

Key FAQs for Interim National Preparedness Goal Roll-Out Conferences

Requirements

Question: What are States and Urban Areas being asked to do this year to help in achieving the Goal?

Answer: In FY 2005, States and Urban Areas are expected to understand and begin to apply the Capabilities-Based Planning process and associated tools for planning, training, and exercises. For example, States are expected to develop a tactical interoperable communications plan as explained in the FY 2005 grant guidance. Similarly, they will address information sharing and collaboration as they conduct a prevention exercise centered on the improvised explosive device scenario. In addition, States and Urban Areas, in consultation with local and tribal entities, are being asked to add an Addendum to their preparedness strategies to address the national priorities and attendant capabilities outlined in the Interim National Preparedness Goal (requested by the end of the fiscal year). Also by the end of FY 2005, States and Urban Areas will conduct limited re-assessments focused on national priorities and attendant capabilities. This information will be used to develop the first Annual Status Report to the President, due in the Spring of 2006.

Question: What will States and Urban Areas be asked to do next year to help in achieving the Goal?

Answer: In FY 2006, States and Urban Areas will participate in a comprehensive update of their Homeland Security Strategies and Assessments based on the Final National Preparedness Goal, and using the updated Target Capabilities List with target levels of capabilities organized by Tiers.

Question: What kinds of assistance will DHS be providing to aid in implementing this new approach?

Answer: First, Mobile Training Teams comprised of experts from state and local government will visit each state and territory to brief and work with State and urban area leadership. DHS will also provide Technical Assistance through our Office of Domestic Preparedness. DHS will phase implementation over a multi-year period to make this as easy a transformation as possible. Certainly over the long term, taking a capabilities-based approach to preparedness will be less burdensome than reporting on thousands of individual projects at the sub-grantee level.

Question: How can we fulfill these requirements when our personnel resources are limited?

Answer: States and local jurisdictions are permitted to use ODP grant funds to hire personnel in support of HSPD-8 implementation. Appendix A of the FY 2005 Homeland Security Grant Program guidance notes that the hiring of full- or part-time staff or contractors/consultants to assist with planning activities is allowable. Furthermore, the FY 2005 State Homeland Security Program and the Urban Areas Security Initiative specifically highlight the costs associated with implementing and adopting HSPD-8 as an allowable planning expenditure. Grantees may not use funds to hire sworn public safety personnel to fulfill traditional public safety duties. Additional questions on allowable costs should be directed to your assigned Preparedness Officer for further clarification.

Question: Can we raise the 3% cap on management and administration to allow us to add additional resources for meeting requirements?

Answer: Although the 3% cap on M&A funds cannot be increased, grantees are encouraged to use planning funds under the FY 2005 State Homeland Security Program and the Urban Areas Security Initiative to support their efforts to implement HSPD-8. The guidance for these programs includes the costs associated with implementing and adopting HSPD-8 as an allowable planning expenditure.

Question: States have traditionally managed the all-hazards emergency management functions and capabilities utilizing the Emergency Management Performance Grants (EMPG) which are formula based to each state. How will this funding stream adapt to the risk and vulnerability based means of funding in the future?

Answer: One of the President's objectives has been to consolidate grant programs and funding streams and provide States with more flexibility for accomplishing their planning, training, exercising, and equipment acquisition. Secretary Chertoff has made threats, vulnerabilities, and consequences the centerpiece of the DHS approach to homeland security. Grants and other assistance will follow that approach, while ensuring that States and Urban Areas retain the flexibility to use the resources to their best advantage.

Question: In future years, does DHS anticipate that some kind of level-specific self-assessment will take place?

Answer: An effective assessment system will be developed, to include self-assessment, peer-review, compliance monitoring, and a robust exercise program.

All-Hazards

Question: Is the Department's approach to HSPD-8 truly an "all-hazards" approach?

Answer: Yes. The objective was to develop the minimum number of credible, high-consequence scenarios needed to identify a broad range of prevention and response requirements. Although the scenarios do not address every potential threat or hazard, they provide a sufficient strategic spectrum of events for which the Nation must collectively prepare. Jurisdictions and agencies that develop the capabilities needed to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from these fifteen scenarios will have the skills and resources to respond to any emergency or hazard, be it caused by natural forces, human error, technological failure, or willful attack.

Question: Why are there only 2 natural disasters among the 15 Planning Scenarios?

Answer: The National Planning Scenarios were developed as a *planning tool* to define the diverse range of events for which the Nation must prepare. The 2 natural disaster scenarios address catastrophic hurricanes and earthquakes which have year and year, been the 2 major categories of natural disasters that generate distinct requirements in terms of needed capabilities. The Scenarios are not intended to be an exhaustive list of every potential major event or hazard that could occur. Rather, they provide general parameters regarding the nature and scale of incidents and a basis to define tasks that need to be performed and the capabilities required to perform them.

Jurisdictions and agencies that develop the capabilities needed to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from the planning scenarios will also be developing the skills and flexibility to respond to any emergency or hazard, regardless of cause.

Question: Will the lack of natural disasters in the Scenarios affect resource allocation?

Answer: The National Planning Scenarios are a planning tool used to identify requirements for capabilities. While it is true, for example, that the Midwest is not subject to hurricanes, they are at high risk for agro-terrorism. Resource allocation is about closing the gaps in capabilities, not chasing hazards. Within the framework of the Interim National Preparedness Goal, States and Urban Areas will be asked to consider the seven National Priorities when defining their own priorities for their Homeland Security Strategies and allocate resources to address specific gaps, excesses, and deficiencies. This identification should include, as appropriate, planning for natural disasters and industrial accidents. While the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) currently pools many of its grant resources, there remain resources specifically earmarked for non-terrorist related needs (e.g., Emergency Management Grant Program, Fire Assistance Programs).

Question: How will the Department ensure that first responders are prepared for the major events that they are most likely to face, i.e., natural disasters and industrial accidents?

Answer: DHS will work closely with stakeholders to identify the levels of capabilities that various types of jurisdictions and first responders should possess in order for the Nation to reach the desired state of national preparedness. Between now and October 1, 2005, States and Urban Areas will use the Interim National Preparedness Goal and Guidance to add addenda to their Homeland Security Preparedness Strategies to focus near-term planning and resource allocation efforts on the seven National Priorities. Entities will conduct their own assessments to determine existing capability gaps, excesses, and deficiencies. When applying for Federal preparedness assistance, entities should prioritize their needs to address the risks of major events they are most likely to face.

Question: Why does the mitigation mission area not appear in the Goal, UTL, or TCL?

Answer: Although mitigation is not spelled-out as a separate mission (e.g., prevention and response), mitigation tasks are included in the UTL and the TCL includes those capabilities needed to mitigate the effects of natural disasters. This is entirely consistent with the NRP and NIMS.

Risk Management

Question: Because FY 2006 grants are supposed to be based on risk and need, will States and localities be asked to complete new threat and vulnerability assessments?

Answer: States and localities will not be asked to complete a new threat or vulnerability assessment similar to those conducted in 2003. DHS will be using a risk and need-based funding allocation model to make funding determinations in FY 2006, similar to that used in the UASI program. Needs data will be gathered from information presented in states' FY 2006 grant applications.

Question: How does HSPD-8 implementation (especially future grant allocation processes) fit into the larger risk-management framework envisioned by Secretary Chertoff?

Answer: HSPD-8 implementation is based on collective assessment of strategic risk, and is supported by analysis of threats, consequences, and vulnerabilities. This risk-based approach to preparedness is highlighted in the Interim Goal's vision statement. The target levels of capabilities that entities in different Tiers will be expected to achieve will be based on an analysis of several risk factors. Entities at all levels of government will be encouraged to allocate resources in the most effective and efficient manner to develop these risk-based target levels of capability.

Question: Do the National Priorities reflect a particular assessment of risk?

Answer: No. Ultimately, the Goal is an overarching statement of strategic intent. It demonstrates our national will to establish and sustain overall readiness against current and future threats. But the Goal does much more than propose a desired “end state” of preparedness. It provides unified strategic direction centered on specific priorities as the best way to build a national preparedness system that is strong, anticipatory, and focused on the areas of greatest need.

Question: How is risk calculated using the capabilities-based planning process?

Answer: Capabilities-Based Planning is defined as planning, under uncertainty, to provide capabilities suitable for a wide range of threats and hazards while working within an economic framework that necessitates prioritization and choice. Risk is determined by assessing consequences, vulnerabilities, and threat. Indicators of risk such factors as population, population density, and critical infrastructure. The assessment of risk helps to inform and optimize decision making at all levels of government by linking resource allocation to the capabilities that are most urgently needed to perform a wide range of assigned missions and tasks. Capabilities-Based Planning will be used to define the “risk-based target levels of capability” organized by Tiers, as called for in the vision for the Interim Goal. DHS is in the process of developing a standardized method for assessing risk.

Target Levels of Capabilities

Question: Will States and localities be required to demonstrate specific levels of capabilities for all 36 target capabilities?

Answer: Every State and locality has a role in national preparedness and possesses varying levels of equipment, trained personnel, and other resource tools – including mutual aid agreements – that can be used to develop appropriate capabilities. However, not every entity is expected to commit the resources to build the target capabilities needed to perform *every* critical task to the same standard. Levels of capabilities will be assigned to groups of jurisdictions, not to individual localities.

The establishment of target levels and Tiers will allow for the balancing of limited Federal resources with the risk of an attack or hazard. Jurisdictions are strongly encouraged to examine innovative ways to develop their target capabilities. This can often be achieved, for example, through participation in regional efforts or through mutual aid agreements. Although each jurisdiction or agency is encouraged to do its part in National preparedness, there are no penalties if the target levels of capabilities are not achieved.

Question: When are the target levels going to be set?

Answer: DHS is working with Federal, State, local, tribal, private sector, and non-governmental stakeholders to refine the TCL for reissuance on October 1, 2005. This new version of the TCL will assign the capabilities by level of government and tiers (groupings of local jurisdictions) .

The primary purpose of the tiers is to account for reasonable differences in target levels of capability (or system-specific elements of capability) among groups of jurisdictions based on differences in risk factors such as total population, population density, and critical infrastructure.

Question: Are States and localities supposed to focus their spending on only the priority capabilities?

Answer: For Fiscal Year (FY) 2006, DHS will focus on improving performance relative to the seven National Priorities listed in the Interim National Preparedness Goal. These seven priorities reflect a limited number of the critical capabilities and cross-cutting initiatives that should drive near-term planning and resource allocation efforts. While resource allocations will address meeting the National Priorities, they do not exclude funding for the other target capabilities. Focus will broaden in FY2007 to address other target capabilities

The National Priorities do not preclude jurisdictions from allocating their own resources to improve their preparedness in any of the 36 target capabilities. Jurisdictions are strongly encouraged to leverage existing resources to achieve the National Priorities **and** the other target capabilities.

Question: Will the Department guarantee a baseline level of funding for all 36 capabilities?

Answer: The target capabilities are a planning tool, not a funding formula. Implementing Capabilities-Based Planning is a long-term effort that will help the Nation to achieve the capacity to perform all 36 target capabilities at the levels needed to effectively prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from major events, especially terrorism. For FY 2006, the focus will be on improving performance in the areas addressed by the National Priorities listed in the Interim Goal. Allocation of Federal preparedness resources will be based on risk and need. Not until States and Urban Areas have assessed and realigned their homeland security strategies and plans will DHS be able to fully determine which of the 36 target capabilities require additional funding. 

Stakeholder Engagement

Question: Has the Department included all relevant stakeholders in the development of the UTL, TCL, and Goal?

Answer: DHS invited Federal, State, local, and tribal entities, non-profit and profit organizations, and national associations to provide significant input for the development of the UTL, TCL and Interim National Preparedness Goal. The documents have been sent out to over 1,500 organizations for broad national review and made available online through the Office for Domestic Preparedness (ODP) Secure Portal (www.odp.esportals.gov) and the Lessons Learned Information Sharing website (www.llis.gov). Stakeholders have submitted hundreds of comments on HSPD-8 documents via two dedicated e-mail addresses (hspd8@dhs.gov and utl@dhs.gov).

Additionally, DHS has held stakeholder conferences and convened two working groups in developing the UTL and TCL. In June 2004, DHS/SLGCP brought together over 160 representatives from agencies at all levels of government and the private sector to review the UTL. In October 2004, DHS/SLGCP held a second workshop with over 350 representatives to obtain input and involvement in the development of the TCL. A Federal Interagency Working Group and a State, Local, and Tribal Working Group have met on a regular basis to provide guidance on the UTL and TCL. The State, Local, and Tribal Working Group also provided input on the development of the Interim Goal and Guidance. A list of participating individuals, agencies, and associations is available.

Question: What are future opportunities to provide stakeholder input into the process?

Answer: In late May, DHS will invite Federal agencies and select national associations to participate in a two-day conference geared towards laying the groundwork for the next effort: defining target levels and tiers for the 36 target capabilities. Smaller workshops will then be convened throughout June and July to refine and build upon the initial framework established in May. Stakeholders that have previously been involved in the UTL, TCL, and Goal development will participate in the smaller workshops as appropriate. Draft documents will be posted to the ODP Secure Portal and the Lessons Learned Information Sharing network for a broad national review in August 2005. The Interim Goal will be updated for consistency with the UTL and TCL, as well as to incorporate feedback captured over the summer from States and Urban Areas, as they participated in the implementation process. The revised Goal will also be sent out for a broad national review in August 2005.

DHS encourages and welcomes any stakeholder organization to submit comments and input on the UTL and TCL. Comments may be submitted to utl@dhs.gov at anytime for inclusion, as appropriate, in the October 1, 2005 UTL and TCL. In addition, DHS has developed an HSPD-8 information and outreach webpage that provides background information on capabilities-based planning, the Interim National Preparedness Goal, and the National Preparedness Guidance: (<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/odp/assessments/hspd8.htm>)

Question: How are the private sector and non-governmental organizations being included in HSPD-8 implementation?

Answer: Because the government plays the largest role in planning for major events, the initial focus has been on the role of public agencies at all levels of government. DHS, however, has sought the input of private sector organizations and non-governmental organizations in the development of the Scenarios, UTL, TCL, and the Interim Goal. Further, the private sector's important role in preparedness will be addressed more specifically in future versions of the UTL and TCL.

Existing Standards

Question: How does this all-hazards approach correlate to the EMAP process that FEMA is currently funding as a baseline assessment of each state's emergency management program?

Answer: We are strong proponents of NFPA 1600/EMAP and are working with the EMAP team to help in development of preparedness assessments. We think the peer review process has tremendous merit.

Question: Will the Department incorporate existing standards (e.g., EMAP, NFPA 1600) into new requirements, especially for the TCL?

Answer: When developing the TCL, DHS did review and incorporate existing industry standards for inclusion in the target capabilities. These standards have been linked to the appropriate target capability under “references.” For example, Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) standards have been linked to Planning, Interoperable Communications, Risk Analysis, Citizen Preparedness and Participation, On-Site Incident Management, and Emergency Operations Center Management capabilities. The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1600 standard has been linked to Firefighting Operations/Support, Citizen Protection: Evacuation and/or In-Place Protection, Emergency Public Information and Warning, Economic and Community Recovery, and Planning capabilities.

As DHS develops target levels and Tiers, we will continue to draw upon existing industry and/or professional standards to help develop the most appropriate performance measures. National associations, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations will continue to be consulted as DHS enhances the UTL and TCL to add target levels, performance measures, and standards.