

GAO

Report to the Ranking Minority Member,
Committee on Governmental Affairs, U.S.
Senate

December 2002

RESULTS-ORIENTED MANAGEMENT

Agency Crosscutting Actions and Plans in Border Control, Flood Mitigation and Insurance, Wetlands, and Wildland Fire Management



G A O

Accountability * Integrity * Reliability



Highlights of [GAO-03-321](#), a report to the Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Governmental Affairs, U.S. Senate

Why GAO Did This Study

GAO’s work has repeatedly shown that mission fragmentation and program overlap are widespread in the federal government. Implementation of federal crosscutting programs is often characterized by numerous individual agency efforts that are implemented with little apparent regard for the presence and efforts of related activities. GAO has in the past offered possible approaches for managing crosscutting programs, and has stated that the Government Performance and Results Act could provide a framework for addressing crosscutting efforts.

GAO was asked to examine the actions and plans agencies reported in addressing the crosscutting issues of border control, flood mitigation and insurance, wetlands, and wildland fire management. GAO reviewed the fiscal year 2001 performance reports and fiscal year 2003 performance plans for the major agencies involved in these issues.

RESULTS-ORIENTED MANAGEMENT Agency Crosscutting Actions And Plans In Border Control, Flood Mitigation And Insurance, Wetlands, And Wildland Fire Management

What GAO Found

GAO did not independently verify or assess the information it obtained from agency performance reports and plans. On the basis of the reports and plans, GAO found that

- Most agencies involved in the crosscutting issues discussed coordination with other agencies in their performance reports and plans, although the extent of coordination and level of detail provided varied considerably.
- The progress agencies reported in meeting their fiscal year 2001 performance goals also varied considerably. For example, wetlands was the only area in which all of the agencies GAO reviewed met or exceeded fiscal year 2001 goals. Some of the agencies that did not meet their goals provided reasonable explanations and/or strategies that appeared reasonably linked to meeting the goals in the future.
- The agencies GAO reviewed generally planned to pursue goals in fiscal year 2003 similar to those in 2001, although some agencies added new goals, dropped existing goals, or dropped goals altogether. Many agencies discussed strategies that appeared to be reasonably linked to achieving their fiscal year 2003 goals.

Agencies Involved in Crosscutting Areas Show Opportunities for Coordination

Agency involved	Crosscutting program areas			
	Border control	Flood mitigation and insurance	Wetlands	Wildland fire management
Agriculture	✓	✓	✓	✓
Commerce			✓	
Defense		✓	✓	
EPA			✓	
FEMA		✓		
Interior			✓	✓
Justice	✓			
State	✓			
Transportation	✓			
Treasury	✓			

Source: GAO analysis.

www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-321

To view the full report, including the scope and methodology, click on the link above. For more information, contact Patricia A. Dalton at (202) 512-6806.

Contents

Letter

Background	1
Scope and Methodology	2
Results in Brief	4
Agencies Involved in Crosscutting Areas Show Opportunities for Coordination	6
Border Control	8
Flood Mitigation and Insurance	9
Wetlands	13
Wildland Fire Management	16
Concluding Observations	19
Agency Comments and Our Evaluation	22
	23

Appendixes

Appendix I: Border Control	25
Appendix II: Flood Mitigation and Insurance	42
Appendix III: Wetlands	48
Appendix IV: Wildland Fire Management	55
Appendix V: GAO Contact and Staff Acknowledgments	59

Tables

Table 1: Agencies Reviewed for Each Crosscutting Program Area	9
Table 2: Coordination Efforts among Agencies Involved in Border Control as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports and Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans	25
Table 3: Agencies' Reported Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Border Control as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports	30
Table 4: Agencies' Expected Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Border Control as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans	34
Table 5: Reliability of Performance Data Reported by Agencies Involved in Border Control as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports	38
Table 6: Coordination Efforts among Agencies Involved in Flood Mitigation and Insurance as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports and Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans	42

Table 7: Agencies' Reported Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Flood Mitigation and Insurance as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports	44
Table 8: Agencies' Expected Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Flood Mitigation and Insurance as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans	45
Table 9: Reliability of Performance Data Reported by Agencies Involved in Flood Mitigation and Insurance as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports	47
Table 10: Coordination Efforts among Agencies Involved in Wetlands-Related Activities as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports and Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans	48
Table 11: Agencies' Reported Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals Involved in Wetlands-Related Activities as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports	51
Table 12: Agencies' Expected Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Wetlands-Related Activities as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans	52
Table 13: Reliability of Performance Data Reported by Agencies Involved in Wetlands-Related Activities as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports	53
Table 14: Coordination Efforts among Agencies Involved in Wildland Fire Management as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports and Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans	55
Table 15: Agencies' Reported Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Wildland Fire Management as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports	56
Table 16: Agencies' Expected Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Wildland Fire Management as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans	57
Table 17: Reliability of Performance Data Reported by Agencies Involved in Wildland Fire Management as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports	58

Abbreviations

APHIS	Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
BCI	Border Coordination Initiative
CDC	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
DEA	Drug Enforcement Administration
DOD	Department of Defense
DOE	Department of Energy
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FDA	Food and Drug Administration
FECA	Federal Employees' Compensation Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FSA	Farm Service Agency
FSIS	Food Safety Inspection Service
FWS	Fish and Wildlife Service
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
HUD	Department of Housing and Urban Development
INS	Immigration and Naturalization Service
MARAD	Maritime Administration
MBDA	Minority Business Development Agency
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPS	National Park Service
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPM	Office of Personnel Management
SBA	Small Business Administration
TSA	Transportation Security Administration
VA	Department of Veterans' Affairs

This is a work of the U.S. Government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. It may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from GAO. It may contain copyrighted graphics, images or other materials. Permission from the copyright holder may be necessary should you wish to reproduce copyrighted materials separately from GAO's product.



United States General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

December 20, 2002

The Honorable Fred Thompson
Ranking Minority Member
Committee on Governmental Affairs
United States Senate

Dear Senator Thompson:

Although federal programs have been designed for different purposes or targeted for different population groups, coordination among federal programs with related responsibilities is essential to efficiently and effectively meet national concerns. Uncoordinated program efforts can waste scarce funds, confuse and frustrate program customers, and limit the overall effectiveness of the federal effort. A focus on results, as envisioned by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Results Act), implies that federal programs contributing to the same or similar results should be closely coordinated to ensure that goals are consistent, and as appropriate, program efforts are mutually reinforcing. This means that federal agencies are to look beyond their organizational boundaries and coordinate with other agencies to ensure that their efforts are aligned.

This report is in response to your request that we examine the actions and plans agencies reported in addressing the crosscutting program areas you identified: border control, flood mitigation and insurance, wetlands, and wildland fire management. Specifically, for each of the crosscutting program areas the objectives of this report were to describe (1) the major agencies involved, (2) the type of coordination these agencies discussed in their performance reports and plans, (3) the progress these agencies reported in their fiscal year 2001 performance reports and, for unmet goals, whether the agencies provide explanations and strategies that are reasonably linked to achieving the unmet goals in the future, (4) the progress these agencies planned to make in fiscal year 2003 and whether agencies describe strategies that are reasonably linked to achieving their goals, and (5) how agencies discussed the completeness, reliability, and credibility of their performance data, known shortcomings in the data, and strategies for addressing those shortcomings. In fulfilling the request, except as otherwise noted, we reviewed the fiscal year 2001 performance report and fiscal year 2003 performance plan required by the Results Act for the major agencies involved in these crosscutting areas. The Department of Defense was not included in this review since it had not issued its combined performance report and performance plan.

Background

Our work has repeatedly shown that mission fragmentation and program overlap are widespread in the federal government.¹ In 1998 and 1999, we found that this situation existed in 12 federal mission areas, ranging from agriculture to natural resources and environment. We also identified, in 1998 and 1999, 8 new areas of program overlap, including 50 programs for the homeless that were administered by eight federal agencies. These programs provided services for the homeless that appeared to be similar. For example, 23 programs operated by four agencies offered housing services, and 26 programs administered by 6 agencies offered food and nutrition services. Although our work indicates that the potential for inefficiency and waste exists, it also shows areas where the intentional participation by multiple agencies may be a reasonable response to a complex public problem. In either situation, implementation of federal crosscutting programs is often characterized by numerous individual agency efforts that are implemented with little apparent regard for the presence of efforts of related activities.

In our past work, we have offered several possible approaches for better managing crosscutting programs—such as improved coordination, integration, and consolidation—to ensure that crosscutting goals are consistent; program efforts are mutually reinforcing; and, where appropriate, common or complementary performance measures are used as a basis for management. One of our oft-cited proposals is to consolidate the fragmented federal system to ensure the safety and quality of food.

Perhaps most important, however, we have stated that the Results Act could provide the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), agencies, and Congress with a structured framework for addressing crosscutting program efforts. OMB, for example, could use the governmentwide performance plan, which is a key component of this framework, to integrate expected agency-level performance. It could also be used to more clearly relate and address the contributions of alternative federal strategies. Agencies, in turn, could use the annual performance planning cycle and subsequent annual performance reports to highlight crosscutting program efforts and to provide evidence of the coordination of those efforts.

¹See U.S. General Accounting Office, *Managing for Results: Using the Results Act to Address Mission Fragmentation and Program Overlap*, [GAO/AIMD-97-146](#) (Washington, D.C.: Aug. 29, 1997) and *Managing for Results: Barriers to Interagency Coordination*, [GAO/GGD-00-106](#) (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 29, 2000).

OMB guidance to agencies on the Results Act states that, at a minimum, an agency's annual plan should identify those programs or activities that are being undertaken with other agencies to achieve a common purpose or objective, that is, interagency and crosscutting programs. This identification need cover only programs and activities that represent a significant agency effort. An agency should also review the fiscal year 2003 performance plans of other agencies participating with it in a crosscutting program or activity to ensure that related performance goals and indicators for a crosscutting program are consistent and harmonious. As appropriate, agencies should modify performance goals to bring about greater synergy and interagency support in achieving mutual goals.²

In April 2002, as part of its spring budget planning guidance to agencies for preparing the President's fiscal year 2004 budget request, OMB stated that it is working to develop uniform evaluation metrics, or "common measures" for programs with similar goals. OMB asked agencies to work with OMB staff to develop evaluation metrics for several major crosscutting, governmentwide functions as part of their September budget submissions. According to OMB, such measures can help raise important questions and help inform decisions about how to direct funding and how to improve performance in specific programs. OMB's common measures initiative initially focused on the following crosscutting program areas:

- low income housing assistance,
- job training and employment,
- wildland fire management,
- flood mitigation,
- disaster insurance, and
- health.

²OMB Circular A-11, section 220.3g.

We recently reported that one of the purposes of the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000 is to improve the quality of agency financial and performance data.³ We found that only 5 of the 24 Chief Financial Officers (CFO) Act agencies' fiscal year 2000 performance reports included assessments of the completeness and reliability of their performance data in their transmittal letters. The other 19 agencies discussed, at least to some degree, the quality of their performance data elsewhere in their performance reports.

Scope and Methodology

To address these objectives, we first defined the scope of each crosscutting program area as follows:

- Border control focuses on major federal security policies and operations that manage and govern the entry of people, animals, plants, and goods into the United States through air, land, or seaports of entry.⁴
- Flood mitigation and insurance focuses on major federal efforts to proactively reduce the loss in lives and property due to floods and minimize the postflood costs of repair and construction.
- Wildland fire management focuses on major federal efforts to reduce accumulated hazardous fuels on public lands.
- Wetlands focuses on major federal efforts to protect and manage this resource, such as restoration, enhancement, and permitting activities.

³U.S. General Accounting Office, *Performance Reporting: Few Agencies Reported on the Completeness and Reliability of Performance Data*, GAO-02-372 (Washington, D.C.: Apr. 26, 2002).

⁴Although drug control is often included as part of border control, because we are covering this area in a separate report, it is excluded from our scope.

To identify the agencies involved in each area we relied on previous GAO work and confirmed the agencies involved by reviewing the fiscal year 2001 Results Act performance report and fiscal year 2003 Results Act performance plans for each agency identified as contributing to the crosscutting program area. One of the agencies we identified as being involved in the areas of flood mitigation and wetlands was the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). Although we identify the Corps, we do not comment on the agency because, as noted above, the Department of Defense did not submit a fiscal year 2001 performance report or fiscal year 2003 performance plan and was not included in our review. To address the remaining objectives, we reviewed the fiscal year 2001 performance reports and fiscal year 2003 performance plans and used criteria contained in the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000 and OMB guidance. The act requires that an agency's performance report include a transmittal letter from the agency head containing, in addition to any other content, an assessment of the completeness and reliability of the performance and financial data used in the report. It also requires that the assessment describe any material inadequacies in the completeness and reliability of the data and the actions the agency can take and is taking to resolve such inadequacies.⁵

OMB guidance states that an agency's annual plan should include a description of how the agency intends to verify and validate the measured values of actual performance. The means used should be sufficiently credible and specific to support the general accuracy and reliability of the performance information that is recorded, collected, and reported.⁶

We did not include any changes or modifications the agencies may have made to the reports or plans after they were issued, except in cases in which agency comments provided information from a published update to a report or plan. Furthermore, because of the scope and timing of this review, information on the progress agencies may have made on addressing their management challenges during fiscal year 2002 was not yet available.

We did not independently verify or assess the information we obtained from agency performance reports and plans. Also, that an agency chose not to discuss its efforts to coordinate in these crosscutting areas in its

⁵31 U.S.C. §3516(e).

⁶OMB Circular A-11, section 220.5a.

performance reports or plans does not necessarily mean that the agency is not coordinating with the appropriate agencies.

We conducted our review from September through November 2002, in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

Results in Brief

Our review of agency performance reports and plans for the four crosscutting areas revealed that there are multiple players within these areas pursuing similar or complementary goals and strategies, suggesting significant opportunities for coordination to achieve common objectives. As we have reported previously, agencies could use the annual performance planning cycle to ensure that crosscutting goals are consistent; program efforts are mutually reinforcing; and, where appropriate, common or complementary performance measures are used as a basis for management. Annual performance reports and plans could then serve as a vehicle to highlight crosscutting program efforts and to provide evidence of the coordination of those efforts.

We found most agencies identified the agencies with which they coordinated on the crosscutting areas in their performance reports and plans, although the specific areas of coordination and level of detail provided varied considerably. At one extreme, neither the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) nor its parent agency, the Department of Commerce, specifically discusses coordinating with other agencies on their wetlands efforts. In contrast, for the area of wildland fire management, both the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service indicate in their performance plans their past coordination in developing the National Fire Plan and a 10-year Comprehensive Strategy as well as their current efforts to develop a joint implementation plan for the Comprehensive Strategy, and planned efforts to conduct an interagency review of the fire plan system. Other discussions of coordination cite participation in interagency initiatives. For example, in the area of border control, both the departments of Justice and the Treasury discuss expanded cooperation through the Border Coordination Initiative (BCI), which according to U.S. Customs, has led to increased cooperation among partner agencies in areas such as cross training, improved sharing of intelligence, community and importer outreach, improved communication among agencies using radio technology, and cooperative operational and tactical planning.

The progress agencies reported in meeting their fiscal year 2001 performance goals across the four crosscutting areas also varied considerably. For example, wetlands was the only area in which each of the five agencies we reviewed reported having met or exceeded all of its fiscal year 2001 goals. However, although all of these goals related to creating, restoring, enhancing, or benefiting acres of wetlands, none of the agencies discussed in their fiscal year 2001 performance reports that their progress contributed to the existing national goal of no net loss in wetlands. In contrast, the Department of Transportation reported not meeting either of its two performance goals related to border control and the Department of Agriculture reported not meeting its one performance goal related to flood mitigation. Although the Forest Service reported meeting its goal of treating wildlands with high fire risks, it did not meet any of the individual indicators related to this goal.

Some of the agencies that did not meet their fiscal year 2001 performance goals, such as Transportation in the area of border control, provided reasonable explanations as well as strategies that appear reasonably linked to meeting the goals in the future. Others, such as Interior, which provided a reasonable explanation for not meeting its goal related to wildland fire management, did not discuss any strategies for achieving the goals in the future. Still others, such as Treasury, which reported meeting its targets for all but two of its seven measures related to its strategic goal of protecting the nation's borders and major international terminals from traffickers and smugglers, did not provide reasonable explanations for the shortfalls and did not discuss strategies for achieving those targets in the future.

The agencies we reviewed generally planned to pursue goals in fiscal year 2003 that were similar to those in fiscal year 2001, with targets adjusted to reflect either higher or lower levels of performance than were planned for fiscal year 2001. Some agencies added new goals, modified existing goals, or dropped goals altogether from their fiscal year 2003 performance plans. Many agencies discussed strategies for achieving their fiscal year 2003 goals that appeared to be reasonably linked to the performance goals to be achieved. Other did not discuss strategies. For example, in the area of border control, the Department of State provided only general statements, such as its commitment to improving visa procedures, on how it plans to achieve its fiscal year 2003 goals.

Five of the 10 agencies we reviewed for all the crosscutting areas—Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Justice, Transportation, and Treasury commented on the overall quality and

reliability of the data in their performance reports. For example, the Secretary's message in Treasury's fiscal year 2001 performance report stated that, as required by the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000, the Secretary had assessed the data in the report and determined that the data were reliable and complete with noted exceptions. Beyond such overarching statements, we also found more detailed discussion of the completeness, reliability, and credibility of the performance data reported. For example, Transportation reported its data verification and validation procedures for each of its performance measures. Neither the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) nor State discussed how they assessed the overall quality of their performance data. Some of the agencies we reviewed discussed shortcomings to their data and described the steps they are taking to resolve the shortcomings. For example, in the area of wetlands, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and EPA acknowledged shortcomings in their data, including the possibility of double counting performance data. EPA also indicated that the measure might not reflect actual improvements in the health of the habitat. While FWS does not discuss any steps to resolve or minimize the shortcomings in its data, EPA described improvements it made to make data reported more consistent.

Agencies Involved in Crosscutting Areas Show Opportunities for Coordination

As shown in table 1, multiple agencies are involved in each of the crosscutting program areas we reviewed.

Table 1: Agencies Reviewed for Each Crosscutting Program Area

Agency Involved ^a	Crosscutting program areas			
	Border control	Flood mitigation and insurance	Wetlands	Wildland fire management ^b
Agriculture ^c	✓	✓	✓	✓
Commerce ^d			✓	
Defense ^e		✓	✓	
EPA			✓	
FEMA		✓		
Interior ^f			✓	✓
Justice ^g	✓			
State	✓			
Transportation ^h	✓			
Treasury ⁱ	✓			

Source: GAO analysis.

^aAlthough our review focused primarily on department-level reports and plans, in some cases our review also focused on bureau-level sections of the reports and plans, as indicated in the notes below.

^bEPA and Commerce also have regulatory responsibility over wildland fire management projects of the two principal land management agencies indicated in the table.

^cWithin Agriculture, we looked at the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service and the Food Safety and Inspection Service for border control, the Farm Service Agency and Natural Resources Conservation Service for wetlands, and the Forest Service for wildland fire management.

^dWithin Commerce, we looked at NOAA for wetlands.

^eWithin Defense, we identified the Corps.

^fWithin Interior, we looked at the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, FWS, and the National Park Service for wildland fire management.

^gWithin Justice, we looked at the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Border Patrol for border control.

^hWithin Transportation, we looked at the Coast Guard for border control.

ⁱWithin Treasury, we looked at the Customs Service for border control.

The discussion of the crosscutting areas below summarizes detailed information contained in the tables that appear in appendix I through IV.

Border Control

Hostile nations, terrorist groups, transnational criminals, and even individuals may target American people, institutions, and infrastructure with weapons of mass destruction and outbreaks of infectious disease. Given these threats, successful control of our borders relies on the ability

of all levels of government and the private sector to communicate and cooperate effectively with one another. Activities that are hampered by organizational fragmentation, technological impediments, or ineffective collaboration blunt the nation's collective efforts to secure America's borders.

Each of the five agencies we reviewed in the area of border control—Agriculture, Justice, State, Transportation, and Treasury—discussed in their performance reports and/or plans the agencies they coordinated with on border control issues, although the specific areas of coordination and level of detail provided varied. For example, Agriculture, which focuses on reducing pest and disease outbreaks and foodborne illnesses related to meat, poultry, and egg products in the United States, discusses coordination with a different set of agencies than the other four agencies, which share a focus on border control issues related to travel, trade, and immigration. Agriculture stated that it is a key member of the National Invasive Species Council, which works with other nations to deal with the many pathways by which exotic pests and diseases could enter the United States. Agriculture also stated that it coordinates with the Department of Health and Human Services and EPA on food safety issues. Although Agriculture states it is responsible for inspecting imported products at ports of entry, it does not specifically describe any coordination with the Customs Service within Treasury or the Border Patrol within Justice.

In its combined performance report and plan, Transportation provided general statements that the Coast Guard regularly coordinates with a variety of agencies on immigration issues and potential international agreements to ensure security in ports and waterways. However, Transportation provided a more extensive discussion of the coordination and roles played by bureaus within the agency. For example, for its goal to ensure that sea-borne foreign and domestic trade routes and seaports remain available for the movement of passengers and cargo, Transportation states that the Transportation Security Administration, the Maritime Administration (MARAD), and the Coast Guard will coordinate with the international community and federal and state agencies to improve coordination of container identification, tracking, and inspection. As an example of the roles described, Transportation states that the Coast Guard and MARAD will test deployment plans through port security readiness exercises. In its performance report, State listed the partners it coordinates with for each performance goal, but did not always provide details about the coordination that was undertaken. Both Justice and Treasury discuss expanded cooperation through BCI, which includes

Agriculture; Customs; Coast Guard; the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), and other federal, state, local, and international agencies. According to Customs, BCI efforts toward increased cooperation among partner agencies included cross training, improved sharing of intelligence, community and importer outreach, improved communication among agencies using radio technology, and cooperative operational and tactical planning.

Of the five agencies we reviewed, only Justice reported meeting all of its fiscal year 2001 performance goals related to securing America's borders.⁷ Transportation reported not meeting either of its two goals related to border control, but provided explanations and strategies for meeting the goals in the future that appeared reasonable. For example, Transportation said it did not meet its target for the percentage of undocumented migrants interdicted and/or deterred via maritime routes because socioeconomic conditions here and abroad and political and economic conditions caused variations in illegal migration patterns. To meet the target in the future, the Coast Guard plans to operate along maritime routes and establish agreements with source countries to reduce migrant flow. For its two performance goals related to border control, State reported progress in meeting its goal of reducing the risk of illegitimate entry of aliens hostile to the nation's interest, but not meeting the immigrant visa targets. State explained that it failed to meet this goal due to extremely high demand for visa numbers from INS to adjust the status of large numbers of aliens already in the United States, but did not provide any specific strategies for meeting this goal in the future.⁸ Treasury reported meeting its targets for all but two of its seven measures related to its strategic goal of protecting the nation's borders and major international terminals from traffickers and smugglers. Treasury did not provide reasonable explanations for either shortfall, and did not discuss strategies for achieving those targets in the future. Agriculture reported meeting all but one of its performance targets for its three goals. The unmet performance target for significantly reducing the prevalence of salmonella on broiler chickens fell under Agriculture's goal of creating a coordinated national and international food safety risk

⁷Justice did not compare its performance for one of the goals—identify, disrupt, and dismantle alien smuggling and trafficking organizations—to a targeted level of performance.

⁸As we reported in October 2002, the number of nonimmigrant visa applications dropped worldwide after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. See U.S. General Accounting Office, *Border Security: Visa Process Should be Strengthened as an Antiterrorism Tool*, [GAO-03-132NI](#) (Washington, D.C.: Oct. 21, 2002).

management system. Agriculture provides a reasonable explanation, but it is not clear if from the discussion if it is a domestic or international issue.

According to their performance plans, the five agencies generally aimed to achieve the same goals as those reported on in fiscal year 2001, with targets adjusted to reflect higher performance levels. Transportation reported that it established a new performance goal and related measure in fiscal year 2002 that would also be included in the fiscal year 2003 plan. The new goal is to ensure that sea-borne foreign and domestic trade routes and seaports remain available for the movement of passengers and cargo. The new measure is the percentage of high-interest vessels screened, with a target of 100 percent for fiscal year 2003.

Three of the five agencies—Agriculture, Justice, and Transportation—discussed strategies that appeared to be reasonably linked to achieving their fiscal year 2003 goals. For example, Transportation discusses strategies for each of its goals. For its new goal Transportation describes strategies, such as increasing intelligence efforts in ports; improving advanced information on passengers, crew, and cargo; and establishing or improving information and intelligence fusion centers in Washington and on both coasts. It also identified more specific efforts, such as increasing boarding and escort operations to protect vessels carrying large numbers of passengers and vessels with dangerous cargo, such as liquefied natural gas or other volatile products, from becoming targets. In contrast, Customs discussed a more limited “strategic context” for each of its goal areas and other information in sections pertaining to specific Customs activities, both of which varied in the level of detail. For example, for its goal of contributing to a safer America by reducing civil and criminal activities associated with the enforcement of Customs laws, Customs defined challenges and constraints to achieving the goal and mentions that it is playing a major role in the interdiction and detection of weapons of mass destruction entering or leaving the United States, including increased vessel, passenger, and cargo examinations. For the most part, State provided only general statements of how it plans to achieve its fiscal year 2003 goals. For example, regarding its visa issuance goal, State said it has committed itself to improving its visa procedures and coordination with other agencies and departments.

Regarding the completeness, reliability, and credibility of their reported performance data, Agriculture, Justice, Transportation, and Treasury provided general statements about the quality of their performance data and provided some information about the quality of specific performance

data. For example, Transportation provided extensive information on its measures and data sources that allow for an assessment of data quality. The information includes (1) a description of the measure, (2) scope, (3) source, (4) limitations, (5) statistical issues, and (6) verification and validation. Other explanatory information is provided in a comment section of Transportation's combined performance plan and report. State did not provide consistent or adequate information for the border-control-related data sources to make judgments about data reliability, completeness, and credibility. For the most part, State provided only a few words on the data source, data storage, and frequency of the data.

Flood Mitigation and Insurance

Floods have inflicted more economic losses upon the United States than any other natural disaster. Since its inception 34 years ago, the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) has combined flood hazard mitigation efforts and insurance to protect homeowners against losses from floods. The program, which is administered by FEMA, provides an incentive for communities to adopt floodplain management ordinances to mitigate the effects of flooding upon new or existing structures. It offers property owners in participating communities a mechanism—federal flood insurance—to cover flood losses without increasing the burden on the federal government to provide disaster relief payments. Virtually all communities in the country with flood-prone areas now participate in NFIP, and over 4 million U.S. households have flood insurance.⁹

⁹U.S. General Accounting Office, *Flood Insurance: Extent of Noncompliance with Purchase Requirements Is Unknown*, [GAO-02-396](#) (Washington, D.C.: June 21, 2002).

The two agencies we reviewed—Agriculture and FEMA—generally address coordination efforts regarding the issue of flood mitigation. Agriculture states in its report and plan that it works with other agencies, such as FEMA and the Corps, to obtain data regarding its goal related to flood mitigation. However, Agriculture does not further specify coordination activities. FEMA’s fiscal year 2001 performance report does not state which agencies it collaborates with to achieve goals related to flood mitigation and insurance. FEMA’s plan provides an appendix that outlines the crosscutting activities and partner agencies associated with its flood mitigation and preparedness activities. For example, FEMA states it is the chair of the President’s Long-Term Recovery Task Force, which helps state and local governments to identify their needs related to the long-term impact of a major, complex disaster. Agencies FEMA coordinates on this effort with include the departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Education, Energy, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, the Interior, Labor, and Transportation, among other organizations.¹⁰

Agriculture reported that it did not meet its only fiscal year 2001 goal related to flood mitigation—providing benefits to property and safety through flood damage reduction by completing 81 watershed protection structures. Agriculture explained that it did not meet the goal because (1) complex engineering can result in watershed protection structures taking several years to complete, (2) multiple funding sources, including federal, state, and local funds, may alter the schedule for completing the structures, and (3) external factors such as weather and delays in obtaining land rights and permits caused delays in construction. Agriculture states that many of the structures that were not completed in time for the fiscal year 2001 report will be complete in the next few months.

¹⁰We did not review these agencies because either they did not have goals associated with flood mitigation or insurance or they were not federal agencies.

FEMA reported meeting all but one of its fiscal year 2001 goals and indicators related to flood mitigation and insurance. FEMA's five goals were (1) prevent loss of lives and property from all hazards, (2) collect and validate building and flood loss data, confirm that the reduction in estimated losses from NFIP activities exceeds \$1 billion, and continue systematic assessment of the impact and effectiveness of NFIP, (3) increase the number of NFIP policies in force by 5 percent over the end of the fiscal year 2000 count,¹¹ (4) improve the program's underwriting ratio, and (5) implement NFIP business process improvements. FEMA reported that it did not meet the third goal, explaining that, although the end of year policy count for fiscal year 2001 increased, the retention rates for existing policies were not maintained. FEMA outlined three strategies that appeared reasonably linked to achieving the unmet goal in the future: (1) placing two new fiscal year 2002 television commercials that emphasize the importance of buying and keeping National Flood Insurance, (2) establishing retention goals for "Write Your Own" companies, private insurance companies that write flood insurance under a special arrangement with the federal government, and (3) targeting its marketing strategies toward those properties no longer on the books.

Because it revised its strategic plan, FEMA reorganized the layout of its fiscal year 2003 performance plan. Nevertheless, FEMA's fiscal year 2003 performance goals and measures are similar to those that appear in its fiscal year 2001 performance plan. FEMA merged its goal of implementation of NFIP business process improvements into its fiscal year 2003 goal of improving NFIP's "bottom line," an income-to-expense ratio, by 1 percent. In addition, FEMA merged two other goals: (1) prevent loss of lives and property from all hazards and (2) collect and validate building and flood loss data, confirm that the reduction in estimated losses from NFIP activities exceeds \$1 billion, and continue the systematic assessment

¹¹In the past, we reported that FEMA had a number of performance goals aimed at improving the result of NFIP, including increasing the number of insurance policies in force. While these goals provide valuable insights into how well NFIP's mission of reducing flood-related losses is being carried out, they do not assess the degree to which the most vulnerable residents—those living in flood-prone areas—participate in the program. Capturing data on the numbers of uninsured and insured structures in flood-prone areas can provide FEMA with another indication of how effectively the program is penetrating those areas most at risk of flooding, whether the financial consequences of floods in these areas are increasing or decreasing, and where marketing efforts can better be targeted. See U.S. General Accounting Office, *Flood Insurance: Emerging Opportunity to Better Measure Certain Results of the National Flood Insurance Program*, [GAO-01-736T](#) (Washington, D.C.: May 15, 2001).

of the impact and effectiveness of NFIP. FEMA adopted one new goal in its fiscal year 2003 plan related to modernizing its floodplain mapping. Agriculture expects to continue making progress on its goal of providing benefits to property and safety through flood damage reduction, but has adopted a new approach to achieving the goal. Agriculture appears to have dropped its target for completing new watershed protection structures and instead plans to implement a new program of rehabilitating aging dams. Overall, the strategies Agriculture and FEMA plan to use appear to be reasonably linked to achieving their fiscal year 2003 goals. For example, to support its fiscal year 2003 performance goals, FEMA outlines several strategies, such as increasing the number of Emergency Action Plans in communities located below significant and potentially high-hazard dams.

In its fiscal year 2001 *Annual Performance and Accountability Report*, FEMA states “the performance measurement criteria and information systems are thought to be generally effective and reliable.” FEMA does not individually identify data quality assessment methods for any of its performance indicators.¹² However, it acknowledges a data limitation for one of its goals relating to business process improvement. FEMA explained that it relied on trend data to assess its performance in customer service for fiscal year 2001 because of a delay in obtaining OMB approval for distributing its customer surveys that year. FEMA states that it plans to conduct the surveys in fiscal year 2002 to obtain more accurate information. Agriculture addresses this issue at the beginning of its report by stating, “performance information supporting these performance goals is of sufficient quality and reliability except where otherwise noted in this document.” Agriculture also states that the data reported by state offices for fiscal year 2001 are accurate.

Wetlands

According to estimates by FWS, more than half of the 221 million acres of wetlands that existed during colonial times in what is now the contiguous United States have been lost. These areas, once considered worthless, are now recognized for the variety of important functions that they perform,

¹²We previously reported that although FEMA’s Federal Insurance Administration tracks data on the number of insurance policies in flood-prone areas, data on the overall number of structures are incomplete and inaccurate. Some communities are developing more accurate data on the number of structures in flood-prone areas. FEMA is also working to improve the quality of its data on the number of structures in flood-prone areas and is participating in the development of new mapping technologies that could facilitate the collection of such data. See [GAO-01-736T](#).

such as providing wildlife habitats, maintaining water quality, and aiding in flood control. Despite the passage of numerous laws and the issuance of two presidential orders for protecting wetlands, no specific or consistent goal for the nation's wetlands-related activities existed until 1989. Recognizing the value of wetlands, in 1989, President George Bush established the national goal of no net loss of wetlands. However, the issue of wetlands protection and the various federal programs that have evolved piecemeal over the years to protect and manage this resource have been subjects of continued debate.

We previously reported that for the six major agencies involved in and responsible for implementing wetlands-related activities—the Corps, Agriculture's Farm Service Agency (FSA) and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), Interior's FWS, Commerce's NOAA, and EPA—the consistency and reliability of wetlands acreage data reported by these federal agencies were questionable.¹³ Moreover, we reported that the agencies' reporting practices did not permit the actual accomplishments of the agencies—that is, the number of acres restored, enhanced, or otherwise improved—to be determined. These reporting practices included inconsistencies in the use of terms to describe and report wetlands-related activities and the resulting accomplishments, the inclusion of nonwetlands acreage in wetlands project totals, and the double counting of accomplishments. We recommended that these agencies develop and implement a strategy for ensuring that all actions contained in the Clean Water Action Plan related to wetlands data are adopted governmentwide.¹⁴ Such actions included, in addition to the ongoing effort to develop a single set of accurate, reliable figures on the status and trends of the nation's wetlands, the development of consistent, understandable definitions and reporting standards that are used by all federal agencies in reporting their wetlands-related activities and the changes to wetlands that result from such activities.

¹³U.S. General Accounting Office, *Wetlands Overview: Problems With Acreage Data Persist*, GAO/RCED-98-150 (Washington, D.C.: July 1, 1998).

¹⁴The Clean Water Action Plan, issued in February 1998, included a number of efforts to improve wetlands data. One of the actions planned was the establishment of an interagency tracking system that would accurately account for wetlands losses, restoration, creation, and enhancement. The system would also establish accurate baseline data for federal programs that contribute to net wetlands gain.

The agencies we reviewed generally discussed the need to coordinate with other agencies in their performance plans, but provided little detail on the level of coordination or specific coordination strategies. Agriculture's annual performance plan includes a strategy to work with other federal agencies and partners to identify priority wetlands that could benefit from conservation practices in the surrounding landscape. Neither of the bureaus within Agriculture—FSA or NRCS—specifically discussed coordination on wetlands issues in their performance reports or plans. Interior's annual performance report and plan indicate that it will work with Agriculture, EPA, the Corps, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), and the states on wetlands issues. EPA discusses cooperation with the Corps, NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service within Commerce, FEMA, FWS within Interior, and NRCS within Agriculture, but provides no specifics. Both Commerce and NOAA indicate that they work with other federal agencies to address crosscutting issues. Although NOAA mentions that it works closely with other agencies on a number of crosscutting issues to address critical challenges facing coastal areas, its plan does not specifically mention coordination with other agencies on wetlands issues.

Each of the agencies we reviewed had goals related to wetlands that it reported having met or exceeded in fiscal year 2001.¹⁵ For example, FWS within Interior reported that it restored or enhanced 144,729 acres of wetlands habitat on non-FWS lands, exceeding its goal of 77,581 acres. However, FWS did not report on the number of acres of wetlands restored or enhanced on FWS lands and did not distinguish between the number of acres restored and the number enhanced. Furthermore, several of the agencies included nonwetlands acreage when reporting their accomplishments, and NOAA changed its performance measure from acres of coastal wetlands restored to acres benefited. Consequently, the contributions made by these agencies toward achieving the national goal of no net loss of the nation's remaining wetlands cannot be determined from their reports.

Each of the agencies we reviewed had plans to create, restore, enhance, and/or benefit additional wetlands acreage in fiscal year 2003, although the targets were in some cases lower than the targets for fiscal year 2001. Of the agencies we reviewed, only NRCS indicated in its plan that its progress

¹⁵NOAA did not report its performance against a target in fiscal year 2001 because it had established a new performance measure.

would contribute to the national goal of no net loss of wetlands. The strategies the agencies planned to use appeared to be reasonably linked to achieving their fiscal year 2003 goals. For example, FSA planned to use the same strategy it has successfully used in past years to achieve its goals—working with producers to enroll land in the Conservation Reserve Program.

Regarding the completeness, reliability, and credibility of the performance data reported, agency discussions varied in the specifics they provided. NOAA and FWS had overall discussions of the sources of their performance data and the verification procedures they followed in their performance reports. Within Agriculture, while FSA reported on the sources and processes used to develop the data reported for the number of wetlands acres restored, NRCS discussed its requirement that each state conservationist verify and validate the state's performance data. NRCS also acknowledged that some discrepancies were noted when the performance data were analyzed, but indicated that there was no compelling reason to discount the performance data reported. Two agencies—FWS and EPA—acknowledged shortcomings in the data, including the possibility of double counting performance data. EPA also indicated that the measure might not reflect actual improvements in the health of the habitat. While FWS does not discuss any steps to resolve or minimize the shortcomings in its data, EPA described improvements it made to make data reported more consistent. FSA indicated some limitations to its data for the Conservation Reserve Program, which it attributed to lags between the date a contract is signed with a producer and when the data are entered, the continual updating of the contract data, and the periodic changes in contract data, but did not discuss any steps to resolve the limitation.

Wildland Fire Management

We recently testified that the most extensive and serious problem related to the health of forested lands—particularly in the interior West—is the overaccumulation of vegetation, which is causing an increasing number of large, intense, uncontrollable, and destructive wildfires.¹⁶ In 1999, Agriculture's Forest Service estimated that 39 million acres of national forested lands in the interior West were at high risk of catastrophic

¹⁶U.S. General Accounting Office, *Wildland Fire Management: Reducing the Threat of Wildland Fires Requires Sustained and Coordinated Effort*, [GAO-02-843T](#) (Washington, D.C.: June 23, 2002).

wildfire. This figure later grew to over 125 million acres as Interior agencies and states identified additional land that they considered to be high risk. To a large degree, these forest health problems contributed to the wildfires in the year 2000—which were some of the worst in the last 50 years. The policy response to these problems was the development of the National Fire Plan—a long-term, multibillion-dollar effort to address the wildland fire threats we are now facing.

Our work on wildland fire has stressed the need for three things: (1) a cohesive strategy to address growing threats to national forest resources and nearby communities from catastrophic wildfires, (2) clearly defined and effective leadership to carry out that strategy in a coordinated manner, and (3) accountability to ensure that progress is being made toward accomplishing the goals of the National Fire Plan. Two years ago, the Forest Service and Interior began developing strategies to address these problems, and recently established a leadership entity—the Wildland Fire Leadership Council—that is intended to respond to the need for greater interagency coordination. Whether the strategy and the council will serve as the framework and mechanism to effectively deal with the threat of catastrophic wildland fire remains to be seen and will depend upon how well the National Fire Plan is implemented. To determine the effectiveness of this implementation effort, we continue to believe that a sound performance accountability framework is needed, one that provides for specific performance measures and data that can be used to assess implementation progress and problems.

Both Interior and the Forest Service indicate in their performance plans their participation in developing the 2000 National Fire Plan and a 10-year Comprehensive Strategy under the plan. Furthermore, both agencies discuss current efforts under way to develop a joint Implementation Plan for the Comprehensive Strategy. Consistent with our recommendations, the implementation plan is reported to include cooperatively developed, long-term goals and performance measures for the wildland fire management program. In its performance report, the Forest Service detailed additional specific actions it collaborated on with Interior and other agencies related to wildland fire management, such as conducting an interagency review of the fire plan system.

Regarding progress in achieving its fiscal year 2001 goals, Interior reported meeting only about half of its planned target of using fire and other treatments to restore natural ecological processes to 1.4 million acres. Although Interior's report provided reasonable explanations for the unmet

goals—difficulty in obtaining permits to carry out the treatments and shifting of resources from restoration to suppression of active fires—it did not discuss any specific strategies for overcoming these challenges in the future. The Forest Service reported meeting its goal of treating wildlands with high fire risks in national forests and grasslands. However, the Forest Service did not meet any of the individual indicators related to this goal. For example, the Forest Service treated only 1.4 million acres of its targeted 1.8 million hazardous fuel acres. The Forest Service provided explanations that appeared reasonable for some of its unmet targets. For example, unusual drought conditions combined with the added complexities and restrictions of treating hazardous fuels in the wildland urban interface contributed to the unmet hazardous fuels goal. The Forest Service did not provide any strategies for meeting the unmet targets in the future.

In fiscal year 2003, Interior expects to treat 1.1 million acres to reduce hazards and restore ecosystem health compared to its goal of 1.4 million acres in 2001. In addition, Interior has added goals for wildland fire containment, providing assistance to rural fire departments, treating high-priority fuels projects, and bringing fire facilities up to approved standards. Interior's strategies for achieving these goals are very broad and general and lack a clear link or rationale for how the strategies will contribute to improved performance. The Forest Service expects to treat 1.6 million acres to reduce hazardous fuels, slightly less than its 2001 target of 1.8 million acres, and assist over 7,000 communities and fire departments. The Forest Service did not include one of its targets for 2001—maximizing fire fighting production capability.¹⁷ The Forest Services strategies for achieving its goals, although fairly general, appear to be reasonably linked to achieving each of the performance targets.

¹⁷We have questioned the credibility of this measure. See U.S. General Accounting Office, *Wildland Fire Management: Improved Planning Will Help Agencies Better Identify Fire-Fighting Preparedness Needs*, [GAO-02-158](#) (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 29, 2002).

The performance data reported by Interior and the Forest Service for wildfire management generally appear to be complete, reliable, and credible. The Forest Service reported that it will use the Budget Formulation and Execution System to report on performance. However, we have found that this system is more of a planning tool for ranking fuel reduction work at the local unit level and that another system, the National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System, is being implemented by both the Forest Service and Interior to track outputs and measure accomplishments. Interior acknowledges that its bureaus may interpret the data they collect differently and that a common set of performance measures is still being developed between Interior and the Forest Service as they implement the National Fire Plan. We have recommended that the agencies develop a common set of outcome-based performance goals to better gauge whether agencies are achieving the objective of restoring ecosystem health.¹⁸ The Forest Service acknowledges possible data limitations and reported that it is currently taking steps, such as conducting field reviews, to ensure effective internal controls over the reporting of performance data.

Concluding Observations

We have previously stated that the Results Act could provide OMB, agencies, and Congress with a structured framework for addressing crosscutting program efforts. OMB in its guidance clearly encourages agencies to use their performance plans as a tool to communicate and coordinate with other agencies on programs being undertaken for common purposes to ensure that related performance goals and indicators are consistent and harmonious. We have also stated that the Results Act could also be used as a vehicle to more clearly relate and address the contributions of alternative federal strategies. The President's common measures initiative, by developing metrics that can be used to compare the performance of different agencies contributing to common objectives, appears to be a step in this direction.

Some of the agencies we reviewed appear to be using their performance reports and plans as a vehicle to assist in collaborating and coordinating crosscutting program areas. Those that provided more detailed information on the nature of their coordination provided greater confidence that they are working in concert with other agencies to achieve

¹⁸[GAO-02-158](#).

common objectives. Other agencies do not appear to be using their plans and reports to the extent they could to describe their coordination efforts to Congress, citizens, and other agencies.

Furthermore, the quality of the performance information reported—how agencies explain unmet goals and discuss strategies for achieving performance goals in the future, and overall descriptions of the completeness, reliability, and credibility of the performance information reported—varied considerably. Although we found a number of agencies that provided detailed information about how they verify and validate individual measures, only 5 of the 10 agencies we reviewed for all the crosscutting areas commented on the overall quality and reliability of the data in their performance reports consistent with the requirements of the Reports Consolidation Act. Without such statements, performance information lacks the credibility needed to provide transparency in government operations so that Congress, program managers, and other decision makers can use the information.

Agency Comments and Our Evaluation

We sent drafts of this report to the respective agencies for comments. We received comments from EPA, FEMA, Commerce, and State. The agencies generally agreed with the accuracy of the information in the report. The comments we received were mostly technical and we have incorporated them where appropriate.

Regarding flood mitigation and insurance, FEMA commented that performance reports and plans are static documents that are over a year old and therefore may not reflect the progress FEMA has made since then. FEMA also stated that, although not reflected in its performance reports and plans, it coordinates its flood mitigation and insurance activities extensively and maintains and employs a number of interagency agreements related to the implementation of its programs. We acknowledge these limitations to our analysis in the scope and methodology section of this report.

Regarding border control, State commented that, as summary documents, performance reports and plans provide a limited opportunity to fully describe their coordination and data validity and verification efforts. State indicated that it plans to include more appropriate measures of performance and performance data that are complete, reliable, and credible in its upcoming performance reports and plans. Regarding its unmet goal for the number of visas processed, State explained that this is

not an accurate measure of program performance because it depends on the demand for visas, which is beyond the agency's control. State plans to revise this measure to one that will more appropriately reflect program effectiveness.

Regarding wetlands, EPA commented on a number of initiatives it has undertaken along with other federal agencies to address the accuracy and availability of data on the extent and health of wetlands. For example, EPA states that its Region V office (Chicago) is working with other federal and state agencies to develop an integrated, comprehensive, geographic information system-based wetlands mapping system for the Minnesota River Basin. Once completed, this new wetland inventory would provide a reliable estimate of total wetland acreage for the Minnesota River Basin, provide a test to update the older National Wetland Inventory data, and serve as a pilot project for identifying wetlands throughout the country using an innovative technology.

We are sending copies of this report to the President, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the congressional leadership, other Members of Congress, and the heads of major departments and agencies. In addition, the report will be available at no charge on the GAO Web site at <http://www.gao.gov>.

If you have any questions about this report, please contact me or Elizabeth Curda on (202) 512-6806 or daltonp@gao.gov. Major contributors to this report are listed in appendix V.



Patricia A. Dalton
Director, Strategic Issues

Border Control

Table 2: Coordination Efforts among Agencies Involved in Border Control as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports and Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans

Department or agency	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program were discussed in their fiscal year 2001 performance reports?	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program are discussed in their fiscal year 2003 performance plans?
Department of Agriculture	<p>Agriculture provided brief descriptions of its coordination with other organizations for its border-control-related goals. For example, for its performance goal to reduce the number and severity of pest and disease outbreaks in the United States, Agriculture stated it is a key member of the National Invasive Species Council and works with other nations and federal agencies to prevent outbreaks by dealing with the many pathways by which exotic pests and diseases could enter the United States. To intercept prohibited products, Agriculture said it participates in inspection “blitzes” as part of multiagency trade compliance teams.</p> <p>For its outcome to reduce the incidence of foodborne illness related to meat, poultry, and egg products in the United States by creating a coordinated national and international food safety risk management system, Agriculture said that its goals require coordination with the Agriculture food safety partner agencies, including the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Agriculture also said it is responsible for reviewing foreign inspection systems that export meat and poultry products to the United States, and for inspecting imported products at ports of entry to assure that standards are equivalent to those of the United States. In the report’s program evaluation section, Agriculture stated that the Food Service Information System (FSIS) and the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) are working towards defining their roles and responsibilities at the U.S. ports of entry regarding products received from restricted countries and enhancing interagency communication.</p>	<p>Agriculture provided brief descriptions of its fiscal year 2003 performance plan coordination similar to its fiscal year 2001 performance report. For example, Agriculture said that one objective is to provide an effective safety net and promote a strong, sustainable United States farm economy, with a key outcome to reduce the number and severity of pest and disease outbreaks in the United States. As a member of the National Invasive Species Council, Agriculture stated that it works with other countries and federal agencies to deploy a range of strategies to safeguard the many pathways by which exotic pests and diseases may enter the United States.</p> <p>For its objective to protect the public health by significantly reducing the prevalence of foodborne hazards, Agriculture stated that its key outcome is to reduce the incidence of foodborne illness related to meat, poultry, and egg products in the United States. According to Agriculture, the goals will require coordination with Agriculture food safety partner agencies, including HHS and EPA.</p> <p>In addition, Agriculture said it has established a Homeland Security Council to provide policy oversight and coordination of Agriculture efforts and to develop performance measures to ensure that investments in homeland security meet priority needs.</p>

Appendix I
Border Control

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program were discussed in their fiscal year 2001 performance reports?	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program are discussed in their fiscal year 2003 performance plans?
Department of Justice ^a	<p>In its combined performance report and performance plan, Justice provided short descriptions of coordination efforts with more specific information for subgoals under performance goals.</p> <p>For its annual goal to secure America's borders, especially to reduce the incidence of alien smuggling, Justice stated that the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) will forge effective relationships and engage in cooperative activities with national, state, and local government as well as nongovernment entities. According to Justice, cooperation will be expanded with the U.S. Customs Service, Coast Guard, Agriculture, and others through the Border Coordination Initiative (BCI). One major strategy of BCI is its outreach efforts to other federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies. INS, the Coast Guard, and Customs have their own border coordinators, co-located at Customs headquarters. Justice also said a de facto border coordinator from Agriculture has been appointed.</p> <p>For its performance goal to promote public safety by combating immigration-related crimes and removing individuals who are unlawfully present in the United States, Justice said INS initiatives on the national and global levels require partnerships with other Justice components to combat terrorism, organized crime, illegal drugs, and violent gangs to reduce the threat of criminal activity.</p> <p>For its performance goal of facilitating port-of-entry traffic and monitoring deferred inspections, Justice said INS will continue to coordinate and integrate efforts with Customs and the other federal inspection services to facilitate the inspection of bona fide travelers. In addition, Justice said that INS inspectors maintain working relations with the intelligence community, routinely sharing information aimed at documenting fraud and human trafficking at ports of entry.</p> <p>For the subgoals under annual goals, Justice provided a description of more specific coordination efforts. For example, under the subgoal of effectively controlling the border, Justice said it will work with</p>	Justice makes no distinction between coordination efforts that occurred in fiscal year 2001 and those that are planned for fiscal year 2003.

**Appendix I
Border Control**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program were discussed in their fiscal year 2001 performance reports?	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program are discussed in their fiscal year 2003 performance plans?
	<p>the Customs Service as part of the BCI. For fiscal year 2003, Justice said BCI is planning to increase its outreach efforts not only to the other federal, state, and local law enforcement organizations along the southwest border, but also to the northern border.</p>	
Department of State	<p>State provided short lists of its coordination “partners” for its one-border control-related performance goal, but did not provide specific coordination details. For its performance goal to facilitate the travel and immigration to the United States of legitimate visa applicants and the denial of visas to ineligible applicants, State said that its partners are Justice (including INS), the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), Customs, APHIS, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the intelligence community, Defense, Energy, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and the Social Security Administration (SSA). State said it uses the TIPOFF database, which has information contributed by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the National Security Agency (NSA), and the FBI. In fiscal year 2002, State anticipated sharing all visa information with INS ports of entry, and is working closely with the Homeland Security Council, Customs, INS, and other relevant agencies to strengthen border security measures with Canada and Mexico.</p>	<p>In its performance plan, State generally provided little specific information on its actual coordination efforts or involved agencies. Instead, State described general aims and uses of information. For example, for its performance goal of timely and effective visa issuance and a reduction of visa fraud, State said it has committed itself to improving its visa procedures and coordination with other agencies and departments. It said it uses TIPOFF, with information gathered from all sources throughout the United States government, especially intelligence and law enforcement information from the CIA, the FBI, and NSA.^b Watchlist names are also entered into the port-of-entry name check system, operated by INS and Customs. State said data generated by consular officers and shared with INS and other agencies enhance both border security and service to visa recipients upon arrival in the United States.</p>

**Appendix I
Border Control**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program were discussed in their fiscal year 2001 performance reports?	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program are discussed in their fiscal year 2003 performance plans?
Department of Transportation	<p>In its performance report and performance plan, Transportation provided extensive information on involved agencies and roles. It has a new 2002 performance goal for coastal and seaport security to ensure sea-borne foreign and domestic trade routes and seaports remain available for the movement of passengers and cargo. For that goal, Transportation said the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), the Maritime Administration (MARAD), and the Coast Guard will coordinate with the international community and federal and state agencies to improve coordination of container identification, tracking, and inspection. MARAD will facilitate improvements in port and cargo security in Latin America and the Caribbean with the Organization of American States. MARAD and the Coast Guard will develop model port security guidelines for commercial strategic ports. In addition, Transportation said the Coast Guard and MARAD will test deployment plans through port security readiness exercises. MARAD will conduct security modules within strategic port defense workshops for federal and commercial port officials. Transportation said it coordinates closely with the Office of Homeland Security, Defense, State, the Customs Service, INS, and local and state governments to ensure security in ports and waterways.</p> <p>Another performance goal is to reduce illegal immigration across U.S. sea borders. According to Transportation, the Border Patrol enforces U.S. immigration laws on shore, while the Coast Guard enforces immigration law at sea. Transportation said the Coast Guard regularly coordinates with State, INS, and the Border Patrol on immigration issues and potential international agreements.</p>	<p>Transportation makes no distinction between coordination efforts that occurred in fiscal year 2001 and those that are planned for fiscal year 2003.</p>

**Appendix I
Border Control**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program were discussed in their fiscal year 2001 performance reports?	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program are discussed in their fiscal year 2003 performance plans?
Department of the Treasury ^c	<p>In its annual performance report, Treasury provided general information on Customs coordination with other agencies. For the border-control-related performance goal to secure the borders while facilitating the expeditious movement of lawful international travel and commerce, Treasury said Customs continued to work closely with INS as well as other law enforcement and inspection agencies around and along the borders. Cooperative efforts such as BCI continued to examine and implement ways partner agencies could better utilize shared resources. According to Customs, a few of these agencies included INS, local and state police, the Coast Guard, Agriculture, and foreign law enforcement. Efforts toward increased cooperation included the cross training of partner agency employees in duties and expertise, technology, and equipment training; improved sharing of intelligence; community and importer outreach; better utilization of radio technology for improved communication among agencies; and cooperative operational and tactical planning.</p> <p>In its fiscal year 2001 report, Customs also provided specific information about information technology initiatives, such as a joint initiative with INS on license plate readers.</p>	<p>In its performance plan, Customs provided details on coordination agencies and initiatives. In line with its mission, Customs described many crosscutting coordination efforts. It said it enforces hundreds of laws and regulations in partnership with dozens of federal agencies and maintains a presence at over 300 ports of entry. Customs provided examples of crosscutting efforts for border control. For example, Customs said it continues to work with other federal agencies in new programs, such as the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System. As part of that program, a national Memorandum of Agreement was completed between the FBI, FAA, and Customs.</p>

Sources: Department of Agriculture, *FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan and Revised Plan for FY 2002* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of Agriculture, *FY 2001 Annual Program Performance Report* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of Justice, *FY 2001 Performance Report & FY 2002 Revised Final, FY 2003 Performance Plan* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of State, *Performance Plan, Fiscal Year 2003* (Washington, D.C.: Sept. 2002); Department of State, *Program Performance Report, Fiscal Year 2001* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of Transportation, *Performance Plan—FY 2003 and Performance Report—FY 2001* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of the Treasury, *Performance Plans, Final for FY 2002, Proposed for FY 2003* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of the Treasury, *Program Performance Report, Fiscal Year 2001* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Customs Service, *FY 2003 President's Budget, Performance Plan and Report* (Washington, D.C.: Feb. 2002); U.S. Customs Service, *Annual Report, Fiscal Year 2001* (Washington, D.C.: 2002).

^aThe departments of Justice and Transportation have combined fiscal year 2001 performance reports and fiscal year 2003 annual performance plans. Where it is not possible to distinguish if material pertains to performance reporting or performance planning, the material is displayed as combined.

^bAccording to State's Congressional Presentation Document, fiscal year 2003, only about half of the TIPOFF records are recorded in the port-of-entry name check systems.

^cThis section represents Customs Service material from the Treasury and Customs Service plans and reports.

**Appendix I
Border Control**

Table 3: Agencies' Reported Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Border Control as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports

Department or agency	What progress in fiscal year 2001 did the agencies report in achieving the goals and measures they established for each program area?	If an agency did not achieve a fiscal year 2001 performance goal or measure, does the agency provide a reasonable explanation for not achieving the goal/measure and describe a strategy that is reasonably linked to achieving the goal/measure in the future?
Agriculture	<p>Agriculture reported that it met or exceeded all but one (risk management system) of its fiscal year 2001 performance targets relating to border control performance goals, which included (1) reducing the number and severity of pest and disease outbreaks in the United States, (2) creating a coordinated national and international food safety risk management system to meet the outcome of reducing the incidents of foodborne illness related to meat, poultry, and egg products in the United States and (3) conducting a comprehensive national and international communication program that is an open exchange of information about opinions about food safety risks.</p>	<p>When the one risk management system performance target was not met, Agriculture provided reasonable, specific explanations for not achieving the performance target. Agriculture reported that it fell short of meeting the target for significantly reducing the prevalence of salmonella on broiler chickens. Agriculture said it is looking into causes as to why rates continue to fluctuate, such as testing being done randomly. The data do not indicate if the problem included problems with imported chickens. According to Agriculture, preliminary data analysis indicated that a number of plants tested in fiscal year 2001 did not meet the performance standard set for broiler chickens, and therefore resulted in a perceived higher prevalence rate.^a Agriculture said it might include not only random sampling, but also sampling when there is an indication that problems exist.</p>
Justice	<p>For its performance targets under its performance goal to secure America's borders, especially to reduce the incidence of alien smuggling, Justice said it met its targets to effectively control the border and exceeded its target to intercept mala fide and offshore travelers en route to the United States. Justice did not provide fiscal year 2001 targets for identifying, disrupting, and dismantling alien smuggling and trafficking organizations, but did provide actual performance data.</p> <p>For its targets under its performance goal to promote public safety by combating immigration-related crimes and removing individuals, especially criminals, who are unlawfully present in the United States, Justice said its targets will be met. Justice stated its target for criminal removals will be met when data are reconciled. However, the data for criminal removals should have been reconciled in January 2002. Therefore, it should be reported in Justice's performance document.</p> <p>For the annual goal to improve the efficiency of the inspections process for lawful entry of persons and goods, Justice said targets were exceeded.</p>	<p>Justice's information reported all performance targets were or will be achieved. However, it is unclear if reconciled data for criminal removals are still pending that would demonstrate that the performance target was achieved.</p>

**Appendix I
Border Control**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What progress in fiscal year 2001 did the agencies report in achieving the goals and measures they established for each program area?	If an agency did not achieve a fiscal year 2001 performance goal or measure, does the agency provide a reasonable explanation for not achieving the goal/measure and describe a strategy that is reasonably linked to achieving the goal/measure in the future?
State	State had two performance goals that affected border control. These were (1) meeting anticipated increases in demand for nonimmigrant and immigrant visas and (2) reducing the risk of illegitimate entry of aliens hostile to the nation's interest. For the visa cases, State used workload measures of cases processed with performance measures and targets. State did not meet its target for immigrant visas. Performance expectations for the second goal were explained in narrative statements, but a set measure and target were not provided.	State said the decrease in immigrant visa case numbers from that expected from fiscal year 2000 to fiscal year 2001 was due to extremely heavy demand from INS for visa numbers to adjust the status of large numbers of aliens already in the United States. State discussed some strategies for reducing the entry of illegal aliens (a performance target was not set), but did not clearly address strategies to address the immigrant visa target.

**Appendix I
Border Control**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What progress in fiscal year 2001 did the agencies report in achieving the goals and measures they established for each program area?	If an agency did not achieve a fiscal year 2001 performance goal or measure, does the agency provide a reasonable explanation for not achieving the goal/measure and describe a strategy that is reasonably linked to achieving the goal/measure in the future?
Transportation	<p>Transportation had two fiscal year 2001 performance goals relating to border control.^b One goal was reducing illegal immigration across United States sea borders, with a measure of the percentage of undocumented migrants interdicted and/or deterred attempting to enter the United States via maritime routes. Transportation did not meet the performance target.</p> <p>A second measure was the percentage of days that the designated number of critical defense assets maintain a combat readiness rating of 2 or better, which Transportation did not meet.</p>	<p>Transportation provided reasonable, specific information on why the target for reducing illegal immigration across U.S. sea borders was not met and strategies to achieve the target in the future. In more general terms, Transportation said the Coast Guard will (1) operate along maritime routes to deter and defeat attempts at smuggling undocumented migrants, (2) establish agreements with source countries to reduce migrant flow, (3) use intelligence to continually improve patrol plans and tactics, (4) develop more capable sensors, advanced vessel search technologies, and nonlethal interdiction technologies, (5) develop tactical data exchange systems, and (6) provide advice and assistance to migrant source countries through State to improve law enforcement efforts against migrant smugglers.</p> <p>Transportation also said political and socioeconomic conditions influence variations in illegal migration patterns. To provide a more understandable migrant interdiction performance measure, Transportation said it will invert the former performance measure and calculate the percentage of undocumented migrants interdicted and/or deterred versus the percentage of undocumented migrants that have successfully entered the United States over maritime routes. Transportation expects to meet the performance targets for fiscal year 2002.</p> <p>For providing combat ready units, Transportation said high endurance cutter and patrol boat readiness remained nearly constant, meeting Defense plan requirements. Transportation and Defense reported high endurance cutter and patrol boat readiness 91 and 100 percent of the time, respectively. Port security units' readiness improved by approximately 3 percent. After 2001, Transportation said this performance goal will be an operating administrative performance goal whose results will be discussed in the context of the new coastal and seaport security performance goal.</p>

**Appendix I
Border Control**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What progress in fiscal year 2001 did the agencies report in achieving the goals and measures they established for each program area?	If an agency did not achieve a fiscal year 2001 performance goal or measure, does the agency provide a reasonable explanation for not achieving the goal/measure and describe a strategy that is reasonably linked to achieving the goal/measure in the future?
Treasury	<p>Treasury has a strategic goal to protect the nation's borders and major international terminals from traffickers and smugglers of illicit drugs, but had measures covering legal violations that were not limited to drug trafficking or smuggling. Related measures include (1) efficiency of targeting selective air passengers and vehicles, (2) air passenger and vehicle compliance with laws and regulations, (3) processing time to clear customs or initial screening, (4) passenger data provided on arrival, (5) response rate to border coordination initiative requests, (6) detection of suspect aircraft entering U.S. territory, and (7) inability to launch Customs aircraft or vessels. Treasury reported that it did not meet its targets for the compliance rate of air travel passengers with laws and regulations and the number of times Customs is unable to launch an aircraft or vessel.</p>	<p>Regarding air travel, Treasury said the fiscal year 2001 final data for air travel indicate a slight increase in the compliance rate over fiscal year 2000 data. Treasury said this reflects the goal of incremental improvement in performance. However, Treasury said it could not identify any deficiency to explain the slight shortfall in the compliance rate between the 2001 actual results and the 2001 goal. Treasury also said the percentage of Customs' no launches of aircraft or vessels during fiscal year 2001 was approximately double the projection. Treasury did not provide any strategies for meeting the performance targets in the future, as its fiscal year 2003 performance plan was still under review at the time of the fiscal year 2001 report publication.</p>

Sources: Department of Agriculture, *FY 2001 Annual Program Performance Report* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of Justice, *FY 2001 Performance Report & FY 2002 Revised Final, FY 2003 Performance Plan* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of State, *Program Performance Report, Fiscal Year 2001* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of Transportation, *Performance Plan—FY 2003 and Performance Report—FY 2001* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of the Treasury, *Program Performance Report, Fiscal Year 2001* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Customs Service, *FY 2003 President's Budget, Performance Plan and Report* (Washington, D.C.: Feb. 2002); U.S. Customs Service, *Annual Report, Fiscal Year 2001* (Washington, D.C.: 2002).

^aIt is not clear if any of the Agriculture information includes foreign plant findings.

^bTransportation also added a new performance goal in fiscal year 2002 for coastal and seaport security to ensure sea-borne foreign and domestic trade routes and seaports remain available for the movement of passengers and cargo. The measure will be the percentage of high interest vessels screened.

**Appendix I
Border Control**

Table 4: Agencies' Expected Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Border Control as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans

Department or agency	What progress did the agencies expect to make in fiscal year 2003?	Do the agencies provide strategies that are reasonably linked to achieving their fiscal year 2003 goals?
Agriculture	<p>Agriculture's fiscal year 2003 performance plan border-related performance goals remained the same as those stated in its fiscal year 2001 performance report, with adjustments to reflect actual 2001 data. The goals included (1) reduce the number and severity of pest and disease outbreaks in the United States, (2) create a coordinated national and international food safety risk management system to ensure the safety of U.S. meat and poultry products from farm to table, and (3) conduct a comprehensive national and international communication program about food safety risks.</p> <p>For the first performance goal, Agriculture performance targets increased from fiscal year 2001 actual performance. For the second performance goal, Agriculture said the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) was reevaluating the targets for the prevalence of foodborne illnesses as a better understanding of the factors become known. Agriculture set targets both lower and higher than the actual amount in fiscal year 2001. The plan does not explicitly contain measures for increasing reviews and audits of foreign inspection systems, described as an important effort in its strategies.</p> <p>For the third performance goal, the fiscal year 2003 targets for getting food safety information to citizens were set lower, and the targets for stakeholder activities held to improve food safety related decisionmaking and public policy were set slightly higher than fiscal year 2001 actual performance. The fiscal year 2001 actual data for food safety information was considerably higher than the target set for 2003, but the annual plan does not describe why the new target was not set higher.</p>	<p>Agriculture's fiscal year 2003 performance plan generally describes several strategies that appear to be reasonably linked to meeting its performance goals.</p> <p>Several strategies are intended to reduce the number and severity of pest and disease outbreaks in the United States. These included efforts to (1) devote additional resources to inspection of incoming people and cargo, (2) assess which agricultural products are likely to carry exotic pests and diseases and establish appropriate, science-based quarantine regulations, (3) promote awareness of the value of these regulations to help the public and importers understand the need for compliance, (4) inspect passenger baggage and cargo at points of origin as well as aircraft, ships, trains, and other vehicles at U.S. ports of entry, (5) enforce penalties for those who are caught carrying prohibited products to deter future violations, and (6) maintain an adequate team of animal and health experts to address emergencies quickly and effectively.</p> <p>For the second performance goal-creating a coordinated national and international food safety risk management system, Agriculture described efforts to (1) establish national performance standards for ready-to-eat meat and poultry products and establish additional standards for raw products, as appropriate, (2) expand access to overseas markets by seeking internationally recognized laboratory accreditation and by expanding United States laboratory capacity to meet European Union residue testing requirements, and (3) ensure that meat, poultry, and egg products imported into the United States are safe by increasing reviews and audits to ensure the continued equivalence of foreign inspection systems.</p>

**Appendix I
Border Control**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What progress did the agencies expect to make in fiscal year 2003?	Do the agencies provide strategies that are reasonably linked to achieving their fiscal year 2003 goals?
Justice	<p>Justice's fiscal year 2003 performance plan has several border-control-related performance goals with subgoals and related measures and targets. For a major objective, to secure America's borders, Justice has several annual performance goals. One is securing America's borders, especially to reduce the incidence of alien smuggling. Subgoals include (1) reducing the number of illegal aliens in the United States, (2) effectively controlling the border, (3) identifying, disrupting, and dismantling alien smuggling and trafficking organizations, and (4) deterring illegal immigration at the source. For the first subgoal, Justice has added new measures to determine the total number of illegal aliens residing in the United States and annual entries of illegal aliens residing in the United States. The performance targets were adjusted. For example, the fiscal year 2003 target for the number of illegal aliens residing in the United States is 6.6 million, compared to 7.0 million estimated in 2001.</p> <p>A second goal is combating immigration-related crimes and removing individuals who are unlawfully present in the United States. For controlling criminal aliens, a subgoal includes increasing the number of criminal alien removals, monitoring alien overstays, and monitoring escort of criminal aliens. The performance targets were adjusted. For example, Justice has increased the target for criminal alien removals from fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2003, consistent with fiscal year 2001 actual performance and fiscal year 2002 targets.</p> <p>Another performance goal is the efficiency of the inspections process for lawful entry of persons and goods, with a subgoal to facilitate port-of-entry traffic and monitor deferred inspections. Targets for fiscal year 2003 were adjusted to reflect fiscal year 2001 performance.</p>	<p>For the third performance goal, Agriculture planned to (1) emphasize both education and explanation of food safety issues, (2) develop information for and deliver information to at-risk populations, (3) incorporate risk communication objectives into risk management strategies, (4) increase seminars and technical training on science-based food safety standards for U.S. foreign delegates, and (5) expand risk prevention for small and very small plants through education.</p> <p>Justice's strategies and initiatives to address its border control performance goals generally appear to be reasonably linked to achieving its goals. Justice provides overarching strategies to secure America's borders that describe objectives to (1) prevent and deter illegal entry by phased implementation of a comprehensive border enforcement strategy that concentrates resources to control corridors of illegal entry, (2) pursue border safety initiatives that create a safe border environment, (3) strengthen the capabilities of host and transit countries to combat illegal migration and prevent and deter illegal immigration at the source, and (4) enhance and maintain an effective intelligence capability through coordination with other agencies and integration of INS worldwide intelligence resources. For each subgoal area, Justice provides additional detail on strategies to achieve the subgoal. For example, Justice discusses strategies to achieve the fiscal year 2003 goal of controlling borders between ports of entry and at ports of entry.</p>

**Appendix I
Border Control**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What progress did the agencies expect to make in fiscal year 2003?	Do the agencies provide strategies that are reasonably linked to achieving their fiscal year 2003 goals?
State	<p>For fiscal year 2003, State established a border control performance goal similar to that used in the past. The goal included timely and effective visa issuance and a reduction of visa fraud. State said it was establishing additional indicators for developing a biometrics collection program for U.S. visas and federal agency access to the Consular Consolidated Database. Projected performance for processing immigrant visa cases was expected to increase from fiscal year 2001 actual performance to projected fiscal year 2003 performance, but decrease for nonimmigrant visa cases.</p>	<p>For the most part, State provided only general statements of how it plans to achieve its fiscal year 2003 goal. Regarding visa issuance, State said it has committed itself to improving its visa procedures and coordination with other agencies and departments. In addition to new priorities such as establishing a robust entry-exit system for foreigners, State said it is also analyzing and improving all current processes and procedures to reflect the lessons learned from September 11. In addition, State said it seeks to facilitate entry for deserving refugees of natural disasters, political repression, and victims of trafficking. According to State, data generated by consular officers and shared with INS and other agencies enhance both border security and service to visa recipients upon arrival in the United States.</p>
Transportation	<p>Transportation said it retained goals and measures for interdiction and/or deterrence of undocumented migrants across United States sea borders. The fiscal year 2003 target for interdicting or deterring undocumented migrants remains at an 87 percent target, the same as the target for the past few years and above the fiscal year 2001 actual achievement of 82.5 percent.</p> <p>Transportation said it established a new performance goal and related measure for fiscal year 2002 that would carry into 2003: Ensure sea-borne foreign and domestic trade routes and seaports remain available for the movement of passengers and cargo. The measure is the percentage of high-interest vessels screened, with a target for fiscal year 2003 set at 100 percent.</p>	<p>For the border-control-related goals, Transportation provided strategies that appear to be reasonably linked to achieving its goals. Transportation said the Coast Guard will have efforts to (1) operate along maritime routes to deter and defeat attempts at smuggling undocumented migrants, (2) establish agreements with source countries to reduce migrant flow, (3) use intelligence to continually improve patrol plans and tactics, (4) develop more capable sensors, advanced vessel search technologies, and nonlethal interdiction technologies, (5) develop tactical data exchange systems, and (6) provide advice and assistance through State auspices for migrant source countries in improving law enforcement efforts against organized migrant smugglers.</p> <p>For the new performance goal, Transportation said it would increase intelligence efforts in ports; improve advanced information on passengers, crew, and cargo; and establish or improve information and intelligence fusion centers in Washington and on both coasts. It also identified more specific efforts, such as increasing boarding and escort operations to protect vessels carrying large numbers of passengers and vessels with dangerous cargo, such as liquefied natural gas or other volatile products, from becoming targets. In another example, Transportation said it is beginning a multiyear task of thoroughly assessing seaport vulnerability. An interagency vulnerability assessment process led by the Coast Guard will complete 55 comprehensive port vulnerability assessments by 2004.</p>

**Appendix I
Border Control**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What progress did the agencies expect to make in fiscal year 2003?	Do the agencies provide strategies that are reasonably linked to achieving their fiscal year 2003 goals?
Treasury ^a	<p>Customs described two border-control-related performance goals for fiscal year 2003. One performance goal is to secure the nation's borders while facilitating the expeditious movement of lawful international travel and commerce, with measures of (1) efficiency of targeting selective air passengers and vehicles, (2) air passenger and vehicle compliance with laws and regulations, (3) processing time for air/land vehicle passengers, (4) passenger data provided on arrival, and (5) the number of passengers processed. The fiscal year 2003 performance targets are lower than fiscal year 2001 actual performance for vehicle compliance rates and targeting efficiency.</p> <p>A second performance goal is to contribute to a safer America by reducing civil and criminal activities associated with the enforcement of Customs laws, with measures of (1) Customs efforts to identify, disrupt, and dismantle organizations that further terrorist activity, such as nonintrusive inspections of cargo or efforts related to border initiatives, (2) smuggling windows of opportunity, such as arriving persons, conveyances, and commercial shipments, and (3) outbound licensing violations.</p>	<p>Customs provides general information on the strategies to achieve its fiscal year 2003 performance goals. It provides a description of its "strategic context" for each of its goal areas and other information in sections pertaining to specific Customs activities. These vary in the level of detail.</p> <p>For securing the border, Customs described going to a Level 1 alert after September 11, requiring antiterrorist questioning and increased inspections of travelers and goods. In addition, Customs described efforts such as (1) deploying inspection technology, (2) applying risk management principles to target and identify high-risk travelers and conveyances, (3) hardening the northern border via installation of technology and infrastructure improvements, and (4) implementing the Customs-Trade Partnership against Terrorism to strengthen the overall supply chain and border security.</p> <p>For disrupting terrorist activities, Customs defined challenges and constraints, and is playing a major role in the interdiction and detection of weapons of mass destruction entering or leaving the United States. For example, Customs will conduct increased vessel, passenger, and cargo examinations. Additional funding is being requested for deploying a mixture of nonintrusive inspections at the nation's seaports.</p> <p>In an operations and maintenance section, Customs said it maintains a Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Intelligence facility to coordinate the combined air and marine efforts of the military and law enforcement agencies within 100 miles of the U.S. coastline.</p>

Sources: Department of Agriculture, *FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan and Revised Plan for FY 2002* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of Justice, *FY 2001 Performance Report & FY 2002 Revised Final, FY 2003 Performance Plan* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of State, *Performance Plan, Fiscal Year 2003* (Washington, D.C.: Sept. 2002); Department of Transportation, *Performance Plan—FY 2003 and Performance Report—FY 2001* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of the Treasury, *Performance Plans, Final for FY 2002, Proposed for FY 2003* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Customs Service, *FY 2003 President's Budget, Performance Plan and Report* (Washington, D.C.: Feb. 2002).

^aThis information was obtained from Customs' fiscal year 2003 *President's Budget Performance Plan and Report*.

**Appendix I
Border Control**

Table 5: Reliability of Performance Data Reported by Agencies Involved in Border Control as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports

Department or agency	How did the agencies discuss the completeness, reliability, and credibility of their performance data?	Are known shortcomings in the data acknowledged and steps to resolve or minimize the shortcomings described?
Agriculture	<p>Agriculture’s fiscal year 2001 performance report generally provides explanations of data completeness and reliability. Regarding the data for the indicator of international air travelers’ compliance with restrictions to prevent entry of pests and diseases, Agriculture said data for this performance measure are collected through the Agriculture Quarantine Inspection (AQI) Monitoring System and are obtained at airports of entry by applying standard statistical sampling procedures.</p> <p>For its risk management data, Agriculture said an automated system provides information on microbiological, chemical, and pathological analyses of meat and poultry and their processed products. Agriculture said it considers the data to be reliable. The report does not say what specific steps were taken to verify and validate the information. Agriculture does not indicate if any of the information pertains to imported meat or poultry.</p> <p>For the national and international communication program, Agriculture said people are informed of food safety information through a variety of outreach programs, including print, radio, and TV outlets. Data on stakeholder activities to improve food safety decision making are based on the number of activities advertised in the <i>Federal Register</i>. Agriculture considers its data to be reliable.</p>	<p>Regarding risk management data on salmonella on broiler chickens, Agriculture said it was looking into why the performance rates continue to fluctuate. Agriculture said it is giving serious consideration to increasing its activities to include not only random sampling but also sampling when there is an indication that problems exist in a plant. Agriculture said it also was giving serious consideration to deleting this indicator, as additional sampling results would skew the salmonella prevalence targets.</p> <p>In its fiscal year 2001 report, Agriculture did not indicate limitations for its communication program. However, in its fiscal year 2003 plan, Agriculture said that while it can estimate the number of people reached, the number of people who follow safe food handling practices can only be determined by periodic surveys that are not conducted annually.</p>

**Appendix I
Border Control**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	How did the agencies discuss the completeness, reliability, and credibility of their performance data?	Are known shortcomings in the data acknowledged and steps to resolve or minimize the shortcomings described?
Justice	<p>Justice’s performance report included explanations about data collection and storage, data validation and verification, and any known data limitations for each measure. The explanations provided adequate information about the completeness, reliability, and credibility of the data. For example, Justice provided a definition of the measure for targeted alien smuggling and trafficking organizations identified, disrupted, and dismantled, and explained the measure’s data collection and storage. Justice said that the Statistics Office of the Office of Policy and Planning conducts data validation and verification. The statistics are corroborated through submission audits and logic, range, and computational edits. According to Justice, the data records are complete, with 95 percent of field office records entered within the first 8 working days of the reporting month. The remaining 5 percent are subsequently obtained through submission audits.</p>	<p>For the most part, Justice did not identify any shortcomings in its fiscal year 2001 performance data. Justice did discuss data limitations for new fiscal year 2002 measures on the total number of illegal aliens residing in the United States and the annual entries of illegal aliens residing in the United States. It also mentioned minor problems with existing measurement data and steps to minimize the problems. For example, Justice said that the data for the measure on high-priority border corridors demonstrating optimum deterrence are the subject of a process to standardize all such recording and reporting of data, which is ongoing across all border patrol sectors to ensure consistency and validity. The collection of these data is currently an intensive manual process. Justice said the use of INS’s intranet to extract existing data from automated systems along with auxiliary data not yet automated is being tested at limited pilot sites.</p>
State	<p>In the fiscal year 2001 performance report, State did not provide consistent or adequate information for the border-control-related data sources to make judgments about data reliability, completeness, and credibility. State provided a few words describing the data source, data storage, and frequency of the data. For example, for the measure of immigrant visa cases and nonimmigrant visa cases, State said a corporate database was the source and storage point. For validity, State said there was no known data source outside the department. Therefore, it was not possible to assess data quality.</p>	<p>For the most part, State did not provide sufficient information on data quality to be used to judge if there were data limitations.</p>

**Appendix I
Border Control**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	How did the agencies discuss the completeness, reliability, and credibility of their performance data?	Are known shortcomings in the data acknowledged and steps to resolve or minimize the shortcomings described?
Transportation	<p>Transportation’s combined plan and report provides extensive information on its measures and data sources that allows an assessment of data quality. The information includes (1) a description of the measure, (2) scope, (3) source, (4) limitations, (5) statistical issues, and (6) verification and validation. Other explanatory information is provided in a comment section. For example, for the migrant interdiction measure, Transportation describes the scope as including Cuban, Dominican, Haitian, and Chinese migrants. The success rate calculation is also described. Transportation said data are obtained from the Coast Guard and INS. Estimates of migrants who successfully arrive and estimates of those with a high potential for undertaking the voyage are derived from investigations of incidents, interviews of detainees, and intelligence gathering. Limitations, statistical issues, and verification and validation observations highlight issues of estimation. The measure’s comment section says that the highly variable nature of illegal migrant activity limits the ability to project future outcomes based on performance in the immediate past.</p> <p>Transportation said that its Office of Inspector General plans to selectively verify and validate performance measurement data each year and also will assess performance measures when pertinent to the conduct of ongoing projects. As part of their ongoing work, Transportation said managers of departmental data programs use quality control techniques, such as flow charting the data collection process, to identify where errors can be introduced into the data collection system. In addition, Transportation said its Bureau of Transportation Statistics is developing a statistical policy framework where the operating administrations work together to identify and implement current statistical best practices in all aspects of their data collection programs.</p>	<p>Transportation provides explanations of data shortcomings and the means to address the shortcomings. For its new coastal and seaport security goal and measure, Transportation said that the data for this measure are collected using a manual count from situation reports sent after a vessel inspection or escort. Data systems have not yet been developed or modified to capture this information, and Transportation said it is possible that errors in the data could result due to manual data collection. Transportation said this is an interim activity-based measure until appropriate outcome-based measures are developed.</p> <p>For other measures, Transportation also provides detailed explanations of any data shortcomings. For example, for the measure of interdicting or deterring undocumented migrants, Transportation said the number of illegal immigrants entering the United States 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, Transportation said the estimated potential flow of migrants may contain significant error. The measure only tracks four migrant groups at this time. Trend information prior to 1995 is not available. The Coast Guard has developed the estimation techniques that support this indicator over the last 6 years in order to more consistently use intelligence information. Transportation said the Coast Guard is seeking independent assessment of the methods.</p>

**Appendix I
Border Control**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	How did the agencies discuss the completeness, reliability, and credibility of their performance data?	Are known shortcomings in the data acknowledged and steps to resolve or minimize the shortcomings described?
Treasury	<p>Treasury provided a general statement on the completeness and reliability of its data, citing adherence to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) standards. Treasury said in its fiscal year 2000 performance plan that bureaus were required to provide self-assessments of data quality using two categories: (1) reasonable accuracy (judged to be sufficiently accurate for program management and performance reporting purposes specified in OMB Circular A-11, section 232, as “acceptably reliable”), or (2) questionable or unknown accuracy—judged to be materially inadequate. Where statistical confidence intervals are available, Treasury said these are provided instead of the rating statements. In addition, Treasury said the submission of fiscal year 2001 information and assurance statements required bureaus to address any performance measure data reliability issues. Treasury said performance data presented in the fiscal year 2001 report meet the standards for reliability set forth in OMB Circular A-11, section 232, in that there is neither a refusal nor a marked reluctance by agency managers or government decision makers to use the data in carrying out their responsibilities.^a</p>	<p>In its fiscal year 2001 performance report, Treasury provided a general description of steps to improve the quality and value of performance data. Treasury said teams of Treasury analysts, with the assistance of a loaned executive from OMB, performed reviews and analyses of Treasury’s fiscal year 2001 performance measures, including a review of existing verification and validation information. Results and recommendations were forwarded to bureaus for use in their data quality improvement efforts. Also, bureau classes on Treasury’s implementation of the Results Act included a session on quality performance measures and data verification and validation.</p>

Sources: Department of Agriculture, *FY 2001 Annual Program Performance Report* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of Justice, *FY 2001 Performance Report & FY 2002 Revised Final, FY 2003 Performance Plan* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of State, *Program Performance Report, Fiscal Year 2001* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of Transportation, *Performance Plan—FY 2003 and Performance Report—FY 2001* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of the Treasury, *Program Performance Report, Fiscal Year 2001* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Customs Service, *FY 2003 President’s Budget, Performance Plan and Report* (Washington, D.C.: Feb. 2002); U.S. Customs Service, *Annual Report, Fiscal Year 2001* (Washington, D.C.: 2002).

^aIn its fiscal year 2003 performance plan, Customs provided a description of each measure’s definition, verification and validation, and data accuracy. Customs said that virtually all border-related measures and data have reasonable accuracy, with relatively high confidence levels. Baseline data for the average time for non-commercial vehicles to clear the Northern and Southern Borders are being developed. In addition, Customs said data verification and validation is planned for information in the Aviation and Marine Operations Reporting System, the source of data for information such as the response rate to border coordination initiative requests, the detection of suspect aircraft entering U.S. territory, and the times Customs is unable to launch an aircraft or vessel.

Flood Mitigation and Insurance

Table 6: Coordination Efforts among Agencies Involved in Flood Mitigation and Insurance as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports and Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans

Department or agency	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program were discussed in their fiscal year 2001 performance reports?	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program are discussed in their fiscal year 2003 performance plans?
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)	The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2001 performance report.	The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2003 performance plan.
Department of Agriculture	Agriculture states in its fiscal year 2001 report that it uses data included in the National Dams Inventory maintained by the Corps and FEMA to help achieve its goal of providing benefits to property and safety through flood damage reduction. According to Agriculture's comments, NCRS provides data to the Corps, which has lead responsibility for the inventory.	Agriculture's fiscal year 2003 performance plan does not identify coordination efforts related to its goal of providing benefits to property and safety through flood damage reduction. It does, however, state that projects are supported by a combination of federal, state, and local funds.
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)	FEMA's fiscal year 2001 performance report does not specify which agencies it collaborates with to achieve goals related to flood mitigation and insurance. ^a	<p>FEMA's fiscal year 2003 performance plan includes an appendix that outlines categories of crosscutting activities, such as mitigation and preparedness.</p> <p>One activity that supports this goal is the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). FEMA states that it coordinates with other federal entities to ensure compliance with mandatory purchase requirements of the National Flood Insurance Reform Act. The purpose of this act is to improve the financial condition of NFIP and reduce federal expenditures for disaster assistance to flood-damaged properties. FEMA states that it works on this effort with the departments of Agriculture, Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and Veterans Affairs (VA), the Small Business Administration (SBA), and, within the Department of the Treasury, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), the Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS), and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC). Other entities involved are the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA), the Farm Credit Administration (FCA), the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Freddie Mac, and Fannie Mae.</p>

**Appendix II
Flood Mitigation and Insurance**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program were discussed in their fiscal year 2001 performance reports?	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program are discussed in their fiscal year 2003 performance plans?
		<p>In addition, FEMA states that it is the chair of the President's Long-Term Recovery Task Force, which helps state and local governments to identify their needs related to the long-term impact of a major, complex disaster. Agencies that FEMA coordinates with on this effort include the departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Education, Energy, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, the Interior, Labor, and Transportation. Other involved entities include the Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), the Internal Revenue Service, the Office of Management and Budget, and SBA.</p>

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, *USDA Fiscal Year 2001 Annual Program Performance Report* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); U.S. Department of Agriculture, *USDA Fiscal Year 2003 Annual Performance Plan and Revised Plan for Fiscal Year 2002* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Federal Emergency Management Agency, *Annual Performance & Accountability Report Fiscal Year 2001*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Federal Emergency Management Agency, *Annual Performance Plan Fiscal Year 2003*, (Washington, D.C.: Feb. 2002).

^aFEMA discussed the agencies it coordinated with and areas of coordination in Appendix I of its fiscal year 2001 annual performance plan, similar to that of the coordination appendix in its fiscal year 2003 annual performance plan.

**Appendix II
Flood Mitigation and Insurance**

Table 7: Agencies' Reported Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Flood Mitigation and Insurance as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports

Department or agency	What progress in fiscal year 2001 did the agencies report in achieving the goals and measures they established for each program area?	If an agency did not achieve a fiscal year 2001 performance goal or measure, does the agency provide a reasonable explanation for not achieving the goal/measure and describe a strategy that is reasonably linked to achieving the goal/measure in the future?
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2001 performance report.	The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2001 performance report.
Agriculture	Agriculture reported it did not meet its goal related to flood mitigation, of providing benefits to property and safety through flood damage reduction by completing 81 watershed protection structures. Agriculture reported it completed 51 watershed protection structures.	<p>Agriculture provides reasonably clear explanations for its unmet goal. In its fiscal year 2001 report, Agriculture states that due to the complexity of engineering, watershed protection structures take several years to complete, and the multiple funding sources, including federal, state, and local funds, may alter the schedule for completing the structures. In addition, external factors such as weather and delays in obtaining land rights and permits caused delays in construction.</p> <p>Agriculture states that many of the structures that were not completed in time for the fiscal year 2001 report will be completed in the next few months.</p>
FEMA	In its fiscal year 2001 performance report, FEMA identifies five goals related to flood mitigation and insurance: (1) prevent loss of lives and property from all hazards, (2) collect and validate building and flood loss data and confirm that the reduction in estimated losses from NFIP activities exceeds \$1 billion and continue systematic assessment of the impact and effectiveness of NFIP, (3) increase the number of NFIP policies in force by 5 percent over the end of the fiscal year 2000 count, (4) improve the program's underwriting ratio, and (5) implement NFIP business process improvements. Additionally, the first of the two goals each have four performance indicators to support them. FEMA reported meeting all but one of its goals and all eight indicators. The goal FEMA did not meet was increasing the number of NFIP policies in force by 5 percent over the end of the fiscal year 2000 count.	<p>In its fiscal year 2001 performance report, FEMA provides a reasonably clear explanation for not achieving its goal of increasing the number of NFIP policies in force by 5 percent over the end of the fiscal year 2000 count. FEMA states although the end of year policy count for fiscal year 2001 increased, the retention rates for existing policies were not maintained. To determine the reason for FEMA's inability to retain policies in force, the agency states it is supporting GAO's study of lender compliance with the National Flood Insurance Reform Act regarding the purchase and maintenance of flood insurance. FEMA outlines three strategies for addressing the retention issue in its goal: (1) placing two new television commercials in fiscal year 2002 that emphasize the importance of buying and keeping National Flood Insurance, (2) establishing retention goals for "Write Your Own" companies, private insurance companies that write flood insurance under a special arrangement with the federal government, and (3) targeting their marketing strategies on those properties no longer on the books.</p>

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, *USDA Fiscal Year 2001 Annual Program Performance Report* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Federal Emergency Management Agency, *Annual Performance & Accountability Report Fiscal Year 2001*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002).

**Appendix II
Flood Mitigation and Insurance**

Table 8: Agencies' Expected Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Flood Mitigation and Insurance as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans

Department or agency	What progress did the agencies expect to make in fiscal year 2003?	Do the agencies provide strategies that are reasonably linked to achieving fiscal year 2003 goals?
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2003 performance plan.	The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2003 performance plan.
Agriculture	In its fiscal year 2003 plan, Agriculture does not identify a target for achieving its goal of providing benefits to property and safety through reducing flood damage by completing watershed protection structures. However, the plan does state that Agriculture will implement a new program to rehabilitate existing structures through the Rehabilitation of Structural Measures (Pub. L. 106-472).	Agriculture, in its fiscal year 2003 plan, appears to describe strategies reasonably linked to its goal. Such strategies include assisting in assessing conditions, conducting river basin surveys and flood hazard analyses, and providing flood plain management assistance; providing the information and tools communities need to reduce potential damage from natural disasters; and carrying out water supply forecasting to reduce potential damages from flood or drought in western states. Agriculture also states that it plans to help individuals and communities identify resource concerns and carry out watershed-based flood management plans, ensure that government and private organizations have the data needed to guide responsible growth, and strengthen local partnerships and other mechanisms to increase the availability of technical assistance in rapidly developing areas.
FEMA	According to its fiscal year 2001 report and fiscal year 2003 plan, FEMA revised its strategic plan, which affected the organization of its fiscal year 2003 performance plan. FEMA's fiscal year 2003 performance goals and measures are similar to those that appear in its fiscal year 2001 performance plan, but are organized differently. FEMA merged its goal of implementation of NFIP business process improvements into its fiscal year 2003 goal of improving NFIP's "bottom line," an income-to-expense ratio, by 1 percent. In addition, FEMA merged two other goals: (1) prevent loss of lives and property from all hazards and (2) collect and validate building and flood loss data, confirm that the reduction in estimated losses from NFIP activities exceeds \$1 billion, and continue systematic assessment of the impact and effectiveness of NFIP.	FEMA provides reasonable strategies for meeting its fiscal year 2003 goals following a description of each goal. For example, FEMA plans to increase the number of Emergency Action Plans in communities located below significant and high-hazard potential dams. For FEMA's goal of increasing the number of flood insurance policies, the Federal Insurance Mitigation Administration will implement two strategies: (1) work with its partners such as the "Write Your Own" insurance companies, insurance and real estate agencies, and lenders to encourage or require the purchase of flood insurance and (2) conduct a marketing and advertising campaign, including paid broadcast flood insurance advertisements, public service announcements, print ads, articles, and other printed material all designed to reach target audiences.

**Appendix II
Flood Mitigation and Insurance**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What progress did the agencies expect to make in fiscal year 2003?	Do the agencies provide strategies that are reasonably linked to achieving fiscal year 2003 goals?
	<p>However, FEMA did adopt one new goal in its fiscal year 2003 plan related to flood mitigation and insurance. The new goal is for the Federal Insurance Mitigation Administration to modernize floodplain mapping and the flood hazard maps in the FEMA inventory. Three performance indicators relate to this goal: (1) reducing the inventory to an average age of 6 years, (2) producing digital mapping products for 15 percent of the highest priority areas, and (3) reducing the number of unmapped communities by 50 percent.</p> <p>With three merged goals and one added goal in its fiscal year 2003 plan, FEMA reports four annual performance goals directly related to flood mitigation and insurance: (1) to support the Federal Insurance Mitigation Administration, which supports state and community development of disaster resistance, and with its partners, improve hazard risk information and tools, (2) to continue to work with its partners to increase the number of flood insurance policies, (3) to improve NFIP's "bottom line," an income-to-expense ratio, by 1 percent, and (4) to modernize floodplain mapping in the flood hazard maps in the FEMA inventory.</p> <p>FEMA identified five targets related to the first goal. These include: (1) 5,000 fewer lives at risk, (2) 2,200 fewer structures at risk, (3) 150 fewer elements of infrastructure at risk, (4) 10 percent more communities actively committed to building their disaster resistance in fiscal year 2003, and (5) \$1.1 billion in estimated avoidance of flood losses because of NFIP activities.</p>	<p>For its goal of improving the "bottom line," an income-to-expense ratio, by 1 percent, FEMA outlines a number of strategies. For example, the Federal Insurance Mitigation Administration has been implementing business improvement processes since fiscal year 1999 in order to improve the exchange of information, turn around times, and accuracy and to reduce costs. FEMA's plan states that these simplified business processes will make it easier for agents to sell and for consumers to buy policies.</p> <p>For its flood mapping modernization goal, FEMA plans to attain this goal and its indicators by encouraging other federal agencies and state, regional, and local governments to actively participate in and contribute to the maintenance of flood maps by providing data collection, engineering, digital mapping, and other in-kind services or cost sharing through the Cooperating Technical Partner Initiative, which is aimed at increasing local involvement in the flood mapping process.</p>

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, *USDA Fiscal Year 2003 Annual Performance Plan and Revised Plan for Fiscal Year 2002* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Federal Emergency Management Agency, *Annual Performance Plan Fiscal Year 2003*, (Washington, D.C.: Feb. 2002).

**Appendix II
Flood Mitigation and Insurance**

Table 9: Reliability of Performance Data Reported by Agencies Involved in Flood Mitigation and Insurance as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports

Department or agency	How did the agencies discuss the completeness, reliability, and credibility of their performance data?	Are known shortcomings in the data acknowledged and steps to resolve or minimize the shortcomings described?
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2001 performance report.	The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2001 performance report.
Agriculture	Agriculture states at the beginning of its fiscal year 2001 report that “performance information supporting these performance goals is of sufficient quality and reliability except where otherwise noted in this document.” Agriculture also states that the data reported by state offices for fiscal year 2001 are accurate.	Agriculture’s report states “data are accurate” and does not further acknowledge shortcomings in the data or steps to resolve or minimize them.
FEMA	<p>FEMA’s fiscal year 2001 performance report does not individually identify data quality assessment methods for any of its performance indicators.</p> <p>FEMA’s <i>Annual Performance & Accountability Report Fiscal Year 2001</i> states, “the performance measurement criteria and information systems are thought to be generally effective and reliable.”</p>	<p>FEMA’s business process improvement goal is the only goal related to flood mitigation and insurance for which it acknowledges a data limitation. FEMA explained that it relied on trend data from previous years’ surveys to assess its performance in customer service for fiscal year 2001 because of a delay in obtaining Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for distributing its customer surveys that year. FEMA states that it plans to conduct the surveys in fiscal year 2002 to obtain more accurate information.</p> <p>FEMA does not have a general statement acknowledging data shortcomings and steps to resolve or minimize them elsewhere in its fiscal year 2001 performance report.</p>

Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture, *USDA Fiscal Year 2001 Annual Program Performance Report* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Federal Emergency Management Agency, *Annual Performance & Accountability Report Fiscal Year 2001* (Washington, D.C.: 2002).

Wetlands

Table 10: Coordination Efforts among Agencies Involved in Wetlands-Related Activities as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports and Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans

Department or agency	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program were discussed in their fiscal year 2001 performance reports?	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program are discussed in their fiscal year 2003 performance plans?
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)	The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2001 performance report.	The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2003 performance plan.
Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency (FSA)	FSA's fiscal year 2001 report does not mention coordination with other agencies when discussing wetlands-related activities.	Agriculture's fiscal year 2003 Annual Performance Plan includes a strategy to work with other federal agencies and partners to identify priority wetlands that could benefit from conservation practices in the surrounding landscape. However, FSA's 2003 plan does not mention coordination with other agencies when discussing its wetlands-related activities. The plan discusses how FSA's performance goal supports Agriculture's goals and the strategy for achieving the fiscal year 2003 goal.
Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)	NRCS's fiscal year 2001 annual performance report does not mention coordination with other agencies when discussing its wetlands-related activities.	Agriculture's fiscal year 2003 Annual Performance Plan includes a strategy to work with other federal agencies and partners to identify priority wetlands that could benefit from conservation practices in the surrounding landscape. In addition, NRCS's fiscal year 2003 annual performance plan contains a section on interagency cooperation and mentions that the agency provides technical assistance to other Agriculture agencies as well as other federal and state agencies, but does not specifically mention wetlands. NRCS's plan also mentions that other agencies provide valuable information that NRCS uses to validate data on resource condition collected by resource inventories. ^a

**Appendix III
Wetlands**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Department or agency	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program were discussed in their fiscal year 2001 performance reports?	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program are discussed in their fiscal year 2003 performance plans?
Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)	Interior's <i>Departmental Overview</i> contains a section on crosscutting efforts. The section includes a table summarizing examples of departmental crosscutting issues and shows the departmental and external organizations that are involved in the crosscutting issues and the linkage to departmental goals. In the table, Interior indicates that its agencies work together with Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Corps, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), and the states on wetlands issues. In addition, although FWS's fiscal year 2001 report/fiscal year 2003 plan states that wetlands will be restored or enhanced through partnerships and other conservation strategies, the report does not provide any details on coordination with other agencies.	Interior makes no distinction between coordination efforts that occurred in fiscal year 2001 and those that are planned for fiscal year 2003.
Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)	In the combined fiscal year 2001 annual performance report and 2003 annual performance plan, Commerce included a short section about crosscutting issues related to its performance goal of ensuring effective resource stewardship in support of the department's programs. Commerce included a general statement that indicated that under the departmental management function, the Office of the Secretary regularly works with other federal agencies on a full range of policy development and program management topics. NOAA also included a section on crosscutting issues in its fiscal year 2001 annual performance report/fiscal year 2003 plan. NOAA indicated that it has leveraged its resources through a variety of effective partnerships and mentioned that it works closely with other agencies on a number of crosscutting issues to address critical challenges facing coastal areas, but does not provide specifics on its efforts to coordinate with other agencies on wetlands-related activities.	Commerce makes no distinction between coordination efforts that occurred in fiscal year 2001 and those that are planned for fiscal year 2003.
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	EPA's fiscal year 2001 annual performance report does not mention coordination with other agencies when discussing its wetlands-related activities.	EPA's fiscal year 2003 plan specifically indicates that its efforts to meet its objective are predicated on the continuation and improvement of "important" relationships with federal, state, tribal, and local partners. The plan specifically mentions cooperation with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), FWS, and NRCS, but provides no specifics on the actions being taken to improve these relationships.

Sources: Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency, *Farm Service Agency's FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of Agriculture, *Farm Service Agency, Farm*

Appendix III
Wetlands

Service Agency's FY 2001 Annual Program Performance Report, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of Agriculture, *USDA FY 2001 Annual Program Performance Report* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Department of Agriculture, *USDA FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan and Revised Plan for FY 2002*, (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency's FY 2001 Annual Report*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Environmental Protection Agency, *U.S. Environmental Protection Agency FY 2003 Annual Plan*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Natural Resources Conservation Service, Initial Performance Plan for FY 2003 and Revised Plan for FY 2002*, (Washington, D.C.: Jan. 2002); Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, *Annual Performance Report Fiscal Year 2001*, (Washington, D.C.: Jan. 2002); Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, *Fish and Wildlife Service FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan/FY 2001 Annual Performance Report*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, *NOAA FY 2001 Annual Performance Report*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, *NOAA FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002).

^aNRCS's National Resources Inventory is an inventory that determines the condition of land cover and use, soil erosion, prime farmland, wetlands, and other natural resource characteristics on nonfederal rural lands in the United States.

**Appendix III
Wetlands**

Table 11: Agencies' Reported Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals Involved in Wetlands-Related Activities as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports

Department or agency	What progress in fiscal year 2001 did the agencies report in achieving the goals and measures they established for each program area?	If an agency did not achieve a fiscal year 2001 performance goal or measure, does the agency provide a reasonable explanation for not achieving the goal/measure and describe a strategy that is reasonably linked to achieving the goal/measure in the future?
Corps	The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2001 performance report.	N/A ^a —The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2001 annual performance report.
Agriculture, FSA	FSA reported that it achieved its goal of restoring 1.7 million acres of wetlands. ^b	N/A—FSA reported that it achieved its fiscal year 2001 goal.
Agriculture, NRCS	NRCS reported that it exceeded its goal to create, restore, or enhance 250,000 acres of wetlands by 45 percent. According the fiscal year 2001 report, the agency actually created, restored, or enhanced 362,000 acres of wetlands.	N/A—NRCS reported that it exceeded its fiscal year 2001 performance goal.
Interior, FWS	FWS reported that it actually restored or enhanced 144,729 acres of wetlands habitat on non-FWS lands, exceeding its fiscal year 2001 goal to restore or enhance 77,581 acres of wetlands habitat. FWS did not report on the number of acres of wetlands restored or enhanced on service lands and did not distinguish between the number of wetlands acres restored and those enhanced.	N/A—FWS reported that it exceeded its fiscal year 2001 performance goal.
Commerce, NOAA	NOAA changed its performance measure from number of acres of coastal wetlands restored (cumulative) to number of acres of coastal acres benefited (cumulative). Because the performance measure was changed, no target was established. However, NOAA reported that 116,000 acres of coastal habitat benefited (cumulative) from NOAA-sponsored projects funded under the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act. ^c	N/A—The goal established by NOAA is a new performance measure.
EPA	According to EPA's fiscal year 2001 report, it exceeded its goal of preserving, restoring, and/or creating 50,000 acres of habitat under the National Estuary Program (cumulative) by 20,000 acres.	N/A—EPA reported that it exceeded its goal.

Sources: Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency, *Farm Service Agency's FY 2001 Annual Program Performance Report*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Department of Agriculture, *USDA FY 2001 Annual Program Performance Report* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency's FY 2001 Annual Report*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, *Annual Performance Report Fiscal Year 2001*, (Washington, D.C.: Jan. 2002); Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, *Fish and Wildlife Service FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan/FY 2001 Annual Performance Report*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, *NOAA FY 2001 Annual Performance Report*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002).

^aNot applicable.

^bFSA included a footnote indicating that this acreage included adjacent uplands.

**Appendix III
Wetlands**

°In its comments on the draft, Commerce indicated that the number of acres of coastal habitat benefited by NOAA-sponsored projects should be changed from 116,000 to 83,802 based on a November 2002 Inspector General audit report, which is still in draft form.

Table 12: Agencies' Expected Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Wetlands-Related Activities as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans

Department or agency	What progress did the agencies expect to make in fiscal year 2003?	Do the agencies provide strategies that are reasonably linked to achieving fiscal year 2003 goals?
Corps	The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2003 annual performance plan.	N/A—The Corps has not submitted a fiscal year 2003 annual performance plan.
Agriculture, FSA	FSA plans to restore 1.9 million acres of restored wetlands (cumulative) in fiscal year 2003—an increase of 100,000 acres from fiscal year 2002.	The strategy that FSA plans to use for fiscal year 2003 appears to be reasonably linked to achieving its goals. The strategy described is the same one that FSA has used in past years to successfully achieve its goal—working with producers to enroll land in the Conservation Reserve Program.
Agriculture, NRCS	NRCS plans to create, restore, or enhance 230,000 acres of wetlands. NRCS indicated that achieving its performance goal would contribute to the national goal of no net loss of wetlands.	The strategies that NRCS plans to use appear to be reasonably linked to achieving its goals. However, NRCS points out that the achievement of its performance depends upon having funding available to provide financial assistance to producers under the Wetlands Reserve Program.
Interior, FWS	FWS plans to enhance or restore 71,473 acres of wetlands habitat in fiscal year 2003.	The strategies that FWS plans to use appear to be reasonably linked to achieving its goals. The strategies cited are the same that FWS has employed in the past to achieve its goals.
Commerce, NOAA	NOAA plans to sponsor projects that will benefit 132,000 acres of coastal habitat (cumulative). These projects will be funded under the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act.	The strategies NOAA cited appear to be reasonably linked to achieving its goals.
EPA	EPA plans to restore or protect 25,000 acres of habitat nationwide through actions or commitments under the National Estuary Program and support 550 wetlands restoration projects.	The strategies cited by EPA appear to be reasonably linked to achieving its 2003 goals.

Sources: Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency, *Farm Service Agency's FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of Agriculture, *USDA FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan and Revised Plan for FY 2002*, (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Environmental Protection Agency, *U.S. Environmental Protection Agency FY 2003 Annual Plan*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of Agriculture, *Natural Resources Conservation Service, Initial Performance Plan for FY 2003 and Revised Plan for FY 2002*, (Washington, D.C.: Jan. 2002); Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, *Fish and Wildlife Service FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan/FY 2001 Annual Performance Report*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, *NOAA FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002).

**Appendix III
Wetlands**

Table 13: Reliability of Performance Data Reported by Agencies Involved in Wetlands-Related Activities as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports

Department or agency	How did the agencies discuss the completeness, reliability, and credibility of their performance data?	Are known shortcomings in the data acknowledged and steps to resolve or minimize the shortcomings described?
Corps	The Corps did not submit a fiscal year 2001 annual performance report.	N/A.
Agriculture, FSA	FSA's report discusses the sources and process used to develop the data reported for the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), including wetlands acreage restored. The report also indicates that technical adjustments were made to the estimation process for many of CRP's performance measures.	The report indicates that some limitations exist, but attributes those limitations to time lags from the date that contracts are signed with producers to the time that the data entered, the continual updating of the contract data, and the periodic changes in contract data. No steps to address the known limitations were described.
Agriculture, NRCS	NRCS's fiscal year 2001 annual performance report did not specifically address the verification and validation of the performance data reported for its wetlands-related data. However, the report did include a section that described its Performance and Results Measurement System (PRMS) and indicated that each state conservationist is required to validate and verify the performance data reported within his or her state. The report also indicated that the agency conducted an internal review of the PRMS and has begun the implementation of a quality assurance strategy for the system.	The report acknowledges that some discrepancies were noted when performance data were analyzed, but that there was no compelling reason to discount the performance data reported.
Interior, FWS	FWS's 2001 report contained information on the source of the data and discussed the process used to verify the data reported.	FWS's report lists several limitations, including the possibility of double counting. The report contained no discussion of steps that FWS has taken or plans to take to address the limitations acknowledged.
Commerce, NOAA	NOAA's 2001 report contained a small section on the verification and validation of performance data. The section identifies the source of the data and the verification procedure that is followed.	NOAA did not identify any limitations.
EPA	In its fiscal year 2001 report, EPA stated that its performance data generally can be considered acceptably reliable and complete, according to guidelines established by the Office of Management and Budget.	EPA listed several current limitations, including the possibility of double counting and that the measurement may not reflect actual improvements in the health of the habitat. EPA also described improvements made to make the data reported more consistent. EPA also indicated that it is too early to determine the extent of data limitations and that because this is a new performance measure and is still being refined, no audits or quality reviews have yet been conducted. While EPA acknowledged that the extent of data limitations is not known, it indicated that it does not believe that any material inadequacies in the data reported exists.

Sources: Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency, *Farm Service Agency's FY 2001 Annual Program Performance Report*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Department of Agriculture, *USDA FY*

Appendix III
Wetlands

2001 Annual Program Performance Report (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency's FY 2001 Annual Report*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, *Annual Performance Report Fiscal Year 2001*, (Washington, D.C.: Jan. 2002); Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, *Fish and Wildlife Service FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan/FY 2001 Annual Performance Report*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002); Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, *NOAA FY 2001 Annual Performance Report*, (Washington, D.C.: 2002).

Wildland Fire Management

Table 14: Coordination Efforts among Agencies Involved in Wildland Fire Management as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports and Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans

Department or agency	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program were discussed in their fiscal year 2001 performance reports?	What types of coordination among the relevant agencies associated with each crosscutting program are discussed in their fiscal year 2003 performance plans?
Department of the Interior	Interior issued a consolidated 2001 report and 2003 plan and discussed coordination only in relation to its 2003 plan.	Interior noted that it and the Forest Service had developed a strategy for aggressive fuels management and for completing the implementation plan for the 10-year Comprehensive Strategy under the National Fire Plan. The implementation plan is reported to include cooperatively developed, long-term goals and performance measures for the wildland fire management program. Through our work in this area, we have witnessed this coordination.
Forest Service	<p>The Forest Service's 2001 report notes the following coordination efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issued a combined report with Interior on accomplishments in 2001 under the National Fire Plan. • Conducted oversight reviews with Interior to regions and local units to assess successes and failures and identify compliance issues. • Conducted activity reviews with Interior in five states to assess overall program function. • Conducted large fire cost reviews with Interior to assess the effectiveness of fire suppression actions and cost efficiency. • Developed joint performance measures with Interior. • Collaborated with other agencies (including Interior) to evaluate the effectiveness and practicality of controlled sheep grazing to reduce wildfires. 	The 2003 plan notes that the Forest Service and Interior jointly released the National Fire Plan in 2000 and developed a 10-year Comprehensive Strategy in fiscal year 2001 showing a collaborative approach to reducing wildland fire risks. The plan also notes how the Forest Service and Interior are developing a joint implementation plan for the Comprehensive Strategy. Further, the 2003 plan states that the Forest Service and Interior are conducting an interagency review of the fire plan system.

Sources: Department of the Interior, *FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan FY 2001 Annual Performance Report, Departmental Overview* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Department of Agriculture, *USDA FY 2001 Annual Program Performance Report* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002); U.S. Department of Agriculture, *USDA FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan and Revised Plan for FY 2002* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002).

**Appendix IV
Wildland Fire Management**

Table 15: Agencies' Reported Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Wildland Fire Management as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports

Department or agency	What progress in fiscal year 2001 did the agencies report in achieving the goals and measures they established for each program area?	If an agency did not achieve a fiscal year 2001 performance goal or measure, does the agency provide a reasonable explanation for not achieving the goal/measure and describe a strategy that is reasonably linked to achieving the goal/measure in the future?
Interior	The goal of restoring natural ecological processes by increasing the use of fire (wildland and prescribed) and other treatments to 1.4 million acres was not met. Interior achieved 52 percent of planned target (i.e., 728,000 acres).	Yes. Interior describes how drought conditions have affected its ability to carry out planned fuel treatments. In addition, it notes difficulty in obtaining permits to carry out treatments and the limited availability of resources due to many resources being committed to fire suppression activities. Interior does not indicate any specific strategy for overcoming these challenges.
Forest Service	The goal of treating wildlands with high fire risks on national forests and grasslands to reduce the risk of loss of life, property, and natural resources from catastrophic wildfire was considered to be met by the Forest Service. However, none of the individual indicators met their targets for fiscal year 2001. Specifically, the Forest Service treated 1.36 million hazardous fuel acres as opposed to its target of 1.8 million. In addition, the Forest Service achieved only 97 percent of its fire-fighting production capability (target was 100 percent). Furthermore, the Forest Service assisted 3,062 communities and volunteer fire departments as opposed to its target of 10,492.	<p>Although the Forest Service stated that it met its goal, the 2001 report notes that the hazardous fuels reduction program was below target due to drought conditions in many parts of the United States and the additional complexities and restrictions incurred in treating hazardous fuels in the wildland urban interface. The Forest Service did not indicate any specific strategy for achieving its fuels reduction goals in the future, reasoning that there will always be a certain level of unpredictability in assigning targets due to the uncontrollable variables associated with hazardous fuels treatment.</p> <p>With regard to the goal of assisting communities and volunteer fire departments, the Forest Service's report notes that the data reported did not include state, private, and National Fire Plan activities and therefore were not adequate to assess whether targets were met.</p> <p>Because the Forest Service reports that it has met its goal for reducing the risks from catastrophic wildfires, it does not provide a strategy for actually meeting fiscal year 2001 targets in the future.</p>

Sources: Department of the Interior, *FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan FY 2001 Annual Performance Report, Departmental Overview* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Department of Agriculture, *USDA FY 2001 Annual Program Performance Report* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002).

**Appendix IV
Wildland Fire Management**

Table 16: Agencies' Expected Progress and Strategies for Achieving Goals in Wildland Fire Management as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2003 Performance Plans

Department or agency	What progress did the agencies expect to make in fiscal year 2003?	Do the agencies provide strategies that are reasonably linked to achieving fiscal year 2003 goals?
Interior	In fiscal year 2003, Interior expects to treat 1.1 million acres to reduce hazards and maintain and restore ecosystem health. In addition, it expects to contain 95 percent of wildland fires at initial attack, provide assistance to 33 percent of the rural fire departments, direct fuels treatments to 9 percent of the highest priority projects, and bring 15 fire facilities up to approved standards.	There is no specific link between the strategies and the specific goals. The strategies are very broad and general in nature and do not provide clear rationale as to how they will contribute to improving performance. For example, the 2003 report states that Interior will complete the implementation plan for the 10-year Comprehensive Strategy.
Forest Service	In fiscal year 2003, the Forest Service has the same goal as it did in fiscal year 2001 of reducing the risks associated with catastrophic wildfires. The Forest Service expects to treat approximately 1.6 million acres to reduce hazardous fuels and assist over 7,000 communities and fire departments. There is no longer a target for maximizing fire-fighting production capability.	While the strategies for achieving fiscal year 2003 goals are fairly general, they appear to be directly linked to each of the performance indicators. For example, the Forest Service states that it will focus fuel reduction efforts on areas with a moderate to high risk of wildfires and conduct prescribed burns, mechanical methods, forest thinning, and selective removal of undergrowth and nonnative plant species. Although there is no target for maximizing fire-fighting production capability the Forest Service notes that it and Interior are reviewing the fire planning system to develop a more comprehensive measure of preparedness performance.

Sources: Department of the Interior, *FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan FY 2001 Annual Performance Report, Departmental Overview* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Department of Agriculture, *USDA FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan and Revised Plan for FY 2002* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002).

**Appendix IV
Wildland Fire Management**

Table 17: Reliability of Performance Data Reported by Agencies Involved in Wildland Fire Management as Discussed in Their Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Reports

Department or agency	How did the agencies discuss the completeness, reliability, and credibility of their performance data?	Are known shortcomings in the data acknowledged and steps to resolve or minimize the shortcomings described?
Interior	For the performance goals identified, the data that Interior is collecting to measure those goals generally appear to be complete, reliable, and credible. In addition, Interior's report provides details on how the data will be validated and verified to ensure the data are consistent and measurable among all bureaus.	Yes. Interior acknowledges that the interpretation of the data collected may vary among the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Fish and Wildlife Service. A common set of performance measures is still being developed between Interior and the Forest Service as part of the implementation of the National Fire Plan. Our work in this area has recommended that the agencies develop common outcome-based performance goals to better measure how the objective of restoring ecosystem health is being achieved. ^a
Forest Service	The Forest Service notes that field reviews and postimplementation reviews will be conducted to ensure the reliability of performance data and reported accomplishments. The Forest Service further notes that it will use the Budget Formulation and Execution System to report on actual accomplishments. However, our current work in this area has found that this system is more of a planning tool used to rank fuel reduction work. Another system, the National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System, is currently being implemented by both the Forest Service and Interior to track outputs and measure accomplishments. In addition, the omission of the performance goal indicator relating to fire-fighting production capability is encouraging because our work in this area has questioned the credibility of such a measurement. ^a	Yes. The Forest Service acknowledges that it is currently revising definitions, developing standards and guidelines for data reporting, and implementing field reviews to ensure effective internal controls over the data related to accomplishment reporting. Recent GAO work in this area has discovered this to be the case with the implementation of the National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System rather than the Budget Formulation and Execution System, as noted by the Forest Service in its 2003 performance plan.

Sources: Department of the Interior, *FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan FY 2001 Annual Performance Report, Departmental Overview* (Washington, D.C.: 2002); U.S. Department of Agriculture, *USDA FY 2001 Annual Program Performance Report* (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 2002).

^aU.S. General Accounting Office, *Wildland Fire Management: Improved Planning Will Help Agencies Better Identify Fire-Fighting Preparedness Needs*, [GAO-02-158](#) (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 29, 2002).

GAO Contact and Staff Acknowledgments

GAO Contact

Elizabeth H. Curda, (202) 512-4040

Acknowledgments

In addition to the individual named above, the following individuals made significant contributions to this report: Steven J. Berke, Paul Bollea, Lisa M. Brown, Sharon L. Caudle, Amy M. Choi, Peter J. Del Toro and Sherry L. McDonald.

GAO's Mission

The General Accounting Office, the investigative arm of Congress, exists to support Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities and to help improve the performance and accountability of the federal government for the American people. GAO examines the use of public funds; evaluates federal programs and policies; and provides analyses, recommendations, and other assistance to help Congress make informed oversight, policy, and funding decisions. GAO's commitment to good government is reflected in its core values of accountability, integrity, and reliability.

Obtaining Copies of GAO Reports and Testimony

The fastest and easiest way to obtain copies of GAO documents at no cost is through the Internet. GAO's Web site (www.gao.gov) contains abstracts and full-text files of current reports and testimony and an expanding archive of older products. The Web site features a search engine to help you locate documents using key words and phrases. You can print these documents in their entirety, including charts and other graphics.

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly released reports, testimony, and correspondence. GAO posts this list, known as "Today's Reports," on its Web site daily. The list contains links to the full-text document files. To have GAO e-mail this list to you every afternoon, go to www.gao.gov and select "Subscribe to GAO Mailing Lists" under "Order GAO Products" heading.

Order by Mail or Phone

The first copy of each printed report is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. A check or money order should be made out to the Superintendent of Documents. GAO also accepts VISA and Mastercard. Orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent. Orders should be sent to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
441 G Street NW, Room LM
Washington, D.C. 20548

To order by Phone: Voice: (202) 512-6000
 TDD: (202) 512-2537
 Fax: (202) 512-6061

To Report Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Federal Programs

Contact:

Web site: www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm

E-mail: fraudnet@gao.gov

Automated answering system: (800) 424-5454 or (202) 512-7470

Public Affairs

Jeff Nelligan, Managing Director, NelliganJ@gao.gov (202) 512-4800
U.S. General Accounting Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7149
Washington, D.C. 20548

**United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001**

**Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300**

Address Service Requested

**Presorted Standard
Postage & Fees Paid
GAO
Permit No. GI00**

