

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Office of Inspector General



**Fiscal Year 2003
Annual Performance Plan**


A Message From The Inspector General

I am pleased to present the first annual performance plan for the Office of Inspector General (OIG), Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The purpose of the plan is to inform DHS, Congress, and the American taxpayer of the work that the OIG will undertake during the remaining months of fiscal year 2003.

Since this office was formally established on January 24, 2003, a stellar management team has been assembled to help me manage a workforce of 456 people. As described throughout the plan, these dedicated employees will enable me to meet my responsibilities as set forth in the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended. In brief, those responsibilities are to inspect, audit, and investigate the programs and operations of the department with a view to promoting effectiveness, efficiency, and economy. We work to find, and to the extent possible, to prevent fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. The goals and objectives incorporated in the plan emphasize program performance and results as envisaged by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. Underlying each of the OIG's performance goals are strategic work projects aimed to help answer two fundamental questions—How is DHS' money spent and how much safer is our country because of these expenditures?

Since the horrific terror attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, the issue of homeland security has rightly moved to the front of the nation's agenda. America's ability to protect itself against terrorist threats depends on whether DHS accomplishes its mission. The OIG plays a critical role in helping the department achieve its mission. This document reiterates the OIG's statutory mission, articulates OIG strategies for achieving its goals, and describes the evaluation methods that will be used to measure OIG performance.

This plan is a fluid document that will be updated throughout the year to reflect the emerging priorities of DHS and to ensure that OIG products and services address questions and issues that decision makers care about. It focuses on programs and activities that will make the most significant contributions to the achievement of the DHS mission.



Clark Kent Ervin
Acting Inspector General

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
1	Introduction	1
2	Overview of the Office of Inspector General	3
3	Fiscal Year 2003 Planning Approach	6
4	Allocation of Resources	8
5	Performance Goals and Measures	9
6	Performance Strategy- Project Narratives	13
	Border and Transportation Security	13
	Emergency Preparedness and Response	25
	Management	27
	Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection	31
	Science and Technology	31
	United States Coast Guard	32
	Citizenship and Immigration Services	34
	United States Secret Service	34
	Appendix A - OIG Headquarters and Field Office Contacts	35
	Appendix B - Acronyms	39

Chapter 1 Introduction

Since the horrific terror attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, securing our nation against another terror incident on American soil has become the most important challenge facing our nation today, and creating DHS was one of the most important steps toward meeting that challenge. The primary mission of DHS is, simply put, the protection of the American people. The fulfillment of that mission, however, cannot be put into simple terms. It is a challenge of monumental scale and complexity. It involves the consolidation of border and transportation security functions, the merger of preparedness, mitigation, and response activities, the creation of a central point to map terrorist threats against vulnerabilities in our critical infrastructure, and the coordination of homeland security research and development efforts. In addition, DHS must ensure that non-homeland security activities, such as responding to natural disasters or saving lives at sea, are not neglected.

The DHS Office of Inspector General (OIG) was established by the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296) by amendment to the Inspector General Act of 1978. Like other political appointees, the Inspector General is appointed by the President and subject to Senate confirmation. Unlike other senior department officials, however, the Inspector General can be removed only by the President, who must then notify Congress, and explain his reasons. This is to ensure that the Inspector General can be truly independent from the department he or she is responsible for overseeing and objective in reviewing its programs and operations. The Inspector General's institutional independence and objectivity lend special credibility to the work of the OIG. The Inspector General has a dual reporting responsibility, to the Secretary of DHS and to the Congress. It is the role of the OIG to assist DHS in fulfilling its mission, strategic goals, and objectives in an efficient, effective, and economical manner, and to ensure the integrity of DHS' programs and operations. The OIG accomplishes this through audits, inspections, and investigations. In addition to these traditional activities, the OIG also participates in an advisory capacity on department task forces and working groups charged with developing regulations and systems or improving policies and processes. The OIG hopes to increase its participation in such forums as part of its efforts to convince DHS managers to view OIG as an internal consulting firm that should be brought in for advice before programs and activities are begun, so that problems can be minimized and successes maximized.


Participation on these task forces and working groups will afford the OIG added opportunities to convey to DHS managers an independent perspective, based on audit, inspection, and investigative experiences, on ways to improve program performance.

This planning document marks the first annual performance plan for the OIG. It reflects the OIG's major audit and inspection initiatives and priorities for the period March 1 through September 30, 2003. It is by no means, however, cast in stone. The OIG recognizes that its plans must be flexible to account for certain uncontrollable or unpredictable factors, such as special requests that may be made from time to time by DHS management officials or Congress. The OIG is committed to maintaining open channels of communication, understanding, and cooperation with DHS management and Congress to ensure that the OIG's work is accurate, useful, timely, and fair.

Chapter 2 Overview of the Office of Inspector General

For fiscal year 2003, the OIG is authorized 456 positions. Of the 456 authorized positions, approximately 180 employees are located in the Washington, D.C. headquarters office. The remaining positions are located in 21 field offices throughout the United States.

To be responsive to the needs of DHS management and the Congress, the OIG's organizational structure not only must reflect the OIG mission and goals, it also must reflect the strategic priorities of DHS. To this end, the OIG is organized, as reflected in the following organizational chart, to ensure adequate audit, inspection, and investigative coverage of DHS' multifaceted and geographically dispersed programs and activities.



Essentially, the OIG functions through five major units, each headed by an Assistant Inspector General- Audits, Investigations, Inspections, Information Technology, and Administrative Services. The following is a brief description of each of those organizational elements.

Office of Audits. The Office of Audits provides the OIG with the ability to examine a program or activity in a formalized, detailed, and in-depth way. The primary thrust of an audit is to ascertain whether a program or activity is managed in an effective, efficient, and economical manner, and whether desired results are being achieved. This office oversees the annual audits of the DHS financial statements, has an extensive field office network capable of performing disaster relief and other grant reviews, and conducts important program audits of DHS operations, to the extent resources permit. It also includes a sophisticated acquisition and contract management audit capability, building on a small existing staff. The office currently has 221 authorized positions.

Office of Investigations. The Office of Investigations investigates alleged criminal and non-criminal misconduct of DHS employees and contractors and grantees affiliated with DHS programs and operations. Most investigations are reactive in nature in that the work is responsive to allegations received from a wide array of sources, e.g., DHS management and employees, the various internal affairs units within DHS, other OIG units, Congress, grant recipients, and the general public. In addition, cases are generated through proactive efforts, i.e., projects specifically designed to identify illegal activity. Auditors and inspectors are often enlisted to support these proactive efforts. The office currently has 141 authorized positions.

Office of Inspections, Evaluations, and Special Reviews. The Office of Inspections, Evaluations, and Special Reviews complements the Audits Division by providing quicker and less detailed program management studies, policy analyses, and program evaluations. This office is expected to provide quick responses to assignments that are tailored to meet special concerns of DHS management, the Congress, and the Inspector General. The office currently has 24 authorized positions.

Office of Information Technology. The Office of Information Technology will house the information technology expertise necessary to evaluate DHS' information management, cyber infrastructure protection, and systems integration activities. This office also assesses DHS' security program as mandated by the

Federal Information Security Management Act. The office currently has 22 authorized positions.

Office of Administrative Services. The Office of Administrative Services provides critical support functions associated with the OIG's operations, i.e., budget formulation and execution, personnel management, procurement, travel, accounting services, facilities, security, and development and maintenance of internal information technology and telecommunication systems. This office is also responsible for the production of the OIG's semiannual reports to Congress. The office currently has 32 authorized positions.

Chapter 3 Fiscal Year 2003 Planning Approach

Although the OIG was formally established on January 24, 2003, this plan covers the period from March 1, 2003, through September 30, 2003. It was not until March 1st that OIG employees, positions, and resources were transferred from six other federal OIGs to form the new DHS OIG.

The Annual Performance Plan is the OIG's formal action plan for managing workload and resources. It is designed to achieve our mission as set forth in the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, while addressing DHS' priority strategic objectives. It also reflects the interests and concerns of DHS senior management officials, the Congress, and the Inspector General based on experience, current plans and priorities, and future goals and objectives.

In establishing priorities, the OIG placed particular emphasis on legislative mandates, such as the Chief Financial Officer's Act and the Federal Information Security Management Act, DHS' critical mission areas, the President's Management Agenda, the Secretary's priorities, Congressional priorities, and the most serious management challenges facing DHS.

DHS' critical mission areas include:

- Intelligence and Warning
- Border and Transportation Security
- Domestic Counterterrorism
- Protecting Critical Infrastructure and Key Assets
- Defending against Catastrophic Threats
- Emergency Preparedness and Response

The President's Management Agenda addresses the following:

- Strategic Management of Human Capital
- Competitive Sourcing
- Improve Financial Performance
- Expanded Electronic Government
- Budget and Performance Integration

The OIG, in coordination with DHS, General Accounting Office (GAO), and those legacy OIGs that now make up DHS OIG, identified the following program and functional areas that represent the most serious management challenges facing DHS:

- Establishing the Department of Homeland Security
- Border Security
- Transportation Security
- Port Security
- Information Technology and Security
- Financial Management
- Contract and Grants Management

The OIG used these management challenges as a basis for prioritizing OIG projects. Each of these programs and functional areas has a significant impact on DHS' ability to accomplish its mission and are priorities of both the Secretary and Congress. In addition, keeping with the priorities of both the Secretary and Congress, the OIG will focus attention on DHS' "non-homeland" mission. Particular attention will be given to the Coast Guard's non-homeland mission, as mandated by the Homeland Security Act, and to natural disaster response and recovery activities.

These programs and functions are not an all-inclusive inventory of DHS' activities. Rather they represent those activities that are the core of DHS' mission and strategic objectives. By answering certain fundamental questions regarding each of these program and functional areas, the OIG will determine how well DHS is performing and will be able to recommend ways for improving the effectiveness, efficiency, and economy of DHS' programs and operations.

The OIG will strive to have a close and collaborative working relationship with the senior management of DHS. Nevertheless, the role of the OIG will be one of independence and objectivity, providing analytical, consultative, and constructive criticism of DHS' programs and operations.

Chapter 4 Allocation of Resources

Of the OIG's 456 authorized positions, approximately sixty percent has been allocated to the audit or inspection of DHS' financial management systems, information technology initiatives, major acquisitions, grant programs, and critical mission areas, particularly border and transportation security. This includes audits and inspections of DHS' non-homeland security activities, such as the disaster relief program and the Coast Guard's search and rescue activities. The primary objective of the OIG's audits and inspections is to increase the effectiveness, efficiency and economy of DHS' programs and operations. Another thirty percent is dedicated to the detection and prevention of fraud, waste, and abuse within DHS and by its grantees and contractors. Particular attention is being given to those DHS programs and activities that are most vulnerable to mismanagement or misconduct. Finally, about ten percent of the OIG's resources are being used for administrative activities in support of the audit, inspection, and investigative operations.

Like DHS, many challenges must be overcome before the OIG's full potential as agents of positive change becomes a reality. First and foremost is the availability of resources. OIG resources are being stretched to the limit and the demands being placed on them is growing. As it now stands, the OIG's workforce level is not commensurate with the breadth, depth, and complexity of DHS' operations. The continued support of the Administration and Congress will be necessary to ensure that there is measured growth to achieve parity with the OIG's responsibilities. Without significant growth, the OIG's ability to carry out its statutory mission and responsibilities, as well as the most basic services, such as auditing DHS' financial statements or investigating blatant cases of fraud, will be severely impaired.

Also, other external factors could affect the achievement of the OIG's priorities that are identified in this plan, such as unplanned, resource intensive, but nevertheless important, "quick turnaround" requests by the Secretary and Congress, or new legislative mandates and unfunded audit, investigative, and inspection requirements. These critical outside and uncontrollable influences could divert resources away from other critical priorities, including evaluating the performance of DHS' programs and operations as they relate to the President's Management Agenda, the Secretary's and Congress' other priorities, and the most serious management challenges facing DHS.

Chapter 5 Performance Goals and Measures

In support of DHS' mission to protect the homeland from terrorist attacks, the OIG has developed the following three operational goals and strategic objectives to provide the focus of its efforts during fiscal year 2003:

Goal One: *Add Value to DHS Programs and Operations.*

Strategic Objective: Build relationships with management and Congress, based on shared commitment to improve DHS programs and operations.

Goal Two: *Ensure Integrity of DHS Programs and Operations*

Strategic Objective: Perform work that identifies vulnerabilities and systemic weaknesses; exposes fraud, waste, and abuse; and results in timely corrective actions and enforcement.

Goal Three: *Deliver Quality Products and Services.*

Strategic Objective: Promote a positive environment with a skilled, diverse and motivated staff who deliver quality products and services in a timely fashion.

This performance plan lays the groundwork for all management decisions affecting OIG resources - people and budget - and sets the direction for the remainder of FY 2003. By establishing goals and objectives and identifying strategies for achieving them, the OIG is able to prioritize and pursue a robust program of audits and inspections. Laying such groundwork at this juncture of the OIG's inception will lay the foundation for developing a comprehensive five-year strategic plan.

Performance Measures

In the development of performance measures, consideration was given to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, which mandates the reporting of certain statistics and related quantitative data to the Secretary and Congress. In addition to those mandatory requirements, performance measures identified here will serve as a basis to determine the overall effectiveness of OIG work.

Goal One: *Add value to DHS Programs and Operations.*

Measure: Build relationships with management and Congress, based on shared commitment to improve DHS programs and operations, as measured by:

- Extent to which DHS and congressional priorities are incorporated into the OIG annual performance plan (75%).
- Extent to which audits and inspections address the President's Management Agenda, the most serious management challenges of DHS as defined by the OIG, DHS' priority strategic objectives, and the programs identified by OMB's program assessment rating tool process (75%).
- Degree to which resources (percentage of staff time) are allocated to the highest priority activities identified in the OIG's annual performance plan (75%).
- The number of inspections and audits that are completed within six months of the project start date (75%).
- The number of complaints and allegations processed within 24 hours (75%).
- Extent that constructive comments are made whether prescribed timeframes on relevant legislation, regulations, and directives affecting DHS programs and operations (75%).
- Frequency of positive feedback on all reports from DHS, Congress, or other customers on the effectiveness, quality, and timeliness of OIG products and services (50%).
- Extent to which DHS invites OIG staff to participate in DHS-sponsored work groups, committees, task forces, training, seminars, and conferences (50%).

- Frequency of meetings and briefing with Congress and DHS executive officials about OIG-related activities (no less than quarterly).

Goal Two: *Ensure Integrity of DHS Programs and Operations*

Measure: Perform work that identifies vulnerabilities and systemic weaknesses; exposes fraud, waste, and abuse; and results in corrective actions and enforcement, as measured by:

- Percentage of performance plan projects accomplished (75%).
- Extent to which statutory and regulatory requirements, such as the annual audits of DHS' financial statement are being satisfied (75%).
- Extent to which OIG work involving DHS' management controls, financial systems, information management systems, and grants management is useful to DHS managers for decisionmaking (75%).
- Percentage of OIG audit recommendations accepted and implemented by DHS management (75%).
- Percentage of monetary recoveries sustained in comparison with amount recommended, including fines, penalties, and settlements (75%).
- Percentage of referred investigative cases resulting in enforcement action, (i.e., indictments, convictions, civil filings, suspensions and debarments, adverse personnel actions) (75%).
- Number of hotline complaints that are satisfactorily processed for investigations or management action (75%).
- Frequency of formal communication with DHS personnel and the public, i.e., fraud awareness presentations, news media promotions of the hotline, audio fraud alerts, distribution of OIG literature, posters, brochures, etc. (at least one quarterly).

Goal Three: *Deliver Quality Products and Services.*

Measure: Promote a positive work environment with a skilled, diverse, and motivated staff who deliver quality products and services in a timely fashion, as measured by:

- Positive results on internal quality control reviews and external peer reviews (100%).
- Adherence to the policies promulgated in the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, PCIE's quality standards for inspections and investigations, AICPA and GAO generally accepted auditing standards, and appropriate internal standard operating procedures (100%).
- Completion of a five-year human capital strategic management plan based on a workforce analysis (100%).
- Completion of a five-year strategic performance plan according to GPRA (100%).
- Extent that office telecommunications and information technology systems, hardware, and software meet DHS standards (75%).
- Employees meeting individual development plan goals and requirements (75%).
- Employees completing performance plans successfully (75%).
- Employees recognized for outstanding work products and services and for innovations that enhance the OIG's effectiveness (100%).
- Employees assigned to multi-disciplinary OIG teams (25%).
- Extent that employees are equipped with appropriate tools (continually updated) to perform their jobs (75%).
- Extent that employees are satisfied with (1) training and professional development opportunities, (2) the employee recognition program, and (3) teamwork and communication (75%).

Chapter 6 Performance Strategy - Project Narratives (Organized by DHS Directorate)

I. Border and Transportation Security

The Directorate of Border and Transportation Security (BTS) has responsibility for securing the nation's borders and transportation systems and enforcing the nation's immigration laws. To accomplish this mission, DHS incorporates the duties and responsibilities of the following agencies: the United States Customs Service (formerly part of the Department of Treasury), the Immigration and Naturalization Service and Border Patrol (formerly part of the Department of Justice), the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (formerly part of the Department of Agriculture), and the Transportation Security Administration (formerly part of the Department of Transportation). BTS also incorporates the Federal Protective Service (formerly part of the General Service Administration) to perform the additional function of protecting government buildings, a task closely related to the department's infrastructure protection responsibilities.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

The Aviation and Transportation Security Act, Public Law 107-71, established the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) on November 19, 2001, as part of the Department of Transportation (DOT). On March 1, 2003, TSA was divested from DOT and made part of DHS. The TSA is responsible for security in all modes of transportation including civil aviation, as well as non-aviation modes including rail, highway, mass transit, cruise lines, and ferries.

Explosives Detection Systems (EDS) Maintenance Contract

Proper maintenance and service of EDS equipment is critical to ensure that this equipment is functioning at peak performance. In January 2003, TSA awarded a contract to continue installation and provide management support for explosives detecting systems equipment at the nation's commercial airports. The contractor was also awarded an extended field services option of approximately \$168 million to maintain the deployed EDS equipment. The contractor subcontracted the maintenance agreement to another company, which, in turn, subcontracted with the company that manufactured the equipment. The value of the service agreement is estimated to be approximately \$30 million in 2003 and as much as

\$300 million over a 5-year period. OIG will review the appropriateness of the contract terms and structure, and the effectiveness of contract oversight.

Explosives Detection Equipment Reliability

The certification of explosives detection systems has been based solely on the merits of the equipment, using detection, false alarm, and throughput rates as the only criteria that must be satisfied for certification to be granted. However, equally important is the equipment's performance in the field, in particular as measured by its availability, reliability, and maintainability. Given the deployment of these expensive machines to airports, it is paramount that they are properly used, adequately maintained, and timely repaired. OIG will evaluate whether TSA is providing adequate training to ensure that explosive detection systems are properly used. OIG will also determine whether TSA is providing adequate maintenance and timely repair for EDS equipment, and whether TSA conducts reliability tests to establish reliability ratios, i.e., downtime and equipment life cycles.

Airport Passenger and Baggage Screening -- Penetration Testing

Appropriate passenger and baggage screening is necessary to ensure airline transportation safety. The Aviation and Transportation Security Act requires TSA to screen or inspect all passengers, goods, and property before entry into the boarding area of the airport. Ensuring that access to the boarding areas of the airport and that passengers and baggage are adequately screened will minimize the opportunity for terrorists to endanger air traffic. OIG will conduct several tests ("penetration testing") of the security processes at various airports to determine the vulnerability of the procedures in place, and to determine whether TSA passenger and baggage screening procedures provide maximum protection against unauthorized entry to the boarding areas.

Airport Access to Secure Areas

Controlling access to secure airport areas where only authorized airport employees and contractors are allowed to go is critical to ensuring the safety of

the flying public. Those with unescorted access to secure areas of the airport are required to have undergone a fingerprint-based criminal history record check by January 2002. This area of security is the primary responsibility of the airport operator and its tenants. OIG will evaluate whether TSA is ensuring that adequate security procedures have been established and implemented to allow only authorized personnel and equipment access to secure airport areas.

Intelligent Containers

U.S. ports of entry are vulnerable to the smuggling of weapons of mass destruction and other implements of terrorism through the use of vessel containers. The volume of sea containers arriving at the ports is heavy, requiring the use of technology to ensure that container traffic is adequately monitored and secure. One such proposed use of technology involves “intelligent” containers. These cargo containers include computer technology to record information on point of origin, contents, and shipping route. Tracking of intelligent containers would include transport from port operations to other modes of transportation, such as rail or highways. OIG will evaluate the status of the intelligent container effort and its role in DHS’ overall port security program and actions taken to integrate intelligent container tracking into ground transportation modes.

Transit Security

Terrorist activities worldwide have focused on the killing and injuring of large crowds of civilians. Mass transit systems have been targets of terrorists, including numerous bus bombings in Israel, subway bombings in England, and several chemical attacks on Japan’s passenger rail systems. It is critical that TSA assess and address the vulnerabilities of the various mass transit systems of major U.S. metropolitan areas to terrorism. OIG will evaluate the actions TSA has taken to assess and address the potential terrorist threats to the mass transit systems of major U.S. metropolitan areas.

TSA National Security Plan

On November 19, 2001, President Bush signed the Aviation Transportation Security Act into law. This act created the TSA and set out a series of objectives and authorities under which the new agency could improve security for the American public across all modes of transportation.

TSA's mission is to protect the nation's transportation systems to ensure freedom of movement for people and commerce. Yet, since its inception, the agency has been mainly concerned with aviation. TSA is in the process of working on a national security plan that will address all modes of transportation. The plan will also address which agencies have the lead for certain areas of security, so as to facilitate organizational effectiveness.

In 2004, TSA will continue to focus on aviation security, since its fiscal year 2004 budget proposal of \$4.8 billion earmarks \$4.5 billion for aviation security and \$85 million for non-aviation transportation modes including rail, highway, mass transit, cruise lines, and ferries. OIG will evaluate TSA's expansion plan for improving security across all modes of transportation and determine whether the plan provides adequate coverage for both aviation and non-aviation modes of transportation.

Pilot Passenger and Baggage Screening Program

The Aviation and Transportation Security Act allows the TSA to use private companies for providing passenger and baggage screening on a test basis. As a result, TSA established the pilot Passenger and Baggage Screening Program. Under this program, TSA awarded contracts to facilitate passenger and baggage screening at five airports to four companies on October 10, 2002. One contractor was awarded the contracts for the San Francisco International Airport and the Tupelo, Mississippi Municipal Airport. These airports represent, respectively, the largest and smallest of the five airports that are participating in the pilot program. The remaining three airports are the Kansas City International Airport, the Rochester, New York Airport, and the Jackson Hole, Wyoming Airport. OIG will review contractor performance to ensure that passenger and baggage security

requirements are being met and the flying public is protected against terrorist activity.

Employee Administration's Recruitment Program

In response to a congressional request, OIG will review the TSA recruitment program. OIG will review the controls in place over the recruitment program, including TSA's contractor oversight, to ensure that recruitment efforts are economical and effective, and expenditures are reasonable. Also, TSA has recently issued a new contract for all of its human resources services. OIG will review the contract to determine whether adequate oversight provisions exist and whether the contract provides an efficient and effective mechanism to obtain the needed services.

Background Investigations of Airport Passenger and Baggage Screeners

As part of the effort to increase airport security in the wake of the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, the Transportation Security Administration was charged with quickly creating a force of federal airport security screeners. Questions have arisen about the real or perceived adequacy of the background investigations of those screeners. OIG will review the requirements for, and administration of, background investigations in the hiring process for the security screeners. Specific areas for evaluation will be: what should have occurred; what did occur; and whether any gaps or deficiencies in the process created a vulnerability for the nation.

CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

The Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) brings together approximately 41,000 federal employees, including inspectors and enforcement officers from the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), the Customs Service, and the Border Patrol. CBP is responsible for border enforcement, protection, and inspection at over 307 ports of entry into the United States.

Controls over the Trade Partnership against Terrorism (C-TPAT)

C-TPAT is an initiative whereby businesses ensure the integrity of their security practices and communicate those practices to their business partners. Currently, 1,600 businesses are participating in C-TPAT. To participate in this initiative, a business must conduct comprehensive self-assessments of security areas such as procedural security, physical security, personnel security, education and training, access controls, manifest procedures, and conveyance security. Any existing security weaknesses must be addressed. The businesses commit to developing security enhancement plans, and if a company fails to uphold its agreements, any benefits would be suspended and participation in the program could be cancelled. The benefits to these companies can include a reduced number of border inspections, an assigned Customs account manager, and designated low-risk importer status. OIG will evaluate management controls that ensure C-TPAT participants are meeting their program participation requirements and program objectives are being met.

Container Security Initiative (CSI)

CSI addresses the vulnerability of cargo containers to the smuggling of terrorists and terrorists' weapons. The four major elements of CSI are: establishing security criteria to identify high-risk containers; pre-screening containers before they arrive at U.S. ports; using technology to pre-screen high-risk containers; and developing and using secure containers with electronic seals and sensors to show whether containers have been tampered with, particularly after being pre-screened. DHS' fiscal year 2004 budget proposal includes \$62 million for CSI. OIG will conduct a series of audits to determine the status of the initiative and its effectiveness.

Customs' Threat Response Plan

In February 2000, the Commissioner of Customs announced the implementation of a new plan of action to respond to security threats at the borders. The plan was established in direct response to Customs' apprehension at Port Angeles, WA, in December 1999 of three people with ties to terrorist activities, along with

the seizure of powerful bomb-making materials. The plan contains four levels, with level 4 pertaining to normal operations and level 1 pertaining to “sustained intensive anti-terrorism operations,” where specific and actionable threat information is known. Each level carries a specific set of instructions for Customs field managers to implement once the alert is activated. OIG will evaluate the Threat Response Plan to determine whether it is kept current and includes appropriate actions to secure our borders.

Targeting of Individuals at Land Border Ports of Entry

In FY 2001, Customs processed more than 436 million pedestrians and passengers. Of those, 65.9 million arrived via commercial airlines, 11 million arrived by ship, 306.8 million arrived by automobile, and 53 million crossed our borders as pedestrians. Before September 11th, Customs officials had developed sophisticated profiles of likely drug smugglers and searched luggage for hidden narcotics. Currently inspectors are also focused on documents such as blueprints, drawings, photographs, flight manuals, chemical data, etc. that might be carried by terrorists. OIG will evaluate what changes have been made to DHS’ policies, procedures, and management controls for conducting personal searches at land border crossings in response to September 11th to allow for effective targeting, while protecting travelers from inappropriate searches.

Inspection Documentation and Reporting

There are various different levels of inspection for cargo entering and leaving the United States. The statistics on inspections are used in performance measures for reporting to Congress under the Government Performance and Results Act. Consistency in performing inspections and reporting accurate information is critical to budget decisions to be made by OMB and Congress. Information on prior inspections is important because it is used for future targeting decisions. OIG will evaluate the reporting program to determine whether inspectors at all 307 ports consistently apply inspectional definitions and whether inspectional statistics are accurate and complete.

Inspectional Cross-training

OIG will evaluate the steps DHS has taken to cross-train the various inspectors and ascertain what obstacles may be hindering this cross training.

Automated Targeting System for Cargo Inspection

With the millions of cargo shipments entering the U.S. from all parts of the world, CBP relies heavily on the use of an automated targeting system (ATS). ATS is critical in identifying those shipments with a higher potential for containing narcotics, contraband, and implements of terrorism. OIG will determine whether: (1) ATS is providing CPB, in a timely manner, all the data necessary to analyze manifested cargo entering the United States; (2) users of the system are being adequately trained and analyzing the data being processed through the system in an effective manner; and (3) CBP measures the effectiveness of ATS.

DHS Passenger Processing Systems

The President's National Strategy for Homeland Security addresses the need for a seamless, integrated information-sharing system that provides for the timely exchange of information on the entry, intra-country movement, and exit of hundreds of millions of individuals and conveyances, i.e., a "smart border." At present, there are numerous existing and planned information systems from agencies merged into DHS to address this need. Customs and INS currently share the Advanced Passenger Information System to query air passengers prior to their arrival in the U.S from foreign locations. OIG will determine whether DHS has identified the various existing and planned international passenger processing system objectives, functions, and capabilities, as well as the actions taken to integrate or coordinate the various international processing systems. This will be the first of a series of audits as part of the OIG's oversight of the development and implementation of the new DHS passenger processing system.

Electronic Entry Exit Program for Foreign Visitors

Many aliens enter the country and remain despite the expiration of their permission (“visa overstays”). Legacy Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) efforts to track entering and departing visitors involved paper-intensive efforts or special purpose automation efforts. The INS initiated the current National Security Entry Exit Registration System (NSEERS) as a targeted Special Registration and tracking system for nationals from approximately 25 designated countries that include photographing, fingerprinting, and extensive reporting. Some of the NSEERS’ features, such as more extensive identification, location, and departure control features, may become part of an eventual electronic entry exit program. On April 29, 2003, DHS announced its plan to create this program as the U.S. Visitor and Immigrant Status Indication Technology (US VISIT). The US VISIT will create an electronic check in/out system for business travelers, foreign tourists, students, and other foreign visa holders to the United States. Reportedly, this initiative will replace NSEERS and may integrate some or part of the department’s legacy systems and processes.

The OIG will evaluate the effectiveness of NSEERS relative to the monitoring of nonimmigrant aliens, including its deployment, tracking, and its relationship to the US VISIT system.

Student & Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS)

SEVIS is a computerized student tracking system designed to tighten oversight of foreign students to ensure they attend an accredited school and otherwise comply with the requirements of their student visas. SEVIS was partially deployed by the INS just before the INS transferred to DHS. An upgraded version of SEVIS is planned to take effect on August 30th. The OIG will evaluate the extent to which the August 30th deadline is met and assess other program and operational issues since SEVIS became DHS’ responsibility.

Immigrant Detention Facilities

The OIG will review the operation of the detention function within DHS and evaluate the extent to which former Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) detention problems and challenges persist in DHS.

Joint FBI and INS Fingerprinting Initiatives (IDENT/IAFIS)

The INS and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) have been working together for several years to integrate the 2-print fingerprint scanning system that the INS deployed along the border and at ports of entry with the more sophisticated 10-print scanning system used by the FBI for full criminal history checks. The Department of Justice OIG and the General Accounting Office have conducted multiple reviews of the INS-FBI effort and have reported slow progress and poor oversight and management of the initiative. OIG will determine whether these deficiencies have been corrected.

Customs Revenue

Customs collects about \$22 billion in duties and fees per year. In FY 2001, Customs estimated that its underpayments totaled \$418 million and its overpayments totaled \$220 million for a net revenue gap of \$198 million. Workload has been increasing dramatically over the last five years. The value of imports has increased from just under \$850 billion to about \$1.175 trillion and the number of importers has increased to over 525,000. Internet commerce through express courier services has further increased demand. Customs staffing prior to divestiture was about 20,000 employees. While workload has been outpacing staffing, Customs can deal with the ever increasing workload requirement only through improved systems and risk management techniques.

- **Reconciliation Program**

Importers are allowed to file entries with the best available information. This is done when other information, such as declared value, remain outstanding. The entry is flagged in the Customs system, with the understanding that the importer

will file reconciliation later. When the reconciliation is filed, it may require additional duties, taxes, fees, and interest, or a refund. As of the fall of 2001, over 4.5 million entries were identified for reconciliation, with 1,700 importers participating. OIG will review controls over this process to determine whether proper duties are collected.

- **Account Management**

The Account Management Program began as part of the Customs trade compliance redesign initiated in 1994 to increase compliance while reducing costs for Customs and the trade community. To facilitate its informed compliance efforts, Customs began shifting its focus from a transaction-based approach to account-based processing. The account management program has become the cornerstone of Customs' risk management approach. Account managers work in partnership with selected accounts to analyze compliance problems, determine their causes, develop strategies to address the issues, and monitor progress to determine whether compliance is improved. Improvements in overall compliance help determine whether Customs identifies and receives the maximum amount of revenue due the government. OIG will determine whether the program has achieved its goal of increasing trade compliance while reducing Customs costs.

- **Compliance Measurement Program**

Customs implemented this program in 1995 to collect statistical data on trade compliance. Customs conducts statistically valid examinations to estimate compliance and estimate underpayments and overpayments of duties (revenue gap). Following the events of September 11th, Customs temporarily suspended this effort. OIG will review whether compliance measurement examinations are being used to help close the revenue gap.

- **Refunds of Duties Resulting from Protests**

An importer is permitted to file a protest with Customs when the importer disagrees with Customs' determination concerning appraised value, classification, or the duty rate. Importers may ask Customs to reexamine the prior determination.

Customs implemented an electronic protest system several years ago to handle importer requests for reexamination. OIG will review the electronic processing of protests to determine whether controls are adequate.

STATE HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM

Fiscal Year 2003 State Homeland Security Grants

OIG will monitor the department's efforts to award fiscal year 2003 State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) funds. The department accepted grant applications until April 22, 2003, and expects to award a total of \$566 million to the states. Grants are to be awarded for equipment, exercises, training, planning, and administrative costs associated with combating domestic terrorism involving chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive weapons. The grants are awarded on a formula basis using population data. OIG plans to monitor the department's grants management processes closely to determine whether the grant funds are awarded in a timely manner and according to applicable regulations and grants management guidelines. Specifically, OIG intends to:

- Work with DHS to identify areas of concern including internal processing challenges, i.e., automated systems and human capital, applicant information gaps, and critical processing bottlenecks.
- Assess the percentage of eligible applicants submitting applications at various intervals before the application deadline closes to determine whether all eligible applicants have the opportunity to submit an application before the deadline.
- Analyze the number of incomplete applications submitted and identify the type of missing information and its relevance to award processing.
- Assess the percentage of dollars awarded at various intervals and the average number of days to approve applications and to make funds available to the state for drawdown.
- Determine the underlying causes of any processing delays and recommend solutions.

- Evaluate the department's level of monitoring, i.e., site visits, financial report, and progress reporting.

Implementation of States' Homeland Security Strategy

New in FY 2003 are planning and administrative funds to support the development and execution of state homeland security strategic plans, formerly referred to as the "state domestic preparedness strategy." Previously, the Department of Justice OIG identified shortcomings in the Justice Department's grant monitoring capabilities and reported that program managers had not developed meaningful performance measures to determine whether the grants actually enhanced state and local capabilities to respond to terrorist attacks. OIG will determine whether states used the grant funds to advance the preparedness objectives outlined in their strategic plans and whether the grant performance measures are sufficient to demonstrate that improvements are being made in state and local capabilities.

II. Emergency Preparedness and Response

Strategic National Stockpile

Emergency Preparedness and Response (EPR) will be preparing for a major increase in funding in fiscal year 2004 for the Strategic National Stockpile program. It will receive about \$900 million to purchase vaccines or medication for bio-defense and \$400 million to maintain the stockpile. OIG will: (1) assess the effectiveness of the stockpile's transition to EPR; (2) assess EPR's preparedness to purchase vaccines and medications; and (3) evaluate the adequacy of EPR's management of the stockpile.

Readiness of Urban Search and Rescue Teams

The National Urban Search and Rescue Response System was created to provide specialized lifesaving assistance during major disasters or emergencies. Currently there are 28 task forces in 19 states. OIG will evaluate whether the task forces

are maintaining their equipment in a ready condition. OIG will also determine whether the funding provided to the task forces is used for its intended purposes.

The National Response Plan

The Federal Response Plan (FRP) has been the government's blueprint for responding to major disasters. It defined the roles of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and other response organizations. During fiscal year 2003, the FRP will be expanded, incorporating an incident command structure, and will be renamed the "National Response Plan." OIG will evaluate the proposed changes to ensure that they address DHS' emphasis on terrorism.

Disaster Grants

The Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, (Stafford Act) governs disasters declared by the President. Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides further guidance and requirements for administering disaster relief grants awarded by EPR. The three major disaster grant programs funded by EPR are:

Public Assistance Grants,
Hazard Mitigation Grants, and
Assistance to Individuals and Households

OIG will perform audits of grantees and subgrantees focusing on large grants, recipients with suspected problems, and areas that are of concern to Congress and EPR. OIG will determine whether grantees and subgrantees accounted for and expended EPR funds according to federal regulations and EPR guidelines. These audits will focus primarily on public assistance grants, but may include hazard mitigation and assistance to individuals and households, as deemed necessary in the circumstances.

State and Local Accountability over Emergency Management Preparedness Grants

The Stafford Act allows EPR to make grant awards to states for comprehensive emergency management, including preparing for the consequences of terrorism and to improve overall emergency planning, preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery capabilities at the state and local level. These grants are referred to as Emergency Management Preparedness Grants (EMPG). OIG expects to perform two audits of EMPG awards to determine whether the funds were properly accounted for and used according to program regulations.

Timeliness of Public Assistance Expenditures

OIG will review the Federal Emergency Management Administration's disaster relief account to determine whether public assistance funds awarded are being awarded and disbursed to state and local governments in a timely manner and whether public assistance projects are being completed within prescribed timeframes.

Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program

OIG will evaluate the grant criteria, oversight, and monitoring activities of EPR to determine whether funds awarded under the Firefighters Grant Program are utilized as intended and do not overlap with the First Responder Grant Program administered by BTS.

World Trade Center

At the request of Congress, OIG will review the timeliness of individual and household grants to victims of the September 11th terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City. The individual and household grant program is administered jointly by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the State of New York.

III. Management Directorate

DHS Financial Statement Audit for FY 2003

OIG will contract with an independent public accounting firm to conduct an audit of DHS' financial statements for its first seven months of operation. The audit is required by the Chief Financial Officer's Act and at the direction of the Office of Management and Budget. The purpose of the audit is to determine whether: (1) DHS' financial statements as of September 30, 2003, and for the seven months then ended, are fairly presented and free of material errors; (2) DHS' internal controls related to financial reporting are adequate; (3) DHS substantially complies with the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act (FFMIA) of 1996; and (4) DHS complies with certain other laws and regulations.

Financial Controls of the National Flood Insurance Program

OIG will contract with an independent public accounting firm to conduct an audit of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The purpose of the audit is to test compliance with controls over financial, underwriting, and claims activities of insurance companies and contractors participating in the NFIP. This audit supports the financial statement audit and is performed because of the government's extensive reliance on private companies and contractors to conduct its insurance business.

Compliance with the Federal Information Security Management Act

As required by the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA), OIG will evaluate the effectiveness of the department's information security program and practices. Under FISMA, the department must develop and implement security policies, procedures, and control techniques sufficient to provide security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of harm resulting from the loss, misuse, or unauthorized access to or modification of information collected or maintained by the department.

Information Technology (IT) Systems and Architectures

OIG will survey the department's IT infrastructure, including information on its organizational structure for managing IT at headquarters and at the directorate levels. From this survey, OIG will develop audit proposals for fiscal year 2004.

Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) Enterprise Web Portal

A contractor has been working on the ACE program since 2001. It is part of the Customs Modernization Program, a 15-year, \$5 billion effort to modernize Customs' automated systems. The ACE program is now at a point where the first user interaction with the system will be fielded on a test basis. The initial test will include 40 trade companies that will have access to their proprietary information with limited functionalities. Plans include allowing access to the portal to over 1,100 companies, with more functionalities being phased-in.

It is important that the portal provide the functionality and security expected for the ACE program, since this will be the foundation for the entire ACE system. This will be the single portal for the trade companies and carriers to provide information for all federal requirements on cargo entering and exiting the United States. OIG will evaluate whether the ACE Enterprise Portal is being managed and developed to meet user expectations. OIG will specifically determine whether: (1) contracted functionalities were provided; (2) system security was adequate; (3) the system provided timely, user-friendly information; and (4) the system provided users with the information and data needed to meet expectations. This will be the first of a series of audits as part of the OIG's oversight of ACE development and implementation.

ACE – Contracting Issues

The Treasury OIG noted problems in the areas of communication, contract management, quality of deliverables, staffing, and funding. It is important that contract management processes are institutionalized, tracked, and modified to ensure that they provide DHS with an effective program to manage large, multi-year projects. OIG will review the ACE program to determine whether the

contract award fee plan has been properly implemented and whether it is meeting the goals and expectations of the program.

Best Practices: Contracting Officers & Contracting Officers' Technical Representatives

To get the best value from agency procurements, it is crucial that the contracting officers and the contracting officers' technical representatives are properly warranted, trained, and supervised. OIG will survey the practices of the various agencies coming into DHS and practices recommended by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy to develop a listing of best practices for consideration by the Under Secretary for Management.

Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act Compliance

The FAIR Act directs federal agencies to issue each year an inventory of all commercial activities (as distinguished from "inherently governmental" activities) performed by federal employees. The FAIR Act defines an "inherently governmental function" as one "that is so intimately related to the public interest as to require performance by federal government employees." The Administration has established goals for competitively sourcing commercial activities. OIG will monitor DHS' compliance with FAIR requirements.

Survey of Major OnGoing Contract Activity

DHS will be integrating the procurement functions of many constituent programs and missions, some lacking important management controls. At least one DHS component has had to rely extensively on contractors to support its mission, leading to significant growth in contract costs. Many incoming DHS components have major procurements under way that need to be closely managed and others, regardless of their earlier merits, that may no longer be relevant, given DHS' mission. OIG will survey the major ongoing contracts to identify any critical control weaknesses, duplication of effort, or efforts not related to the current DHS mission.

Best Practices: Purchase/Travel Card Controls

The GAO and the Inspector General community have identified purchase/travel card abuse as a high-risk area throughout the federal government. To assist DHS in developing the most effective program possible, OIG will survey the practices of the various components coming into DHS and practices recommended by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy to develop a listing of best practices for consideration by DHS management.

Acquisition Workforce Planning

GAO has recently reviewed acquisition workforce planning at six major civilian agencies and found that most acquisition professionals will need to acquire new skills focusing on business management. Because of a more sophisticated acquisition environment, these professionals can no longer be merely purchasers or process managers. Instead, they will need to be adept at analyzing business problems and developing strategies in the early stages of an acquisition.

DHS will be relying heavily on a multitude of acquisition vehicles to fulfill critical administrative and mission-related functions. Because of the speed required for many of these acquisitions and the immaturity of DHS' acquisition control program, these acquisitions may be especially vulnerable to fraud, waste, and abuse. The development of an effective acquisition workforce is key to putting an effective control program in place. OIG will review DHS' acquisition workforce plans to determine whether DHS is adequately preparing for the acquisition management challenges it faces. OIG will also work with DHS and GAO to identify best practices in acquisition workforce planning.

IV. Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate

The Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate is intended to merge under one roof the capability to identify and assess current and future threats to the homeland, map those threats against current vulnerabilities, issue

timely warnings, and immediately effect appropriate preventative and protective action. The directorate plans to fulfill this mission through timely and accurate threat analysis and warning and through the coordination of a national effort to secure critical infrastructure. OIG will survey the directorate's operations to identify specific activities for future inspection and audit work.

V. Science and Technology Directorate

The Science and Technology Directorate is tasked with researching and organizing the scientific, engineering, and technological resources of the United States and leveraging those resources into technological tools to help protect the homeland. One of the priorities in fulfilling this mission is the creation of the Advanced Research Projects Agency to jumpstart and facilitate early research and development efforts to help address critical needs in homeland defense on the scientific and technological front. OIG will survey the directorate's operations to identify specific activities for future inspection and audit work.

VI. United States Coast Guard

Deepwater Procurement Project

In June 2002, the Coast Guard awarded the "Deepwater Project" contract with an estimated cost of \$17 billion. The project is intended to replace or modernize all assets used in missions that generally occur more than 50 miles offshore, including approximately 190 cutters, 100 aircraft, and assorted sensors and communications systems by 2022. Since the events of September 11th and the Coast Guard's expanded role in homeland security, additional project requirements have been identified. In addition, the Homeland Security Act required the Coast Guard to determine whether the project could be accelerated for completion within 10 years. Both requirement changes and project acceleration would result in increased annual funding needs for the project. OIG will assess the Coast Guard's plans and progress to date on establishing project management controls related to the Deepwater project.

Mission Performance

The Coast Guard responded to the September 11th attacks by redirecting approximately 59 percent of its resources to domestic maritime security. The redeployment, however, came at the expense of other important but non-security-related missions. For example, mission hours devoted to core missions, such as drug interdiction, dropped from 21 percent to 11 percent. Other core mission areas, such as living marine resources, marine safety, alien migrant interdiction, aids to navigation, and law enforcement, were also hard hit. Further, the Coast Guard has been unable to restore the number of mission hours devoted to non-homeland security-related missions, despite a sharp increase in its funding.

The Homeland Security Act requires the Inspector General to conduct an annual review that will assess thoroughly the performance by the Coast Guard of all missions (including homeland security missions and non-homeland security missions), with a particular emphasis on examining its performance of non-homeland security-related missions.

High Interest Vessels

The Coast Guard is responsible for detecting, identifying, tracking, boarding, inspecting, and escorting high interest vessels that may pose a substantial risk to U.S. ports due to the composition of a vessel's crew, passengers, or cargo. More than 8,000 vessels make 51,000 port visits each year. The Coast Guard has instituted strict reporting requirements for all vessels arriving/departing U.S. seaports. They also have developed a sophisticated decision-making system for targeting high interest vessels, cargoes, and crews. Responding to high interest vessels also requires a substantial commitment of personnel, equipment, and funding. OIG will evaluate to what extent the Coast Guard is able to detect, identify, board, and inspect all high interest vessels before they enter a U.S. port. OIG will also determine whether the program has the right number of personnel with the required expertise and equipment to conduct thorough inspections of vessels, cargoes, and crews.

Congressional Request on the HITRON TEN Contract

The review is being conducted in response to congressional concern that the Coast Guard had modified its procurement procedures and specifications to justify its selection of the MH-68A helicopter for the Helicopter Interdiction Tactical Squadron (HITRON-TEN) project. Certain members expressed concern that these changes were significant and could negatively affect crew safety, as well as limit the Coast Guard's search and rescue capability.

The HITRON TEN force was established in 2000, when the Coast Guard awarded a one-year \$12 million contract to lease eight MH-68A helicopters (renewable for up to 4 additional years). These helicopters are used primarily to interdict fast-moving boats carrying illegal narcotics and usually deploy from the Coast Guard cutters. Recently, the contractor was awarded a subcontract from the prime contractor to the Deepwater Project.

OIG will review the original specifications in the Coast Guard's HITRON TEN request and its follow-up contract, the extent to which the MH-68A helicopter meets those specifications, and the impact of any specifications not met on crew safety and search and rescue capability.

VII. Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

The Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services is tasked with providing efficient immigration services and easing the transition to American citizenship. The bureau will administer services such as immigrant and nonimmigrant sponsorship, adjustment of immigration status, work authorizations and other permits, naturalization, and asylum or refugee processing. OIG will survey the bureau's operations to identify specific activities for future inspection and audit work.

VIII. United States Secret Service

Presidential Directive 62 (PDD-62) issued in 1998, and codified in the authorizing statute, Title 18 United States Code 3056, names the Secret Service as the lead federal agency for the planning, designing, and implementing of security plans at events designated as National Special Security Events (NSSEs). Since 1998 the Secret Service implemented security plans for 13 NSSE events. OIG will review the effect that PDD-62 has had on the Secret Service workforce and its workload.

Appendix A - OIG Headquarters and Field Office Contacts

OIG Headquarters

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
ATTN: Office of Inspector General
245 MURRAY DRIVE, BLDG 410
WASHINGTON, DC 20528

Telephone Number (202) 254-4100

Website Address- www.dhs.gov

Clark Kent Ervin.....Acting Inspector General
Richard L. Skinner.....Deputy Inspector General
Richard Reback.....Counsel to the Inspector General
Richard Berman.....Assistant Inspector General/Audit
Elizabeth Redman.....Assistant Inspector General/ Investigations
Robert L. Ashbaugh.....Assistant Inspector General/Inspections,
Evaluations and Special Reviews
Frank Deffer.....Assistant Inspector General/ Information
Technology
Ed Cincinnati.....Assistant Inspector General/ Administrative
Services
Tamara Faulkner..... Congressional Liaison and Media Affairs
Jennifer Price.....Executive Assistant to the Inspector General

Field Offices

Locations of Offices with Auditors

Atlanta, GA

3003 Chamblee-Tucker Rd., Suit 374
Atlanta, GA 30341
(770) 220 -5228 Fax: (770) 220-5259

Philadelphia Area

5002D Greentree Executive Campus,
Route#73 and Lincoln Drive
Marlton, NJ, 08053
(856) 968-4907 / Fax: (856)-968-4914

Boston, MA

408 Atlantic Avenue, Room 330
Captain J.F. Williams Federal Building
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 223-8640 / Fax: (617)-223-8651

Chicago, IL

55 W. Monroe Street, Suite 1010
Chicago, IL 60603
(312) 886-6300 / Fax: (312)-886-6308

Dallas, TX

3900 Karina Street, Suite 224
Denton, TX 76208
(940) 891-8918 / Fax: (510) 891-8948

El Segundo, CA

222 N. Sepulveda Blvd, Suite 1680
El Segundo, CA 90245
(310) 665-7300 / Fax: (310)-665-7302

Houston, TX

5850 San Felipe Road, Suite 300
Houston, TX 77057
(713) 706-4611 / Fax: (713)-706-4625

Indianapolis, IN

5915 Lakeside Boulevard
Indianapolis, IN 46278
(317) 298-1596 / Fax: 317-298-1597

Kansas City, MO

901 Locust, Room 470
Kansas City, MO 64106
(816) 329-3880 / Fax: (816) 329-3888

Miami Area

3401 SW 160th Ave, Suite 401
Miramar, FL 33027
(954) 602-1980 / Fax: (954)-602-1033

New York, NY

80 Centre Street
New York, NY 10116
(212) 667-8921 / Fax: (212) 667-7222

Oakland, CA

1111 Broadway, Suit 1200
Oakland, CA 94607-4052
(510) 629-7007 / Fax: (510) 627-7017

St. Thomas, VI

Nisky Center Suit 211
St Thomas, VI 00802
(340) 774-0190 / Fax: (340) 774-0191

San Juan, PR

New San Juan Office Building
159 Cgabor Ave 5th Floor
Hato Rey PR 00918
(787) 296-3552 / Fax: (787) 296-3655

Locations of Offices with Investigators

Atlanta, GA

3003 Chamblee-Tucker Rd
Suite 301
Atlanta, GA 30341
(770) 220-5290 / Fax: (770) 220-5288

Chicago, IL

55 W. Monroe Street, Suite 1010
Chicago, IL 60603
(312) 886-2800 / Fax: (312)-886-2804

Dallas, TX

3900 Karina Street, Suit 228
Denton, TX 76208
(510) 891-8941 / Fax: (510) 891-8959

El Centro, CA

321 South Waterman Avenue
Room #108
El Centro, CA 92243
(760) 335-3549 / Fax: (760) 335-3534

El Paso, TX

Federal Office Building
4050 Rio Bravo Suit # 200
El Paso, TX 79902
(915) 577-0102 / Fax: (915) 577-9012

El Segundo, CA

222 N. Sepulveda Blvd, Suite 1640
El Segundo, CA 90245
(310) 665-7302 / Fax:(310)-665-7309

Houston, TX

5850 San Felipe Road, Suite 300
Houston, TX 77057
(713) 706-4611 / Fax: (713)-706-4625

Miami Area

3401 SW 160th Ave, Suite 401
Miramar, FL 33027
(954) 602-1980 / Fax: (954) 602-1033

New York, NY

80 Centre Street
New York, NY 10116
(212) 693-7452 / Fax: (212) 693-7498

Oakland, CA

1301 Clay St, Suit 420N
Oakland, CA 94612-5217
(510) 637-5056 / Fax: (510) 637-4327

St. Thomas, VI

Office 550 Veterans Driver,
Room 207A
St. Thomas, USVI 00802
(340) 777-1792 / Fax: (340) 777-1803

St. Croix, VI

1108 King Street
U.S. Attorney's Office
Christiansted, ST. Croix, USVI 00820
(340) 773-3920 / Fax: (340) 692-5138

San Diego, CA

701 B Street, Room #560
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 557-5970 / Fax: (619) 557-6518

San Francisco, CA

333 Market Street, Suite 275
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 977-8810 / Fax: (415) 977-8811

Philadelphia Area

5002B Greentree Exec. Campus,
Route# 73 and Lincoln Drive
Marlton, NJ, 08053
(856) 968-6600 / Fax: (856)-968-6610

McAllen, TX

Bentsen Tower
1701 W. Business Highway 83
Room #510 McAllen, TX 78501
(956) 618-8151 / Fax: (956) 618-8145

San Juan, PR

Fomento Commercial Building
159 Chardon Avenue 5th Floor
Hato Ray, San Juan, PR 00918
(787) 296-3533 / Fax: (787) 296-3652

Tucson, AZ

Federal Office Building
10 East Broadway Suite 105
Tucson, AZ 85701
(520) 670-5243 / Fax (520) 670-5246

Appendix B - Acronyms

APPENDIX B – Acronyms

ACE	Automated Commercial Environment
AICPA	American Institute of Certified Public Accountants
APHIS	Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
ATS	Automated Targeting System
BTS	Border and Transportation Security
CBP	Customs and Border Protection
CFO	Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990
CSI	Container Security Initiative
C-TPAT	Controls over the Trade Partnership Against Terrorism
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DOT	Department of Transportation
EDS	Explosive Detection Systems
FAIR	Federal Activities Inventory Reform
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FFMIA	Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996
FISMA	Federal Information Security Management Act
FRP	Federal Response Plan
GAO	General Accounting Office
GPRA	Government Performance Results Act of 1993
GISRA	Government Information Security Reform Act
HITRON-TEN	Helicopter Interdiction Tactical Squadron
INS	Immigration and Naturalization Service
IT	Information Technology
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NSEERS	National Security Entry Exit Registration System
NSSE	National Special Security Events
OIG	Office of Inspector General
SEVIS	Student and Exchange Visitor Information System
TSA	Transportation Security Administration



Additional Information and Copies

To obtain additional copies of this report, call the Office of Inspector General (OIG) at (202) 254-4100, fax your request to (202) 254-4285, or visit the OIG web site at www.dhs.gov.

OIG Hotline

To report alleged fraud, waste, abuse or mismanagement, or any other kind of criminal or noncriminal misconduct relative to department programs or operations, call the OIG Hotline at 1-800-323-8603; write to Department of Homeland, Washington, DC 20528, Attn: Office of Inspector General, Investigations Division – Hotline. The OIG seeks to protect the identity of each writer and caller.