prevent terrorism.				
Program:	Law Enforcement Training - Federal Law Enforcement Training Center				

Performance Goal:	Remove all removable aliens from the United States.				
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).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	80.7%	109%	81%	124.37%	Met
Description:	With certain exceptions, an alien illegally in the United States is "removable" when an immigration judge issues a "final order of removal" or administrative orders are issued per statute. 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 aliens. The measure is an approximation that becomes meaningful only as the basis for comparing results from quarter to quarter.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The increased number of fugitive apprehension teams in FY 2006 has paid off with a healthy 124.37% removal rate. This means we have started to remove aliens who were not removed in previous quarters that should have been removed. This achievement improves the safety and security of our nation and its people. The quarterly results are as follows: Quarter 1: Final Orders of Removals (FOR), 41,165 and Removals for the 1st quarter were 43,440 @ 105.53%. Quarter 2: FOR, 44,190, and Removals for the 2nd quarter were 47,126 @ 106.64%. Quarter 3: FOR, 32,061, and Removals for the 3rd quarter were 50,375 @ 157.12%. Quarter 4: FOR, 32,091, and Removals for the 4th quarter were 45,003 @ 140.24%.				

Objective/s Supported:	2.2 - Enforce trade and immigration laws.
Program:	Detention and Removal - United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement

Performance Goal:	Prevent the exploitation of systemic vulnerabilities in trade and immigration that allow foreign terrorists, other criminals, and their organizations to endanger the American people, property, and infrastructure.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of closed investigations which have an enforcement consequence (arrest, indictment, conviction, seizure, fine or penalty).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	37.9	38.5%	36.4%	Not Met
Description:	More effective immigration and trade enforcement will contribute to enhanced homeland security as well as to greater deterrence. One method for measuring this effectiveness is to determine the extent to which investigations are completed successfully, i.e., closed with an enforcement consequence. It should be noted, however, that although many cases arise that are worth pursuing, the potential of an investigation is not known at its inception; therefore, it is to be expected that many cases will be closed each year without an enforcement consequence when it is determined that the investigation is no longer viable. In addition to getting criminals off the street, successful investigations also expose and close, or contribute to the elimination of, vulnerabilities in various aspects of trade and immigration, i.e., the ways in which criminals manage to evade safeguards that are supposed to prevent their illegal activity, and areas in which such safeguards are lax or do not exist.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Explanation of FY 2006 Results: During the 4th quarter, it was found that a number of investigative cases with an enforcement consequence had been affected by the unapproved inclusion of administrative arrest data into the database by some field offices. The Office of Investigations, thereupon, initiated a certification process of the data to correct the errant figures. This caused changes to the value of the performance measure and necessitated the recalculation of the measure for each quarter in order to have comparable data. However, the data are not comparable to the target, which was a projection based on the previous year's data.				
Recommended Action:	On October 1, 2006, an enhancement of the data system was made to accommodate, and separately account for, both criminal and administrative arrests in the system. In light of the enhancement to the data system, we will revisit the data elements that should be included in the data computation of our performance measure and will adjust the target as needed.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.2 - Enforce trade and immigration laws.				
Program:	Office of Investigations - United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement				

Performance Goal:	Provide dependable risk analyses, effective systems for surveillance and detection, and reliable bioforensic analyses to protect the nation against biological attacks.				
Performance Measure:	Number of bioaerosol collectors deployed in the top threat cities.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	223	198	Not Met
Description:	The total number of bioaerosol collectors deployed in the top threat U.S. cities, in order to determine the characteristic and extent of a potential terrorist airborne health threat to the public and protect the public by enabling early response actions to identification of airborne materials in the event of an attack. The term “employed” will now be used to track collectors in a jurisdiction. This term better defines the operational status of a jurisdiction.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The total number of collectors reported for Q4 FY 2006 is less than the total number reported in prior quarters. This discrepancy is due to a different interpretation of the definition of “deployed.” In operational terms “deployed” means the collector is located in the threat city. It does not distinguish whether the collector is functioning operationally. The term “employed” is defined as functioning operationally. The numbers reported in Q4 FY 2006 are re-baselined as those collectors that are “employed.” In the future, number of “employed” collectors will be reported.				
Recommended Action:	Total number expected was 320 employed. Achieving full operational capability for the outdoor monitoring component of Gen 2 has taken longer than anticipated for several reasons, in part because DHS assumed responsibility for administration of the Cooperative Agreement money from EPA this year and the transition took several months. Additionally, Gen 2 enhancements required site permission and, as a result, collector installation took longer than anticipated. Some of the enhancement cities have also had state or local hiring freezes, which further delayed employment. The resolution of these issues will enable the program to meet its targets in coming fiscal years.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Biological Countermeasures - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	Provide dependable risk analyses, effective systems for surveillance, detection, and cleanup, and reliable chemical forensic analyses to protect the nation against chemical attacks.				
Performance Measure:	Percent completion of an effective restoration capability to restore key infrastructure to normal operation after a chemical attack.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	25%	25%	Met
Description:	The percentage of work that has been accomplished out of the total amount needed to prototype an effective capability that can restore key infrastructure to normal operations after a chemical attack.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The target of 25% was met, thus showing that the project is on track. Effort comprises three thrust areas: development and transition of mobile laboratory, prototype of fixed laboratories, and developing guidelines for decontamination. Mobile laboratory design features were developed in coordination with the Environmental Protection Agency and the program down-selected a performer for final prototype mobile lab, as well as a process for transitioning the final product to the Environmental Protection Agency in FY 2007. The program also surveyed fixed labs in Washington, DC and New York City regions for prototyping and down-selected three through interagency panel review. A market survey of decontamination technologies was completed. The final development of these new technologies will improve the protection of our nation from chemical attacks.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Chemical Countermeasures - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	Improve explosives countermeasures technologies and procedures to prevent attacks on critical infrastructure, key assets, and the public.				
Performance Measure:	Cumulative number of air cargo and rail passenger explosives screening pilots initiated.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	4	5	Met
Description:	The number of pilot programs initiated to derive concepts of operation, training requirements, and tailored equipment suites which may most effectively and efficiently screen a substantially higher percentage of rail passengers and air cargo before it is loaded on commercial flights in order to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The target of four pilots was achieved. The results of these pilots will make future designs more robust, thus making air and rail travel safer. The second phase of the pilot program to screen people for improvised explosive devices (IEDs) in a rail station was initiated. The pilot program to screen Air Cargo for IEDs was started at the San Francisco International Airport. The logistics for two concurrent Air Cargo Pilot programs at Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport and Seattle-Tacoma International Airport are currently being worked.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Explosives Countermeasures - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	Advance capabilities for threat discovery and awareness, information management and sharing, linkage of threats with vulnerabilities, and capability and motivation assessments for terrorist organizations.				
Performance Measure:	Average of expert reviews of improvement in the national capability to assess threats of terrorist attacks.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	7	7	Met
Description:	The number of science and technology program areas reviewed for factors that include mission and user relevance, technical competency, management effectiveness, and collaborative efforts, with a special focus on integration and consolidation, to ensure that operational end users in the future will have the technology and capabilities needed to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	All seven program areas have been reviewed for relevance, technical progress, management effectiveness, and collaborations. Integration and consolidation were underway at the close of the fiscal year. These program area reviews provide for alignment across programs, strategies and technology. This means the Department's efforts will more likely provide the needed improvements in safety and security for the nation and its people.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Threat Awareness Portfolio - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	Develop well-designed standards and test and evaluation protocols for products, services, and systems used by the Department of Homeland Security and its partners to ensure consistent and verifiable effectiveness.				
Performance Measure:	Number of Department of Homeland Security official technical standards introduced.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	15	15	Met
Description:	The number of standards introduced for adoption by the Department of Homeland Security - not all are adopted. The Standards Council and our working groups identify standards and examine their suitability for adoption. Only those standards with clear requirements and applicability are adopted.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Working with our partners - other Federal agencies and Standards development organizations, as well as our newly chartered Standards Council - the Standards program has greatly increased our communications with stakeholders and introduced more standards. By continuously reviewing standards for adoption, the Department improves its processes and communications to those who are on the front line of securing our nation.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of standards introduced that are adopted by Department of Homeland Security and partner agencies.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	67%	92%	Met
Description:	The percentage of standards and protocols for products, services, and systems that are adopted by the Department and its partner agencies, thus ensuring high levels of effectiveness among the technologies and capabilities end users need to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Following the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act, the Department of Homeland Security Science and Technology Standards focuses on standards developed and/or adopted by other agencies - ensuring interoperability and private sector accessibility while avoiding duplication of effort. By implementing sound standards, the Department improves its processes and communications to those who are on the front line of securing our nation.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Standards - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	Develop effective technologies and tools to increase the capabilities of the Department of Homeland Security operational components to execute their mission to secure the homeland.				
Performance Measure:	Percentage of program funding dedicated to developing technologies in direct response to DHS components' requirements.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	80%	94%	Met
Description:	The percentage of science and technology funding that directly supports the development of technologies requested by the Department components, to ensure that operational end users are provided with the technology and capabilities they need to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Exceeded target-reprioritization of requirements and program funds through interaction with the Department of Homeland Security Components resulted in a more focused set of programs. By working collaboratively with the components, funding is put toward those programs that will have the best likelihood of improving our nation's safety and security.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Support to Department of Homeland Security Components - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	Establish and sustain a coordinated university-based research, development and education system to enhance the Nation's homeland security.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of peer review adjectival ratings on University Programs' management and research and education programs that are very good or excellent.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	78%	54.3% (average)	Not Met
Description:	The percentage of those Department-funded University research, development, and education programs through the Centers of Excellence that are reviewed each year by relevant experts, and are rated as very good or excellent for quality, relevance, and effectiveness, to ensure that operational end users will have the technology and capabilities they need to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities in the future.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	University Programs conducted all scheduled and planned peer reviews for three Centers of Excellence during FY 2006. The Center for Risk and Economic Analysis of Terrorism Events (CREATE), the National Center for Food Protection and Defense (NCFPD) and the National Center for Foreign and Zoonotic Disease Defense (FAZD). CREATE's review occurred in the second quarter with an adjectival rating of very good or excellent--83%; In the 4th quarter NCFPD and FAZD received adjectival ratings of very good or excellent--61% and 19%, respectively. 54.3% is the average of percent of peer review adjectival ratings against the three Centers reviewed in FY 2006. These percentages reflect individual scores of very good or excellent and do not reflect the average of the reviewers. By ensuring the university-based research is focused and effective, the Department is making sure the funding for improved national security is maximized.				
Recommended Action:	University Programs will use these ratings and the input that reviewers provided to realign the Center's research and education to the Science and Technology Directorate's mission so that the Department's needs are met to the greatest extent possible.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	University Programs - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	Prevent terrorist attacks by developing effective capabilities to characterize, assess, and counter new and emerging threats.				
Performance Measure:	Average customer satisfaction rating with risk assessments to identify potential future threats.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	7.5	9	Met
Description:	The number of science and technology program areas reviewed for factors that include mission and user relevance, technical competency, management effectiveness, and collaborative efforts, with a special focus on integration and consolidation, to ensure that operational end users in the future will have the technology and capabilities needed to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	All program areas have been reviewed for relevance, technical progress, management effectiveness, and collaborations. Integration and consolidation were underway at the close of the fiscal year. These program area reviews provide for alignment across programs, strategies and technology making the Department's efforts more likely to provide the needed improvements in safety and security for the nation and its people.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Emerging Threats - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	Identify and rapidly develop, prototype, and commercialize innovative technologies to thwart terrorist attacks.				
Performance Measure:	Number of prototypes delivered through DHS funded projects through Technical Support Working Group (TSWG), Rapid Technology Application Program (RTAP) and Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	4	17	Met
Description:	This measure demonstrates how well the program is delivering prototypes within a short timeframe as well as through Small Businesses. (Prototypes that are delivered through the Rapid Technology Application Program (RTAP) meet an accelerated time frame for the deployment of advanced technologies so as to address urgent user requirements.)				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Delivered FY 2006 prototypes include Personnel Protection Equipment, computer security tools (hardware & software), explosives & explosive detection device, investigative technology tools, Chemical/Biological/Nuclear detection and analysis tools. Some of the prototypes are currently being used by end-users, e.g. gas monitor sensor, bio-aerosol threat warning detector, personnel heat stress calculator, and computer security tools. These new technologies being prototyped will lead to fielded systems that will improve our nation's security.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Rapid Prototyping - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	Provide effective and economical capabilities to dramatically reduce the threat to commercial aircraft posed by man-portable anti-aircraft missiles.				
Performance Measure:	Increase in Mean Flight Hours Between Failure (MFHBF) from Phase II to Phase III.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	1100	0	Not Met
Description:	The number of flight hours that the Counter Man-Portable Air Defense System (MANPADS) systems operate and are available. This number is expected to increase with the increased number of hours of flights, increasing the system reliability and reducing the total life-cycle costs.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Flight test was originally projected to start in 4Q FY 2006. Once operational, this system will dramatically reduce the threat to commercial aircraft posed by man-portable anti-aircraft missiles.				
Recommended Action:	Because of the delay in making the OTA (Other Transaction Authority) awards, and the subsequent postponement of testing until Q1 FY 2007, the program was not able to make any progress in increasing the number of flight hours that the Counter-MANPADS systems operate and are available. Once the testing starts, however, the program fully expects to demonstrate improved performance. The program will also explore means to prevent future delays.				

Performance Measure:	Number of operational flight hours of Counter-MANPADS system conducted in a commercial aviation environment.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	300	0	Not Met
Description:	The number of hours that the Counter Man-Portable Air Defense System (MANPAD) has been tested in operational flights, used to validate and verify hardware reliability; maintenance, operational, and security procedures; and reduce operating costs, which will enable implementation onboard commercial aircraft, better protecting the flying public against acts of terrorism.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Suitability testing was originally projected to start in 4Q FY 2006. However, once operational, this system will dramatically reduce the threat to commercial aircraft posed by man-portable anti-aircraft missiles.				
Recommended Action:	Because of the delay in making the OTA awards, and the subsequent postponement of testing until Q1 FY 2007, the program was not able to make any progress in increasing the number of flight hours that the Counter-MANPADS systems are tested in operational flights. Once the testing starts, however, the program fully expects to demonstrate improved performance. The program will also explore means to prevent future delays.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Counter Man-Portable Air Defense System (MANPADS) - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	Ensure interoperability and compatibility between emergency response agencies at the local, state, and federal levels and standardize federal testing and evaluation efforts for emergency response technologies.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of grant programs for public safety wireless communications that include "SAFECOM" Federal standards-approved grant guidance.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	Met
Description:	Measure demonstrates that the Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) effectively incorporates SAFECOM-approved grant guidance language into the grant documentation of its federal partners.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The Office for Interoperability and Compatibility has achieved its performance measure for FY 2006. Improved interoperability between emergency response agencies during emergencies will save lives.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of states that have initiated or completed a statewide interoperability plan, such as the Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	26%	26%	Met
Description:	Measure tracks how well the Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) is encouraging the development of statewide interoperability plans.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Office for Interoperability and Compatibility has achieved its performance measure for FY 2006. Improved interoperability between emergency response agencies during emergencies will save lives.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Interoperability & Compatibility - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	Produce actionable information and recommend reliable technologies to help protect U.S. critical infrastructure.				
Performance Measure:	Number of analyses/simulations completed on the Critical Infrastructure Protection - Decision Support System (CIP-DSS) to provide actionable information to help protect U. S. critical infrastructure.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	4	4	Met

Description:	The cumulative number of scenarios developed and stored in the Critical Infrastructure Protection - Decision Support System (CIP-DSS). The CIP-DSS provides a rational, scientifically-informed approach for prioritizing critical infrastructure protection strategies and resource allocations using modeling, simulation, and analyses to assess vulnerabilities, consequences, and risks; develop and evaluate protection, mitigation, response, and recovery strategies and technologies; and provide real-time support to decision makers during crises and emergencies. This measure demonstrates the availability of actionable information to help protect the U.S.'s critical infrastructure from acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies.
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The Critical Infrastructure Protection-Decision Support System has provided analyses for Hurricane Katrina response planning, Avian Influenza planning, a chemical release scenario, and a biological outbreak. These scenarios and analyses will be used to improve our ability to protect our nation's infrastructure.
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.
Program:	Critical Infrastructure Protection - Science and Technology Directorate

Performance Goal:	Enable the creation of and migration to a more secure critical information infrastructure.				
Performance Measure:	Cumulative number of cyber security data sets contained in protected repository.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	100	68	Not Met
Description:	Measure tracks the cumulative number of data sets available in the protected repository. In FY 2006 the Science and Technology (S&T) Directorate continued the ongoing collection, refreshing, and sharing of data sets, and addition of new partners as applicable for the Protected Repository for the Defense of Infrastructure against Cyber Threats (PREDICT) repository. This is important because the repository needs to continually add new data that will contain the latest cyber attacks so that the cyber security research community can have the most recent information to help them improve the quality of their research results.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Achieved 68 datasets in the data repository for FY 2006. Did not meet target of 100 data sets because the PREDICT repository was put on hold due to issues with the Department of Homeland Security's Privacy Office.				
Recommended Action:	The program did not meet its target for FY 2006 because the PREDICT repository was put on hold. In FY 2007, the program plans to work with the Department of Homeland Security Privacy Office to resolve the issue so that the program can resume full operation.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Cyber Security - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	Encourage the development and deployment of anti-terrorism technologies by awarding SAFETY Act benefits to homeland security technology producers.				
Performance Measure:	Percentage of full applications that receive liability protection under the SAFETY Act.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	65%	100%	Met
Description:	As part of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, Public Law 107-296, Congress enacted the SAFETY (Support Anti-Terrorism by Fostering Effective Technologies) Act to provide certain protections for sellers of qualified anti-terrorism technologies and others in the supply and distribution chain. Specifically, the SAFETY Act creates certain liability limitations for “claims arising out of, relating to, or resulting from an act of terrorism” where qualified anti-terrorism technologies have been deployed. This measure provides the percentage of applications for which the Department granted liability protection out of all those evaluated. This liability protection helps to encourage the development of effective technologies aimed at preventing, detecting, identifying, or deterring acts of terrorism, or limiting the harm that such acts might otherwise cause.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Although a significant amount of time was spent assisting the applicants with the process to ensure these results, we achieved a 100% success. This success helps ensure our producers are not constrained by issues that would affect their ability to provide the needed products and services to secure our nation.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	SAFETY Act - Science and Technology Directorate				

Performance Goal:	AS STATED IN THE FY 2006 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN: Reduce the probability of a successful terrorist or other criminal attack to the air transportation system by improved passenger and baggage screening processes. AS ENHANCED TO BETTER REFLECT NEAR-TERM PROGRAM PERFORMANCE: Reduce the probability of a successful terrorist or other criminal attack to the air transportation system by improved aviation security.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of the nationally critical aviation transportation assets or systems that have been assessed during the fiscal year and have mitigation strategies in place to reduce risk.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	33%	33%	33%	Met
Description:	The percentage of aviation assets on the ‘Nationally Critical Transportation Assets’ list that have had vulnerability assessments completed during the fiscal year as compared with the total number of assets. Current annual plans require one-third of aviation assets to be assessed annually for a continuous three-year cycle. Vulnerability Assessment assumes that all airports are meeting baseline compliance of security regulations outlined in 49CFR1542. Vulnerability Assessment involves identifying vulnerabilities of existing approved security practices and procedures, in order to reduce the probability of a successful terrorist or other criminal attack to the air transportation system.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	In FY2006, 33 percent of nationally-critical aviation transportation assets or systems have been assessed and have mitigation strategies in place to reduce risk, which meets the target of 33 percent annually for a 3-year cycle. TSA conducted Joint (TSA/FBI) Vulnerability Assessments (JVAs) to determine where vulnerabilities exist at the airports deemed nationally critical. Success in this area will help ensure that there is a reduced probability of a successful terrorist or other criminal attack to the air transportation system by improved aviation security				

Performance Measure:	Level of the Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI-A) for Aviation Operations.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	78	81	81	Met
Description:	The CSI -A is a composite index incorporating data on security confidence, passenger surveys, and compliments/complaint data on screener performance. TSA aspires to provide effective screening operations with minimum disruption to the traveling public. CSI-A is scaled where 0 is very dissatisfied, 25 is dissatisfied, 75 is satisfied, and 100 is very satisfied.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	In FY2006, the score on the Customer Satisfaction Index for Aviation (CSI-A) reached 81, a new level for customer satisfaction with screening operations at the nation's security checkpoints. This score, when considered with other performance measures, indicates that TSA was able to perform necessary checkpoint screening operations to prevent and protect against adverse actions, while maintaining a high level of customer satisfaction.				

Performance Measure:	Passenger screening covert test results (percent of screeners correctly identifying and resolving).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	Classified	Classified	Classified	Met
Description:	This measures the percentage of the time that passenger Transportation Security Officers (TSO's) correctly identify prohibited material during covert tests, in order to reduce the probability of a successful terrorist or other criminal attack to the air transportation system. The target and actual results are classified for security reasons and are not releasable to the public at this time.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The strong results of the Screener Training Exercises and Assessments (STEA) program indicate that the TSO's are adept in the performance of their duties and are providing a more secure environment for air travel and the traveling public, thus, in part, fulfilling the mission of TSA and DHS. The goal of the STEA program is to educate TSO's on a variety of threats that they may face in as real-world an environment as possible.				

Performance Measure:	Baggage screening covert test results (percent of screeners correctly identifying and resolving).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	Classified	Classified	Met
Description:	This measures the percentage of the time that baggage Transportation Security Officers (TSO's) correctly identify prohibited material in baggage during covert tests, in order to reduce the probability of a successful terrorist or other criminal attack to the air transportation system. The target and actual results are classified and are not releasable to the public at this time for security reasons.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The strong results of the STEA program indicate that the TSO's are adept in the performance of their duties and are providing a more secure environment for air travel and the traveling public, thus, in part, fulfilling the mission of TSA and DHS. The goal of the STEA program is to educate TSO's on a variety of threats that they may face in as real-world an environment as possible.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.3 - Provide operational end users with the technology and capabilities to detect and prevent terrorist attacks, means of terrorism and other illegal activities. 2.5 - Strengthen the security of the Nations transportation systems. 3.1 - Protect the public from acts of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Aviation Security - Transportation Security Administration				

Performance Goal:	Reduce the probability of a successful terrorist or other criminal attack on surface transportation systems through the issuing of standards, compliance inspections, and vulnerability assessments.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of nationally critical surface transportation assets or systems that have been assessed during the fiscal year and have mitigation strategies in place to reduce risk.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	.75%	3.57%	0	Not Met
Description:	The total number of surface assets on the 'Nationally Critical Transportation Assets' list that have had vulnerability assessments completed during the fiscal year and have created mitigation strategies in order to reduce the probability of a successful terrorist or other criminal attack on surface transportation systems.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	TSA uses a risk-based approach that makes the most of both public and private resources. It focuses on those assets and systems most critical to the Nation's surface transportation. Those assets and systems are assessed to identify gaps or vulnerabilities to which mitigation strategies may be developed to reduce the risk. At the origination of this measure TSA had access to only one Department-sanctioned vulnerability assessment tool. Since that time, the Department has recognized several viable alternative vulnerability assessment tools that provide additional efficient options for conducting risk assessments, such as making use of assessments conducted by other Federal entities. In FY 2006, the Surface Transportation Security Program underwent an OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) assessment that changed the wording of this annual measure to better reflect its content and emphasize these important first steps towards risk reduction.				
Recommended Action:	In the future, this measure will be replaced by the following PART measure: "Percentage of nationally critical surface transportation assets or systems that have been assessed and have mitigation strategies developed based on those assessments." This new measure expands the data that is collected to include assessments made by multiple Federal agencies which provide a more complete picture of the assets or systems assessed. This measure revision will enable TSA to meet a more appropriate target in the future. Through participation in the Federal Risk Assessment Working Group (FRAWG) and direct communication with our federal partners, TSA has visibility into the assessments conducted by other federal agencies. TSA is managing the surface transportation assessment efforts conducted at the nationally critical surface transportation assets and systems.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.5 - Strengthen the security of the Nations transportation systems.				
Program:	Surface Transportation Security - Transportation Security Administration				

Performance Goal:	Promote confidence in our nation's civil aviation system through the effective deployment of Federal Air Marshals to detect, deter, and defeat hostile acts targeting U.S. air carriers, airports, passengers, and crews.				
Performance Measure:	Number of successful terrorist and other criminal attacks initiated from commercial passenger aircraft cabins with Federal Air Marshal Service (FAMS) coverage.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	0	0	0	0	Met
Description:	The number of successful criminal attacks initiated from commercial passenger aircraft cabins while at least one Federal Air Marshal was aboard. The Federal Air Marshals are trained to detect, deter, and defeat hostile acts targeting U.S. air carriers, airports, passengers, and crews.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	During FY 2006, there were no successful terrorist/criminal attacks initiated from commercial passenger aircraft cabins while at least one Federal Air Marshal was aboard. The presence of Federal Air Marshals within the aviation domain, specifically on commercial aircraft has proven to be an effective deterrent that mitigates the threat of criminal attacks originating from passenger aircraft cabins. There is a reasonable expectation that the continued deployment of Federal Air Marshals will successfully defeat future terrorist and other criminal in-air attacks on commercial aircraft.				

Performance Measure:	Percentage level in meeting Federal Air Marshal Service (FAMS) mission and flight coverage targets for each individual category of identified risk.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	Classified	Classified	Classified	Classified	Met
Description:	This is a measure of the performance levels of FAMS coverage of targeted critical flights based upon impact (geographical location), vulnerability (aircraft destructive potential), threats, and intelligence relative to the availability of resources. Coverage is provided to those flights that have been identified as Targeted Critical Flights for deployment under 10 individual risk categories that were identified in the FAMS Concept of Operations. Coverage is provided using a risk-based management approach for mission planning.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	During FY 2006, there were no successful terrorist/criminal attacks initiated from commercial passenger aircraft cabins while at least one Federal Air Marshal was aboard. The presence of Federal Air Marshals within the aviation domain, specifically on commercial aircraft has proven to be an effective deterrent that mitigates the threat of criminal attacks originating from passenger aircraft cabins. There is a reasonable expectation that the continued deployment of Federal Air Marshals will successfully defeat future terrorist and other criminal in-air attacks on commercial aircraft.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.5 - Strengthen the security of the Nations transportation systems. 3.1 - Protect the public from acts of terrorism and other illegal activities.				
Program:	Federal Air Marshal Service - Transportation Security Administration				

Performance Goal:	Enable Federal Immigration and border Management agencies to make timely and accurate risk and eligibility decisions through coordination of screening capability policies, business strategy and processes, data, information systems, and technology to further enhance security and immigration, travel, and credentialing experiences.				
Performance Measure:	Number of biometric watch list hits for travelers processed at ports of entry.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	2059	1850	1941	Met
Description:	US-VISIT supports Customs and Border Protection in identifying persons of interest and taking appropriate actions at ports of entry. A hit occurs when the biometric data provided by a traveler matches biometric data contained in a biometric watch list. This measure reflects hits resulting from biometric matching alone, which means that these referrals to officers would not have been made through queries solely of biographic watch lists.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	From inspection of the data, US-VISIT uncovered evidence that as the number of hits at the consular offices rises, the number of hits at the ports of entry falls.				

Performance Measure:	Number of biometric watch list hits for visa applicants processed at consular offices.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	897	800	2558	Met
Description:	US-VISIT provides the ability to identify persons of interest at consular offices, which creates a virtual border and contributes to the strategic goal of prevention. This measure reflects the ability of US-VISIT to provide consular offices with useful information on which they can base their decisions on visa applications.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The second quarter figures rose 56% over the first quarter numbers, with a corresponding decrease in hits at the POEs. From inspection of the data, we have uncovered evidence that as the number of hits at the consular offices rises, the number of hits at the ports of entry falls.				

Performance Measure:	Ratio of adverse actions to total biometric watch list hits at ports of entry.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	30%	33%	21%	Not Met
Description:	US-VISIT seeks to get the right information to the right individuals to make decisions regarding admissibility into the U.S. This measure captures efforts by US-VISIT to work with its partner agencies to continually improve the value of the information provided. The decision not to admit is considered an adverse action.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	US-VISIT is still investigating the factors that resulted in the FY2006 actual indicator of 21%, which is lower than the FY2006 target indicator of 33%. These factors include the random movement of travelers due to seasonal variation, the composition of the watch lists, and the severity of criminal histories associated with the watch lists. Since FY2006 is the second year of capturing data for this measure and the first year of trending this data, the target indicator for future years will be adjusted based on the data captured in FY2006.				
Recommended Action:	US-VISIT is reconsidering both the performance targets for this measure and the performance measure itself due to factors outside of the control of the program. These factors include: the composition of the watch list; the types and severity of criminal histories that trigger adverse action by law enforcement; the traveler volume randomly and seasonally arriving at the ports. US-VISIT is addressing developing a new measure that better captures the continuous improvement of data shared between US-VISIT and its partner agencies.				

Objective/s Supported:	2.1 - Secure our borders against terrorists, means of terrorism, illegal drugs and violations of trade and immigration laws. 6.4 - Facilitate the efficient movement of legitimate cargo and people.
Program:	US-VISIT (Previously Screening Coordination Office) - U S Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology

Performance Goal:	Eliminate maritime fatalities and injuries on our Nation's oceans and waterways.				
Performance Measure:	Maritime Injury and Fatality Index				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	1,293	1,277	1,280	1,400	Not Met
Description:	This measure evaluates how well the Coast Guard Marine Safety Programs prevent maritime fatalities and injuries by comparing the current period to those of previous periods. This measure is a five-year average of reportable Passenger and Mariner deaths & injuries for the current and four previous calendar years, and Recreational Boating fatalities for the current year. There is no denominator. Passenger deaths & injuries include reportable casualties of commercial passengers on U.S. vessels operating in any waters and commercial passengers on foreign flag vessels operating in U.S. waters. Mariner deaths & injuries include casualties of crewmembers or employees aboard U.S. commercial vessels. Passenger and Mariner Data are collected from USCG Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement System. Recreational Boating fatalities are derived from data provided by State Boating Law Administrators and captured in the USCG Boat Accident Report Database.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The five-year average number of commercial deaths and injuries added to the annual deaths from recreational boating in 2006 increased to 1,400 in FY 2006, a number that exceeds the 2006 target of 1,280. There were 33 more boating deaths reported in 2006, however this is within normal variation and is less than a 1% increase in the five-year average. Commercial deaths & injuries were also within normal variation with the change in five-year average due largely to increased passenger injuries. Our 2006 target was ambitiously set last year based in part on anticipated towing vessel regulations that were not yet fully implemented. Completion of these regulations, as well as proposed changes to requirements for safety/survival systems and a requirement that vessels subject to fishery observers have a current safety decal are expected to favorably impact future results. Please note that data for the period just ended is likely to change as more data becomes available.				
Recommended Action:	Completion of towing vessel regulations which will allow for the inspection and certification of towing vessels currently not inspected as well as finalization of proposed changes to requirements for safety/survival systems are expected to favorably impact future results. In addition, an additional increase of grant funds will be made available to the States and national nonprofit organizations in FY 2007 for boating safety programs, thus resulting in increased boating safety efforts. Further, through the development and implementation of a new national boating survey, the Coast Guard will substantially enhance its capability for data gathering, analysis, and problem definition concerning recreational boating accidents, thus allowing us to target our efforts and resources more effectively.				
Objective/s Supported:	1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence. 1.4 - Develop a Common Operating Picture for domestic situational awareness, including air, land, and sea. 2.5 - Strengthen the security of the Nations transportation systems.				
Program:	Marine Safety - United States Coast Guard				

Performance Goal:	Reduce the flow of illegal drugs entering the U.S. via non-commercial maritime shipping sources.				
Performance Measure:	Removal rate for cocaine that is shipped via non-commercial maritime means.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	30.7%	27.3%	22%	22% (estimate based on 105.58 Metric Tons seized)	Estimated - Met
Description:	<p>The percentage of cocaine shipped through maritime routes that was intended to enter the U.S., but did not because of the efforts of the U.S. Coast Guard. The Cocaine Removal Rate reflects the amount of cocaine lost to the smuggler through seizures (documented in the DEA administered Federal-wide Drug Seizure System), jettison, burning, and other non-recoverable events (vetted through the Inter Agency Consolidated Counter-Drug Database) divided by the non-commercial maritime cocaine flow through the transit zone (documented in Defense Intelligence Agency's annual Interagency Assessment of Cocaine Movement report). Since it is estimated that a 35% to 50% disruption rate would prompt a collapse of profitability for smugglers, the removal rate measure allows for a direct evaluation of the Coast Guard's efforts in disrupting the market as prescribed by National Priority III of the National Drug Control Strategy.</p>				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	<p>Several external factors such as intelligence and interagency cooperation play a vital role in the Coast Guard's drug interdiction mission. These efforts enable Coast Guard commanders to best position assets for anticipated interdictions. FY 2005 was a record breaking year for cocaine seizures. The FY 2006 target aligns with National Priority III, Disrupting the Market of the 2004 National Drug Control Strategy promulgated by the Office of the National Drug Policy. Flow data used in the performance metric are developed annually and published in the Interagency Assessment of Cocaine Movement (IACM). This report is not published until July of the following year. We estimate that we will meet the 22% target based on the 105.58 Metric Tons of cocaine seized the year in comparison with FY 2005.</p>				
Objective/s Supported:	<p>1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence. 1.4 - Develop a Common Operating Picture for domestic situational awareness, including air, land, and sea. 2.1 - Secure our borders against terrorists, means of terrorism, illegal drugs and violations of trade and immigration laws.</p>				
Program:	Drug Interdiction - United States Coast Guard				

Performance Goal:	Eliminate the flow of undocumented migrants via maritime routes to the U.S.				
Performance Measure:	Percentage of undocumented migrants who attempt to enter the U.S. via maritime routes that are interdicted or deterred.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	87.1%	85.5%	89%	less than 89% (7,885 migrants interdicted)	Estimated - Not Met
Description:	<p>The Coast Guard has been charged through Executive Orders and Presidential Decision Directive to enforce the Immigration and Nationality Act. Performance is measured by the percent of undocumented migrants who are interdicted while, or deterred from, attempting to enter the U.S. via maritime routes. Haitian, Cuban, Dominican & Chinese are tracked, as they constitute the majority of the migrant flow entering the U.S. via maritime means. The measure is computed by dividing the number of successful landings by the migrants who actually attempt illegal immigration or were deterred from making an attempt. Subtracting this percentage from 100% gives the total migrants interdicted or deterred. The migrant flow is provided by the USCG Intelligence Coordination Center; interdictions and landings are reported by USCG units & other law enforcement agencies. In FY06 USCG will track the number of successful landings via maritime means of all nationalities.</p>				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	<p>Maritime Migration and Human Smuggling Monthly Flow Reports are typically published 30-45 days after the end of each month. Based on an estimate of 5,500 successful landings, we anticipate falling slightly short of the 89% target. Cuban interdictions remain more than twice FY 2004, while Haitian and Dominican interdictions dropped by 652 and 598, respectively. Lacking an effective legal deterrent, migrant smugglers operate with near impunity which drives the performance gap. An improved performance measure will be implemented in FY 2007 based on an independent program evaluation.</p>				
Recommended Action:	<p>Two performance improvement initiatives being pursued include the use of biometrics to identify and subsequently prosecute persons attempting to re-enter the U.S. illegally, including wanted felons and smugglers, and implementing the Maritime Alien Smuggling Law Enforcement Act to improve the viability of maritime migrant smuggling prosecutions and civil forfeiture of vessels outfitted for migrant smuggling.</p>				
Objective/s Supported:	<p>1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence. 1.4 - Develop a Common Operating Picture for domestic situational awareness, including air, land, and sea. 2.1 - Secure our borders against terrorists, means of terrorism, illegal drugs and violations of trade and immigration laws. 6.3 - Support the United States humanitarian commitment with flexible and sound immigration and refugee programs.</p>				
Program:	Migrant Interdiction - United States Coast Guard				

Performance Goal:	Reduce the numbers of vessel incursions into the United States Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).				
Performance Measure:	Number of incursions into the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	247	171	199	164	Met
Description:	<p>This performance measure counts the number of foreign fishing vessel (FFV) incursions into the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). FFV incursions provide an indication of the adequacy of USCG security efforts within the EEZ. The 3.36 million square mile U.S. EEZ includes the sea floor and adjacent waters extending up to 200 nautical miles away from the U.S. and its territories. It is the largest EEZ in the world, containing up to 20% of the world's fishery resources. The Magnuson-Stevens Act charges the Coast Guard to enforce fisheries regulations within it. Coast Guard units conduct this mission to maintain sovereign control of our maritime borders, protecting fish stocks from foreign exploitation and denying terrorists and other threats from using maritime routes to harm the United States. Data for the measure are collected through external sources and USCG units patrolling the EEZ. The information is consolidated at USCG HQ through monthly messages from the Area Commanders.</p>				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	<p>The Gulf of Mexico accounts for the vast majority of illegal EEZ incursions, with 146 of the 161 total for FY 2006. The CG established meetings with Mexican enforcement agencies to increase fisheries law enforcement co-operation on the US/MX maritime border. Meetings, in December 2005, and July 2006 established a co-operative foundation upon which the Coast Guard hopes to build a more functional working relationship with MX fisheries enforcement personnel. Through this partnership we have developed procedures for turnover of interdicted vessels, case information, and prosecutorial feedback – this cooperation is intended to yield increased deterrence as the procedures are implemented by both sides. The Coast Guard continued its efforts, with increased success in 2006 to monitor, detect, and interdict foreign fishing vessel incursions into the US EEZs of the Western Central Pacific and along the maritime boundary line with Russia in the Bering Sea.</p>				
Objective/s Supported:	<p>1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence. 1.4 - Develop a Common Operating Picture for domestic situational awareness, including air, land, and sea. 2.1 - Secure our borders against terrorists, means of terrorism, illegal drugs and violations of trade and immigration laws.</p>				
Program:	Other LE (law enforcement) - United States Coast Guard				

Performance Goal:	Support our national security and military strategies by ensuring assets are at the level of readiness required by the combatant commander.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of time that Coast Guard assets included in the Combatant Commander Operational Plans are ready at a Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) rating of 2 or better.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	76%	69	100%	62%	Not Met
Description:	<p>This measure uses the Navy SORTS reporting system to assess the readiness of Coast Guard war fighting assets' capabilities: equipment, logistics, personnel, training, and preparedness. The measure is the number of days that a USCG asset type is ready at a SORTS rating of 2 or better* divided by the total number of days that USCG assets are required by DOD Operational Plans. Asset types tracked by this measure include High Endurance Cutters, 110' Patrol Boats and Port Security Units. This measure is the best indicator of outcome performance because it directly measures the program's stated outcome (readiness to support DOD's specific requirements) with a standardized, fleet-wide methodology. The measure's data source is the Navy SORTS database, which is populated in the field by carefully-reviewed required submissions from each unit's commanding officer. * "2 or better" indicates that a unit possesses the resources necessary and is trained to undertake most of its wartime missions.</p>				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	<p>In FY 2006, the USCG did not meet its Defense Readiness performance target. The shortfall was primarily driven by: equipment casualties attributable to an aging cutter fleet and limited annual reserve training time that precluded the rapid accomplishment of both personnel and unit training requirements for Port Security Units (PSUs). The previous years' shortfalls in PSU manning levels have been eliminated.</p>				
Recommended Action:	<p>Continue personnel and unit level training regimes at PSUs within the reserve program available annual drills. Refine reporting requirements as the Navy SORTS reporting system is replaced with the Defense Readiness Reporting System. With regard to equipment casualties that effected readiness, it is expected that continued implementation of the Integrated Deepwater System will reduce such occurrences.</p>				
Objective/s Supported:	<p>1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence. 1.4 - Develop a Common Operating Picture for domestic situational awareness, including air, land, and sea. 2.4 - Coordinate national and international policy, law enforcement, and other actions to prevent terrorism.</p>				
Program:	Defense Readiness - United States Coast Guard				

Performance Goal:	Enhance the integrity of the legal immigration system.				
Performance Measure:	Conduct Benefit Fraud Assessment on X Form Types and report as percentage of fraudulent cases found.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	33% (I-360, Petition for Amerasian, Widow(er), or Special Immigrant)	3 Form Types	3 Form Types	Met
Description:	The Office of Fraud Detection and National Security conducts Benefit Fraud Assessments using statistically random samplings of immigration form types, pulled from pending and completed cases, that historically have been identified as fraud prone or high risk-oriented. These assessments help ensure the security and integrity of the immigration system. Note: The Benefit Fraud Assessment for Form I-90, Application to Replace Permanent Resident Card, was previously reported as completed during FY 2005. It was actually finalized in FY 2006.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	During FY 2006, Benefit Fraud Assessments (BFA) were completed on three form types. The forms and resulting fraud rates were: I-90, Application to Replace Permanent Resident Card) 1%, I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker EW3 (unskilled) 11%, I-140 E31 (skilled) 11%. The BFAs for the I-140 represent two separate immigrant classifications; one representing skilled workers, and the other unskilled workers. Both classifications in this BFA show overall fraud rates of 11%. BFA results are used to develop and propose procedural and legislative changes to counteract fraud. These assessments help ensure the security and integrity of the immigration system.				

Performance Measure:	Number of form types where procedural and/or legislative changes to counteract fraud are proposed as a result of Benefit Fraud Assessments				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	3	3	Met
Description:	The number of types of immigration transactions where proposed procedural or legislative changes have been offered in order to combat fraud as a result of the fraud assessments that have been conducted. These fraud assessments help to ensure the security and integrity of the immigration system by identifying needed improvements to procedures or legislation.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The Benefit Fraud Assessment for Form I-360, Petition for Amerasian, Widow(er), or Special Immigrant, resulted in several changes to Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for religious workers which include additional background checks on forms I-360, I-129, Petition for A Nonimmigrant Worker, and I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or to Adjust Status, as well as 100% Administrative Site Visits for I-360 religious worker petitions. The Office of Fraud Detection and National Security memorandum concerning the I-360 BFA has been signed and forwarded to the field. A proposed rule for religious workers was also forwarded to DHS/HQ. BFAs help to ensure the security and integrity of the immigration system.				
Objective/s Supported:	2.6 - Ensure the security and integrity of the immigration system.				
Program:	Immigration Security and Integrity - United States Citizenship and Immigration Services				

Strategic Goal 3 – Protection

The focus of this strategic goal is to safeguard our people and their freedoms, critical infrastructure, property and the economy of our nation from acts of terrorism, natural disasters and other emergencies. The objectives established by the Department to achieve this goal are provided below.

Objective 3.1 - Protect the public from acts of terrorism and other illegal activities.

Objective 3.2 - Reduce infrastructure vulnerability from acts of terrorism.

Objective 3.3 - Protect our Nations financial infrastructure against crimes, to include currency and financial payment systems.

Objective 3.4 - Secure the physical safety of the President, Vice President, visiting world leaders and other protectees.

Objective 3.5 - Ensure the continuity of government operations and essential functions in the event of crisis or disaster.

Objective 3.6 - Protect the marine environment and living marine resources.

Objective 3.7 - Strengthen nationwide preparedness and mitigation against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies.

Detailed information concerning actual performance during fiscal year 2006 to achieve this goal is provided below.

Performance Goal:	Reduce the impact of natural hazards on people and property through the analysis and reduction of risks and the provision of flood insurance.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of the national population whose safety is improved through the availability of flood risk data in Geospatial Information System (GIS) format.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	5%	38.6	50%	47.7%	Not Met
Description:	The cumulative percentage of the national population that has updated digital flood risk data available online for their community. This digital data replaces old-fashioned paper flood maps. There are some communities, representing 8% of the population, with little to no flood risk, that will not be mapped. The availability of this information helps to protect American citizens against natural or man-made disasters.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	At the end of FY06, preliminary results, as of October 5, 2006, indicate that 47.7-percent was achieved. Primary factors contributing to this shortfall include issues associated with levees and Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Data to demonstrate that certain levees provide adequate flood protection is not readily available. Delays in obtaining these data have caused digital map production for approximately 6% of the U.S. population to be delayed or placed on hold in FY06.				

Recommended Action:	FEMA issued guidance in September 2006 that allows mapping partners to issue preliminary flood maps while communities and levee owners gather documentation to demonstrate that levees provide adequate flood protection. Hurricanes Katrina and Rita impacted many communities scheduled to receive digital flood maps in FY05 and FY06. Many areas were put on hold to reassess the floodplain delineations and incorporate new information. Some communities received preliminary maps in FY06. However, many communities, approximately 1% of the U.S. population, did not receive preliminary maps due in part to technical issues encountered while performing new analyses. FEMA addressed these issues by updating the Guidelines and Specifications and worked with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to improve storm surge modeling procedures which are being applied to map coastal hazards in Louisiana and Mississippi. FEMA projects the 50% mark will be achieved in 1st quarter FY07.
---------------------	--

Performance Measure:	Number of communities taking or increasing action to reduce their risk of natural or man-made disaster				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	750	735	585	1555	Met
Description:	The number of American communities who have taken action or increased their measures to reduce the risk of a natural or man-made disaster, thus protecting American citizens.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Because of the extraordinary commitment of time and personnel required in response to Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma, which struck at the end of fiscal year 2005, the Risk Reduction Branch coordinated with FEMA's Individual Assistance programs and National Emergency Management Information System (NEMIS) developers to make millions of property addresses damaged by hurricanes available in support of the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. This accomplishment is saving the government in staff time and resources, promoting increased efficiency, and ensuring greater data and reporting integrity. In addition, 3 Electronic-Grants External System Training Workshops were delivered in February and March of 2006. State and local participants were trained on developing and submitting grant applications, accepting grant award packages, and preparing and submitting quarterly reports.				

Performance Measure:	Potential property losses, disasters, and other costs avoided				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	\$1.949B	\$1.895	\$2.27B	2.3B	Met
Description:	The estimated dollar value of losses to the American public which were avoided or averted through flood insurance. Losses are avoided to property (buildings and infrastructure) through the provision of: 1) Financial and technical assistance to States, Territories, Tribes, and communities authorities to implement pre-identified, cost-effective mitigation measures (via Hazard Mitigation Assistance); 2) Sound flood hazard management at States, Territories, Tribes, and communities (Floodplain Management); 3) State-of-the-art building science technologies, guidance and expertise for natural and man-made hazards (Disaster-Resistant Building Sciences), thus protecting American citizens from disasters through assistance, education, and technology.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The Risk Reduction Branch assisted the Regional Offices with over 900 map adoptions in fiscal year 2006, representing a 63% increase over fiscal year 2005 also enrolling 185 communities into the National Flood Insurance Program. The Severe Repetitive Loss program was developed to develop incentives for States and communities to mitigate severe repetitive loss properties.				

Objective/s Supported:	3.7 - Strengthen nationwide preparedness and mitigation against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies.
Program:	Mitigation - Federal Emergency Management Agency

Performance Goal:	Help ensure the nation is ready to respond to and recover from acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies through implementation of the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the provision of emergency management training.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of respondents reporting they are better prepared to deal with disasters and emergencies as a result of training				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	83%	84.3%	80%	90%	Met
Description:	The percentage of students attending training at the Emergency Management Institute (EMI) and FEMA's Employee Development program who responded to a survey and indicated that they are better prepared to deal with disasters and emergencies as a result of the training they received. Respondents may answer "yes," "no," or "no opportunity since completing the training." This training provides Federal, State, local and tribal officials having key emergency responsibilities with the knowledge and skills needed to strengthen nationwide preparedness and respond to, recover from, and mitigate against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	This measure currently represents a roll-up of both EMI training data and FEMA's Employee Development training program. The original target also includes the National Fire Academy training data which has since transferred out of FEMA.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of Federal, State, Local and Tribal Governments compliant with the National Incident Management System (NIMS)				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	82%	100%	100%	Met
Description:	This measure tracks the percentage of critical partners who are compliant with the National Incident Management System (NIMS). Federal Agencies were required to identify a point of contact within their agency to act as a liaison with NIMS Integration Center (NIC), create a NIMS Implementation Plan, incorporate NIMS into their respective Emergency operations Plans, and train all appropriate personnel in the NIMS standard training curriculum. States are required to submit self-certification of compliance based on 23 compliance requirements in the NIMCAST system. The DHS Office of Grants and Training (OG&T) and the NIC coordinate to monitor the previous year's submission of NIMS implementation within States. Selective data audits, field monitoring and continuous refinements on reporting metrics to identify inconsistencies and errors are used to ensure reliability.				

Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The self-certification process was chosen for the first two years of the program to allow State and local governments to receive adequate technical assistance and support to meet NIMS compliance requirements. Full NIMS implementation is a multi-year phase-in process with important linkages to the National Response Plan (NRP) and the National Preparedness Goal. Beginning in FY 2007, compliance will be performance-based and will be monitored by the DHS Office of Grants and Training (OGT). While compliance in FY 2005 and FY 2006 was through a self-certification system, compliance with a performance-based metrics system, which will come on line in 2007.
Objective/s Supported:	3.7 - Strengthen nationwide preparedness and mitigation against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies.
Program:	Readiness - Federal Emergency Management Agency

Performance Goal:	Ensure all Federal Departments and Agencies have fully operational Continuity of Operations (COOP) and Continuity of Government (COG) capabilities.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of fully operational Continuity of Government (COG) capabilities				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	75%	20%	70%	70%	Met
Description:	The percentage of federal departments and agencies that have developed and exercise plans to ensure the continuity of government operations and essential functions in the event of crisis or disaster.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Current Continuity of Government (COG) operational capability has been achieved through successful implementation of a quarterly interagency test, training & exercise program in accordance with current policy.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of Federal Departments and Agencies with fully operational Continuity of Operations (COOP) capabilities				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	70%	90%	95%	95%	Met
Description:	The Federal Emergency Management Agency (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.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The implementation of a successful Continuity of Operations (COOP) capability was demonstrated by Federal Departments and Agencies, as listed in the COOP Deployment Options Matrix, during Forward Challenge 2006. Federal Departments and Agencies successfully completed an alert and notification test, deployed emergency relocation teams, and tested the ability to perform essential functions from an alternate facility.				
Objective/s Supported:	3.5 - Ensure the continuity of government operations and essential functions in the event of crisis or disaster.				
Program:	National Security - Federal Emergency Management Agency				

Performance Goal:	Complete and continuous law enforcement and security protection of federally controlled facilities, their tenants, and the visiting public.				
Performance Measure:	Effectiveness of Federal Protective Service Operations measured by the Federal Facilities Security Index				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	92%	100%	66.5%	Not Met
Description:	The Federal Facilities Security Index quantifies the overall effectiveness of FPS operations in accomplishing annual performance measurement goals. The index is made up of three components that will reflect: 1) how effective the FPS is in implementing security threat countermeasures (by comparing actual countermeasure implementation to planned implementation); 2) how well the countermeasures are working (by testing of countermeasures); and 3) how efficient FPS is in responding to incident calls for law enforcement by measuring response time. A security index of one (100%) or greater reflects accomplishment of, or exceeding, performance targets. A security index of less than one reflects failure to meet performance goals to protect government employees and the public from acts of terrorism and other illegal activities, and reduce infrastructure vulnerability from acts of terrorism or other criminal activity.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Based on the FY 2005 results, targets for FY 2006 and out-years have been set and they reflect a range of a six to twenty percent increase in effectiveness. These measures, built upon a risk-based security program will enable FPS to better protect and reduce vulnerabilities in Federal facilities. Planned countermeasure implementation versus actual implementation was estimated to be met 90% of the time. Testing showed countermeasures to be effective 92% of the time. Average actual response time was shown to be 46.62 minutes. The ability of the FPS to meet the previously established performance target for the Federal Facilities Security Index was adversely affected by the unanticipated revenue shortfall and the startup delays inherent in full implementation of the new measures, testing and reporting protocols in FY 2006.				
Recommended Action:	Adjustments have been made to integrate funding and planning for new threat countermeasure projects and the testing and reporting protocols are now fully operational. As such, the FPS is confident that the targets for FY 2007 can be successfully accomplished.				
Objective/s Supported:	3.1 - Protect the public from acts of terrorism and other illegal activities. 3.2 - Reduce infrastructure vulnerability from acts of terrorism. 3.5 - Ensure the continuity of government operations and essential functions in the event of crisis or disaster.				
Program:	Protection of Federal Assets-Federal Protective Service - United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement				

Performance Goal:	Strengthen the Nation's capacity to prepare for and respond to natural or other disasters.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of recommendations made by reviewing authorities (i.e., IG, OMB, GAO) that are implemented within 1 year.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	100%	90%	Est. 95%	Estimated - Met
Description:	This measure assesses the progress of National Preparedness Task Force (NPTF) programs in implementing recommendations from independent reviewing authorities. Successful implementation of these recommendations demonstrates NPTF's progress in improving the management and performance of its programs. NPTF collects information on recommendations made by independent reviewing authorities and evaluates which recommendations have been implemented within one year.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Fiscal year 2006 actual results for this measure are estimated and are expected to meet the 90% target. Because recommendations are made by reviewing authorities throughout the fiscal year, data on the percent implemented within one year will not be fully available until the end of FY 2007. The NPTF has already made significant progress on this measure, identifying 19 of 20 recommendations that are either completed or nearly completed. Actual FY 2006 results will be reported in the FY 2007 Performance and Accountability Report.				
Objective/s Supported:	3.2 - Reduce infrastructure vulnerability from acts of terrorism. 3.7 - Strengthen nationwide preparedness and mitigation against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies.				
Program:	National Preparedness Integration and Coordination - Preparedness				

Performance Goal:	Protect the Nation's high risk and most valued critical infrastructure and key resources (CI/KR) by characterizing and prioritizing assets, modeling and planning protective actions, building partnerships, and issuing targeted infrastructure protection grants.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of high-priority critical infrastructure/key resources (CI/KR) sites at which a vulnerability assessment (VA) has been conducted				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	14%	15%	15%	Met
Description:	Percentage of the nation's high priority critical infrastructure of key resource sites for which assessments of vulnerability have been conducted in order to identify suitable protective measures needed to reduce vulnerability from acts of terrorism, and make corresponding resource allocation decisions.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Of the high priority CI/KR sites (as currently defined), over 15% have had a vulnerability assessment conducted within the past three years, using Risk Management Division (RMD) resources. The results of these assessments provide a key input into the protective action selection process as well as into sector and cross-sector risk analyses.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program communities with a nuclear power plant that are fully capable of responding to an accident originating at the site.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	Met
Description:	Percentage of U.S. communities surrounding a nuclear power plant that are capable of responding to an accident originating at the site improving their ability to respond to and recover from terrorist attacks.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Meets the mission requirement to ensure the emergency preparedness capabilities of communities surrounding nuclear power plants.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of goals and objectives identified in Regional Transit Security Strategies addressed by grantee projects				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	53%	No data	Not Met
Description:	Percentage of goals and objectives identified in Regional Transit Security Strategies that are being addressed by grant recipients improving their ability to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks. Measurement of progress toward identified goals and objectives compares actual implementation data against planned implementation deadlines reported in the strategies.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	There is no data available to support this measure. The requirement that grantees meet goals and objectives identified in the Regional Transit Security Strategies was removed from the grant guidance sent out to applicants. This measure is unsupported in the absence of that requirement.				
Recommended Action:	Grants and Training is in the process of establishing new performance measures for FY 2007 that will assess grant recipients efforts to improve their ability to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of high-priority critical infrastructure for which a Buffer Zone Protection Plan (BZPP) has been implemented.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	18%	28%	58%	Met
Description:	Percentage of the Nation's high priority critical infrastructure for which a Buffer Zone Protection Plan (BZPP) has been implemented to reduce specific vulnerabilities by developing protective measures that extend from the critical infrastructure site to the surrounding community to deny terrorists an operational environment.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	These "outside the fence" BZP Plans involve a collaborative effort among facility operators and community first responders to identify site vulnerabilities and then use this information to select and prioritize an effective set of protective actions. This structured approach aides in identifying personnel, equipment and training needs and it supports federal grant processing.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of identified high-priority critical infrastructure/key resources sites at which at least two suitable protective actions (PA) have been implemented.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	10%	14%	Met
Description:	Percentage of the Nation's critical infrastructure or resource sites, which have been designated high risk and highly valued, for which a minimum of two protective actions that are designed to reduce vulnerability from acts of terrorism have been implemented.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Protective actions, whether they involve equipment, personnel, training and/or procedures, directly lead to reduced vulnerability and therefore lower risk. Due to changing threat conditions, lessons-learned, technology advances and the need for balanced protection, assessment and implementation of protective actions must be an on-going effort.				
Objective/s Supported:	1.2 - Identify and assess the vulnerability of critical infrastructure and key assets. 3.2 - Reduce infrastructure vulnerability from acts of terrorism. 3.7 - Strengthen nationwide preparedness and mitigation against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies.				
Program:	Infrastructure Protection - Preparedness				

Performance Goal:	Improve the security of America's cyber and emergency preparedness telecommunications assets by working collaboratively with public, private, and international entities.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of targeted stakeholders who participate in or obtain cyber security products and services.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	50%	92%	Met
Description:	This measure assesses the impact of National Cyber Security Division (NCSA) activities targeting multiple stakeholders and NCSA's success in building effective partnerships with its stakeholders. As NCSA is able to reach a greater number of organizations and individuals, their awareness of the need to and the means of protecting cyber space increases and they act to implement NCSA recommendations to improve cyber space.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	This measure counts the overall number of cyber security products and services NCSA produces and delivers, for the purpose of reducing vulnerabilities and minimizing the severity of cyber attacks. The stakeholders who receive these products and services include Federal agencies; state, local and tribal governments; non-governmental organizations such as industry and academia; and individual users. As NCSA is able to reach a greater number of organizations and individuals, their awareness of the need to and the means of protecting cyber space increases and they act to implement NCSA recommendations to improve cyber space.				

Performance Measure:	As stated in the Fiscal Year 2005 Annual Performance Plan: Government Emergency Telecommunications (GETS) call completion rate during periods of network congestion. Reworded to clarify measurement: Government Emergency Telecommunications Service (GETS) call completion rate during periods of network congestion.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	95.5%	90%	97.8	Met
Description:	Percentage of calls made using the GETS service during times of network congestion that are successfully completed. The percentage compares calls completed to calls attempted. This measure applies only to significant disasters and/or emergencies. This ensures effective continuity of government and continuity of operation functions.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	In FY06, the National Communications System (NCS) met its annual outcome measure target with an average 97.8% Call Completion Rate during times of network congestion. To meet this target, the National Communications System (NCS) supervised and coordinated telecommunications restoration and recovery efforts between government and industry during Hurricanes Rita and Wilma. The NCS achieved Wireless Priority Service (WPS) Full Operational Capability (FOC) within the Global System for Mobile (GSM) carriers nationwide and increased WPS user subscriptions to over 38,594. NCS increased total distributed Government Emergency Telecommunications Service (GETS) cards to 158,669.				
Objective/s Supported:	3.2 - Reduce infrastructure vulnerability from acts of terrorism.				
Program:	Cyber Security & Telecommunications - Preparedness				

Performance Goal:	Enhance the Nation's preparedness by increasing the capability of states, territories, and local jurisdictions to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorism and all-hazard events through the provision of grants, first responder training, technical assistance, and exercises.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of jurisdictions demonstrating acceptable performance on applicable critical tasks in exercises using Grants and Training approved scenarios.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	40%	60%	35%	Not Met
Description:	Percentage of jurisdictions that demonstrate acceptable performance during exercises on critical tasks identified by the Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation (HSEEP) strengthening nationwide preparedness and mitigation against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies. Measuring improvements in jurisdictions' performance on critical tasks over time reflects the impact of Grants and Training 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 Evaluation Guides (EEGs) 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 EEG.				

Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Fiscal year 2006 results for this measure are below the target. DHS reprioritized direct support exercise funding to support tactical interoperable communications plan (TICP) exercises and hurricane preparedness exercises. This reprioritization of exercise activities resulted in a smaller-than-expected number of direct support exercises, limiting the sample size for this measure. In addition, the continued promulgation of HSEEP resulted in jurisdictions exercising more challenging scenarios with more rigorous evaluation criteria, producing results that did not meet the target.
Recommended Action:	The National Exercise Program (NEP) expects to fund direct support exercises for State and local jurisdictions at typical levels in FY 2007, increasing the sample size of exercises for this measure. In addition, the NEP is planning to release new HSEEP EEGs in FY 2007, leading to improved understanding and evaluation of exercise performance. As a result, DHS anticipates that critical task performance results will improve next year.

Performance Measure:	Percent of state and local homeland security agency grant recipients reporting measurable progress towards identified goals and objectives to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	35%	90%	61.8	Not Met
Description:	Percentage of state and local homeland security agency grant recipients who report measurable progress toward the goals and objectives identified in individual State Homeland Security Strategies thus strengthening nationwide preparedness and mitigation against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies. Demonstrating progress towards identified goals and objectives illustrates improvements in the abilities of State and local homeland security grant recipients to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks. Measurement of progress towards identified goals and objectives is based on project implementation data as reported by grant recipients in Biannual Strategy Implementation Reports (BSIRs).				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	61.8% for State HS grants: The average progress score is 3.09 out of 5.00 (3.09/5.00=61.8%) -This number represents a sub-set of FY 2006 state monitoring reports that have been fully approved through FY 2006 Q4. The number represents the average progress score of the goals contained within the state homeland security strategies. Progress was measured on a scale of 0-5 with the following criteria: 0 = No effort or system underway nor recognition of the need; 1 = Recognition of the need but no effort or resources to accomplish the output; 2 = Initial efforts and resources underway to achieve the output; 3 = Moderate progress towards accomplishing the output; 4 = Sustained efforts underway and output nearly fulfilled; 5 = Output achieved and resources devoted to sustain the effort.				
Recommended Action:	This is a new measure which was baselined in FY 2006. The target was set prior to the measure being baselined and methods of collecting data being established. Therefore, the result was an unrealistic target and results not being met. However, with new baseline data more realistic targets will be set and more feasible collection methods will be used to ensure better performance.				

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.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	8%	90%	64.8	Not Met
Description:	Percentage of urban area grant recipients who report measurable progress toward the goals and objectives identified in individual Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies, thus strengthening preparedness and mitigation against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies. Demonstrating progress towards identified goals and objectives illustrates improvements in the abilities of urban area grant recipients to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks. Measurement of progress towards identified goals and objectives is based on project implementation data as reported by grant recipients in Biannual Strategy Implementation Reports (BSIRs).				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	64.8% for UASI: The average progress score is 3.24 out of 5.00 (3.24/5.00=64.8%) - This number represents a sub-set of FY 2006 urban area monitoring reports that have been fully approved through FY 2006 Q4. The number represents the average progress score of the goals contained within the urban area homeland security strategies. Progress was measured on a scale of 0-5 with the following criteria: 0 = No effort or system underway nor recognition of the need; 1 = Recognition of the need but no effort or resources to accomplish the output; 2 = Initial efforts and resources underway to achieve the output; 3 = Moderate progress towards accomplishing the output; 4 = Sustained efforts underway and output nearly fulfilled; 5 = Output achieved and resources devoted to sustain the effort.				
Recommended Action:	This is a new measure which was baselined in FY 2006. The target was set prior to the measure being baselined and methods of collecting data being established. Therefore, the result was an unrealistic target and results not being met. However, with new baseline data more realistic targets will be set and more feasible collection methods will be used to ensure better performance.				

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.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	38.5%	38%	27%	Estimated - Not Met
Description:	Percentage of state and local homeland security professionals, who report improvements in knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA) after the completion of training, strengthening first responder preparedness and mitigation against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies. Measuring these improvements indicates the impact of training services on the nation's preparedness level.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The Training Division offers fewer awareness courses than before (see above). Students in awareness level courses traditionally test lower on pre-tests and higher on post-tests than in performance level courses, which results in higher percentage gains in KSAs. Since the Training Division offers fewer awareness level courses and more performance level courses than it did prior to the advent of the decentralized initiative, test scores overall are reflecting lower gains in KSAs.				

Recommended Action:	The Training Division is revisiting the level 2 assessments administered for its courses and is also currently refining its measures and targets for FY 2007 to reflect policy and operational changes. Level 1 assessments are measures of how participants in a training program react to it. It attempts to answer questions regarding the participants' perceptions of the training. Level 2 assessments move beyond learner satisfaction and assess the extent students have advanced in knowledge, skills, or abilities. Measurement at this level is more difficult and laborious than level one. Methods range from formal to informal testing to team assessment and self-assessment. If possible, participants take the test or assessment before the training (pretest) and after training (post test) to determine the amount of learning that has occurred.
---------------------	--

Performance Measure:	Percentage of homeland security strategies that are compliant with DHS planning requirements at the submission date.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	50%	89.4%	Met
Description:	Percentage improvement in the thoroughness and completeness of homeland security strategies submitted by state and urban area jurisdictions to the Office of Grants and Training (G&T). The measure reflects the Technical Assistance Program's goal of strengthening and improving the homeland security strategy process, which will enhance the Nation's preparedness by increasing the capability of states, territories, and local jurisdictions to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorism and all-hazard events. Data for this measure are derived from G&T's review board process through which updated homeland security strategies are reviewed and approved.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	During FY 2006, 104 strategies were submitted for review. Based on G&T's established strategy review board process, 35 were approved without any changes required and 58 were conditionally approved based on minor changes required, therefore 93 of 104 (89.4%) were approved upon submission.				
Objective/s Supported:	3.7 - Strengthen nationwide preparedness and mitigation against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies.				
Program:	Grants, Training & Exercises - Preparedness				

Performance Goal:	Ensure a coordinated and unified approach to represent medical readiness among the United States health community by providing data-driven, scientifically based policy and advice to advocate public health needs.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of agencies providing timely bio-surveillance information to National Biosurveillance Integration System (NBIS).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	15%	15%	Met
Description:	Percentage of agencies that provide information to NBIS, enabling capability assessment, strategic planning, and real time information needed by the Nation's medical personnel to provide aid in response to terrorist threats and incidents.				

Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Foundation was laid for cooperation with the Department of Defense, Department of State, Department of Interior, Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. A Memorandum of Understanding was developed to formalize information sharing and personnel support requirements.
Objective/s Supported:	3.7 - Strengthen nationwide preparedness and mitigation against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies.
Program:	Medical Coordination - Preparedness

Performance Goal:	Maximize the health and safety of the public and firefighting personnel against fire and fire-related hazards by providing assistance to fire departments and by training the Nation's fire responders and health care personnel to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from fire-related events.				
Performance Measure:	Percent reduction in the rate of loss of life from fire-related events.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	18%	4% See explanation	Estimated - Not Met
Description:	To reduce the percentage in the rate of loss of life from fire-related events using the baseline of 13.5 deaths per million population in the year 2000.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	In FY 2000 the United States Fire Administration established a long-term, ten-year performance goal of 30% reduction in the rate of loss of life from fire-related events (3% reduction per year). Therefore, the target for FY 2006 was set at 18%. The information is collected by the National Center for Health Statistics which uses census data. Given the time it takes to collect and publish census data, USFA will be unable to calculate the FY 2006 actual until April 2009. Therefore, the 4% published in the FY 2006 field reflects the FY 2003 actual which is the most current data available. The target for FY 2003 was 9%. Given that the FY 2003 target was not met, it is estimated that the FY 2006 target of 18% will also not be met.				
Recommended Action:	Pending the availability of funding, the USFA will work to target its technical support and training programs so that at risk populations receive the resources they need to help reduce the loss of life from fire-related events.				

Performance Measure:	Ratio of on-scene fire incident injuries to total number of active firefighters				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	3.4%	3.4%	Met
Description:	Percentage of firefighters injured on the scene as compared with the total number of the Nation's firefighters. This measure assesses improvements in firefighter safety in jurisdictions receiving Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG) funds to maximize the health and safety of firefighting personnel against fire and fire-related hazards by providing assistance to fire departments and by training the Nation's fire department personnel to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from fire-related events. The ratio of firefighter injuries to active firefighters reflects the effectiveness of AFG funds in promoting firefighter safety through its support for firefighter training, wellness programs, and protective equipment.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Calculation Based upon USFA estimate of 1.1 million firefighters, FY 2004. Based on NFPA annual report reflecting 2004 data, next NFPA report will be released Q1 FY07				

Objective/s Supported:	3.7 - Strengthen nationwide preparedness and mitigation against acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies.
Program:	Fire and Emergency Assistance - Preparedness

Performance Goal:	Achieve sustained fisheries regulation compliance on our Nation's Oceans.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of fishermen complying with federal regulations.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	96.3%	96.4%	97%	96.6%	Not Met
Description:	Percentage of U.S. Coast Guard boardings of domestic fishing vessels without significant violations of Federal regulations being found (those that result in significant damage or impact to the fisheries resource, provide significant monetary advantage to the violator, or have high regional or national interest), divided by the total number of USCG domestic fishing vessel boardings. The measure is an observed compliance rate, as boardings are not random; vessels deemed a higher likelihood of being in violation receive a higher boarding priority. Boardings and violations are documented by USCG Report of Boarding Forms. The Marine Inspection and Law Enforcement Database maintains this data. The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act specifically task the Coast Guard with enforcing fisheries regulations. Observed Compliance rate documents the effectiveness of at-sea enforcement to advance conservation and management of living marine resources and their environment.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Concerted enforcement efforts ensured compliance rate was exceptionally close to the aggressive FY 2006 target. Lower observed compliance rates primarily in the Atlantic are responsible for an overall rate below 97%. Three-fourths of all significant violations are attributed to three fisheries: over 50% of all significant violations occurred in the Atlantic sea scallop and Northeast groundfish fisheries, with the remaining 25% occurring in the Gulf of Mexico/South Atlantic shrimp fishery. Complex, ever-changing fisheries regulations in the Northeast, particularly when combined with days at sea restrictions, produced strong incentives to violate the regulations, which contributed to a steady number of violations. Several years of poor economic conditions in the shrimp fisheries, and effects of the 2005 hurricane season, create a strong incentive for fishers to disregard regulations. For the second year in a row, total CG fisheries boardings topped 6000.				
Recommended Action:	The Coast Guard will continue to adapt to trends in violations and allocate additional resources to those fisheries that experience the highest incidence of illegal use. This provides a deterrent to illegal fishing, and should lead to an increase in compliance with federal regulations.				
Objective/s Supported:	1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence. 1.4 - Develop a Common Operating Picture for domestic situational awareness, including air, land, and sea. 3.6 - Protect the marine environment and living marine resources.				
Program:	Living Marine Resources (LMR) - United States Coast Guard				

Performance Goal:	Reduce homeland security risk in the maritime domain.				
Performance Measure:	Ports, Waterways, and Coastal Security Risk Index reduction to that terror related Maritime Risk the Coast Guard is able to impact				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	3.4%	14%	18%	Met
Description:	<p>This is a risk-based outcome measure that involves the scoring (by maritime security representatives) of likely high-consequence maritime terrorist attack scenarios with respect to threat, vulnerability, and consequence. Such scoring generates an index number level of "raw risk" that exists in the maritime domain. Next, Coast Guard incremental interventions (both operational and regulatory regime activities) that have taken place throughout the fiscal year are scored against the attack scenarios with regard to the percent decrease in threat, vulnerability and consequence that each has been estimated to have afforded. The resultant measure shows the change in "raw risk" (due, in large part, to things outside of the Coast Guard's ability to control) and the reduction in total risk the Coast Guard estimates that it has affected. Note: in the FY 2006 Plan printing the complete measure statement was not shown through clerical error but is correctly stated in this report.</p>				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	<p>In FY 2006, the Coast Guard met its goal of reducing, by at least 14%, the risk due to terrorism in the maritime domain that it is able to impact. Examples of new or enhanced initiatives aimed at improved maritime risk reduction include: a comprehensive update to Neptune Shield (the Combating Maritime Terrorism (CMT) field operational order); verification of 78% of the uninspected vessel fleet for security compliance; operational testing of explosive screening technology for ferries; enhancements to the Maritime Law Enforcement Academy facility and curriculum; promulgation of Maritime Sentinel (a strategic campaign plan for CMT); creation of the National Maritime Recovery Symposium; and the implementation of the Maritime Security Risk Analysis Model, a tool that allows local and regional assessment of infrastructure-focused security risk. FY 2006 also marked the Coast Guard's assumption of duties associated with air intercept support for defense of the National Capital Region.</p>				
Objective/s Supported:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence. 1.4 - Develop a Common Operating Picture for domestic situational awareness, including air, land, and sea. 2.1 - Secure our borders against terrorists, means of terrorism, illegal drugs and violations of trade and immigration laws. 2.5 - Strengthen the security of the Nations transportation systems. 3.1 - Protect the public from acts of terrorism and other illegal activities. 4.1 - Reduce the loss of life and property by strengthening response readiness. 4.2 - Provide scalable and robust all-hazard response capability. 				
Program:	Ports Waterways and Coastal Security (PWCS) - United States Coast Guard				

Performance Goal:	Protect our nation's leaders and other protectees.				
Performance Measure:	Percentage of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	100%	100%	100%	100%	Met
Description:	The percentage of travel stops where our nation's leaders and other protectees arrive and depart safely. The security of protectees is the ultimate priority of the Secret Service; therefore, all necessary resources are utilized before and during a protective assignment in order to provide the highest-quality protection the Secret Service demands for all protectees. The performance target is always 100%. Anything under 100% is unacceptable.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The Domestic Protectees Program met its target of providing incident-free protection for the Nation's leaders and other protectees by ensuring their safety at 4,400 travel stops. Travel stops are a count of cities or other definable subdivisions visited by a protectee. The Domestic Protectees Program achieved its goal by coordinating with all federal, state and local agencies to develop and implement seamless security plans that created a safe and secure environment for the Nation's leaders and other protectees.				
Objective/s Supported:	3.4 - Secure the physical safety of the President, Vice President, visiting world leaders and other protectees.				
Program:	Domestic Protectees (DP) - United States Secret Service				

Performance Goal:	Protect visiting world leaders.				
Performance Measure:	Percentage of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely - Foreign Dignitaries.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	100%	100%	100%	100%	Met
Description:	The percentage of travel stops where visiting world leader protectees safely arrive and depart. The security of protectees is the ultimate priority of the Secret Service; therefore, all necessary resources are utilized before and during a protective assignment in order to provide the highest-quality protection the Secret Service demands for all protectees. The performance target is always 100%. Anything under 100% is unacceptable.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions Program met its target of providing incident-free protection for visiting world leaders by ensuring the safety of these protectees at 1,875 travel stops during FY 2006. Travel stops are a count of cities or other definable subdivisions visited by a protectee, which can fluctuate depending on the frequency and pace of world leaders' visits to the United States. The Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions Program utilized a wide-variety of security measures, and coordinated with military and federal, state, local, and international law enforcement agencies to guarantee the safety of its protectees.				
Objective/s Supported:	3.4 - Secure the physical safety of the President, Vice President, visiting world leaders and other protectees.				
Program:	Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions (FP/FM) - United States Secret Service				

Performance Goal:	Reduce threats posed by global terrorists and other adversaries.				
Performance Measure:	Number of Protective Intelligence Cases Completed.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	3,992	4,614	4,000	4,164	Met
Description:	The total number of intelligence cases completed by agents assigned to field operations. These cases generally represent an assessment of individuals or groups who have threatened a protectee of the Secret Service.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The Protective Intelligence Program evaluated protective-related intelligence on groups, subjects and activities that pose threats to protected individuals, facilities or events. Through their efforts, the Protective Intelligence Program investigated all potential threats helping to ensure the security of protectees, facilities and events under its protection.				
Objective/s Supported:	3.4 - Secure the physical safety of the President, Vice President, visiting world leaders and other protectees.				
Program:	Protective Intelligence (PI) - United States Secret Service				

Performance Goal:	Reduce losses to the public attributable to counterfeit currency, other financial crimes, and identity theft crimes that are under the jurisdiction of the Secret Service, which threaten the integrity of our currency and the reliability of financial payment systems worldwide.				
Performance Measure:	Counterfeit Passed per Million Dollars of Genuine U.S. Currency.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	\$60	\$80	\$74	\$81	Not Met
Description:	The dollar value of counterfeit notes passed on the public per million dollars of genuine currency. This measure is calculated by dividing the dollar value of counterfeit notes passed by the dollar value of genuine currency in circulation, multiplied by \$1 million. This measure is an indicator of the proportion of counterfeit currency relative to the amount of genuine U.S. Currency in circulation, and reflects our efforts to reduce financial losses to the public attributable to counterfeit currency.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The Financial Investigations Program did not meet its goal of restricting counterfeit currency in circulation to under \$74 per \$1 million of genuine U.S. Currency. The target represents an estimate, and the actual amount can fluctuate due to many factors including an increase in the currency replicable by commercially-available off-the-shelf technology. The amount this year of \$81 per \$1 million of genuine currency represents less than one ten-thousandth of one percent of circulating genuine U.S. currency, and shows the commitment of the Secret Service to reduce the amount of counterfeit currency in circulation.				
Recommended Action:	The Financial Investigations Program is committed to reducing the amount of counterfeit currency passed on to the public. The Secret Service will continue to be active in the development and proliferation of counterfeit detection countermeasures to combat new methods of counterfeiting. The Secret Service is very proactive in educating our partners in the banking and financial crime community, as well as the public in general, both domestically and internationally, on counterfeiting trends, and will continue to disrupt counterfeiting activities through their criminal investigations and work toward the program's annual targets.				

Performance Measure:	Financial Crimes Loss Prevented (Billions).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	\$1.7	\$1.8	\$1.5	\$1.23	Not Met
Description:	An estimate of the direct dollar loss to the public that was prevented due to Secret Service intervention or interruption of a criminal venture through a criminal investigation. This estimate is based on the likely amount of financial crime that would have occurred had the offender not been identified nor the criminal enterprise disrupted, and reflects our efforts to reduce financial losses to the public attributable to financial crimes.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The Financial Investigations Program did not meet its goal of preventing at least \$1.5 billion in losses attributable to financial crimes. Although the target for FY 2006 was not met, the Financial Investigations Program did prevent \$1.23 billion in losses, which was achieved through conducting criminal investigations, and leveraging the investigative partnerships found in both electronic and financial crime task forces, to intervene and disrupt criminal ventures. The actual amount of loss prevented can fluctuate due to a number of factors including the number of referrals by victims, the increasing complexity of financial crime cases and U.S. Attorney thresholds. The Financial Investigations Program is committed to reducing losses to the public that are attributable to financial crimes and identity theft.				
Recommended Action:	The Financial Investigations Program will continue to be proactive in their approach to disrupting financial crimes. The program understands the importance of building relationships with other law enforcement agencies, private industry and academia, and will continue to work with their partners to identify emerging domestic and international criminal enterprises to prevent losses attributable to financial crimes and achieve the program's annual targets.				
Objective/s Supported:	3.3 - Protect our Nations financial infrastructure against crimes, to include currency and financial payment systems.				
Program:	Financial Investigations (FI) - United States Secret Service				

Performance Goal:	Reduce losses to the public attributable to electronic crimes and crimes under the jurisdiction of the Secret Service that threaten the integrity and reliability of the critical infrastructure of the country.				
Performance Measure:	Financial Crimes Loss Prevented.(Millions)				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	\$150	\$556.2	\$150	\$315.9	Met
Description:	An estimate of the direct dollar loss to the public that was prevented due to investigations by Secret Service Electronic Crimes Task Forces throughout the United States, which were established pursuant to the USA PATRIOT Act. This estimate is based on the likely amount of electronic financial crime that would have occurred had the offender not been identified nor the criminal enterprise disrupted. This measure reflects our efforts to reduce financial losses to the public attributable to electronic crimes.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The Infrastructure Investigations Program met its target of preventing at least \$150 million in losses attributable to electronic financial crimes. Through the use of its Electronic Crimes Task Forces, the Secret Service prevented \$315.9 million in losses, which was achieved through the successful proactive investigations of computer-related and telecommunications crimes. This led to the intervention or interruption of criminal ventures.				
Objective/s Supported:	3.3 - Protect our Nations financial infrastructure against crimes, to include currency and financial payment systems.				
Program:	Infrastructure Investigations - United States Secret Service				

Strategic Goal 4 – Response

The focus of this strategic goal is to lead, manage and coordinate the national response to acts of terrorism, natural disasters and other emergencies. The objectives established by the Department to achieve this goal are provided below.

Objective 4.1 - Reduce the loss of life and property by strengthening response readiness.

Objective 4.2 - Provide scalable and robust all-hazard response capability.

Objective 4.3 - Provide search and rescue services to people and property in distress.

Detailed information concerning actual performance during fiscal year 2006 to achieve this goal is provided below.

Performance Goal:	Ensure the capability and readiness of all FEMA disaster response teams and logistics capabilities to respond quickly and effectively to provide assistance when and where needed.				
Performance Measure:	Average percent of response teams reported at operational status.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	50%	85%	85%	Met
Description:	The percentage of FEMA's response teams indicating they are ready to respond quickly and effectively to acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies. This measure tracks the readiness of four types of teams: the 52 Disaster Medical Assistance Teams (DMATs) within the National Disaster Medical System (NDMS); the 28 task forces of Urban Search and Rescue (US&R); the five Mobile Emergency Response Support (MERS) detachments, and the two Federal Incident Response Support Teams (FIRSTs).				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	This performance measure was designed to measure the overall operational level of specialized Federal response teams providing assistance in terms of situation monitoring and coordination, as well as, providing direct medical aid to disaster victims. Federal response teams included in this measure are Urban Search & Rescue (US&R), National Disaster Medical System (NDMS) teams, Federal Initial Response Teams (FIRST), and Mobile Emergency Response Services (MERS) detachments. These entities provide support to State and local authorities in, and handle the myriad coordination, monitoring and rescue duties generated by particular disaster situations. In order to be truly effective in meeting the needs of communities and disaster victims, team operational level targets must be ambitious. An increased percentage of operational teams equates to more lives saved, reduced response time, and greater continuity of services and enhanced logistical capability.				

Performance Measure:	Average response time in hours for emergency response teams to arrive on scene.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	50	22	48	25	Met
Description:	The average number of hours elapsed for deployment of FEMA's response teams to the field in the event of natural disasters and other emergencies. These teams include the National Disaster Medical System (NDMS), the Urban Search and Rescue (US&R), Mobile Emergency Response Support System (MERS), and the Federal Initial Response Support Teams (FIRSTs). For life-saving and other emergency response efforts, the hours immediately following a disaster are the most critical, and these teams must respond quickly and effectively to provide assistance when and where needed.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The faster response time in FY05 is due to emergency response teams already positioned in the region (due to hurricane Katrina) when hurricane Rita made landfall.				

Performance Measure:	Average time in hours to provide essential logistical services to an impacted community of 50,000 or fewer.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	65	60	63.5	Not Met
Description:	The average response time in hours to provide essential logistical services to a community of 50,000 or less, in the event of a natural disaster or other emergency. Logistical services provided to communities include ice, water, meals ready to eat, and other commodities. Start time is measured from the driver pick up time and end time is measured as delivery to the destination.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	This objective measures the length of time in hours it takes an impacted community of 50,000 or fewer to receive essential logistical services. This result was measured from the time a requisition for commodities is received until they arrive on scene. This performance measure is beneficial to FEMA's support of State and local governments, and ultimately disaster victims, by providing an established timeframe in which life-saving and life-sustaining commodities are provided to 50,000 disaster victims for a time period of 72 hours.				
Recommended Action:	The target was not met but performance improved in the last three quarters of the year. FEMA will conduct analysis of what can be done to improve response time and address procedures and practices to improve.				
Objective/s Supported:	4.1 - Reduce the loss of life and property by strengthening response readiness. 4.2 - Provide scalable and robust all-hazard response capability.				
Program:	Response - Federal Emergency Management Agency				

Performance Goal:	Save mariners in imminent danger on our Nation's oceans and waterways.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of mariners in imminent danger saved.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	86.8%	86.10%	86% lives saved	85.27%	Not Met
Description:	The percentage of mariners who were in imminent danger on our Nation's oceans and waterways, and whose lives were saved by the Coast Guard. The number of lives lost before and after the Coast Guard is notified is factored into this percentage. Several factors compound the difficulty of successful responses, including untimely notification to the USCG of distress, incorrect reporting of the distress site location, severe weather conditions at the distress site, and distance to the scene. The number of lives saved is the best outcome measure for search and rescue because it includes lives lost both before and after the USCG is notified, thereby encouraging the USCG to invest in supporting systems, like Rescue 21 and safe boater programs, that increase the possibility that a search and rescue mission will end with lives saved.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Search and Rescue performance results are slightly lower than the preceding three years but reflect the same general level of performance. This calculation excludes cases involving over 11 lives (30 cases with a total of 842 lives saved; 1 case with 20 lives lost). A review of the SAR data does not indicate a specific reason the goal was not achieved, but contributing factors include delays in fielding improved SAR capabilities and the uncontrollable variables that influence the number and outcome of SAR incidents (weather, location, incident severity, life saving devices on board, etc.). The Coast Guard also tracks 'Lives Unaccounted For' (LUF) data and will include it with "lives lost" data in the future. Parallel reporting will begin in FY07. Lives Unaccounted For are those persons known to be missing at the end of a SAR response, but no body has been recovered. The goal including LUF is not yet established.				
Recommended Action:	The SAR Program expects to meet its performance goal when improved capabilities such as Rescue 21, new medium response boat and SAROPS come on line in Fiscal Years 2007-2010.				
Objective/s Supported:	1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence. 1.4 - Develop a Common Operating Picture for domestic situational awareness, including air, land, and sea. 4.3 - Provide search and rescue services to people and property in distress.				
Program:	Search and Rescue (SAR) - United States Coast Guard				

Performance Goal:	Eliminate oil spills and chemical discharge incidents.				
Performance Measure:	The five-year average number of U.S. Coast Guard investigated oil spills greater than 100 gallons and chemical discharges into the navigable waters of the U.S. per 100 million short tons of chemical and oil products shipped in U.S. waters.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	22.1	18.5	19 or less	16.3	Estimated - Met
Description:	This measure evaluates how well the Coast Guard prevents discharges of chemicals or oil into U.S. navigable waters by comparing the current period to those of previous periods. A five-year average of current and four previous years' number of chemical spills, and oil spills greater than 100 gallons, discharged into U.S. navigable waters per 100 million short tons of chemicals and oil products shipped. A five-year average is used to dampen the impact of year-to-year variation and to ensure that trends are apparent. Only discharge incidents from maritime sources into U.S. waters are counted. Discharges onto land, into the air, or into enclosed spaces are excluded, as are discharges from non-maritime sources. Discharges from naval and other public vessels; fixed platforms and pipelines, and discharges from unspecified, unclassified, and unknown sources are also excluded. Data are collected from USCG Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement System.				

Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The five-year average number of chemical spills and oil spills greater than 100 gallons declined to 16.3 per 100 million short tons shipped. This achievement represents a continuation in the overall downward trend of oil spills occurring since 1999, and can be attributed to many initiatives including a more thorough assessment of the skills of merchant mariners employed as members of a ship's engineering watch, as well as a more uniform enforcement policy for compliance with the International Safety Management Code that governs such routine ship operations as routine cargo transfers and ship fueling operations. Please note that data for the period that just ended is likely to change, and shipping volumes are a projection—actual shipping data for the period will not be available until the end of 2007.
Objective/s Supported:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence. 1.4 - Develop a Common Operating Picture for domestic situational awareness, including air, land, and sea. 3.6 - Protect the marine environment and living marine resources. 4.1 - Reduce the loss of life and property by strengthening response readiness. 4.2 - Provide scalable and robust all-hazard response capability. 5.2 - Provide scalable and robust all-hazard recovery assistance.
Program:	Marine Environmental Protection (MEP) - United States Coast Guard

Strategic Goal 5- Recovery

The focus of this strategic goal is to lead national, state, local and private-sector efforts to restore services and rebuild communities after acts of terrorism, natural disasters and other emergencies. The objectives established by the Department to achieve this goal are provided below.

Objective 5.1 - Strengthen nationwide recovery plans and capabilities.

Objective 5.2 - Provide scalable and robust all-hazard recovery assistance.

Detailed information concerning actual performance during fiscal year 2006 to achieve this goal is provided below.

Performance Goal:	Help individuals and communities affected by federally declared disasters return to normal function quickly and efficiently, while planning for catastrophic disaster recovery operations.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of customers satisfied with Public Recovery Assistance				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	89.2	Data Not Available	88%	89.2% see explanation	Estimated - Met
Description:	The percentage of communities affected by disaster or other emergency who indicate satisfaction with the Public Disaster Recovery Assistance provided by FEMA to help them return to normal and function quickly and efficiently. Following a Presidential Declaration, Public Assistance is provided through grants to state and local governments and certain private nonprofit organizations for debris removal, emergency protective measures, and repair or replacement of damaged infrastructure.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Quarterly actuals for the percent of customers satisfied are not available for fiscal year 2005 due to the extraordinary commitment of time and personnel required in response to Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma. In addition, the final results of the Public Assistance Program Evaluation and Customer Satisfaction Survey that is conducted for calendar year of 2006 will not be available until February 2007, and will be reported in the 2007 Performance and Accountability Report. Therefore, the 89.2 percent published in the fiscal year 2006 field reflects the fiscal year 2004 actual which is the most current data available. The fiscal year 2004 target was 87 percent. Given that the fiscal year 2004 target was met it is estimated that the fiscal year 2006 target of 88 percent will also be met. The Public Assistance Branch is currently working with contractors to develop a methodology that would allow for quarterly reporting on a real-time basis.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of customers satisfied with Individual Recovery Assistance				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	90.4%	93%	90%	91%	Met
Description:	The percentage of Americans affected by disaster or other emergency who indicate satisfaction with the Individual Disaster Recovery Assistance provided by FEMA to help them return to normal and function quickly and efficiently.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Current year results exceeded the established baseline for the Individual Assistance Program. This well-established customer survey meets all industry standards, including neutrality and random selection. Responses gathered throughout the year from each FY06 declaration are representative of the multitude of disaster assistance customers who received monetary housing and/or other needs assistance through Individual Assistance Programs.				
Objective/s Supported:	5.1 - Strengthen nationwide recovery plans and capabilities. 5.2 - Provide scalable and robust all-hazard recovery assistance.				
Program:	Recovery - Federal Emergency Management Agency				

Strategic Goal 6 – Service

The focus of this strategic goal is to serve the public effectively by facilitating lawful trade, travel and immigration. The objectives established by the Department to achieve this goal are provided below.

- Objective 6.1 - Increase understanding of naturalization, and its privileges and responsibilities.
- Objective 6.2 - Provide efficient and responsive immigration services that respect the dignity and value of individuals.
- Objective 6.3 - Support the United States humanitarian commitment with flexible and sound immigration and refugee programs.
- Objective 6.4 - Facilitate the efficient movement of legitimate cargo and people.

Detailed information concerning actual performance during fiscal year 2006 to achieve this goal is provided below.

Performance Goal:	Eliminate collisions, allisions and groundings by vessels on our Nation's oceans and waterways.				
Performance Measure:	Five-Year Average of Number of Collisions, Allisions, and Groundings (CAG)				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	1,876	1825	1,748 or fewer	1,765	Not Met
Description:	This measure evaluates how well the Coast Guard Waterways Management Programs and Aids to Navigation (AtoN) system prevents collisions, allisions (vessel striking a fixed object), and groundings (CAG) by comparing results from the current period to those of previous periods. This measure is a five-year average of distinct CAG events; figured by summing the number of events for the entire five-year period and dividing by five. A five-year average is used to dampen the impact of year-to-year variation and to ensure that trends are apparent. Data are collected from USCG Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement System.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results	The five-year average number of distinct Collision, Allision and Grounding (CAG) events continues to decline for 2006. Some of this improvement is attributable to the Coast Guard's reorganization along service delivery processes at every level of the organization. In addition to Aids to Navigation, Waterways Management harmonizes other activities including vessel traffic services, bridge administration and Domestic Icebreaking. Effective management of these activities provides for a total systems approach that is inherently more encompassing, efficient and responsive. Continued improvement, including meeting future targets, is expected as our Waterways Management organization becomes increasingly efficient.				
Recommended Action:	Future improvements are expected to result from the Coast Guard's reorganization along service delivery processes at every level of the organization. In addition to Aids to Navigation, the Waterways Management program includes other activities such as vessel traffic services, bridge administration, icebreaking, etc. Management of all of these activities as one service delivery is expected to produce further reductions in CAGs.				
Objective/s Supported:	1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence. 1.4 - Develop a Common Operating Picture for domestic situational awareness, including air, land, and sea. 6.4 - Facilitate the efficient movement of legitimate cargo and people.				
Program:	Aids to Navigation (AtoN) - United States Coast Guard				

Performance Goal:	Maintain operational channels for navigation, limiting channel closures to two days (during average winters) and eight days (during severe winters).				
Performance Measure:	Limit the number of days critical waterways are closed due to ice to 2 days in an average winter and 8 days in a severe winter.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	4 closure days, average winter	0 Closures	2(avg), 8 (severe)	0 Closures	Met
Description:	This measure is an indicator of how well Coast Guard Domestic Ice Operations limit channel closures of critical waterways due to ice. Nine Great Lakes waterways have been identified as critical to icebreaking based on historical ice conditions, volume of ship traffic and potential for flooding—with the St. Mary's River identified as the reference point. The annual total number of days that these critical waterways are forced to close during the winter is measured at this point. Targets for this measure depend on the severity of the winter: no more than 2 closures during average winters, and no more than 8 during severe winters. Winter severity is calculated using the method outlined in the Maximum Freezing Degree-Days as a Winter Severity Index for the Great Lakes, 1897-1977, by Raymond A. Assel.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The Coast Guard's domestic icebreaking mission ensures efficient and reliable waterways availability. This is done by maintaining open waterways, monitoring weather patterns, and consulting with industry stakeholders when channels are at risk for disruptions due to ice. Icebreakers directly assist commercial vessels transiting ice bound waters, perform track maintenance in ice-laden channels and assist the U.S. Army Corps of Engineering in relieving flood conditions resulting from ice on domestic waters. As a result of our effective management, there were no closures of critical waterways recorded in FY 2006 due to ice.				
Objective/s Supported:	1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence. 1.4 - Develop a Common Operating Picture for domestic situational awareness, including air, land, and sea. 6.4 - Facilitate the efficient movement of legitimate cargo and people.				
Program:	Ice Operations - United States Coast Guard				

Performance Goal:	Provide immigration benefit services in a timely, consistent, and accurate manner.				
Performance Measure:	Actual cycle time to process form I-485 (Application to Register for Permanent Residence or to Adjust Status).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	13.9	6 months or less	5.93 months	Met
Description:	<p>The amount of time it takes to provide a decision regarding an I-485, Application to Adjust Status. This is the form used to adjust the permanent legal status of an immigrant, and is one of our highest volume application types. On a monthly basis, performance data on applications received, completed and pending is collected through the Performance Analysis System. Actual Cycle Time is calculated by counting back the number of preceding months until the sum of the monthly receipts equals the current month's End Pending (e.g. if 100 cases are pending and case receipts were 20, 30, 15, 25, and 10 over the past 5 months, then cycle time is 5 months). Applications for which no visa number is available are considered pending, but not part of the backlog. Cases are also removed from the backlog calculation if a Request For Evidence is pending for the regulatory period with the applicant, the applicant has requested a later appearance date, or the required name check is pending with the FBI.</p>				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	<p>For the past two years, USCIS has implemented new initiatives to streamline processes and increase efficiency while maintaining security. As part of these efforts, USCIS has reallocated staff to align resources with workload; redistributed workloads to offices with excess capacity; piloted new processes to find more efficient methods of operations; updated policies and procedures to eliminate duplicative efforts; and initiated systems sweeps to replace inefficient manual queries and increase productivity, while at the same time bolstering process integrity. Forms I-485, Application for Adjustment of Status, and N-400, Application for Naturalization, cycle times represented the greatest challenges for USCIS, since these forms take the longest to complete. Despite the challenges presented, we achieved cycles times below six months for both the I-485 and N-400.</p>				

Performance Measure:	Actual cycle time to process form I-129 (Petition for Nonimmigrant Worker).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	1.5	2 months or less	2 months	Met
Description:	<p>The amount of time it takes for U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to provide a decision regarding an I-129, Petition for Nonimmigrant Worker, that an employer has used to petition for an alien to come to the U.S. temporarily as a nonimmigrant worker. To provide immigration benefit services in a timely manner, on a monthly basis the USCIS collects performance data on applications received, completed and pending through its Performance Analysis System. Actual Cycle Time is calculated by counting back the number of preceding months until the sum of the monthly receipts equals the current month's End Pending (e.g. if 100 cases are pending and case receipts were 20, 30, 15, 25, and 10 over the past 5 months, then cycle time is 5 months).</p>				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	<p>For the past two years, USCIS has implemented new initiatives to streamline processes and increase efficiency while maintaining security. As part of these efforts, USCIS has reallocated staff to align resources with workload; redistributed workloads to offices with excess capacity; piloted new processes to find more efficient methods of operations; updated policies and procedures to eliminate duplicative efforts; and initiated systems sweeps to replace inefficient manual queries and increase productivity, while at the same time bolstering process integrity.</p>				

Performance Measure:	Actual cycle time to process form N-400 (Application for Naturalization).				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	10.9	6 months or less	5.58 months	Met
Description:	The amount of time it takes to make a decision regarding an N-400, Application for Naturalization. On a monthly basis USCIS collects performance data on applications received, completed and pending. Actual Cycle Time is calculated by counting back the number of preceding months until the sum of the monthly receipts equals the current month's End Pending (e.g. if 100 cases are pending and case receipts were 20, 30, 15, 25, and 10 over the past 5 months, then cycle time is 5 months). Cases are removed from the backlog calculation if the applicant has failed the English/Civics requirement and is waiting the statutory period between testing attempts, is awaiting a judicial oath ceremony for more than one month, the required name check is pending with the FBI, or if a Request For Evidence is pending for the regulatory period with the applicant.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	For the past two years, USCIS has implemented new initiatives to streamline processes and increase efficiency while maintaining security. As part of these efforts, USCIS has reallocated staff to align resources with workload; redistributed workloads to offices with excess capacity; piloted new processes to find more efficient methods of operations; updated policies and procedures to eliminate duplicative efforts; and initiated systems sweeps to replace inefficient manual queries and increase productivity, while at the same time bolstering process integrity. Forms I-485, Application for Adjustment of Status, and N-400, Application for Naturalization, cycle times represented the greatest challenges for USCIS, since these forms take the longest to complete. Despite the challenges presented, we achieved cycles times below six months for both the I-485 and N-400.				

Performance Measure:	Number of refugee interviews conducted.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	58,937	up to 90,000	50,199	Met
Description:	The number of refugees seeking resettlement to the U.S. who have been interviewed by an immigration officer to get information about the applicant's claim for refugee status. A person is eligible for resettlement to the United States as a refugee pursuant to Immigration and Nationality Act §207 if he or she is of special humanitarian concern to the United States, is a refugee pursuant to Immigration and Nationality Act §101(a)(42), is not firmly resettled in a third country, and is otherwise admissible to the United States. Such person's spouse and unmarried children also derive refugee resettlement status. The Presidential Determination for FY2006 established a refugee admissions ceiling of 70,000. Approximately 90,000 applications must be adjudicated to meet this ceiling. USCIS uses the State Department's Worldwide Refugee Admissions Processing System to capture performance statistics and ensure that services are provided to refugees in a timely, consistent, and accurate manner.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The FY2006 results were accomplished in 141 overseas circuit rides to approximately 50 countries, 83 (58%) completed by newly trained Refugee Corps officers and 58 (42%) completed mostly by volunteers from the Asylum Corps. USCIS generally adjudicates all of the cases referred to it by the Department of State in a given fiscal year. Performance reported was obtained through the Worldwide Refugee Admissions Processing System (WRAPS), a refugee program database that is maintained by the Department of State.				

Performance Measure:	Percent of asylum reform referrals (at local offices) completed within 60 days of receipt.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	79%	75%	88%	Met
Description:	<p>Asylum is a form of protection that allows refugees to remain in the U.S. Before asylum was reformed in 1995, applicants could obtain work authorization simply by filing for asylum, which made the system vulnerable to abuse. Since asylum reform, work authorization is obtained only if asylum is granted or no negative decision has been made within 180 days. If USCIS finds an applicant ineligible for asylum and the applicant is not in valid/legal status, USCIS refers the application to an immigration judge for final determination in the course of removal proceedings. Immigration courts require approximately 120 days to complete adjudications. To meet the 180 threshold for a decision, USCIS aims to refer 75% of ineligible applications to immigration courts within 60 days of filing. Recognizing that some cases should be exempt due to their complexity or the unavailability of staff at certain times, the program has exempted 25 percent of its workload from this requirement.</p>				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	<p>The Department saw a significant increase over the FY 2005 percentage achieving an 88% mark. Timely completion of asylum cases continues to be a priority for the Asylum Division for the following reasons: timely processing of applications deters individuals from applying for asylum solely to obtain employment authorization; the more timely genuine asylees receive work authorization, the better able they are to support themselves; asylees can more quickly reunite with their families waiting overseas in potentially dangerous situations; and possible security risks can be assessed and identified promptly. In FY 2006, all eight local asylum offices exceeded the 75% timeliness target for asylum case processing. Management has developed a system to schedule new filings for an interview quickly and track cases as they age.</p>				
Objective/s Supported:	<p>2.6 - Ensure the security and integrity of the immigration system. 6.2 - Provide efficient and responsive immigration services that respect the dignity and value of individuals. 6.3 - Support the United States humanitarian commitment with flexible and sound immigration and refugee programs.</p>				
Program:	Adjudication Services - United States Citizenship and Immigration Services				

Performance Goal:	Provide timely, consistent, and accurate information to our customers.				
Performance Measure:	Customer satisfaction rate with USCIS phone centers.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	75.5%	79%	83%	Met
Description:	<p>Percentage of people who obtained immigration services and benefits information from USCIS over the telephone, who have indicated satisfaction with the service they received. On a monthly basis, USCIS selects a random group of customers who have called the phone centers. A contracted company with expertise in conducting phone surveys then calls each customer and conducts a survey to rate their overall experience with the service received from USCIS' phone center. A standardized USCIS and General Accountability Office approved survey tool is used to collect customer responses. This satisfaction rate measures our performance in providing timely, consistent, and accurate information regarding immigration services and benefits to immigrants, U.S. employers, and the American public over the telephone.</p>				

Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	In FY2006, USCIS contracted with a secondary vendor to provide additional capacity within the contract call centers. Combined, our two Tier 1 vendors provided more than 475 Customer Service Representatives to answer customer inquiries. In addition, USCIS improved the scripting used by our contract operations creating a call flow that more accurately directed our telephone representatives to the correct responses, thereby improving the quality of the information provided. USCIS placed a strong emphasis on quality in FY2006 by further expanding the mystery shopper program whereby test calls were placed using specific scenarios to measure vendor performance. These initiatives all contributed to our FY2006 Customer Satisfaction Rating.
Objective/s Supported:	6.2 - Provide efficient and responsive immigration services that respect the dignity and value of individuals.
Program:	Information and Customer Service - United States Citizenship and Immigration Services

Performance Goal:	Enhance educational resources and promote opportunities to support immigrants' integration and participation in American civic culture.				
Performance Measure:	Significant Outreach per FTE				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	21	96	111	Met
Description:	The average number of significant outreach actions each year by each Community Liaison Officer to educate immigrants and encourage their participation in American civic culture. [Calculation: Number of significant outreach actions conducted each year divided by the number of full time equivalent (FTE) Community Liaison Officers (CLO)]. With this indicator, the Office is able to track the progress of the efficiency of our program, and estimate how much more outreach we could accomplish with the addition of new CLO FTEs. Since the Office of Citizenship is mandated to increase the understanding of citizenship, the Office must maintain a constant and continuous outreach agenda. The CLOs fulfill this mission by working in 19 locations across the country to establish and maintain relationships with community stakeholders in order to promote civic integration of immigrants. Significant outreach actions include conferences, ceremonies, meetings, presentations, and trainings.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	We have seen a significant improvement in Outreach over the past two years. These results were achieved through guidance on outreach goals and priorities from headquarters Office of Citizenship to the field Community Liaison Officers (CLOs). The CLOs conducted significant outreach which supported the Office civic integration mandate as well as outreach support for all USCIS operational matters. Improved Outreach promotes opportunities to support immigrant integration and participation in American civic culture.				
Objective/s Supported:	6.1 - Increase understanding of naturalization, and its privileges and responsibilities.				
Program:	Citizenship - United States Citizenship and Immigration Services				

Strategic Goal 7 – Organizational Excellence

The focus of this strategic goal is to value our most important resource - our people. We will create a culture that promotes a common identity, innovation, mutual respect, accountability and teamwork to achieve efficiencies, effectiveness and operational synergies. The objectives established by the Department to achieve this goal are provided below.

Objective 7.1 - Value our people.

Objective 7.2 - Drive toward a single Departmental culture.

Objective 7.3 - Continually improve our way of doing business.

Detailed information concerning actual performance during fiscal year 2006 to achieve this goal is provided below.

Performance Goal:	Add value to the DHS programs and operations; ensure integrity of the DHS programs and operations; and enable the OIG to deliver quality products and services.				
Performance Measure:	Percentage of recommendations made by the Office of Inspector General (OIG) that are accepted by the Department of Homeland Security.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	92%	93%	79%	91%	Met
Description:	The Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, requires the OIG to audit programs for fraud, waste, and abuse. The Act also requires the review of programs for activities designed to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. The criteria used to select programs for audit include: statutory and regulatory requirements; adequacy of internal control systems; newness; changed conditions; potential dollar magnitude; etc. Where appropriate, OIG audit and inspection reports include recommendations which, if accepted and implemented, will improve the respective program. The OIG tracks the recommendations that are issued until they have been implemented.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	During FY 2006, 91% of all Office of Inspector General recommendations were accepted, exceeding the performance target of 79%. The performance target will increase each year for the next several years — the targets for FY 2006 and FY 2007 are both an increase of 4% over the previous year’s target — but it will not approach 100%. The Office of Inspector General adds value to the Department by providing objective assessments of departmental programs and, where warranted, recommendations for improvement. It is expected that there are going to be areas of disagreement with departmental managers on some of its recommendations. To ensure departmental management acceptance, it would not be prudent to set the performance target at a level that could lead to a dilution of recommendations.				
Objective/s Supported:	7.3 - Continually improve our way of doing business.				
Program:	Audit, Inspections, and Investigations Program				

Performance Goal:	The Department of Homeland Security components and stakeholders have world class information technology leadership and guidance enabling them to efficiently and effectively achieve their vision, mission and goals.				
Performance Measure:	Percentage of major IT projects that are within 10% of cost/schedule/performance objectives.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	52%	81%	85%	78%	Not Met
Description:	This measure gauges the percent of major IT investments that are on schedule, on cost, and delivering their planned performance. These indicators are the industry accepted critical factors for assessing project management effectiveness, and ultimately the success of IT investments.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	This information helps the Chief Information Officer track and identify problem areas that merit management attention. During FY 2006, 78% of major IT projects were within 10% of cost / schedule / performance objectives. This is evidence that the majority of major IT investments are on schedule, within cost, and performance is as expected.				
Recommended Action:	The Chief Information Officer is tracking quarterly the performance of major investments through the Periodic Reporting process. Those reporting more than 8% cost/schedule/performance variance must provide explanations for the performance on their quarterly Periodic Reports, along with actions designed to improve future performance. In addition, these investments must submit breach remediation plans that describe the plan to improve future performance. Selected reviews have been and will continue to be conducted on investment programs reporting more than 8% variances. Future year target levels for this measure will be set based on historical data and an estimate of realistic future performance.				
Objective/s Supported:	1.1 - Gather, fuse, and analyze all terrorism and threat related intelligence. 7.3 - Continually improve our way of doing business.				
Program:	Office of the Chief Information Officer				

Performance Goal:	Operating entities of the Department and other Federal agencies are promptly reimbursed for authorized unforeseen expenses arising from the prevention of or response to terrorist attacks.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of qualifying reimbursements that are made with established standards of timeliness and proper authorization.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	Met
Description:	The Counterterrorism Fund provides a means to pay unbudgeted and unanticipated critical costs associated with providing support to counter, investigate, and prosecute terrorism, and to reestablish the operational capability of property damaged or destroyed as a result of any terrorist incident. This measure represents the percent of funds that were reimbursed to DHS components for unforeseen expenses that arose from the prevention of or response to terrorist attacks, including costs associated with providing support to counter, investigate, and pursue terrorism. The Fund may also be used to reimburse other Federal agencies for costs related to their participation over and above normal operations, in particular terrorism prevention or response activities. If no payments are required, the actual will be "n/a;" in these cases, the target is met because all the mechanisms are in place to make 100% of qualifying reimbursements within established standards and in a timely manner.				

Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	There were no requests for reimbursements.
Objective/s Supported:	7.3 - Continually improve our way of doing business.
Program:	Counterterrorism Fund

Performance Goal:	Provide comprehensive leadership, management, oversight, and support to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Department.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of DHS strategic objectives with programs that meet their associated performance targets.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	84.9%	90	69%	Estimated - Not Met
Description:	This measure is defined as the total number of DHS strategic objectives with programs that meet their associated performance targets. Performance data is tabulated against the 33 strategic objectives of the DHS Strategic Plan. The Department Homeland Security (DHS) gauges its success in meeting its mission through implementation of the DHS Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan includes strategic goals and objectives as well as strategies and programs that describe what the Department does and what the Department will accomplish. Each program is linked to the DHS strategic goals and objectives and has specific performance measures. DHS demonstrates the value and outcomes of its services through the results of program performance metrics. The performance outcomes of DHS programs essentially tell how the Department is impacting citizens, stakeholders, and customers and meeting its mission.				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	During FY 2006, 69% of DHS programs met their associated performance targets. (This percentage includes those performance targets that programs have estimated as met, but does not include the performance measure for OSEM in the total.) This is evidence that while DHS is realizing its strategic goals and objectives and has made progress towards meeting its mission, additional improvement is still necessary.				
Recommended Action:	All programs that did not meet performance targets are required to submit a plan of recommended action that details how they will strengthen performance in the coming fiscal year. As programs (and Components) begin to meet targets, performance throughout the Department will improve.				
Objective/s Supported:	7.3 - Continually improve our way of doing business.				
Program:	Office of the Secretary and Executive Management				

Performance Goal:	Improve the effective and efficient delivery of business and management services throughout the Department.				
Performance Measure:	Percent of Under Secretary of Management programs that meet their associated performance targets.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	N/A	75%	0%	Not Met
Description:	Total number of programs (offices) within the Under Secretary of Management with measures that meet their associated performance targets.				

Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	Despite improvement over previous years, programs within the Under Secretary for Management missed performance targets for FY 2006. Programs will continue to set high goals for performance and strive to continue to improve.
Recommended Action:	All of the programs within the Under Secretary for Management are working to improve their performance. Further, some programs are refining their performance metrics. This measure is currently under review, as it does not accurately gauge improvement.
Objective/s Supported:	7.1 - Value our people. 7.3 - Continually improve our way of doing business.
Program:	Office of the Under Secretary for Management

Performance Goal:	Develop and maintain a Department-wide financial system that produces financial data that is timely, reliable, and useful to decision makers; strengthen accountability by ensuring that internal controls are in place across the Department and oversight reviews are conducted.				
Performance Measure:	Percentage decrease in the number of the previous year's reportable conditions that are considered to be material weaknesses at the consolidated audit level.				
Fiscal Year:	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2006 Results
Target/Actual Indicator:	N/A	0%	25%	0%	Not Met
Description:	The Department measures the number of material weaknesses throughout its programs and works to bring this number down. OMB Circular A-123 considers a material weakness to be "a deficiency that the agency head determines to be significant enough to be reported outside the agency (i.e. included in the annual Integrity Act report to the President and the Congress). . . This designation requires a judgment by agency managers as to the relative risk and significance of deficiencies."				
Explanation of FY 2006 Results:	The number of material weaknesses identified in the FY 2006 financial statement audit equaled the number identified in the FY 2005 audit. The exact composition of the weaknesses changed and several components successfully ended their contribution to specific material weaknesses. The lack of reduction in material weaknesses does not indicate that progress did not occur. In FY 2006, management undertook a rigorous OMB Circular A-123 internal control self-assessment which uncovered new weaknesses in internal controls over financial reporting. The auditors also continued to drill down and establish a more precise baseline of material weaknesses. The implementation of a new corrective action plan process and a Department-wide tracking system in addition to continued OMB Circular A-123 work should lead to significant progress in FY 2007 and beyond.				
Recommended Action:	All components that exhibit material weaknesses are required to submit corrective action plans that detail how they will address these weaknesses in the coming fiscal year. As components correct weaknesses, particularly those identified by the more rigorous assessment implemented in FY 2006, financial management throughout the Department will improve.				
Objective/s Supported:	7.3 - Continually improve our way of doing business.				
Program:	Office of the Chief Financial Officer				

Fiscal Year 2005 Estimated Actuals Updates

Some programs reported estimated actuals in the fiscal year 2005 Performance and Accountability Report. The Department committed to update these actuals in this year's Report, and did so in the applicable tables in this section. Some programs and/or measures that appeared in the 2005 Report were not reported on in this year's Report. To account for these programs and/or measures, we have created the following list arranged by strategic goal under which the program was reported in the FY 2005 Performance and Accountability Report Completeness and Reliability Section.

Goal 1 – Awareness

Reported results contained no estimates

Goal 2 – Prevention

Program: Drug Interdiction (United States Coast Guard)

Measure: Removal rate for cocaine that is shipped via non-commercial maritime means.

- FY05 Estimate = Estimate (as of 9/30/05) 137.5 Metric Tons Seized
- FY05 Actual = 27.3% (Estimated Met, Actually Met)

Program: Marine Safety (United States Coast Guard)

Measure: Maritime Injury and Fatality Index.

- FY05 Estimate = 1,304
- FY05 Actual = 1,277 (Estimated Met, Actually Met)

Program: Detention and Removal (United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement)

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).

- FY05 Estimate = 65.6%
- FY05 Actual = 109.69% (Estimated Not Met, Actually Met)

Goal 3 – Protection

Program: Evaluation and National Assessment Program (State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness) Under Departmental reorganization, this program was transferred to the Preparedness component under its Evaluation and National Assistance subprogram.

Measure: Percent of recommendations made by reviewing authorities (i.e. IG, OMB, GAO) that are implemented within 1 year.

- FY05 Estimate = 100%
- FY05 Actual = 100% (Estimated Met, Actually Met)

Program: Fire Act Program (State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness) Under Departmental reorganization, this program was transferred to the Preparedness component under its Assistance to Firefighters subprogram.

Measure: Number of Firefighter injuries

- FY05 Estimate = 39,500
- FY05 Actual = 75,840 (Estimated Met, Actually Not Met)

Program: Fire Act Program (State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness) Under Departmental reorganization, this program was transferred to the Preparedness component under its Assistance to Firefighters subprogram.

Measure: Number of Civilian Deaths from Fire

- FY05 Estimate = 3,400
- FY05 Actual = 3,675 (Estimated Not Met, Actually Not Met)

Program: Protection of Federal Assets (Federal Protective Service)

Measure: Percent annual increase in the Facility Security Index

- FY05 Estimate = Planned countermeasure implementation versus actual implementation was estimated to be met 90% of the time. Testing showed countermeasures to be effective 92% of the time. Average actual response time was show to be 46.62 minutes.
- FY05 Actual = 92% (Estimated Met, Actually Met)

Goal 4 – Response

Program: Response (Emergency Preparedness and Response) Under Departmental reorganization, this program was transferred to the FEMA component.

Measure: (A) Cumulative percentage of emergency teams and operations evaluated through at least one readiness evaluation or exercise (in a four-year cycle); (B) Average percentage of evaluated teams and operations achieving “fully operational” or better status; (C) Average percentage of evaluated teams rising one operational level in a year (considering four operational levels); and (D) Average maximum response time in hours for emergency response teams to arrive on scene.

- FY05 Estimate As of Q3: = (A) 18% (B) 50% (C) N/A (D) 20
- FY05 Actual = (A) 27% (B) 50% (C) N/A (D) 22 (Estimated Met, Actually Met)

Note: Measure (C) did not have a target for FY05 and was therefore shown with a target of N/A. It was listed as a measure for future use. This composite measure (A) through (D) was disaggregated as of January 1, 2006 into single measures. Constituent elements of this measure now appear with subprogram under the main program they represent.

Goal 5 – Recovery

Program: Recovery (Emergency Preparedness and Response) Under Departmental reorganization, this program was transferred to the FEMA component.

Measure: Percent of customers satisfied with (A) Individual Recovery Assistance and (B) Public Recovery Assistance; percentage reduction in program delivery cost for (C) Individual Recovery Assistance and (D) Public Recovery Assistance; and (E) reduction in Individual Recovery Assistance processing cycle time; (F) percentage completion of catastrophic disaster recovery plan.

- FY05 Estimate as of Q3=* (A) 93% (B) Data Not Available (C) TBD (D) N/A (E) N/A (F) 30%
- FY05 Actual = (A) 93% (B) Data not available (C) Baseline not completed; (D) N/A (E) N/A; (F) 30% (Estimated Met, Actually Met)

Note: Measures (D) and (E) did not have targets for FY05 and were therefore shown with a target of N/A. They were listed as measures for future use. Measures (C) Because of the extraordinary commitment of time and personnel required in response to Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma, which struck at the end of fiscal year 2005, performance baseline figures for FEMA’s Recovery Program could not be established thereby being shown as “Baseline not completed”. It was listed as a measure for future use. This composite measure (A) through (F) was disaggregated as of January 1, 2006 into single measures. Constituent elements of this measure now appear with subprograms under the main program they represent.

Goal 6 – Service

Reported results contained no estimates

Goal 7 – Organizational Excellence

Reported results contained no estimates

Program Evaluations

The Department of Homeland Security is committed to making its programs efficient and effective. As part of our assessment and evaluation process, we identify the strengths and weaknesses of Department programs and take action to ensure effectiveness. The primary tool for this process is the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART). This Office of Management and Budget sponsored process evaluates program in four areas; Purpose, Planning, Management, and Results/Accountability. Upon completion of the evaluations, programs are classified as being Effective, Moderately Effective, Adequate, Ineffective, or Results Not Demonstrated. A rating of Results Not Demonstrated means that a program does not have sufficient performance measurement or performance information to show results, and therefore it is not possible to assess whether it has achieved its goals. Those ratings, the program and evaluation names, summary findings, and actions taken in FY 2006 to address recommendations are shown below. Another round of evaluations was started in FY 2006, and will be completed for publication of the FY 2007 Performance and Accountability Report. PART summaries follow with their improvement plans, after which is information about Government Accountability Office and DHS Office of Inspector General reports.

Analysis and Operations (A&O): Homeland Security Operations Center (National Operations Center)

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003615.2005.html>

Rating: Adequate. This rating describes a program that needs to set more ambitious goals, achieve better results, improve accountability or strengthen its management practices.

The Department of Homeland Security has successfully established the Homeland Security Operations Center. A functional center is currently operating at the Department’s main headquarters. Thus far, the Operations Center has focused its resources on acquiring operating systems and personnel. The Operations Center has also done well to collaborate with Federal and non-Federal partners.

The Homeland Security Operations Center has yet to establish meaningful annual or long-term performance goals. As the Center continues to mature, management should focus on such goal in order to better evaluate its programs and activities.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
1) Developing meaningful annual and long-term performance goals	In progress	
2) To date, the Homeland Security Operations Center has relied on output measures to track performance. As the Center matures, program managers will develop outcome measures to improve performance.	In progress	

CBP: Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry's Program

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003600.2005.html>

Rating: Effective. This is the highest rating a program can achieve. Programs rated Effective set ambitious goals, achieve results, are well-managed and improve efficiency.

The program has a clear purpose, and helps to focus the agency's efforts to protect the American public from terrorists and terrorist acts along the border.

The program is a performance based program whose funding is tied to accomplishment of their goals.

The program collaborates with multiple other federal agencies including the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Food and Drug Administration, State, and Treasury.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
1) Continuing to work with their program partners to achieve its annual performance goals.	Completed	CBP currently examines 34.7% of inbound rail and truck-containerized cargo and 5% of all inbound containerized vessel cargo. CBP screens information for all cargo containers arriving in the US, and scrutinizes all high-risk shipments. CSI now operates in 44 ports in 26 countries. CSI discussed sharing rapid analysis of cargo that may contain nuclear or radioactive material with Department of Energy and, in 2006, implemented an operational and emergency response to mitigate the threat.
2) Demonstrating improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness.	Completed	CBP continuing use of advance cargo and passenger information, and commercial and law enforcement databases to pre-screen, target, and identify potential terrorists and terrorist shipments efficiently and cost-effectively. CSI continues setting up ports in foreign countries efficiently. CSI is working with internal CBP and DHS organizations to obtain personnel, expertise and services it needs from experienced organizations to create the infrastructure and develop an operational port effectively.
3) Improving performance measures.	Completed	The BSITF program has to continue to develop and refine their performance measures and meet their annual targets. CBP's measures are fully linked and supportive of the Agency and Departmental Strategic Plans and support the FYHSP. The CSI program continues to be effective in achieving results. CSI has improved the automation of its data collection of port activity to achieve more timely and consistent performance measure reporting.

FEMA: Emergency Preparedness and Response - Mitigation Program

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003604.html>

Rating: Moderately Effective. In general, a program rated Moderately Effective has set ambitious goals and is well-managed. Moderately Effective programs likely need to improve their efficiency or address other problems in the programs' design or management in order to achieve better results.

The Mitigation programs use risk identification and assessment processes to target at-risk people and property. FEMA works with state and local governments on mitigation planning, and grant funds are targeted to projects that are consistent with these planning efforts.

Contract and grant obligations are monitored and reported quarterly. However, the program has been slow to award grant funds in the Pre-Disaster Mitigation program.

Flood insurance has worked well in the past, but needs to increase the number of policies and to reduce the number of properties with repetitive losses, that require a disproportionate share of payments. FEMA is increasing the number of policies by improving lender compliance, simplifying the program, and expanding marketing. A new pilot program will help to address repetitive loss properties.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Improve the National Flood Insurance Program premium income per \$100 dollars of combined operating expense and historical losses paid.	In progress	The Mitigation Division improved its performance on this goal from \$119.30 to \$121.60 by implementing a moderate rate increase of 4.1% while holding its expense ratio unchanged.

Federal Law Enforcement Training Center:

Rating: Adequate. This rating describes a program that needs to set more ambitious goals, achieve better results, improve accountability or strengthen its management practices.

The program continues to address a specific need for training law enforcement personnel and has responded quickly to emerging training needs post-9/11 by quickly expanding the number of training classes needed to address rapid hiring goals that added thousands of new officers. However, partner organizations have little financial incentive to ensure that initial training projections are accurate.

In addition to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, several other Federal agencies maintain training facilities. The existence of duplicative training facilities is beyond the Center's control and was allowed by Congress, but more coordination across training programs is needed. Fortunately, new appropriations language has largely halted the proliferation of new facilities.

While the program has made good progress in defining improved annual and long-term performance measures, there is a lack of sufficient baseline data to determine how ambitious the performance targets are.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
1) Continuing to develop and utilize the Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation Board in order to increase the number of programs accredited and re-accredited.	Action taken, but not completed	FLETC received FLETA Academy accreditation and is working toward program accreditation. FLETA conducted 3 FLETA Assessments, 2 accreditation manager courses and 3 assessor training courses, assisted in 4 Self-Assessments and expect 1 academy and program awarded accreditation for this period.
2) Improving coordination with other Federal law enforcement training facilities and with partner organizations by holding them more accountable for cost, schedule, and performance results.	Action taken, but not completed	FLETC has opened dialog with other training organizations and continues to conduct monthly Partner Organization meetings to promote communication and a forum to exchange information.
3) Considering a competitive sourcing study to ensure that all Federal Law Enforcement Training Center training, including the Border Patrol, is done in the most effective and cost-efficient manner.	Action taken, but not completed	To date, FLETC has completed one Competitive Sourcing Study, is planning to announce three additional competitions in FY06 and FY07, and has an approved green plan based on the FLETC's FAIR Inventory.

ICE: Automation Modernization Program (ATLAS)

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003601.2005.html>

Rating: Results Not Demonstrated. A rating of Results Not Demonstrated (RND) indicates that a program has not been able to develop acceptable performance goals or collect data to determine whether it is performing.

The program has weak program and management structure and must dramatically improve its ability to manage its resources.

The program has developed some preliminary measures to mark its short-term progress.

ATLAS should expand its focus beyond short-term agency integration goals and develop a long-term strategy to help the agency share information with its law enforcement and immigration enforcement partners.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Developing a spending plan for current resources.	Completed	The Atlas PMO has put processes in place to expedite Expenditure Plan preparation. An ICE Atlas Business Case was finalized 12/21/05 and provides the basis for documenting future baseline requirements. The FY 05 Expenditure Plan received Congressional approval on 6/22/06. ICE submitted the 2006 Plan on November 6, 2006. ICE is drafting the FY 08 Expenditure Plan in conjunction with BY Exhibit 300 formulation.
Developing a long-range strategic plan that helps ICE share information with its law enforcement and immigration enforcement partners	Action taken, but not completed	ICE is engaged in strategic planning to share information with enforcement partners. ICE is leading DHS Case Management and participating in the DHS Team 5 working group to develop architectures that share data among DHS, DOJ/FICMS, Sentinel and other partners. ICE is also executing the Atlas IMI project, planning the Consolidated Enforcement Environment (CEE) and planning Detention and Removal Modernization (DROM) to share ICE enforcement and investigative information with enforcement partners
Establishing a strong program office to monitor program's performance and use of appropriated resources.	Action taken, but not completed	By 9/05, the program named dedicated project managers to each Atlas project and assembled a fully staffed Contractor PMO. The program hired and is awaiting clearance for four Government employees for the program manager position and three project manager positions. The Atlas PMO completed a PMO Organizational Assessment on 4/12/06 and procured Primavera as the program's enterprise project management tool in May.

Prep: Grants and Training Office - National Exercise Program

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003606.2005.html>

Rating: Effective. This is the highest rating a program can achieve. Programs rated Effective set ambitious goals, achieve results, are well-managed and improve efficiency.

The National Exercise Program supports a robust, well-coordinated series of exercises at the national, state, and regional levels. The program is a key component of evaluating the performance of homeland security grant recipients.

However, the exercise schedule and reporting requirements have not been fully aligned to allow for a robust assessment of many state and local capabilities.

Implementation of standardized exercise procedures and reporting requirements have improved exercise quality. However, compliance with reporting requirements was less than 50% by exercise organizers in FY04 and FY05.

The National Exercise Program has improved coordination with other Federal agencies participating in homeland security exercises. However, more progress can be made to improve coordination with other Federal agency exercises. As of August 2005, the Program had not submitted the National Exercise Plan that would address such coordination issues.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Define scope of National Exercise Program needed to support other SLGCP performance measures.	Complete	The NEP supports other agencies' performance measures through evaluation and improvement planning systems that collect structured data that can be used to identify trends in preparedness related to the Office of Grants and Training's mission area. Specifically: 1) The NEP's Corrective Action Program (CAP) System tracks post-exercise improvement actions that address After Action Report recommendations. The action items tracked by this system inform other G&T elements' assessments of equipment, training, and planning needs. The CAP System is currently in beta-testing, but when fully functional will house a large set of data that collectively can be analyzed to identify prominent equipment, training, and planning gaps, as well as progress toward resolution of those gaps. 2) The NEP has made a priority of developing and deploying new Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) exercise evaluation guides (EEGs) which will standardize task and capability-based exercise evaluation. The new HSEEP EEGs are partially completed and undergoing field-testing in select exercises. When the new HSEEP EEGs are fully deployed, they will allow for standardized evaluation of task, capability, and activity performance throughout the nation, enabling cross-cutting assessments of preparedness that will support a variety of SLGCP performance measures.
SLGCP budget links NEP program funding to goals.	Complete	The NEP developed a program plan which linked existing and planned activities to long-term goals and objectives. This program plan was used as the basis for SLGCP's FY08 budget request for the NEP.
Submit the National Exercise Plan for interagency review	Complete	National Exercise and Evaluation Program Plan submitted to Homeland Security Council's (HSC) Plans, Training, Exercises, and Evaluations Policy Coordination Committee. Feedback received and incorporated. HSC policy statement is currently being collaboratively developed that links activities in the NEEP Plan to an over-arching DHS/DOD/Interagency exercise program.
Increase state and local compliance with HSEEP doctrine and reporting requirements.	Complete	Between FY05 and FY06 the estimated percentage of NEP State and Local Direct Support exercises in compliance with HSEEP doctrine and reporting requirements rose from 56% to 70%. The estimated rise in HSEEP Compliance for all exercises (direct support and grant-funded exercises) rose from 33% to 46% over the same period. The NEP has also introduced the HSEEP Toolkit, an integrated suite of online automated tools meant to facilitate planning, conduct, and evaluation of HSEEP-compliant exercises. The HSEEP Toolkit an audience of over 5,000 registered users.

Prep: Grants and Training Office - State and Local Training Program

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003607.2005.html>

Rating: Adequate. This rating describes a program that needs to set more ambitious goals, achieve better results, improve accountability or strengthen its management practices.

The Program has developed training that addresses critical skills and abilities needed by state and local responders to prepare, prevent, and respond to a terrorist incident. It still lacks independent evaluations, or a methodology for comparing the performance of different training programs and providers.

Coordination and consistency with other Federal preparedness training programs is limited. Little progress has been made on developing a broader interagency preparedness training framework required under Homeland Security Presidential Directive Eight.

Funding and available training slots are not well targeted. Funding for several major training centers is based on past appropriation earmarks, not competition or effectiveness. Training slots are allocated by state population, not by risk of terrorist attacks.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Seek language encouraging greater flexibility and/or competition among training partners.	Action taken, but not completed	No progress has been made on this measure in terms of new legislative language. However, the Training Division continues to fund the Competitive Training Grants Program (CTGP), which allows flexibility and competition among its training partners. In 2006, 207 applications were submitted in response to a solicitation for programs to address issue areas relating to the eight national priorities identified in the National Goal. Fifty-one applicants were invited to submit full proposals.
Incorporate state-based risk methodology into allocation of training slots among SLGCP training partners.	Completed	States and territories receiving Homeland Security grant funds are required to develop state strategies, which identify their funding priorities. Also, grant recipients have been required to develop multi-year exercise plans. In order to incorporate state-based risk methodology, the Training and Exercise Division began requiring that states and territories begin development of multi-year training and exercise plans.
In coordination with DHS components and Federal agency partners, complete development of the National Training Program required under HSPD-8.	Action taken, but not completed	HSPD-8 requires the development of a National Goal and measurable target capabilities. The two products required by HSPD-8 have been assigned to and are under development by the Office of Policy, Initiatives, and Analysis (OPIA). They are not yet approved by the Homeland Security Council (HSC). Once approved, the target capabilities will drive the development of Exercise Evaluation Guidelines (EEGs) and the reconfiguration of Training Division courses that align to the capabilities.
As DHS manages several major training programs aimed at Federal, state, and local personnel, it should pursue cross-cutting, comparative evaluations of their strengths and weaknesses. Consolidation of several training activities under the new "Preparedness Directorate" is a first step in this effort.	Action taken, but not completed	The Training Division has begun the effort of convening the four DHS agencies whose training courses are closely related: the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC); FEMA's Emergency Management Institute (EMI), and the National Fire Academy (NFA). To date, DHS has not undertaken any cross-cutting, comparative evaluations of the strengths and weaknesses of each of its training programs which target state and local first responders.

Develop standardized assessments of homeland security knowledge, skills and abilities that can be used to more systematically compare the impact of training, both among trainees and training providers.	Action taken, but not completed	The Training Division has implemented a series of actions to ensure its training is of the highest quality. Using Kirkpatrick's four levels of evaluation as a model, the Training Division requires that all training partners administer standardized Level 1 and Level 2 evaluations to their students. The Level 2 evaluation tests student comprehension of the course material and is administered before participation and after the conclusion of the class.
Develop an FY06 spending plan and FY07 Budget request that more closely link resource allocation to the program's long-term goals.	Completed	In 2006 the Training and Exercises Divisions were merged. At that time, a Business Office was created. One of the major responsibilities of the Training and Exercise Division Business Office was to link resource allocations more closely to program goals. All requests for 2006 funds were accompanied by a justification explaining how the funded project is tied to the accomplishment of goals from the Division's strategic plan

Prep: Grant and Training Office - Technical Assistance Program

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003605.2005.html>

Rating: Adequate. This rating describes a program that needs to set more ambitious goals, achieve better results, improve accountability or strengthen its management practices.

The program provides a wide range of expertise to state and local grantees to assist in developing and implementing homeland security programs. However, in responding to shifting priorities, the program has until recently lacked clear long-term goals for improving grantees' planning and management capabilities.

The program has broadened its range of services provided to keep pace with the range of capabilities eligible for DHS grant funding. Some of these services are similar to technical assistance services provided by other Federal agencies, and do not reflect a clear "core competency" of the Office of Grants and Training.

The program's funding level is not transparent, with actual expenditures exceeding estimates in the President's Budget and Congressional appropriations. Relation of actual funding levels to goals and results is unclear.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Clarify the underlying problems that the program is trying to solve.	Completed	The Technical Assistance Program has ensured that all TA services developed and delivered to State and local homeland security personnel have been mapped to address specific mission areas, priorities, and capabilities outlined in the National Preparedness Goal. This mapping ensures that the Technical Assistance Program develops services that address priority needs and build capabilities in the most critical areas.
Develop an FY06 spending plan and FY07 Budget that more clearly identify program resources, with linkages to performance.	Completed	The Technical Assistance Program has developed a spending plan for FY06 and FY07 that articulates the number of deliveries and performance objectives for each technical assistance service. These plans also map each service to all aspects of the National Preparedness Goal. The spending plans are used to educate Technical Assistance budget requests. The Technical Assistance Program is rapidly moving towards competing or re-competing all contract vehicles by FY08.
Develop long-term performance measures focused on outcomes.	Completed	With assistance from OMB, the Technical Assistance Program developed two new long-term measures focused on outcomes and has begun to collect relevant data to fulfill the reporting requirement.

Prep: National Communications Service (NCS) - National Security and Emergency Preparedness Communications

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003617.2005.html>

Rating: Moderately Effective. In general, a program rated Moderately Effective has set ambitious goals and is well-managed. Moderately Effective programs likely need to improve their efficiency or address other problems in the programs' design or management in order to achieve better results.

The National Communications Service is fulfilling its mission to ensure required telecommunications to respond to and recover from national disasters or incidents, including war. Call completion rates for the Government Emergency Telecommunications Service during national events such as 9/11, 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Salt Lake City, and the 2004 Florida Hurricanes exceeded 90%.

The Government Emergency Telecommunications Service has 100,000 users/subscribers and is available in all 50 states. This service allows government officials to place priority calls ahead of the general public during an incident.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Working with program partners to improve accountability, cost-effectiveness, and performance.	Action taken, but not completed	The Continuity Communications Working Group has initiated work on a Continuity Communications Enterprise Architecture. This effort will help to support Minimum Essential Functions of the Federal Government under all circumstances, including crisis, emergency, attack, recovery, and reconstitution. We are working with Continuity Communications Working Group (CCWG) partners to design and develop NS/EP architecture requirements in coordination with the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP).

Prep: National Cyber Security Division (NCSD) - Infrastructure Protection

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003614.2005.html>

Rating: Results Not Demonstrated. A rating of Results Not Demonstrated (RND) indicates that a program has not been able to develop acceptable performance goals or collect data to determine whether it is performing.

The National Cyber Security Division has not established meaningful annual or long-term performance measures. For example, no baseline for performance has been set. This lack of information limits the ability of the program to evaluate itself.

The National Cyber Security Division needs to ensure independent evaluations are regularly conducted. While internal periodic reviews have begun, regular external reviews should be implemented. The Division recognizes that reviews help ensure programs are aligned with its mission.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Developing baselines and targets for performance measures.	Action taken, but not completed	New measures are being developed that accurately represent the broad range of programs and projects implemented within NCSD. Based on guidance from the DHS Program Analysis and Evaluation (PA&E) office, the measures are being refined. NCSD implemented these proposed measures for internal collection and reporting at the end of the third quarter this year, and will evaluate internal performance under these measures in the third quarter of this Fiscal Year.
Establish external processes to evaluate effectiveness of cyber security programs.	Action taken, but not completed	To achieve its program goals in an effective and efficient manner, NCSD revised its strategic plan (Implementation Plan) goals and objectives to also include quarterly milestones for fiscal years 2006 through 2011. Each internal program is reviewed with the proposed quarterly performance metrics and the target base and/or intended beneficiaries identified.

S&T: Emerging Homeland Security Threat Detection

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003611.2005.html>

Rating: Moderately Effective. In general, a program rated Moderately Effective has set ambitious goals and is well-managed. Moderately Effective programs likely need to improve their efficiency or address other problems in the programs' design or management in order to achieve better results.

Program needs an ambitious agenda to continue forward at the pace required in the face of the rapidly emerging technological threats in the world.

The program now has strong performance measures, but some targets are under development. The program has not yet undertaken an independent evaluation of sufficient scope and quality.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Working with Congress to consolidate the Emerging Threats and Rapid Prototyping portfolios into one office to increase efficiencies and better leverage assets of each.	In progress	
Conducting an independent, external audit to determine if competitive sourcing and long term performance goals are on track and results can be validated	In progress	
Develop additional annual and long-term performance metrics and targets that focus on outcomes that accurately measure the program.	Action taken, but not completed	A long-term measure has been developed; this measure is an improvement and is more focused on meeting the program's long-term goal. The program continues to work to develop additional annual and efficiency measures.
Conduct independent assessments of sufficient scope and quality.	Action taken, but not completed	Regular independent reviews are scheduled to begin in FY 2006 and will be focused on supporting program improvements as well as evaluating effectiveness and relevance to counter emerging terrorism threats. Additionally, this will ensure the efforts are not duplicative with other research within the Department or with other federal agencies. The reviews have not been conducted, but are planned. They may not be conducted in 4th quarter, but may be for first quarter FY 2007.

S&T: Rapid Prototyping of Countermeasures

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003612.2005.html>

Rating: Moderately Effective. In general, a program rated Moderately Effective has set ambitious goals and is well-managed. Moderately Effective programs likely need to improve their efficiency or address other problems in the programs' design or management in order to achieve better results.

This program needs to have outside evaluations conducted to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness.

More progress needs to be demonstrated toward achievement of long term goals. This is a new program and has a limited track record.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Develop additional annual and long-term performance metrics and targets that focus on outcomes that accurately measure the program.	Action taken, but not completed	An output measure has been developed; this measure is an improvement and is more focused on meeting the program's long-term goal. The program continues to work to develop a long-term and efficiency measures.
Conduct independent assessments of sufficient scope and quality.	Action taken, but not completed	Regular independent reviews are scheduled to begin in FY 2006 and will be focused on supporting program improvements as well as evaluating effectiveness and relevance to counter emerging terrorism threats. Additionally, this will ensure the efforts are not duplicative with other research within the Department or with other federal agencies. The reviews have not been conducted, but are planned. They may not be conducted in 4th quarter, but may be for first quarter FY 2007.
Working to develop sensible, ambitious targets on the number of technologies brought to market.	In progress	
Conducting independent evaluations to benchmark progress and ensure competitive sourcing practices are followed	In progress	
Proposing in the budget and working with Congress to consolidate the Emerging Threats and Rapid Prototyping portfolios into one office to increase efficiencies and better leverage assets of each.	In progress	

S & T: Science and Technology Dir: Univ./H.S. Fellowship

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003610.2005.html>

Rating: Moderately Effective. In general, a program rated Moderately Effective has set ambitious goals and is well-managed. Moderately Effective programs likely need to improve their efficiency or address other problems in the programs' design or management in order to achieve better results.

Need to conduct independent evaluations to assess the scope and quality of the program and its effectiveness.

The program needs to establish better linkages between investment in scholarship and fellowship recipients and results that benefit the U.S. government.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Develop additional annual and long-term performance metrics and targets that focus on outcomes that accurately measure the program.	Action taken, but not completed	Additional measures have been developed including long-term, efficiency, and annual. These measures are an improvement and are more focused on meeting the program's long-term goal.
Conduct independent assessments of sufficient scope and quality.	Action taken, but not completed	The program was evaluated by an independent board of visitors/review panel in 9/05. The Center for Risk and Economic Analysis of Terrorism Events was evaluated by an independent review panel in 4/06. The reviews provided valuable information in the areas of mission relevance,
Conduct independent assessments of sufficient scope and quality.	Action taken, but not completed	technical competency, and management effectiveness. An external review panel will assess the program annually, with the next review scheduled for Fall 2006. Planned for Fall 2006 are reviews for two additional centers.
Conducting an independent, external audit to determine if long-term performance and efficiency goals are on track and results can be validated.	In progress	
Decrease funding for this program until a better linkage between the investment in scholarship and fellowship recipients and the results derived to the nation from that investment can be established.	In progress	

TSA: Air Cargo Security Programs

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003602.2005.html>

Rating: Results Not Demonstrated. A rating of Results Not Demonstrated (RND) indicates that a program has not been able to develop acceptable performance goals or collect data to determine whether it is performing.

TSA should improve methods to evaluate risks and vulnerability in the air transportation system as it relates to air cargo.

The program has recently developed interim long-term and annual measures to measure program effectiveness. However, due to data limitations, the program is unable to measure the risk reduced as a result of implementing program objectives.

Work remains to close security loopholes, including improving screening efforts and refining procedures to approve indirect air carriers. The program has developed a strategic plan and is deploying a new security screening system, both of which are steps in the right direction.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Deploy the Freight Assessment System to improve gap analyses and risk/vulnerability assessments. Complete the pilot by the middle of calendar year in 2006 and full deployment beginning in FY 2007 and completing in FY 2008.	Action taken, but not completed	A Proof of Concept is near completion. An operational pilot will follow in early FY 2007. A new program baseline will be established based on the results of the Proof of Concept including an updated timeline.
Develop a long-term outcome oriented performance measure that measures risk reduced as a result of implementing program objectives. This goal will be included in the FY 2008 Budget.	Action taken, but not completed	TSA has developed and calculated a surrogate risk reduction long-term outcome oriented performance measure for this program. The FY 2005 baseline was completed and ambitious targets have been set.
By the end of FY 2006, TSA will develop and deploy a pay-for-performance system to hold federal managers accountable for cost, schedule, and performance results.	Action taken, but not completed	The development of the pay-for-performance system is being phased in by TSA. By the end of FY 2006 all of the approximately 45,000 Transportation Security Officers (TSO) and TSO managers will be under the system. By the end of FY 2007, the remaining TSA organizations (roughly 6,000 staff) will be under the system.

TSA: Aviation Regulation and Enforcement

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003603.2005.html>

Rating: Results Not Demonstrated. A rating of Results Not Demonstrated (RND) indicates that a program has not been able to develop acceptable performance goals or collect data to determine whether it is performing.

The program was recently created; therefore, it is unclear if the program is organized in such a way that it promotes maximum efficiency and effectiveness.

The program is in the process of developing long-term outcome measures that focus on reduction of risk as a result of implementing program objectives.

The program has developed procedures to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
By FY 2007, develop a plan to systematically review current regulations to ensure consistency among all regulations in accomplishing program goals.	Action taken, but not completed	TSA has established a working group comprised of legal counsel, operational and support program representatives to develop input into the Unified Agenda which is published semi-annually in the Federal Register to provide the public with a snapshot of future rulemakings. This working group also provides input into the Regulatory Plan that is published once a year and contains the most important significant regulatory actions each agency reasonably expects to publish.
By FY 2007, develop baselines and ambitious targets for the annual measures.	Action taken, but not completed	Eight of the ten measures in this program now have reported baseline numbers. Upon receiving actuals for FY 2006, TSA will evaluate the trend data and create targets for outlying years if targets have not already been established. Firm dates for actions to close this recommendation will be provided by the end of FY 2006.
Develop a long-term outcome oriented performance measure that measures risk reduced as a result of implementing program objectives. This goal will be included in the FY 2008 Budget.	Action taken, but not completed	There are currently two surrogate risk reduction measures that are considered long-term outcome oriented performance measures. TSA is reviewing these measures to determine how to best calculate them. Upon completion of this review, baselines will be derived and targets will be set. The goal is to complete this action by the end of FY 2006.
By the end of FY 2006, TSA will develop and deploy a pay-for-performance system to hold federal managers accountable for cost, schedule, and performance results.	Action taken, but not completed	The development of the pay-for-performance system is being phased in by TSA. By the end of FY 2006 all of the approximately 45,000 Transportation Security Officers (TSO) and TSO managers will be under the system. By the end of FY 2007, the remaining TSA organizations (roughly 6,000 staff) will be under the system.

TSA: Flight Crew Training

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003616.2005.html>

Rating: Results Not Demonstrated. A rating of Results Not Demonstrated (RND) indicates that a program has not been able to develop acceptable performance goals or collect data to determine whether it is performing.

Due to data limitations, the program is unable to measure the risk reduced as a result of implementing program objectives. Therefore, it has developed an interim long-term measure to help gather data necessary to develop outcome goals.

The program has developed an efficiency goal: increase the percentage of training programs within 10 percent of cost, schedule and performance.

The Crew Member Self Defense Training program is unique in its advanced self-defense, threat detection, and appropriate use of force techniques. While the Federal Flight Deck Officer program is the only program that deputizes airline crew members as federal law enforcement officers, it is similar in mission to the Federal Air Marshals program.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
By FY 2007, develop a plan to systematically review current regulations to ensure consistency among all regulations in accomplishing program goals.	Action taken, but not completed	TSA performed a comprehensive assessment of this program. The review has been completed and changes have been implemented that will make the training more accessible to crew members, while fulfilling its statutory requirements. The prototyping of this new approach occurred in June 2006, and the full national roll-out is scheduled to begin in July 2006. The results of this revised approach will be provided prior to the end of FY 2006.
By FY 2007, develop an independent evaluation process to ensure programs are comprehensively reviewed on a regular basis.	Action taken, but not completed	TSA performed a comprehensive assessment of this program. The review has been completed and changes have been implemented that will make the training more accessible to crew members, while fulfilling its statutory requirements. The prototyping of this new approach occurred in June 2006, and the full national roll-out is scheduled to begin in July 2006. The results of this revised approach will be provided prior to the end of FY 2006.
Develop a long-term outcome oriented performance measure that measures risk reduced as a result of implementing program objectives. This goal will be included in the FY 2008 Budget.	Action taken, but not completed	TSA has developed and calculated a surrogate risk reduction long-term outcome oriented performance measure for this program. The program will set ambitious targets when the collection of baseline is completed for FY 2006. It is TSA's goal to complete this action by the end of FY 2006.
By FY 2007, develop baselines and ambitious targets for the annual measures.	Action taken, but not completed	Two of the five measures for this program have baseline numbers. It is our goal to have baseline numbers for all measures by the end of FY 2006. Upon receiving actuals for FY 2006, TSA will trend the data and create targets for outlying years.
By the end of FY 2006, TSA will develop and deploy a pay-for-performance system to hold federal managers accountable for cost, schedule, and performance results.	Action taken, but not completed	The development of the pay-for-performance system is being phased in by TSA. By the end of FY 2006 all of the approximately 45,000 Transportation Security Officers (TSO) and TSO managers will be under the system. By the end of FY 2007, the remaining TSA organizations (roughly 6,000 staff) will be under the system.

USCG: Marine Safety

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003609.2005.html>

Rating: Adequate. This rating describes a program that needs to set more ambitious goals, achieve better results, improve accountability or strengthen its management practices.

This program conducts ad hoc analyses to investigate deviation from annual performance targets, but does not have an institutionalized set of annual performance metrics to track improvement in the program's outcomes.

Although this program has demonstrated long-term improvements in its performance, because its long-term goals were often set above the prior year's level of achievement, it is difficult to tell whether managers are truly challenged to improve program performance.

This program exercises sound financial management techniques that hold program partners accountable for program performance.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
The Coast Guard needs to develop a plan for regular, independent assessments of its programs' performance. While the Coast Guard has a schedule to conduct one-time evaluations of all of its programs, it still needs to develop a more routine and regular process for evaluation.	Action taken, but not completed	Coast Guard initiated a PART-inspired and aligned series of program evaluations with the Center for Naval Analyses. As a result, several evaluations have already concluded, others are ongoing, and more are planned. The Marine Safety Program is slated for an independent evaluation by the Center for Naval Analysis in Fiscal Year 2008.
Harmonize recreational boating regulations. The Coast Guard should work with its recreational boating partners (Department of the Interior, Army Corps of Engineers) to harmonize overlapping federal regulatory structures and standards.	Action taken, but not completed	The Coast Guard is presently assessing the Marine Safety PART recommendations, and will incorporate OMB's recommendation into program-level work plans.
Normalize existing performance measures. The Coast Guard should work to normalize its existing performance measures to reflect the effect of a growing boating population on the program's performance. The result of this revision would be to present program performance as a ratio of deaths and injuries to the boating population.	Action taken, but not completed	The Coast Guard will be conducting an annual review of its mission-program performance measurement framework in February and March. During this audit, the measurement improvement recommendation provided by OMB will be taken for action.
Create annual measure scorecard. The Coast Guard should work to institutionalize supporting operational measures that help program managers better understand factors that contribute to annual program performance achievement. Concurrent with these measures, the Coast Guard should set ambitious performance targets to encourage performance improvements. These measures should be promulgated to all program managers on a routine basis.	Action taken, but not completed	The Coast Guard will be conducting an annual review of its mission-program performance measurement framework in February and March. During this audit, the measurement improvement recommendation provided by OMB will be taken for action.

USCIS: Immigration Services

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10000018.2005.html>

Rating: Moderately Effective. In general, a program rated Moderately Effective has set ambitious goals and is well-managed. Moderately Effective programs likely need to improve their efficiency or address other problems in the programs' design or management in order to achieve better results.

While this program has decreased the processing time of some immigration applications more work is warranted. In particular, this program needs to more effectively leverage technology to collect, process, and adjudicate immigration applications in a more accurate and timely manner.

The program has also demonstrated improvements toward providing the right benefit to the right person. A Fraud Detection and National Security office was established to identify immigration benefit fraud, enhance security checks, and develop a joint anti-fraud strategy in partnership with other Federal agencies.

The program has made progress in decreasing the backlog of immigration applications. At the end of 2005, the backlog had fallen by over 2.5 million cases (from a high of 3.8 million in January 2004) and had achieved a six-month or better cycle time in 9 of the 16 applications under the backlog elimination effort.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Modernize IT systems to better respond to fluctuating workload.	Action taken, but not completed	The IT Transformation Program has been subsumed by the Business Transformation Program. Please see update to Improvement Plan 2 "Modernize IT systems to better respond to fluctuating workload"
Reengineer business processes to modernize processes and systems to more efficiently adjudicate applications and effectively provide immigration benefits.	Action taken, but not completed	Implementing Business Transformation Plan to change how USCIS interacts with customers; receives/processes/exchanges information and data; ensures the security and integrity of the immigration system; and improves efficiency. Plan addresses: upgrading IT infrastructure; transition from paper to electronic case management; integrating information; improving data integrity/security. In Planning Phase, which includes business process re-engineering, pilot development in FY07.

USSS: Secret Service Domestic Protectees

www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10003608.2005.html

Rating: Effective. This is the highest rating a program can achieve. Programs rated Effective set ambitious goals, achieve results, are well-managed and improve efficiency.

The Domestic Protectees program met all annual performance targets. In FY 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005, protectees arrived and departed safely in 100% of instances, persons inside the White House and Vice President's residence received incident-free protection 100% of the time, and 100% of National Special Security Events that commenced were successfully completed.

This program routinely works in partnership with numerous Federal, military, state, local, and international agencies to ensure the protection of domestic protectees. Particularly when protectees travel, advance teams network with partnering agencies in the jurisdictions that protectees visit. Duplication and overlapping of effort are avoided by the design of the program.

Resources are effectively managed and allocated in response to such factors as protectee travel destinations, National Special Security Event venues, variance in national threat levels, and/or crisis management scenarios.

Improvement Plan:

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:	Action Taken	Comments
Reviewing efficiency index to incorporate where possible variables (such as threat level) that may impact workload and other efficiency factors.	Completed	The Secret Service determined that it is not feasible to incorporate a threat level variable, into the current efficiency index. This variable is difficult to develop as data is qualitative or classified. The process to collect appropriate and timely inputs, and a system to capture data for this measure to be relevant, would be elusive. The current efficiency measure incorporates the threat environment as it considers prior year data, and is used in planning and executing protective activities.
Performing environmental scanning to ensure that protective doctrine and the program's countermeasures keep pace with emerging threats.	Action taken, but not completed	LE Sensitive.
Revising how program evaluations are conducted to ensure that efficiency is incorporated as a key component of evaluations.	Action taken, but not completed	The Secret Service's Management and Organization Division has expanded its Strategic Planning Management Branch to include a formal program evaluation function. Once fully staffed (target date: 2007), the new branch (Planning and Evaluation Branch) will have analysts dedicated to program evaluation. The branch will incorporate program efficiency from the inception of the branch's program evaluation function.

Office of Inspector General Evaluations

The DHS Office of the Inspector General's "Major Management Challenges Facing The Department of Homeland Security" is included within this reports Section IV "Other Accompanying Information". It summarizes the most significant overall findings of the Office of the Inspector General's audits and investigations, which are footnoted in his report. Their complete list of FY 2006 reports can be viewed at:

http://www.dhs.gov/xoig/rpts/mgmt/editorial_0334.shtm

Government Accountability Office Evaluations

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) lists 111 reports on DHS issued in FY 2006. Given the large number of reports its issues, GAO produce its "high risk" series to focus attention on the most critical issues. This series identifies from all the audits and evaluations those federal programs and operations that in some cases are high risk due to their greater vulnerabilities to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. Increasingly, GAO also has identified high-risk areas that are in need of broad-based transformations to address major economy, efficiency, or effectiveness challenges. The GAO high risk items relative to DHS are identified in the Management's Discussion and Analysis section of the draft PAR. A list of FY 2006 reports completed by GAO can be viewed at: <http://www.gao.gov/docsearch/agency.php>