

Migratory Bird Management and Conservation

Program Code 10002354

Program Title Fish and Wildlife Service - Migratory Bird Management and Conservation

Department Name Department of the Interior

Agency/Bureau Name United States Fish and Wildlife Service

Program Type(s) Direct Federal Program
Competitive Grant Program

Assessment Year 2004

Assessment Rating Results Not Demonstrated

Assessment Section Scores	Section	Score
	Program Purpose & Design	100%
	Strategic Planning	62%
	Program Management	90%
	Program Results/Accountability	27%

Program Funding Level (in millions)	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009
	\$127	\$126	\$154

- Ongoing Program Improvement Plans
- Completed Program Improvement Plans
- Program Performance Measures
- Questions/Answers (Detailed Assessment)

Ongoing Program Improvement Plans

Year Began	Improvement Plan	Status	Comments
2005	Schedule and carry out independent program	Action taken, but not completed	The Migratory Bird Program selected and is currently working with a contractor to conduct independent program evaluations. A comprehensive evaluation of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan was completed. A draft outline of the

evaluations, including the regulatory part of the program.

Environmental Impact Statement on Hunting of Migratory Birds was completed in 2007; this included assignments for preparation of specific sections. Preliminary drafts were completed for some sections in 2007; the remainder will be drafted in 2008.

Completed Program Improvement Plans

Year Began	Improvement Plan	Status	Comments
2005	Adopt long-term outcome and annual output goals developed during PART process. Accomplishment of the outcome goals will depend on the efforts of many and will require the program to continue to work with partners to achieve these goals.	Completed	The Migratory Birds Program has adopted the long-term outcome and annual goals developed during the PART process. These measures have been shared with the Migratory Bird Leadership Team, Regional Coordinators and staff, and program partners.
2005	Request additional funding in the Budget to develop and implement management plans for five migratory bird species to help achieve the program's new long-term goal to increase the percentage of migratory birds that are healthy and sustainable.	Completed	The FY 2006 budget request included \$750,000 to develop and implement focused management actions that will lead to desired changes in the status of targeted bird populations (focal species). The requested budget increase will be used initially to fund completion of management plans and then to implement, in cooperation with our partners and to the extent possible within available budget, the highest priority management recommendations.
2005	Link individual employee performance plans with specific goal-related performance targets for each year.	Completed	The Fish and Wildlife Service required all employees have performance measures included in their FY 2006 individual employee performance plans. Measures were taken from the Service's FY 2006 Operational Plan - which includes appropriate program-level measures.
2005	Develop baseline data and revise targets as necessary for new performance measures.	Completed	This task is now completed. Mig Bird Mgt has developed baseline data for new annual measure: % of pop. Management needs met for healthy and sustainable birds. On 9/30/05 the program completed the list of needs met (numerator) and on 6/23/06 completed compilation of total list of management needs (denominator). This task has proven larger than anticipated, in part because this contributes to new

Program Performance Measures

Term	Type										
Long-term	Outcome	<p>Measure: Percent of all migratory bird species that are at healthy and sustainable levels.</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> This measure reflects the efforts of the Fish and Wildlife Service's Migratory Birds Program to protect and manage birds (permits, surveys, species management plans, national and international agreements and strategies such as the National Bird Conservation Initiative), restore bird habitat through grants (NAWCA and Neotrops), and partnership initiatives (Joint Ventures and the NAWMP), manage game species (surveys, population estimates, hunting seasons), and super abundant nuisance species (mute swans, cormorants, etc.).The percent of bird species that are at healthy and sustainable levels will be defined as those species that are not on the FWS Birds of Management Concern List, or in the case of game species (which are all considered "of management concern") those for which the populations are at desirable management conditions, as a percentage of all migratory bird species (n=912).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="440 999 691 1207"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>baseline</td> <td>61.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>63.3%</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Target	Actual	2001	baseline	61.8%	2008	63.3%	
Year	Target	Actual									
2001	baseline	61.8%									
2008	63.3%										
Long-term	Outcome	<p>Measure: Percent of adult Americans who participate in bird-related recreation.</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> This measure reflects the commitment of the Fish and Wildlife Service's Migratory Birds Program to improving hunting, bird-watching, and other outdoor bird-related experiences and opportunities for the continuing benefit of the American people. bird-related recreation will be defined as migratory bird hunting, bird watching, bird photography and bird feeding. This information is collected, analyzed, and published every 5 years by the Departments of Interior and Commerce, and the Census Bureau as the National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation. The most recent survey was published in 2001 and the next will be available in 2006, and then 2011.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="440 1734 691 1877"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>baseline</td> <td>29.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Target	Actual	2001	baseline	29.8%			
Year	Target	Actual									
2001	baseline	29.8%									

2011	30%
------	-----

Annual Output

Measure: Percent of bird population management needs met to achieve healthy and sustainable populations of birds listed on the Birds of Management Concern list. (Baseline and targets are under development.)

Explanation:

Year	Target	Actual
2006	100%	92%
2007	99%	80%
2008	99%	
2009	99%	

Annual Output

Measure: Percent of habitat needs met to achieve healthy and sustainable levels of migratory birds.

Explanation:

Year	Target	Actual
2004	baseline	40%
2005	40%	40%
2006	43%	46%
2007	43%	51.5%
2008	52.1%	
2009	55.6%	

Annual Efficiency

Measure: Acres of wetland restored per million dollars expended.

Explanation: Efficiency measure assumes restoration cost only, does not include land acquisition.

Year	Target	Actual
2005	N/A	17,139

2006	N/A	16,303
2007	16,700	8,366
2008	8,400	
2009	8,500	

Annual Output

Measure: The percent of Migratory Bird species that may be harvested for sport hunting or falconry according to the Migratory Bird Treaties for which harvest is formally approved.

Explanation:

Year	Target	Actual
2004	58.6%	58.6%
2005	58.6%	58.9%
2006	58.9%	58.9%
2007	58.9%	58.9
2008	59%	
2009		

Questions/Answers (Detailed Assessment)

Section 1 - Program Purpose & Design

Number	Question	Answer	Score
--------	----------	--------	-------

1.1	Is the program purpose clear?	YES	20%
-----	--------------------------------------	-----	-----

Explanation: The Migratory Bird Program's (MBP) mission is to conserve migratory bird populations (including neo-tropic birds) and their habitats for future generations, through careful monitoring and effective management.

Evidence: >Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) - 16 USC 703-712. >Migratory Bird Management - A Trust Responsibility. FWS brochure. >Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980 requires the Secretary of the Interior to identify conservation measures to assure that nongame migratory bird species do not reach the point at which measures of the

Endangered Species Act are necessary. (16 U.S.C 2912) >North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA), Sec. 4401. - Findings and statement of purpose >Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (NMBCA) (114 Stat. 593, PL 106-247). >A Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds. The Service is authorized by more than 25 primary conventions, treaties, and laws to ensure the conservation of more than 800 species of migratory birds and their habitats (see Appendix 3 of Blueprint).

1.2

Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

YES 20%

Explanation: Declining numbers of migratory birds and the adverse impacts on related economic and recreational activities resulted in International treaties and domestic laws to protect migratory birds. While some of the causes for bird declines have been adequately addressed (e.g. plume hunting, use of DDT), many new or recurring factors continue to adversely impact migratory bird populations and public benefits derived from healthy bird populations. More than 400 species, subspecies, or populations of migratory birds have been identified as Birds of Management Concern (BMC) due to listing under the Endangered Species Act, declining population trends, populations below desired levels, or overabundance that is potentially damaging to natural ecosystems or human interests. Reductions in habitat quantity and quality are the primary causes of negative population trends, but pesticides and contaminants; invasive species; collisions or entanglement with human-made structures; and disease outbreaks also cause significant migratory bird mortality. For example, Grassland nesting migratory birds have been declining since the late 1960s, with 61 percent showing significant population declines due to loss or degradation of grassland habitat from agricultural uses.

Evidence: >A Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds, Appendix 4. >NAWCA, Sec. 4401. - Findings and statement of purpose >NMBCA, Sec. 6101. - Findings >NAWCA Progress Report (pgs 13-14) see Q1.5 >Migratory Birds of Conservation Concern list (<http://migratorybirds.fws.gov/reports/BCC02/BCC2002.pdf>)

1.3

Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

YES 20%

Explanation: The Migratory Bird Program is the only entity devoted specifically to the range-wide conservation of migratory birds. Many entities support or are involved in activities

related to bird conservation, but no other agency, organization, or program, public or private, is designed to address the full range of issues, problems, and interests related to migratory bird conservation and management. These other efforts compliment rather than duplicate Migratory Bird Program efforts. Other conservation agencies/organizations have land or species conservation programs directed at or contributing toward healthy migratory bird populations or habitats. These programs, however, are generally more limited in scope either geographically or by species (or both). The FWS Refuge System and other land management agencies contribute to bird habitat conservation, but generally don't address habitat on private lands or outside the country. The FWS Partners program provides habitat conservation on private lands but not specifically for birds. Many state wildlife agencies have migratory bird programs but they are limited geographically and do not address range-wide needs or concerns. U.S.G.S. contributes to bird population monitoring and assessment but do not have the authority for promulgating regulations to ensure conservation.

Evidence: >The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (1918)

1.4

Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

YES 20%

Explanation: No major design flaws have been identified that would prevent the program from meeting program goals and objectives. The program uses a wide array of tools to achieve its mission and goals such as land acquisition and easements, monitoring, and establishing hunting regulations. The past 6 years have been virtually free of any serious GAO corrective actions or Congressional Oversight Hearings. A 1997 Inspector General audit of North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) grant administration found no material weaknesses. Litigation involving the MBP has generally involved challenges to the scientific information used as a basis for management decisions.

Evidence: >A Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds. >Migratory Bird Treaty Act, >FWS Manual Chapters >Review of Flyway councils >NAWCA audit results >Summary of recent litigation

1.5

Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?

YES 20%

Explanation: The MBP targets funds and activities directly to address its purpose to maintain healthy populations of migratory birds to benefit the American public. Program resources support 5 broad strategic plan strategies: population monitoring; assessment & management; habitat conservation; permits & regulations; consultation, cooperation, and communication; and recreation. Each strategy contains detailed sub-strategies which guide development of action plans, budget requests, and project proposals necessary to achieve overall program goals. Individual components have targeting mechanisms to ensure resources reach intended beneficiaries. For example, competitive grants selection criteria prioritize awards to projects that best address priority species, habitats, and conservation actions in intended geographic areas. Joint venture (JV) funding is allocated to individual JV's based on assessments of regional bird conservation needs. Population surveys are prioritized to provide the information necessary to establish sound hunting regulations for those species desired by migratory bird hunters.

Evidence: >A Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds >FY05 Budget Request >JV Strategic Plans and reports >NAWCA biannual reports >NAWCA and NMBTA application guidelines >Joint Venture funding needs assessment.

Section 1 - Program Purpose & Design Score 100%

Section 2 - Strategic Planning

Number	Question	Answer	Score
---------------	-----------------	---------------	--------------

2.1	Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?	YES	12%
-----	--	-----	-----

Explanation: The MBP recently completed a comprehensive strategic plan that identifies 3 program strategic goals and supporting strategies to fulfill the program's purpose. The strategic plan identified 3 strategic goals and supporting strategies to help guide development and refinement of program activities. During the PART specific long-term outcome performance goals were developed, consistent with the program strategic goals, to measure the effectiveness of the various components of the program. These goals all support the program's mission and are consistent with outcome goals of the DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence: >Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds: Migratory Bird Program Strategic Plan

2004-2014 >DOI Strategic Plan FY2003-2008

2.2	Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?	YES	12%
	<p><i>Explanation:</i> The program developed targets for the long-term outcome measures developed during the PART process. Joint ventures, through their individual strategic plans, have developed ambitious long- term targets for achieving landscape conditions necessary to sustain migratory birds, but most other program components do not have comparable targets.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> >Joint Venture Planning documents</p>		
2.3	Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?	YES	12%
	<p><i>Explanation:</i> During the PART process, specific annual output performance goals were developed, consistent with the program strategic goals, to measure the effectiveness of the various components of the program. These goals all support the program's mission and are consistent with outcome goals of the DOI Strategic Plan.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> >Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds, Appendix 5 >DMBM planning documents</p>		
2.4	Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?	NO	0%
	<p><i>Explanation:</i> Baselines and ambitious targets for annual performance measures are under development.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> >Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds, Appendix 5 >FY 05 Greenbook</p>		
2.5	Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?	YES	12%

Explanation: Partners generally support the overall strategic goals of the program. The 3 strategic program goals included in the new program Strategic Plan were accepted in the general sense by program partners. Some program components have established partnerships directed associated with more specific goals and objectives. The National Flyway Council is an organization representing all the States and works with the Service for a common goal of developing annual hunting regulations that protect the breeding stock of all migratory game birds and yet provide recreational hunting opportunity to the public. JV'S are partnerships comprised of agencies, organizations, and individuals that have accepted migratory bird population goals and related habitat objectives detailed in joint venture plans as a common purpose. Grant agreements for NAWCA and NMBCA include program performance measures in their reporting requirements.

Evidence: >See Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds in other questions >Director's Order 98 >Grants policies and assistance agreements

2.6

Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?

NO 0%

Explanation: The scope and complexity of the Migratory Bird Program make a single comprehensive evaluation difficult. Various program components have conducted or are planning to conduct evaluations aimed at evaluating effectiveness and identifying needed improvements (e.g. Flyway Council System Review; periodic review of individual MB survey programs, review of permit program). One of the operating principles of the program's Strategic Plan (Blueprint) is the application of science-based management and an adaptive approach for improving programs components. This commitment to regular assessments for improving program performance is tied to the other operating principle, partnerships. The program relies on collaboration with partners to pool expertise and resources to bring peer review and the best analytic practices to migratory bird conservation efforts. Nevertheless, the program does not conduct independent evaluations covering the program through either a single comprehensive evaluation or multiple evaluations on a regular or as needed basis.

Evidence: >NAWCA programmatic evaluation >NAWCA evaluation grant summaries >NAWMP Assessment Framework >AHM Task Force >Permit Workload study >Permit

Program Scoping Notice (63FR 42639; August 10, 1998).

2.7

Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?

NO 0%

Explanation: While some program components can connect Budget requests and annual appropriations with outputs and performance goals, a complete and transparent linkage between performance targets and budget needs has not been made. Past Budget requests have failed to fully account for indirect costs and administrative overhead associated with the program. Recent funding shortfalls in the program have resulted partly because of this disconnect. Reprogramming of funds from other programs has been required to ensure the program was able to continue with minimal damage to the sustainability of ongoing monitoring and other program efforts. The recently completed Migratory Bird Program Strategic Plan will serve as a guidepost for identifying program needs and priorities for budgeting purposes in the future. Program staffs are currently involved with developing short-term (3 year) action plans that will step down the priorities and strategies identified in the Blueprint into projects and program components so that managers can link program goals and performance targets with comprehensive budget needs.

Evidence: >Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds >FY2005 Budget Request >Project database

2.8

Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?

YES 12%

Explanation: The Service has recently completed a two-year effort to develop a long-term strategic plan for Migratory Birds. This effort was undertaken to identify priority program needs, coordinate with partners on those priorities and needs, and link the resulting priorities and needs with the DOI Strategic Plan, GPRA measures, and future budgeting activities. The Migratory Bird Program has been a leader in promoting an adaptive management approach to wildlife conservation through its role as a leader in the development of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, individual joint ventures, other national and continental bird conservation plans, and Adaptive Harvest Management.

Evidence: >Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds >NAWMP >JV evaluations >PIF, USSCP, NAWCP, Woodcock Plan >AHM and AMAT documents

Section 2 - Strategic Planning Score 62%

Section 3 - Program Management

Number	Question	Answer	Score
--------	----------	--------	-------

3.1	<p>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</p>	YES	10%
-----	---	-----	-----

Explanation: The competitive grant programs regularly collect grantee performance information and use this information to manage and improve the grants program. On an annual basis the Migratory Birds Program (MBP) and key partners conduct over 200 surveys and assessments of migratory bird populations. These measures are used to develop long term trend information for migratory bird populations, evaluate management and conservation activities and other impacts on migratory bird populations, and set harvest seasons for those species which are legally hunted. Survey information feeds directly into the regulatory framework for game birds (e.g. length of hunting seasons), species specific management plans, and development of the list of birds of conservation concern. Priorities & work activities are adjusted based on these plans and this list.

Evidence: >Bird surveys >Birds of Conservation Concern >Species Management plans >June 1, 1998, Director memo re New Approach to Permitting >Permit scoping notice (63 FR 42639, August 10, 1998) >Proposed policy on General Conservation Permits (64 FR 58086, October 28, 1999) >July 11, 2001, Director memorandum re The permits Initiative and Request for Information >December 10, 2001 Director memorandum re. Status of the Service wide Permits Program Evaluation and >Call for a Plan of Action >Leaving a Lasting Legacy (permits vision document) >Permits Website fact sheet >Proposed Fee Rule (68 FR 51222, August 26, 2003) >Permit Workload Study

3.2	<p>Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</p>	NO	0%
-----	--	----	----

Explanation: Annual performance plans for MBP staff are being revised currently to have the GPRA measures included as critical factors in the plans. For most surveys, work must be completed fully and on time so that tight schedules for establishing migratory game bird hunting seasons can be met using the data collected that year. All competitive grants require signed agreements which hold the grantees accountable for project cost, schedule, and performance results. Unmet performance by grantees results in payment modifications, project cancellation, and grantees being designated as high risk for future grants.

Evidence: >Annual reports of gamebird survey results >Example NAWCA Grant with Administration Policies (3/14/2001) >Example Grantees Report >MBCC March 2004 meeting response to Congressmen Dingle

3.3

Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?

YES 10%

Explanation: MBP obligates 95-100% of its resource management funds in the fiscal year it is appropriated. For grant programs approval for obligations are completed on a timely basis through a standard review and approval process. Obligation of these funds can take longer due to the peculiarities of the grants and grantees. To expedite this process many of our grants are executed as unilateral agreements making it possible to obligate the funds upon the sole signature of the FWS official. MBP ensures funds are expended for their intended purpose through end-of-year reporting requirements for GPRA, review of JV management plans and actions, reporting requirements instituted through the NAWCA and NMBCA grants processes, and financial reporting requirements that are regulated by 43 CFR and Treasury as related to reporting of costs and expenditures. MBP recently completed risk assessment concluded that none of the MBP activities are considered susceptible to significant erroneous or improper payments.

Evidence: >Recently completed Risk Assessments for the Migratory Birds Program and the NAWCA, and NMBCA grant programs. >analysis of completed NAWCA grant match proposed/received 2001-2003 >Greenbook >Mig birds workplan >Grant program guidelines >NAWCA Programmatic Evaluations at <http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/images/programmaticevaluation.pdf> and <http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/images/programmaticevaluationMX.pdf>

3.4

YES 10%

Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Explanation: The NAWCA grants program has a wetlands efficiency measure developed as part of the Administration's common measures activity. Additional program efficiencies are sought through consolidation of purchases and standardization of equipment such as IT contracts. MBP completed a permits workload study in 2002 to better determine the minimum operational needs of the permit program based on workload functions. The implementation plan being developed for the MBP strategic plan includes project tracking system to improve alignment of efforts with program priorities and strategic plan goals. In 2003 the MBP implemented unilateral grants and SMARTLINK, an electronic payment system, which increased obligation rate to 91% in 2003, improved the grant payment process, expedited delivery of federal funds to coincide with recipient outlays, and reduced paper invoices processed. NMBCA grants are applied for and reviewed entirely on-line reducing paperwork and facilitating quicker review and responses.

Evidence: >Permits workload analysis and follow up >Ongoing workload analysis of NAWCA grants program >Leveraging funds

3.5

YES 10%

Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

Explanation: MBP's mission extends across all programmatic functions within FWS and effectively coordinates with the other programs. For example, using NAWCA grants the MBP collaborates with the Refuge program to restore habitat on Refuge lands. Outside the Service, MBP collaborates with other Federal agencies as well; for example with the Dept. of Agriculture to prepare Environmental Impact Statements on wildlife damage issues. Additionally, much of MBP's work requires the collaboration and assistance of other states and foreign governments. Joint Ventures are an example of the effective partnerships the MBP has fostered in order to complete its conservation mission, so is the research funded by MBP and conducted by states and others for webless migratory game species. Non-governmental partners and the general public promote and participate in events such as International Migratory Bird Day and Urban Treaties for migratory birds and demonstrate innovative and unique partnerships.

Evidence: >Executive Order 13186 (January 10, 2001) Responsibilities of Federal Agencies To Protect Migratory Birds >Partners in Flight Strategic Plan >The North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4401) >DEIS on Resident Canada Goose Management >FEIS on Cormorant Management >DOI FY2002 & 2003 Annual Reports on Performance Accountability >Birdscapes Articles >Director's memo on Wind Energy >Leaving a Lasting Legacy

3.6

Does the program use strong financial management practices?

YES 10%

Explanation: MBP is considered a low risk for making significant erroneous or improper payments under Public Law 107-300. Restructuring of personnel and programs has enabled MBP to limit access to financial data based on clearly defined responsibilities and authorities and provides direct lines of reporting and improved efficiency. Financial information systems improve obligations and payments, and provide comprehensive obligation and payment data. MBP actively participated on the DOI working group (P.L. 106-107) for the purpose of ensuring compliance with current and changing federal regulations and developing good management practices in the area of financial assistance. A 1997 Inspector General's audit of the NAWCA grant program identified several improper financial practices and made recommendations to improve grant administration, these were adopted. Despite established procedures for financial management, the MB Program experienced a significant shortfall in operating funds for FY04, resulting in reductions in activities and a request for reprogramming.

Evidence: >DMBM annual workplan detailing allocations of funds by project >Risk assessment reports

3.7

Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

YES 10%

Explanation: A 2001 Control Review of the NAWCA program identified 4 system design weaknesses dealing with grant processes; these have been corrected and are being implemented.

Evidence: >Workload analysis follow up report >Management control review and follow up >letters from Director to State agencies, citing need for State input and emphasizing placement of highest priority on activities related to the annual development of migratory

	game bird hunting regulations.		
3.CO1	<p>Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> NAWCA and NMBCA funds are awarded following highly competitive processes. Proposals are scored by panels of experts, and only the most meritorious are selected. 100% are peer reviewed; none are earmarked. Outreach for NAWCA has been conducted through Federal Register notice, Grants.gov, our publication 'Birdscapes', and through partner networks. The NAWCA Small Grants program is designed specifically to reach new awardees, and the majority each year are new. NMBCA outreach has been hampered by Internet problems, although partner networks such as the 'La Tangara' newsletter have been effective in Latin America. Since NMBCA is a new program (2002), and covers a large geographic area, most awardees are new.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> >North American Wetlands Conservation Act, Section 5. Approval of Wetlands Conservation Projects. >North American Wetlands Conservation Act, United States Standard Grants, 2004 Proposal Instructions >NMBCA Grant Instructions >Indirect Costs Budget Justification >NAWCA Small Grant Evaluation Questions</p>	YES	10%
3.CO2	<p>Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> NAWCA and NMBCA projects require annual and final reports that track both financial and programmatic activities, as well as quarterly reports of expenditures. All projects are subject to periodic desk monitoring (email and/or telephone contact with grantees) and a protocol and schedule for post award site visits has been developed.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> >Annual and final reports for a NAWCA project. >Annual and final reports for a NMBCA project. >Site visit report for a NAWCA project. >Site visit report for a NMBCA project. >SF272, Report of Federal Cash Transactions, for a NAWCA project. >SF272, Report of Federal Cash Transactions, for a NMBCA project</p>	YES	10%
3.CO3	<p>Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it</p>	YES	10%

available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?

Explanation: NAWCA performance data are collected on an annual basis from grantees. These data are compiled every two years into a Progress Report, which is distributed widely and also posted on the program website. All projects are described on the program website as soon as information is available. The NMBCA is just two years old and although some site visits have been made to project sites, performance data are not yet compiled.

Evidence: >North American Wetlands Conservation Act Progress Report, 2002 ' 2003. North American Wetlands Conservation Council, January 2002, 41 pp. >On the Internet, go to <http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/grants.htm>. Click on 'Biennial Progress Report'. >For detailed NAWCA project information, go to <http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/projects/USprojects/USmap.htm>. >For a list of NMBCA projects, go to <http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NMBCA/projectsNar.htm>.

Section 3 - Program Management Score 90%

Section 4 - Program Results/Accountability

Number	Question	Answer	Score
---------------	-----------------	---------------	--------------

4.1	Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?	SMALL EXTENT	7%
-----	---	-----------------	----

Explanation: Long-term performance goals and performance measures for the MBP were developed during the PART. Consequently, there are no data at present to measure performance. However, long-term GPRA goals in place prior to 2004 are useful in identifying program direction at that time and demonstrating progress made in achieving those goals. The previous long-term goal projected that, by 2005, 48 (12%) of the migratory bird populations of management concern in North America would show improvement in their numbers. Through 2003, 27 populations had improved their status; 21 monitoring programs were initiated for reliable baseline information on these populations of management concern to inform management activities and decisions. Prior to 2004, no long term goals specific to habitat acreage for NAWCA existed. By 2005, habitat goals were 850,000 acres of habitat protected, and 3,200,000 acres enhanced and restored. For 2001-2003, NAWCA contributed 1,125,547 acres protected and 1,025,391

	acres restored to the Service goals. <i>Evidence:</i> >FY2001 Annual Performance Report		
4.2	<p>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> New annual goals for the migratory bird program are under development. As mentioned in 4.1, significant progress was demonstrated towards achieving the previous set of long-term GPRA goals within the migratory bird program, indicating that annual performance goals were, in large part, accomplished. For example, in FY 2003, the migratory bird program met three of the old annual goals (e.g. number of birds of management concern with improved population status; number of baseline monitoring programs initiated; habitat acres added to the NWRS).</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> >FY2001 Annual Performance Report</p>	NO	0%
4.3	<p>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The program has undertaken a number of activities, especially related to the permitting part of the program, to achieve improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness. Tangible productivity or efficiency gains, however, have not yet been realized and/or measured.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> >Webless Migratory Game Bird Research Program Report 2002</p>	NO	0%
4.4	<p>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> While the program is not duplicative of other programs, some of the activities conducted by the program are also conducted by other programs for similar purposes and goals. Restoring, protecting, and enhancing wetlands is an example. Data collected for the wetlands common measures exercise indicates that the Migratory Bird Program compares</p>	SMALL EXTENT	7%

somewhat favorably to other FWS programs that protect and re-establish wetlands.

Evidence:

4.5

Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

LARGE
EXTENT

13%

Explanation: There has never been a comprehensive, independent evaluation of the overall migratory bird program, however, independent evaluations have occurred for significant parts of the program. For example, the US/Canada North American Wetlands Conservation Act programs (2002) and the Mexico program (2003) have been assessed. These evaluations concluded that the NAWCA is effective and achieving results in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico. Key findings were the number of acres affected, partnership dollars that are leveraged, the number of partners involved with the program, and the economic benefits that have accrued. The program's migratory bird survey activities have also been examined independently to ensure optimal design, reliability, realistic objectives, and cost-effectiveness. In 1995, the flyway system for managing migratory game birds, including Service participation, was examined by a panel of State, federal, and private representatives. Today, many Flyway Council activities reflect recommendations from this review. More recently, the Service's program for issuing take permits for migratory birds was reviewed to improve all aspects of program delivery, staffing, and funding support. In some instances these evaluation may not meet the PART requirements for adequate scope and quality.

Evidence: >NAWCA Program Evaluation-Mexico >NAWCA Program Evaluation-US, Canada >Flyway Council System Review Report >Workload Study/Migratory Bird Program >Waterfowl Survey Review 1973 >Waterfowl Survey Review 1995 >Draft Report Congress, Federal Regulations & Unfunded Mandates, 2004 >Evaluation Plans, PPJV, LMVJV >NAWMP Progress Assessment

Section 4 - Program Results/Accountability

Score 27%