



Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General

Independent Review of the U.S. Coast Guard's Reporting of FY 2010 Drug Control Performance Summary Report



Office of Inspector General

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, DC 20528



**Homeland
Security**

JAN 26 2011

Preface

The Department of Homeland Security (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*. This is one of a series of audit, inspection, and special reports prepared as part of our oversight responsibilities to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness within the department.

This report presents the results of the review of the Performance Summary Report of the U.S. Coast Guard for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2010, for the Office of National Drug Control Policy. We contracted with the independent public accounting firm KPMG LLP to perform the review. The U.S. Coast Guard prepared the Performance Summary Report and management assertions to comply with requirements of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Circular, *Drug Control Accounting*, dated May 1, 2007. KPMG LLP is responsible for the attached independent accountants' report dated January 18, 2011, and the conclusions expressed in it. We do not express an opinion on the Performance Summary Report and management's assertions.

We trust this report will result in more effective, efficient, and economical operations. We express our appreciation to all of those who contributed to the preparation of this report.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Anne L. Richards".

Anne L. Richards
Assistant Inspector General for Audits



KPMG LLP
2001 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Independent Accountants' Report

Inspector General
U.S. Department of Homeland Security

We have reviewed the accompanying Performance Summary Report of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) United States Coast Guard (USCG) for the year ended September 30, 2010. We have also reviewed the accompanying management's assertions for the year ended September 30, 2010. USCG's management is responsible for the Performance Summary Report and the assertions.

Our review was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and applicable standards contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. A review is substantially less in scope than an examination, the objective of which is the expression of an opinion on the Performance Summary Report and management's assertions. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

Management of USCG prepared the Performance Summary Report and management's assertions to comply with the requirements of the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) Circular, *Drug Control Accounting*, dated May 1, 2007.

Based on our review, nothing came to our attention that caused us to believe that (1) the Performance Summary Report for the year ended September 30, 2010, is not presented, in all material respects, in conformity with ONDCP's Circular, *Drug Control Accounting* (May 1, 2007), or that (2) management's assertions referred to above are not fairly stated, in all material respects, based on the criteria set forth in ONDCP's Circular, *Drug Control Accounting* (May 1, 2007).

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management of DHS and USCG, the DHS Inspector General, the ONDCP, and the U.S. Congress, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

KPMG LLP

January 18, 2011

U.S. Department of
Homeland Security

United States
Coast Guard



Commandant
United States Coast Guard

2100 Second Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20593-0001
Staff Symbol: DCO-81
Phone: (202) 372-2684
Email: morgan.h.roper@uscg.mil

7110
January 18, 2011

Department of Homeland Security
Director of Financial Management
Office of the Inspector General
Attn: Mr. John D. Shiffer, CPA
1120 Vermont Avenue, 10th Floor, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Mr. Shiffer,

In accordance with the Office of National Drug Control Policy Circular: *Annual Accounting of Drug Control Funds* dated May 1, 2007, enclosed is the Coast Guard's final FY 2010 Performance Summary Report.

If you require further assistance on this information, please contact LT Morgan Roper, 202-372-2684.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "C. S. Swirbliss".

C. S. SWIRBLISS
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard
Chief, Office of Performance Management &
Assessment

Enclosure (1) FY 2010 Performance Summary Report with Final Edits Approved

Copy: DHS Budget Office

Drug Budget
United States Coast Guard
Performance Summary Report FY 2010

I. PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Decision Units: Primary Outcome Measure

NOTE: *Although the Coast Guard appropriation is apportioned along budget decision unit lines (i.e., Acquisitions, Construction & Improvements (AC&I), Operating Expenses (OE), Research Development Testing and Evaluation (RDT&E), and Reserve Training (RT)), the Coast Guard does not manage performance along decision unit lines. This is impractical due to the multi-mission performance of our assets, which transcends budget decision units.*

The Coast Guard’s drug interdiction performance is best summarized by the lead outcome measure of the program. This measure is the central focus of its Performance Summary Report. The Coast Guard Drug Interdiction Program has a suite of metrics that support the lead outcome measure. The lead outcome measure and its supporting metrics suite were validated during a 2007 Program Assessment and Rating Tool (PART) Evaluation. In FY 2009, the Coast Guard transitioned the methodology by which it calculates its primary outcome measure as recommended by the 2007 Independent Program Evaluation by the Center for Naval Analyses. The Coast Guard transitioned from the Interagency Assessment of Cocaine Movement (IACM) to the Consolidated Counter Drug Database (CCDB) as the authoritative source for estimating illicit drug flow through the transit zone. The change in methodology permits the Coast Guard to evaluate its performance on a quarterly basis. Historically, CCDB cocaine movement estimates are significantly higher than the IACM because it includes all confidence maritime flow (IACM does not count low confidence data), which translates to a lower perceived performance result for cocaine removal rate.

Measure: Cocaine Removal Rate (Removal rate for cocaine that is shipped via non-commercial maritime means (CCDB)).

Table 1: Cocaine Removal Rate

FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2010 Target	FY 2011 Target
16.9%	16.6%	13.2%	15.0%	13.5%	18.5%	15.5%

(1) Describe the measure. In doing so, provide an explanation of how the measure (a) reflects the purpose of the program, (b) contributes to the *National Drug Control Strategy*, and (c) is used by management of the program. This description should include sufficient detail to permit non-experts to understand what is being measured and why it is relevant to the agency’s drug control activities.¹

The goal of the Coast Guard’s Drug Interdiction program is to reduce the supply of illegal drugs by denying smugglers the use of air and maritime routes by projecting an effective law enforcement presence in and over the six million square mile transit zone of the

¹ Requirements 1 through 4 in this section are drawn from the Office of National Drug Control Policy Circular: Drug Control Accounting, dated May 1, 2007.

Caribbean Sea, the Gulf of Mexico and the Eastern Pacific Ocean. The Coast Guard's primary outcome measure, the Cocaine Removal Rate, indicates how effective the program is at disrupting the flow of cocaine traveling via non-commercial maritime means toward the United States. The more cocaine bound for the United States that the Coast Guard removes, the less supply of cocaine available within the United States. The cocaine removal rate is calculated by dividing the total amount of cocaine removed by the Coast Guard by the total estimated non-commercial maritime movement of cocaine towards the United States, both of which are captured and validated in the CCDB.

The 2010 *National Drug Control Strategy* maintains the interagency, transit zone removal rate goal for cocaine at 40% by 2015; a goal originally set in the 2007 *National Drug Control Strategy*. With over 80% of the cocaine moving through the transit zone via non-commercial maritime means, the higher the Coast Guard's cocaine removal rate, the less cocaine that needs to be removed by our domestic and international partner agencies to achieve that 40% goal. The Drug Interdiction program managers monitor the cocaine removal rate, watching for both changes in Coast Guard removals as well as increases or decreases in flow. Any changes are then diagnosed to determine the cause and to develop strategies to continue to increase the removal rate. Factors that can impact the removal rate include, but are not limited to, changing modes, tactics and routes by the drug trafficking organizations; increased or decreased patrol effort by the Coast Guard or its drug interdiction partner agencies/nations; the availability, quality and timeliness of tactical intelligence; new or upgraded diplomatic and legal tools; and the implementation of new capabilities (National Security Cutter and HC-144A aircraft, for example).

(2) Provide narrative that examines the FY 2010 actual performance results with the FY 2010 target, as well as prior year actual results. If the performance target was not achieved for FY 2010, the agency should explain why this is the case. If the agency has concluded it is not possible to achieve the established target with available resources, the agency should include recommendations on revising or eliminating the target.

In FY 2010, the Coast Guard removed 91.8 Metric Tons (MT) of cocaine. Relative to the total estimated movement of non-commercial cocaine destined to the United States in FY 2010, captured in the CCDB, the Coast Guard removed 13.5% of this estimated flow, below its target of 18.5%. Comparatively, in FY 2010 the Coast Guard removed 1.5% less cocaine than from the FY 2009 total (15.0% removed). However, the number of Coast Guard interdiction and disruption events remained nearly the same for each fiscal year (123 in FY 2009 and 122 in FY 2010), indicating that the amount removed for each event dropped from a 1,301kg average per event in FY 2009 to 753kg average per event in FY 2010. The total cocaine removed by the Coast Guard in the transit zone declined from 160 MT in FY 2009 to nearly 92 MT in FY 2010. The Coast Guard may have been able to increase its number of interdiction events, however, asset/resource availability and unanticipated major response operations, diverting surface and air (detection and interdiction) assets from the counter-drug mission (earthquake in Haiti and the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico), hindered performance. The advancing age of the Coast Guard's cutter fleet has caused an increase in unscheduled maintenance days and casualties; this coupled with emergency response operations reduced the available deployable assets (both maritime patrol aircraft (MPA) and major cutters) operating in the drug transit zone in support to Joint Interagency Task Force South (JIATF-S). Through the

2010 Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Statement of Intent, the Coast Guard planned to provide 2,190 cutter days and 4,700 Maritime Patrol Aircraft (MPA) hours to JIATF-S, but was only able to provide 1,486 cutter days and 3,590.9 MPA hours for FY 2010 or approximately 66% of intended cutter days and 76% of intended MPA hours. Lastly, there was a reduction in the estimate of cocaine being smuggled through the transit zone in FY 2010 (1067 MT via non-commercial means in FY 2009 to 682 MT in FY 2010).

(3) The agency should describe the performance target for FY 2011 and how the agency plans to meet this target. If the target in FY 2010 was not achieved, this explanation should detail how the agency plans to overcome prior year challenges to meet targets in FY 2011.

The Coast Guard's target for FY 2011 is to remove 15.5% percent of the cocaine moving via non-commercial maritime means towards the United States. This target is reached by examining historical trends, as well as forecasting asset and resource availability along with the estimated flow of cocaine. The Coast Guard works cooperatively with other Federal agencies to carry out the National Drug Control Strategy, including support for the JIATF-S counter drug mission. To increase interdiction capability and capacity, the Coast Guard has several initiatives, which will come to fruition in FY 2011. The third National Security Cutter (Coast Guard Cutter STRATTON) will be commissioned and available for deployment to the JIATF-S Area Of Responsibility (AOR). Additionally, the Coast Guard brought online a new Counter Drug hidden compartment detection course at the Maritime Law Enforcement Academy (MLEA) in FY 2010 that will improve boarding teams' ability to investigate, search, locate, and access hidden compartments on suspect vessels. With go-fast type vessels remaining the primary means of conveyance by Drug Trafficking Organizations (DTOs) operating in and around the littorals, the Coast Guard plans to continue seeking expanded bilateral agreements, as well as providing international training programs to enhance partner nation capability and to support Theater Security Cooperation initiatives. Such engagement strengthens ties with source and transit zone partner nations and increases their maritime law enforcement competency and capability throughout the transit zone. Based on its baseline of performance, the expanded capabilities mentioned, and anticipated intelligence gains in FY 2011 to focus detection and monitoring efforts, the Coast Guard expects that it can achieve its FY 2011 target.

(4) The agency should describe the procedures used to ensure performance data for this measure are accurate, complete, and unbiased in presentation and substance. The agency should also describe the methodology used to establish targets and actual results, as well as the data source(s) used to collect information.

The data used to calculate the Coast Guard's Cocaine Removal Rate is drawn from the interagency-validated CCDB. The amount of cocaine removed by the Coast Guard is the sum of all cocaine that is physically seized by Coast Guard personnel and all cocaine lost to the drug trafficking organizations due to the Coast Guard's efforts. This latter amount is often an intelligence-based estimate of the quantity of cocaine onboard a given vessel that is burned, jettisoned, or scuttled in an attempt to destroy evidence when Coast Guard presence is detected. Cocaine removals are drawn from the CCDB. Data entered into the CCDB are approved through a quarterly, interagency vetting process. Although the cocaine removals are originally reported in kilograms, the Coast Guard converts the removal to metric tons to compute the Cocaine Removal Rate. The estimated non-

commercial maritime flow of cocaine towards the United States is extracted from the CCDB. All data contained in the CCDB are deemed to be as accurate, complete and unbiased in presentation and substance as possible.

At least annually, the Coast Guard's Office of Law Enforcement and Office of Performance Management and Assessment review all the assumptions that factor into the setting of its out-year targets, and makes adjustments as necessary. Revisions to the targets are reported via the Department of Homeland Security's Future Year Homeland Security Program database.

The Coast Guard Office of Law Enforcement has recently updated its out-year performance targets to be reviewed and finalized January 2011. The key factors that drive the target setting process are the estimated out-year cocaine flow, the projected availability of Coast Guard resources (mainly major cutters, long range MPA, Law Enforcement Detachment Team (LEDET) and Airborne Use of Force (AUF)), and any anticipated changes in Coast Guard capabilities, authorities, or partnerships that may impact cocaine removals.

II. MANAGEMENT'S ASSERTIONS

The Report should include a letter in which an accountable agency official makes the following assertions regarding the information presented above:

(1) **Performance reporting system is appropriate and applied** – The agency has a system to capture performance information accurately and that system was properly applied to generate the performance data.

The Coast Guard performance reporting system is appropriate and applied. It was reviewed in a 2007 Independent Program Evaluation by the Center for Naval Analyses and a 2007 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) PART evaluation. Both reviews verified the appropriateness and application of the performance reporting system, and the Coast Guard has made all significant changes recommended to ensure continued validity.

(2) **Explanations for not meeting performance targets are reasonable** – The explanation(s) offered for failing to meet a performance target and for any recommendations concerning plans and schedules for meeting future targets are reasonable.

The Coast Guard was not within the DHS allowable deviation of 1% from its target, and the explanations offered for failing to meet the target are reasonable. The Coast Guard's FY 2011 target satisfies OMB Circular A-11's guidance for establishing targets.

(3) **Methodology to establish performance targets is reasonable and applied** – The methodology described above to establish performance targets for the current year is reasonable given past performance and available resources.

Enclosure (1) to letter dated January 18, 2011

The Coast Guard methodology to establish performance targets is reasonable and applied. The Coast Guard uses a quantitative and qualitative process that reviews intelligence, logistics, strategic and operational policy, capability, emerging trends, past performance, and capacity variables impacting mission performance to establish performance targets. Targets generated by the program manager are reviewed independently by performance and budget oversight offices at Coast Guard Headquarters, as well as the DHS Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation, prior to entry into budget documents and the DHS Future Year Homeland Security Program database.

(4) Adequate performance measures exist for all significant drug control activities

The 2007 OMB PART of the Coast Guard Drug Interdiction Program and 2007 Independent Program Evaluation by the Center for Naval Analyses validated the adequacy of Coast Guard performance measures.

The agency has established one acceptable performance measure that covers all four budget decision units for which a significant amount of obligations (\$1,000,000 or 50 percent of the agency drug budget, whichever is less) were incurred in the previous fiscal year.

Report Distribution

Department of Homeland Security

Secretary
Deputy Secretary
Chief of Staff
Deputy Chief of Staff
General Counsel
Executive Secretary
Director, GAO/OIG Liaison Office
Assistant Secretary for Office of Policy
Assistant Secretary for Office of Public Affairs
Assistant Secretary for Office of Legislative Affairs
Chief Financial Officer
Chief Information Officer

Office of Management and Budget

Chief, Homeland Security Branch
DHS OIG Budget Examiner

Office of National Drug and Control Policy

Associate Director for Planning and Budget

United States Coast Guard

Commandant
Chief Financial Officer
Chief Information Officer

Congress

Congressional Oversight and Appropriations Committees, as appropriate



ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND COPIES

To obtain additional copies of this report, please call the Office of Inspector General (OIG) at (202) 254-4100, fax your request to (202) 254-4305, or visit the OIG web site at www.dhs.gov/oig.

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 our Hotline at 1-800-323-8603;
- Fax the complaint directly to us at (202) 254-4292;
- Email us at DHSOIGHOTLINE@dhs.gov; or
- Write to us at:
DHS Office of Inspector General/MAIL STOP 2600,
Attention: Office of Investigations - Hotline,
245 Murray Drive, SW, Building 410,
Washington, DC 20528.

The OIG seeks to protect the identity of each writer and caller.