

OBP 50/8-C


U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

APR 23 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR:

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
Chief Patrol Agent
El Centro Sector

FROM:

 Michael J. Fisher
Chief
U.S. Border Patrol

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

SUBJECT:

El Centro Sector CDS AoA Re-evaluation and Distribution

U.S. Border Patrol Headquarters representatives met recently with the El Centro Sector subject-matter experts to conduct a re-evaluation of the Consequence Delivery System's (CDS) Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) method. The AoA, a requirement of the CDS process, used six months of data, including the weighting factors that you and your command staff provided. The sector's support and input resulted in the creation of an improved guide that better supports the application of effective and efficient consequences that helps to achieve strategic outcomes.

The CDS AoA, a decision-support tool, is a crucial piece in the evaluation of available consequences. Your sector's successful completion of the AoA process had a direct impact on the development of the new El Centro Sector-specific CDS Guide and Evaluation Process. The new guide has significant changes compared to the original CDS guide that was used as a primer during FY 2011. These differences are a result of changing operational conditions, improved efficiencies and effectiveness in consequence application, and an improved ability to collect and analyze CDS-specific data. The methodology used to analyze CDS data has also improved from the previous version leading to an increased accuracy and reliability of the new guidance. One improvement is the inclusion of nine members of your command staff along with nine subject-matter experts representing the program-management, operations, prosecutions, and intelligence disciplines.

The new El Centro Sector CDS Guide and Evaluation Process is attached and should be implemented April 30, 2012. All field processing facilities and agents should receive copies of the new guidance. During Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 baseline data will be collected on each alien classification and consequence addressed by the El Centro Sector guide. The FY 2012 baseline data will support future sector- and national-level performance measures. Every effort should be made to apply the most effective and efficient consequence to each alien classification as indicated on the guide to the greatest number of apprehensions. The new guide will remain in effect throughout FY 2012 and will undergo periodic re-evaluation. CDS results will be reported on a quarterly basis.

The results of the El Centro Sector AoA process are attached. Results for each alien classification are shown in their own table and also included is a summary table showing the average results of all seven classifications.

El Centro Sector CDS AoA Re-evaluation and Distribution

Page 2

The Border Patrol's CDS methodology has been expanded to other CBP components. DHS frequently cites the CDS process as an analytical best practice. I look forward to working with you and your staff to improve this process.

As always, I am available to answer any questions you may have at (202) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C). Staff may direct specific questions to Operations Officer (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) or Management and Program Analyst (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) of the Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division at (202) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C).

Attachments

EL CENTRO SECTOR CONSEQUENCE DELIVERY SYSTEM GUIDE

	WA/NTA	ER	Std. Pros	Reinstate	OASISS	ATEP	VR
First Apprehension (BP)	•	•	•			•	•
Family Unit	•	•		•			•
Second/Third Apprehension (BP)	•	•	•	•		•	•
Persistent Alien	•	•	•	•		•	•
Suspected Smuggler	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Targeted Smuggler	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Criminal Alien	•	•	•	•			

* *This Consequence Delivery System Guide is to be utilized for the processing of illegal aliens. The combination of any of the above consequences is encouraged, especially when the best/most effective consequence can not be applied. OBP is dividing apprehended aliens into these groups in order to analyze and determine the best combination of consequences to be applied to affect an alien's decision to attempt any additional illegal entry into the United States.*

** *This chart is Not meant to be inclusive of every illegal alien arrested or consequence available, as there will be special cases in each category.*

■	Best Consequence/Most Effective	■	Less than Best Consequence/Effective	■	Preferred over a Voluntary Return
■	More Effective than Remaining Alternatives	■	Least Preferred/Least Effective	■	Not Applicable **



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

For Use in FY2012



EVALUATION PROCESS

STEP 1

Record Checks

- e3
- Fed Query
- FINS Link

STEP 2

Review History

- Prior Criminal
- Prior Immigration
- Prior Consequences
- Outcome(s)

STEP 3

Review Nexus

- Criminal Organization
- Target/Focus Area
- Targeted Demographic

STEP 4

Classify/Verify Entrant Classification

- First Apprehension (BP)
- Family Unit
- Second/Third Apprehension (BP)
- Persistent Alien
- Suspected Smuggler
- Targeted Smuggler
- Criminal Alien

STEP 5

Review Consequence Delivery

- Previous Actions
- Expected Outcomes
- Possible Path Forward
- Best Available CDS

STEP 6

Execute

- Record Disposition
- Place Alert
- Information Sharing with Strategic Partners



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection



OBP 50/8-C

U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

JAN 26 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR:

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Chief Patrol Agent
El Paso Sector

FROM:

Michael J. Fisher
Chief
U.S. Border Patrol

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

SUBJECT:

El Paso Sector Consequence Delivery System, Analysis of
Alternatives Re-evaluation and Distribution

U.S. Border Patrol Headquarters representatives and subject-matter experts in El Paso Sector met recently to conduct an Analysis of Alternatives (AoA), which is required as part of the Consequence Delivery System (CDS) re-evaluation. Using eight months of data, and combined with factor weighting results from you and your command staff, the AoA was completed on schedule, preceding the proposed implementation of a new CDS Guide on February 1, 2012. Thank you for supporting this effort to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of how consequences are applied and achieve our strategically aligned outcomes.

The CDS AoA as a decision-support tool is a crucial piece in the evaluation of available consequences, and it has informed the development of the new El Paso Sector-specific CDS Guide and Evaluation Process to be implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2012. There have been some significant changes from the original CDS Guide used as a primer during FY 2011. These differences are a result of changing operational conditions, improved efficiency and effectiveness, and the ability to collect and analyze data specific to CDS. Additionally, the analytical methodology for developing this new guidance evolved with many significant improvements over the past version, including the participation of 13 members of your command staff and 15 subject-matter experts representing program management, operations, prosecutions, and intelligence disciplines. These improvements have increased the accuracy and reliability of the analysis.

The new El Paso Sector CDS Guide and Evaluation Process is attached and should be distributed to all field processing facilities and agents, effective February 1, 2012. During FY 2012, baseline data will be collected for each alien classification and consequence represented on the new El Paso Sector CDS Guide, in support of future sector- and National-level performance measures. Therefore, every effort should be made to apply the most effective and efficient consequence to the greatest number of apprehensions as indicated for each alien classification on the guide. This new guide will remain in effect throughout FY 2012, and, in consultation with your sector point-of-contact, will undergo periodic evaluation. The reporting of results will occur on a quarterly basis. Also attached is a file showing the results of the El Paso Sector AoAs for every individual alien classification, as well as a summary averaging results among all seven of the classifications.

El Paso Sector Consequence Delivery System, Analysis of Alternatives Re-evaluation and Distribution
Page 2

The Border Patrol's CDS is quickly becoming a model for U.S. Customs and Border Protection and is being considered by the Department of Homeland Security as a best practice. I look forward to working with you to implement and further improve this process.

As always, I am available to answer any questions you may have at (202) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C). Staff may direct specific questions to Operations Officer (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) or Management and Program Analyst (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) of the Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division at (202) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C).

Attachments

EL PASO SECTOR CONSEQUENCE DELIVERY SYSTEM GUIDE

	Std Pros	Reinstate	OASISS	ER	W/NTA	VR
First Apprehension (BP)	•			•	•	•
Family Unit	•			•	•	•
Second/Third Apprehension (BP)	•	•		•	•	•
Persistent Alien	•	•		•	•	•
Suspected Smuggler	•	•	•	•	•	•
Targeted Smuggler	•	•	•	•	•	•
Criminal Alien	•	•		•	•	•

* *This Consequence Delivery System Guide is to be utilized for the processing of illegal aliens. The combination of any of the above consequences is encouraged, especially when the best/most effective consequence can not be applied. OBP is dividing apprehended aliens into these groups in order to analyze and determine the best combination of consequences to be applied to affect an alien's decision to attempt any additional illegal entry into the United States.*

** *This chart is **Not** meant to be inclusive of every illegal alien arrested or consequence available, as there will be special cases in each category.*

•	Best Consequence/Most Effective	•	Less than Best Consequence/Effective	•	Preferred over a Voluntary Return
•	More Effective than Remaining Alternatives	•	Least Preferred/Least Effective	•	Not Applicable **



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

Revised: November 2011



EVALUATION PROCESS

STEP 1

Record Checks

- e3
- Fed Query
- FINS Link

STEP 2

Review History

- Prior Criminal
- Prior Immigration
- Prior Consequences
- Outcome(s)

STEP 3

Review Nexus

- Criminal Organization
- Target/Focus Area
- Targeted Demographic

STEP 4

Classify/Verify Entrant Classification

- First Apprehension (BP)
- Family Unit
- Second/Third Apprehension (BP)
- Persistent Alien
- Suspected Smuggler
- Targeted Smuggler
- Criminal Alien

STEP 5

Review Consequence Delivery

- Previous Actions
- Expected Outcomes
- Possible Path Forward
- Best Available CDS

STEP 6

Execute

- Record Disposition
- Place Alert
- Information Sharing with Strategic Partners



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection



000009
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

Tucson Sector
September 2011

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

Alternative	Factor Weight
OASISS	
WA/NTA	
Streamline	
MIRP	
ER	
ATEP	
Standard Prosecutions	
Quick Court	
Reinstate	
VR	

61%							18%			21%			100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs			Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Severity of Consequence (sentencing, displaced)	Displacement	Awareness/ Messaging/ Psychological/ Deterrence Factor	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Reapprehension Rate	Recidivism Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Avg. Time between Repatriation and Re-Entry	Time Required for BP to Process	Man-Hours per Case	BP Staffing to the Program	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	Cost per Border Mile				BP Cost per Alien
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)														100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measureable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

000010
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

Tucson Sector
September 2011

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

Alternative	Factor Weight
OASISS	
WA/NTA	
Streamline	
MIRP	
ER	
ATEP	
Standard Prosecutions	
Quick Court	
Reinstate	
VR	

61%										18%			21%			100%	Field Scores	
Performance										Schedule			Costs			Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Severity of Consequence (sentencing, displaced)	Displacement	Awareness/ Messaging/ Psychological/ Deterrence Factor	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Reapprehension Rate	Recidivism Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Avg. Time between Repatriation and Re-Entry	Time Required for BP to Process	Man-Hours per Case	BP Staffing to the Program	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	Cost per Border Mile	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)													100.00%		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)		

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measurable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

000011
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

Tucson Sector
September 2011

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

Alternative	Factor Weight
OASISS	
WA/NTA	
Streamline	
MIRP	
ER	
ATEP	
Standard Prosecutions	
Quick Court	
Reinstate	
VR	

61%							18%			21%			100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs			Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Severity of Consequence (sentencing, displaced)	Displacement	Awareness/ Messaging/ Psychological/ Deterrence Factor	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Reapprehension Rate	Recidivism Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Avg. Time between Repatriation and Re-Entry	Time Required for BP to Process	Man-Hours per Case	BP Staffing to the Program	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	Cost per Border Mile				BP Cost per Alien
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)														100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measureable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 Tucson Sector
 September 2011

Alternative	Category Weight	61% Performance										18% Schedule					21% Costs					100% Total Weight		Field Scores	
		Severity of Consequence (sentencing, displaced)	Displacement	Awareness/ Messaging/ Psychological/ Deterrence Factor	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Reapprehension Rate	Recidivism Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Avg. Time between Repatriation and Re-Entry	Time Required for BP to Process	Man-Hours per Case	BP Staffing to the Program	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	Cost per Border Mile	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total						
OASISS		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(7)(E)													100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	000012							
WANTA																									
Streamline																									
MIRP																									
ER																									
ATEP																									
Standard Prosecutions																									
Quick Court																									
Reinstate																									
VR																									

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measurable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

000013
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

Tucson Sector
September 2011

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

Alternative
OASISS
WA/NTA
Streamline
MIRP
ER
ATEP
Standard Prosecutions
Quick Court
Reinstate
VR

61%							18%			21%			100%	Field Scores	
Performance							Schedule			Costs			Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Severity of Consequence (sentencing, displaced)	Displacement	Awareness/ Messaging/ Psychological/ Deterrence Factor	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Reapprehension Rate	Recidivism Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Avg. Time between Repatriation and Re-Entry	Time Required for BP to Process	Man-Hours per Case	BP Staffing to the Program	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	Cost per Border Mile			
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)													100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measureable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

Tucson Sector
September 2011

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

Alternative
OASISS
WA/NTA
Streamline
MIRP
ER
ATEP
Standard Prosecutions
Quick Court
Reinstate
VR

61%							18%			21%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Severity of Consequence (sentencing, displaced)	Displacement	Awareness/ Messaging/ Psychological/ Deterrence Factor	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Reapprehension Rate	Recidivism Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Avg. Time between Repatriation and Re-Entry	Time Required for BP to Process	Man-Hours per Case	BP Staffing to the Program	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	Cost per Border Mile	BP Cost per Alien				Cost per Hour of BP Processing
(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)														100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measureable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

Tucson Sector
September 2011

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

Alternative	Factor Weight
OASISS	
WANTA	
Streamline	
MIRP	
ER	
ATEP	
Standard Prosecutions	
Quick Court	
Reinstate	
VR	

61%							18%			21%			100%	Field Scores	
Performance							Schedule			Costs			Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Severity of Consequence (sentencing, displaced)	Displacement	Awareness/ Messaging/ Psychological/ Deterrence Factor	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Reapprehension Rate	Recidivism Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Avg. Time between Repatriation and Re-Entry	Time Required for BP to Process	Man-Hours per Case	BP Staffing to the Program	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	Cost per Border Mille			
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)													100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measureable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

OBP 50/8-C

MAY 29 2012


**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

MEMORANDUM FOR:

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

 Chief Patrol Agent (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
 Laredo Sector

FROM:

 for Michael J. Fisher
 Chief
 U.S. Border Patrol

SUBJECT:

Laredo Sector CDS AoA Re-evaluation and Distribution

U.S. Border Patrol Headquarters representatives met recently with the Laredo Sector subject-matter experts to conduct a re-evaluation of the Consequence Delivery System's (CDS) Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) method. The AoA, a requirement of the CDS process, used six months of data, including the weighting factors that you and your command staff provided. Laredo Sector's support and input to this effort resulted in the creation of an improved guide that better supports the application of effective and efficient consequences that helps to achieve strategic outcomes.

The CDS AoA, a decision-support tool, is a crucial piece in the evaluation of available consequences. Your sector's successful completion of the AoA process had a direct impact on the development of the new Laredo Sector-specific CDS Guide and Evaluation Process. The new guide has significant changes compared to the original CDS guide that was used as a primer during Fiscal Year (FY) 2011. These differences are a result of changing operational conditions, improved efficiencies and effectiveness in consequence application, and an improved ability to collect and analyze CDS-specific data. The methodology used to analyze CDS data has also improved from the previous version leading to an increased accuracy and reliability of the new guidance. One improvement is the inclusion of ten members of your command staff along with 15 subject-matter experts representing the program management, operations, and prosecutions disciplines.

The new Laredo Sector CDS Guide and Evaluation Process is attached and should be implemented June 1, 2012. All field processing facilities and agents should receive copies of the new guidance. During FY 2012, baseline data will be collected on each alien classification and consequence addressed by the Laredo Sector guide. The FY 2012 baseline data will support future sector- and national-level performance measures. Every effort should be made to apply the most effective and efficient consequence to each alien classification as indicated on the guide to the greatest number of apprehensions. The new guide will remain in effect throughout FY 2012. The guide will undergo periodic re-evaluation. Reporting of CDS results will occur on a quarterly basis.

The results of the Laredo Sector AoA process also are attached. Results for each alien classification are shown in their own table and also included is a summary table showing the average results of all seven classifications.

Laredo Sector CDS AoA Re-evaluation and Distribution
Page 2

The Border Patrol's CDS methodology has been expanded to other CBP components. DHS frequently cites the CDS process as an analytical best practice, and I look forward to working with you and your staff to improve this process.

As always, I am available to answer any questions you may have at (202) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) Staff may direct specific questions to Operations Officer (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) or Management and Program Analyst (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) of the Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division at (202) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Attachments

LAREDO SECTOR CONSEQUENCE DELIVERY SYSTEM GUIDE

	ER	ATEP	Reinstate	Std. Pros	WANTA	Streamline	VR
First Apprehension (BP)	•	•		•	•	•	•
Family Unit	•		•		•		•
Second/Third Apprehension (BP)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Persistent Alien	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Suspected Smuggler	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Targeted Smuggler	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Criminal Alien	•	•	•	•	•	•	

* This Consequence Delivery System Guide is to be utilized for the processing of illegal aliens. The combination of any of the above consequences is encouraged, especially when the best/most effective consequence can not be applied. OBP is dividing apprehended aliens into these groups in order to analyze and determine the best combination of consequences to be applied to affect an alien's decision to attempt any additional illegal entry into the United States.

** This chart is *Not* meant to be inclusive of every illegal alien arrested or consequence available, as there will be special cases in each category.

■	Best Consequence/ Most Effective	■	Preferred over a Voluntary Return
■	Less than Best Consequence/ Effective	■	Least Preferred/ Least Effective
■	More Effective than Remaining Alternatives	■	Not Applicable**



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

For Use During FY2012



EVALUATION PROCESS

STEP 1

Record Checks

- e3
- Fed Query
- FinsLink
- TRACS

STEP 2

Review History

- Prior Criminal
- Prior Immigration
- Prior Consequences
- Outcome(s)

STEP 3

Review Nexus

- Criminal Organization
- Target /Focus Area
- Targeted Demographic

STEP 4

Classify/Verify Entrant Classification

- First Apprehension (BP)
- Family Unit
- Second/Third Apprehension (BP)
- Persistent Alien
- Suspected Guide/ Mule
- Targeted Guides
- Criminal Alien

STEP 5

Review Consequence

- Delivery
- Previous Actions
- Expected Outcomes
- Possible Path Forward
- Best Available CDS

STEP 6

Execute

- Record Disposition
- Place Alert
- Information Sharing with Strategic Partners



U.S. Department of Homeland Security
 Headquarters, Washington, D.C.



OBP 50/8-C

APR 02 2012

U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

MEMORANDUM FOR:

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Acting Chief Patrol Agent
Del Rio Sector

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

FROM:

Michael J. Fisher
Chief
U.S. Border Patrol

SUBJECT:

Del Rio Sector Consequence Delivery System, Analysis of
Alternatives Re-evaluation and Distribution

Recently, U.S. Border Patrol Headquarters representatives and subject-matter experts in Del Rio Sector met to conduct an Analysis of Alternatives (AoA), which is required as part of the Consequence Delivery System (CDS) re-evaluation. Using six months of data, and combined with factor-weighting results from you and your command staff, the AoA was completed on schedule, preceding the proposed implementation of a new CDS Guide March 1, 2012. Thank you for supporting this effort to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of how consequences are applied and achieve our strategically aligned outcomes.

The CDS AoA as a decision-support tool is a crucial piece in the evaluation of available consequences and it has informed the development of the new Del Rio Sector-specific CDS Guide and Evaluation Process to be implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2012. You will notice there have been some significant changes from the original CDS Guide used as a primer during FY 2011. These differences are a result of changing operational conditions, improved efficiency and effectiveness, and the ability to collect and analyze data specific to CDS. Additionally, the analytical methodology for developing this new guidance evolved with many significant improvements over the past version, including the participation of 13 members of your command staff and 15 subject-matter experts representing program management, operations, prosecutions, and intelligence disciplines. These improvements have increased the accuracy and reliability of the analysis.

The new Del Rio Sector CDS Guide and Evaluation Process is attached and should be distributed to all field processing facilities and agents, effective March 1, 2012. During FY 2012, baseline data will be collected for each alien classification and consequence represented on the new Del Rio Sector CDS Guide in support of future sector- and national-level performance measures. Therefore, every effort should be made to apply the most effective and efficient consequence to the greatest number of apprehensions as indicated for each alien classification on the guide. This new guide will remain in effect throughout FY 2012, and in consultation with your sector point-of-contact, will undergo periodic evaluation; the reporting of results will occur on a quarterly basis. Also attached is a file showing the results of the Del Rio Sector AoAs for every individual alien classification, as well as a summary averaging results among all seven classifications.

Del Rio Sector Consequence Delivery System, Analysis of Alternatives Re-evaluation and Distribution
Page 2

The U.S. Border Patrol's CDS is quickly becoming a model for CBP and is being considered by DHS as a best practice. I look forward to working with you to implement and further improve this process.

As always, I am available to answer any questions you may have at (202) (b)(6) (b)(7) Staff may direct specific questions to Operations Officer (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) or Management and Program Analyst (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) of the Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division at (202) (b)(6) (b)(7)

Attachments

DEL RIO SECTOR CONSEQUENCE DELIVERY SYSTEM GUIDE

	Std. Pros.	ER	Reinstate	Streamline	WA/NTA	ATEP	VR
First Apprehension (BP)	•	•		•	•	•	•
Family Unit		•	•	•	•		•
Second/Third Apprehension (BP)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Persistent Alien	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Suspected Smuggler	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Targeted Smuggler	•	•	•	•	•		
Criminal Alien	•	•	•	•	•	•	

* *This Consequence Delivery System Guide is to be utilized for the processing of illegal aliens. The combination of any of the above consequences is encouraged, especially when the best/most effective consequence can not be applied. OBP is dividing apprehended aliens into these groups in order to analyze and determine the best combination of consequences to be applied to affect an alien's decision to attempt any additional illegal entry into the United States.*

** *This chart is **Not** meant to be inclusive of every illegal alien arrested or consequence available, as there will be special cases in each category.*

•	Best Consequence/Most Effective	•	Less than Best Consequence/Effective	•	Preferred over a Voluntary Return
•	More Effective than Remaining Alternatives	•	Least Preferred/Least Effective	•	Not Applicable **



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

For Use in FY2012



EVALUATION PROCESS

STEP 1

Record Checks

- e3
- Fed Query
- FINS Link

STEP 2

Review History

- Prior Criminal
- Prior Immigration
- Prior Consequences
- Outcome(s)

STEP 3

Review Nexus

- Criminal Organization
- Target/Focus Area
- Targeted Demographic

STEP 4

Classify/Verify Entrant Classification

- First Apprehension (BP)
- Family Unit
- Second/Third Apprehension (BP)
- Persistent Alien
- Suspected Smuggler
- Targeted Smuggler
- Criminal Alien

STEP 5

Review Consequence Delivery

- Previous Actions
- Expected Outcomes
- Possible Path Forward
- Best Available CDS

STEP 6

Execute

- Record Disposition
- Place Alert
- Information Sharing with Strategic Partners



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection



Category Weight

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 YUM Sector
 March 2012

Factor Weight	
FIRA	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)
Alien Classification	
Alternative	
WA/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

56% Performance										19% Schedule					25% Costs					100%		Field Scores	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mille	Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total						
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)							

000024

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 YUM Sector
 March 2012

FMUA Alien Classification		Factor Weight
Alternative		
WA/NTA		
Streamline		
ER		
ATEP		
Std. Prosecution		
Reinstate		
VR		

56%							19%			25%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)

000026
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

YUM Sector
 March 2012

SOTA
 Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
W/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

56%							19%			25%				100%	Field Scores	
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing			
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)														100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(7)(E)

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 YUM Sector
 March 2012

PERA Alien Classification		Factor Weight
Alternative		
WA/NTA		
Streamline		
ER		
ATEP		
Std. Prosecution		
Reinstate		
VR		

Category Weight		56%							19%			25%				100%	Field Scores	
		Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
		Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile		
	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

YUM Sector
March 2012

SGDA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
WA/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight

Factor Weight

56%							19%			25%				100%	Field Scores	
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing			
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)														100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)

000029
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis

YUM Sector
 March 2012

TGDA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
WA/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight		56%							19%			25%				100%	Field Scores		
		Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
		Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile			
		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measureable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 YUM Sector
 March 2012

CRMA	
Alternative	Factor Weight
WA/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight		56%							19%			25%				100%	Field Scores		
		Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
		Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile			
		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%		
																		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)

000021
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

YUM Sector
March 2012

Field Scores

Raw Score Total

Weighted Score Total

SUMMARY

Alien Classification

Alternative		
WA/NTA	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
Streamline		
ER		
ATEP		
Std. Prosecution		
Reinstate		
VR		

U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

OBP 50/5-C

JUL 12 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR:

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Chief Patrol (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
Big Bend Se

FROM:

Michael J. F
Chief
U.S. Border Patrol

SUBJECT:

Big Bend Sector Consequence Delivery System
Analysis of Alternatives: Re-evaluation and Distribution

U.S. Border Patrol Headquarters representatives recently met with Big Bend Sector subject-matter experts to conduct a re-evaluation of the Consequence Delivery System (CDS) Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) method. The AoA process, a requirement of the CDS, used six months of data, including the weighting factors that you and your command staff provided. The sector's support and input to this effort created an improved guide that better supports effective and efficient consequences to help achieve strategic outcomes.

The CDS AoA is a decision-support tool that is crucial to evaluating available consequences. Your sector's successful completion of the AoA process had a direct impact on the development of the new Big Bend Sector-specific CDS Guide and Evaluation Process. The new guide was changed significantly from the original CDS guide used as a primer during Fiscal Year (FY) 2011. The differences result from changing operational conditions, improved efficiencies and effectiveness in consequence application, and an improved ability to collect and analyze CDS-specific data. The methodology used to analyze CDS data also improved from the previous version, leading to increased accuracy and reliability in the new guidance. One improvement is the inclusion of 11 members of your command staff along with 14 subject-matter experts representing the program management, operations, and prosecutions disciplines.

The new Big Bend Sector CDS Guide and Evaluation Process is attached and should be implemented July 15, 2012. All field processing facilities and agents should receive copies of the new guidance. During FY 2012, baseline data will be collected on each alien classification and consequence addressed by the Big Bend Sector CDS Guide. The FY 2012 baseline data will support future sector- and national-level performance measures. Every effort should be made to apply the most effective and efficient consequence to each alien classification, as indicated in the guide, to the greatest number of apprehensions. The new guide will remain in effect throughout FY 2012. The guide will undergo periodic re-evaluation. Reporting of CDS results will occur on a quarterly basis.

The results of the Big Bend Sector AoA process are attached. Results for each alien classification are shown in that classification's table and also in a summary table showing the average results of the seven classifications.

Big Bend Sector CDS AoA, Re-evaluation and Distribution
Page 2

The Border Patrol's CDS methodology has been expanded to other components of U.S. Customs and Border Protection. The Department of Homeland Security frequently cites the CDS process as an analytical best practice.

I look forward to working with you and your staff to improve this process. I can be contacted at (202) (b)(6) (b) (b) should you have questions. Staff may direct specific questions to Operations Officer (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) or Management and Program Analyst (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) of the Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division at (202) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Attachments

BIG BEND SECTOR CONSEQUENCE DELIVERY SYSTEM GUIDE

	Reinstate	WANTA	ER	Std. Pros	VR
First Apprehension (BP)	■	●	●	●	●
Family Unit	●	■	●	■	●
Second/Third Apprehension (BP)	●	●	●	●	●
Persistent Alien	●	●	●	●	●
Suspected Smuggler	●	●	●	●	●
Targeted Smuggler	●	●	●	●	■
Criminal Alien	●	●	●	●	■

* This Consequence Delivery System Guide is to be utilized for the processing of illegal aliens. The combination of any of the above consequences is encouraged, especially when the best/most effective consequence can not be applied. OBP is dividing apprehended aliens into these groups in order to analyze and determine the best combination of consequences to be applied to affect an alien's decision to attempt any additional illegal entry into the United States.

** This chart is **Not** meant to be inclusive of every illegal alien arrested or consequence available, as there will be special cases in each category.

■	Best Consequence/Most Effective	■	Less than Best Consequence/Effective	■	Preferred over a Voluntary Return
□	More Effective than Remaining Alternatives	■	Least Preferred/Least Effective	▨	Not Applicable **



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

For Use in FY 2012



EVALUATION PROCESS

STEP 1

Record Checks

- e3
- Fed Query
- FINS Link

STEP 2

Review History

- Prior Criminal
- Prior Immigration
- Prior Consequences
- Outcome(s)

STEP 3

Review Nexus

- Criminal Organization
- Target/Focus Area
- Targeted Demographic

STEP 4

Classify/Verify Entrant Classification

- First Apprehension (BP)
- Family Unit
- Second/Third Apprehension (BP)
- Persistent Alien
- Suspected Smuggler
- Targeted Smuggler
- Criminal Alien

STEP 5

Review Consequence Delivery

- Previous Actions
- Expected Outcomes
- Possible Path Forward
- Best Available CDS

STEP 6

Execute

- Record Disposition
- Place Alert
- Information Sharing with Strategic Partners



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection



Alternatives Evaluation Matrix Consequence Delivery System Analysis		Field Scores	
EPT Sector January 2012		Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
SUMMARY Alien Classification			
Alternative			
OASISS	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)		
WA/NTA			
ER			
Standard Prosecutions			
Reinstate			
VR			

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix Consequence Delivery System Analysis SDC Sector November 2011		Field Scores	
SUMMARY Alien Classification Alternative		Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
OASISS	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)		
WA/NTA			
ER			
ATEP			
Standard Prosecutions			
Reinstate			
VR			

OBP 50/8-C


**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**
DEC 29 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR:

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

 Chief Patrol Agent (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
 San Diego Sector

FROM:

 Michael J. Fisher
 Chief
 U.S. Border Patrol

SUBJECT:

 San Diego Sector Consequence Delivery System, Analysis of
 Alternatives Re-evaluation and Distribution

U.S. Border Patrol Headquarters representatives and subject-matter experts in San Diego Sector met recently to conduct an Analysis of Alternatives (AoA), which is required as part of the Consequence Delivery System (CDS) re-evaluation. Using eight months of data, and combined with factor weighting results from you and your command staff, the AoA was completed on schedule, preceding the proposed implementation of a new CDS Guide on January 1, 2012. Thank you for supporting this effort to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of how consequences are applied and achieve our strategically aligned outcomes.

The CDS AoA as a decision-support tool is a crucial piece in the evaluation of available consequences and has informed the development of the new San Diego Sector-specific CDS Guide and Evaluation Process to be implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2012. You will notice there have been some significant changes from the original CDS Guide used as a primer during FY 2011. These differences are a result of changing operational conditions, improved efficiency and effectiveness, and the ability to collect and analyze data specific to CDS. Additionally, the analytical methodology for developing this new guidance evolved with many significant improvements over the past version, including the participation of 22 members of your command staff and 14 subject-matter experts representing program management, operations, prosecutions, and intelligence disciplines. These improvements have increased the accuracy and reliability of the analysis.

The new San Diego Sector CDS Guide and Evaluation Process is attached. It must be distributed to all field processing facilities and agents, effective January 1, 2012. During FY 2012, baseline data will be collected for each alien classification and consequence represented on the new San Diego Sector CDS Guide to support future sector- and National-level performance measures. Therefore, every effort should be made to apply the most effective and efficient consequence to the greatest number of apprehensions as indicated for each alien classification on the guide. This new guide will remain in effect throughout FY 2012, and in consultation with your sector's point-of-contact, will undergo periodic evaluation. The reporting of results will occur on a quarterly basis. Also attached is a file showing the results of the San Diego Sector AoAs for every individual alien classification, as well as a summary of average results among all seven classifications.

San Diego Sector Consequence Delivery System, Analysis of Alternatives Re-evaluation and Distribution
Page 2

The Border Patrol's CDS is quickly becoming a model for U.S. Customs and Border Protection and is being considered by the Department of Homeland Security as a best practice. I look forward to working with you to implement and further improve this process.

As always, I am available to answer any questions you may have at (202) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) Staff may direct specific questions to Operations Officer (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) or Management and Program Analyst (b)(6) (b)(7) of the Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division at (202) (b)(6) (b)(7)

Attachments

SAN DIEGO SECTOR CONSEQUENCE DELIVERY SYSTEM GUIDE

	Std. Pros.	WA/NTA	Reinstate	OASISS	ER	ATEP	VR
First Apprehension (BP)		•				•	•
Family Unit		•			•		•
Second/Third Apprehension (BP)	•	•	•		•	•	•
Persistent Alien	•	•	•		•	•	•
Suspected Smuggler	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Targeted Smuggler	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Criminal Alien	•	•	•		•		

* *This Consequence Delivery System Guide is to be utilized for the processing of illegal aliens. The combination of any of the above consequences is encouraged, especially when the best/most effective consequence can not be applied. OBP is dividing apprehended aliens into these groups in order to analyze and determine the best combination of consequences to be applied to affect an alien's decision to attempt any additional illegal entry into the United States.*

** *This chart is Not meant to be inclusive of every illegal alien arrested or consequence available, as there will be special cases in each category.*

Best Consequence/Most Effective	Less than Best Consequence/Effective	Preferred over a Voluntary Return	
More Effective than Remaining Alternatives	Least Preferred/Least Effective	Not Applicable **	



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

Revised: December 2011
For Official Use Only



EVALUATION PROCESS

STEP 1

Record Checks

- e3
- Fed Query
- FinsLink
- TRACS

STEP 2

Review History

- Prior Criminal
- Prior Immigration
- Prior Consequences
- Outcome(s)

STEP 3

Review Nexus

- Criminal Organization
- Target /Focus Area
- Targeted Demographic

STEP 4

Classify/Verify Entrant Classification

- First Apprehension (BP)
- Family Unit
- Second/Third Apprehension (BP)
- Persistent Alien
- Suspected Guide/ Mule
- Targeted Guides
- Criminal Alien

STEP 5

Review Consequence Delivery

- Previous Actions
- Expected Outcomes
- Possible Path Forward
- Best Available CDS

STEP 6

Execute

- Record Disposition
- Place Alert
- Information Sharing with Strategic Partners



U.S. Department of
Homeland Security

For Official Use Only



Alternatives E00049 Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

ELC Sector
March 2012

FIRA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
OASISS	
WA/NTA	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

53%							18%			29%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Alternatives E00050n Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 ELC Sector
 March 2012

Category Weight →

53%							18%			29%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

FMUA

Alien Classification

Factor Weight →

Alternative	Factor Weight
OASISS	
WA/NTA	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Alternatives E00051 Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 ELC Sector
 March 2012

SOTA	
Alien Classification	Factor Weight
Alternative	
OASISS	
WA/NTA	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

53%							18%			29%				100%	Field Scores	
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing			
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)														100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

ELC Sector
March 2012

PERA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
OASISS	
WA/NTA	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight

Factor Weight

53%							18%			29%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

ELC Sector
March 2012

SGDA
Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
OASISS	
WA/NTA	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight

Factor Weight

53%							18%			29%				100%	Field Scores	
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing			
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)														100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

000051
 Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

ELC Sector
 March 2012

TGDA
 Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
OASISS	
WA/NTA	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight	53%							18%			29%				100%	Field Scores		
	Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
	Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measureable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

000055
 Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

ELC Sector
 March 2012

CRMA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
OASISS	
WA/NTA	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

53%							18%			29%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
Consequence Delivery System Analysis

ELC Sector
March 2012

SUMMARY

Allen Classification

Alternative	Field Scores			
OASISS	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total		
WA/NTA			(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
ER				
ATEP				
Std. Prosecution				
Reinstate				
VR				

Alternatives E-00057 Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 RGV Sector
 October 2011

		60%							18%			22%				100%	Field Scores		
		Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
		Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
Alternative	Factor Weight	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
WA/NTA		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
Streamline		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
ER		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
ATEP		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
Standard Prosecutions		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
Reinstate		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
VR		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measurable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 RGV Sector
 October 2011

		60%							18%			22%				100%	Field Scores		
		Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
		Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
Alternative	Factor Weight	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
WA/NTA		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
Streamline		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
ER		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
ATEP		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
Standard Prosecutions		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
Reinstate		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	
VR		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measurable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

RGV Sector
October 2011

Category Weight

Factor Weight

Alternative	Factor Weight
WA/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Standard Prosecutions	
Reinstate	
VR	

60%							18%			22%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measureable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 RGV Sector
 October 2011

Alternative	Factor Weight	60%							18%			22%				100%	Field Scores		
		Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
		Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%		
WA/NTA		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
Streamline		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
ER		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
ATEP		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
Standard Prosecutions		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
Reinstate		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
VR		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measurable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

000061
 Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

RGV Sector
 October 2011

Alternative	Factor Weight	60%							18%			22%				100%	Field Scores		
		Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
		Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
WA/NTA		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)
Streamline		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
ER		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
ATEP		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
Standard Prosecutions		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
Reinstate		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
VR		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measureable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 RGV Sector
 October 2011

Alternative	Category Weight	60%							18%			22%				100%	Field Scores		
		Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
	Factor Weight	Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile			
WA/NTA		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)
Streamline		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
ER		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
ATEP		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
Standard Prosecutions		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
Reinstate		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
VR		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measurable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 RGV Sector
 October 2011

Alternative	Factor Weight	60%							18%			22%				100%	Field Scores		
		Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
		Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
WA/NTA		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)
Streamline		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
ER		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
ATEP		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
Standard Prosecutions		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
Reinstate		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
VR		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measurable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 000061
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 RGV Sector
 October 2011

Alternative	Factor Weight	60%							18%			22%				100%	Field Scores		
		Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
		Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
WA/NTA		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)
Streamline		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
ER		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
ATEP		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
Standard Prosecutions		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
Reinstate		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	
VR		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																	

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measurable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

RGV Sector
October 2011

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

Alternative	Factor Weight
WA/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Standard Prosecutions	
Reinstate	
VR	

60%							18%			22%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measurable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

OBP 50/8-C

**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

DEC 14 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR:

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Chief Patrol Agent
Rio Grande Valley Sector

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

FROM:

Michael J. F...
Chief
U.S. Border Patrol

SUBJECT:

Rio Grande Valley Sector Consequence Delivery System, Analysis
of Alternatives Re-evaluation and Distribution

Recently, U.S. Border Patrol Headquarters representatives and subject-matter experts in Rio Grande Valley Sector met to conduct an Analysis of Alternatives (AoA), which is required as part of the Consequence Delivery System (CDS) re-evaluation. Using eight months of data, and combined with factor weighting results from you and your command staff, the AoA was completed on schedule, preceding the proposed implementation of a new CDS Guide on December 15, 2011. Thank you for supporting this effort to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of how consequences are applied and achieve our strategically aligned outcomes.

The CDS AoA, as a decision-support tool, is a crucial piece in the evaluation of available consequences and it has informed the development of the new Rio Grande Valley Sector-specific CDS Guide and Evaluation Process to be implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2012. You will notice there have been some significant changes from the original CDS Guide used as a primer during FY 2011. These differences are a result of changing operational conditions, improved efficiency and effectiveness, and the ability to collect and analyze data specific to CDS. Additionally, the analytical methodology for developing this new guidance evolved with many significant improvements over the past version, including the participation of 14 members of your command staff and 14 subject-matter experts representing program management, operations, prosecutions, and intelligence disciplines. These improvements have increased the accuracy and reliability of the analysis.

The new Rio Grande Valley Sector CDS Guide and Evaluation Process is attached and should be distributed to all field processing facilities and agents, effective December 15, 2011. During FY 2012, baseline data will be collected for each alien classification and consequence represented on the new Rio Grande Valley Sector CDS Guide, in support of future sector- and National-level performance measures. Therefore, every effort should be made to apply the most effective and efficient consequence to the greatest number of apprehensions as indicated for each alien classification on the guide. This new guide will remain in effect throughout FY 2012, and in consultation with your sector point-of-contact, will undergo periodic evaluation; the reporting of results will occur on a quarterly basis. Also attached is a file showing the results of the Rio Grande Valley Sector AoAs for every individual alien classification, as well as a summary averaging results among all seven of the classifications.

Rio Grande Valley Sector Consequence Delivery System, Analysis of Alternatives Re-evaluation and Distribution

Page 2

The Border Patrol's CDS is quickly becoming a model for U.S. Customs and Border Protection and is being considered by the Department of Homeland Security as a best practice. I look forward to working with you to implement and further improve this process.

As always, I am available to answer any questions you may have at (202) (b)(6) (b) Staff may direct specific questions to Operations Officer (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) or Management and Program Analyst (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) of the Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division at (202) (b)(6) (b)(6)

Attachments

RIO GRANDE VALLEY SECTOR CONSEQUENCE DELIVERY SYSTEM GUIDE

	ATEP	W/ANTA	ER	Reinstate	Std. Pros	Streamline	VR
First Apprehension (BP)	•	•	•			•	•
Family Unit	•	•	•	•			•
Second/Third Apprehension (BP)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Persistent Alien	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Suspected Guide/ Mule	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Targeted Guides	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Criminal Alien	•	•	•	•	•	•	

* This Consequence Delivery System Guide is to be utilized for the processing of illegal aliens. The combination of any of the above consequences is encouraged, especially when the best/most effective consequence can not be applied. OBP is dividing apprehended aliens into these groups in order to analyze and determine the best combination of consequences to be applied to affect an alien's decision to attempt any additional illegal entry into the United States.

** This chart is **Not** meant to be inclusive of every illegal alien arrested or consequence available, as there will be special cases in each category.

Best Consequence/Most Effective	Less than Best Consequence/Effective	Preferred over a Voluntary Return	More Effective than Remaining Alternatives
Least Preferred/Least Effective	Not Applicable **		



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

Revised: November 2011
For Official Use Only



Category Weight

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 DRT Sector
 February 2012

FIRA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
WA/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

48% Performance	21% Schedule					31% Costs					100% Total Weight		Field Scores				
	Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Psychological / Deference Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)														000000
																(b)(5) (b)(7) (E)	

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

DRT Sector
February 2012

FMUA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
WAINA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight

Factor Weight

48%							21%			31%			100%	Field Scores	
Performance							Schedule			Costs			Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien			
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)													100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

000071
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 DRT Sector
 February 2012

SOTA Alien Classification		Factor Weight
Alternative		
WAINA		
Streamline		
ER		
ATEP		
Std. Prosecution		
Reinstate		
VR		

Category Weight →												100%		Field Scores		
48% Performance							21% Schedule			31% Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing			
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)												100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)		

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 DRT Sector
 February 2012

PERA	
Alternative	Alien Classification
WANTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight														Field Scores		
48%							21%			31%				100%		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile		
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)														100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

000073
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

DRT Sector

February 2012

SGDA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
W/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

48%							21%			31%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis
DRT Sector
February 2012

Category Weight	48% Performance										21% Schedule					31% Costs					100% Total Weight		Field Scores	
	Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile	Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total						
																			(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)				
TGDA	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)						
Alternative	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)						
WANTA																								
Streamline																								
ER																								
ATEP																								
Std. Prosecution																								
Reinstate																								
VR																								

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measurable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

000075
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

DRT Sector

February 2012

CRMA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
WA/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

48%							21%			31%			100%	Field Scores	
Performance							Schedule			Costs			Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien			
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)													100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

000076
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

DRT Sector
February 2012

Field Scores

Raw Score Total

Weighted Score Total

SUMMARY

Alien Classification

Alternative	
WA/NTA	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 LRT Sector
 April 2012

Category Weight	51% Performance										21% Schedule					28% Costs					100% Total Weight		Field Scores	
	Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile	Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total						
	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	000077							

Factor Weight	Alternative
	WAINA
	Streamline
	ER
	ATEP
	Std. Prosecution
	Reinstate
	VR

000078
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 LRT Sector
 April 2012

FMUA	
Alien Classification	
Alternative	Factor Weight
W/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

51%										21%			28%			100%	Field Scores	
Performance										Schedule			Costs			Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile				
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)													100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)			

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

LRT Sector
April 2012

SOTA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
W/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

51%							21%			28%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Category Weight

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 LRT Sector
 April 2012

PERA

Alien Classification

Alternative

Factor Weight

WA/INTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

51% Performance	21% Schedule					28% Costs					100% Total Weight	Field Scores					
	Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process		Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile	Raw Score Total
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	080000

000081
 Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

LRT Sector
 April 2012

SGDA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
W/ANTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

51%							21%			28%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 000082
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 LRT Sector
 April 2012

TGDA Alien Classification	
Alternative	Factor Weight
W/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight	51%							21%			28%				100%	Field Scores		
	Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
	Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measureable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

LRT Sector
April 2012

CRMA
Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
WA/NTA	
Streamline	
ER	
ATEP	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight

Factor Weight

51%							21%			28%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%		
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
Consequence Delivery System Analysis

LRT Sector
 April 2012

SUMMARY

Alien Classification

Alternative	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
WA/NTA	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)
Streamline	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)
ER	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)
ATEP	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)
Std. Prosecution	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)
Reinstate	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)
VR	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)

OBP 50/8-C


**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

SEP 30 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR:

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Acting Chief (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
Tucson Sector

FROM:

Michael J. Fisher
Chief
U.S. Border Patrol

SUBJECT:

Tucson Sector Consequence Delivery System, Analysis of
Alternatives Re-evaluation and Distribution

Recently, U.S. Border Patrol Headquarters representatives and subject-matter experts in Tucson Sector met to conduct an Analysis of Alternatives (AoA), which is required as part of the Consequence Delivery System (CDS) re-evaluation. Using six months of data, and combined with factor weighting results from you and your command staff, the AoA was completed on schedule, preceding the proposed implementation of a new CDS Guide on October 1, 2011. Thank you for supporting this effort to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of how consequences are applied and achieve our strategically aligned outcomes.

The CDS AoA as a decision-support tool is a crucial piece in the evaluation of available consequences and it has informed the development of the new Tucson Sector-specific CDS Guide and Evaluation Process to be implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2012. You will notice there have been some significant changes from the original CDS Guide used as a primer during FY 2011. These differences are a result of changing operational conditions, improved efficiency and effectiveness, and the ability to collect and analyze data specific to CDS. Additionally, the analytical methodology for developing this new guidance evolved with many significant improvements over the past version, including the participation of 16 members of your command staff and 14 subject-matter experts representing program management, operations, prosecutions, and intelligence disciplines. These improvements have increased the accuracy and reliability of the analysis.

The new Tucson Sector CDS Guide and Evaluation Process is attached for further distribution to all field processing facilities and agents, effective October 1, 2011. During FY 2012, baseline data will be collected for each alien classification and consequence represented on the new Tucson Sector CDS Guide, in support of future sector- and National-level performance measures. Therefore, every effort should be made to apply the most effective and efficient consequence to the greatest number of apprehensions as indicated for each alien classification on the guide. This new guide will remain in effect throughout FY 2012, and in consultation with your sector point-of-contact, will undergo periodic evaluation and the reporting of results will occur on a quarterly basis.

Tucson Sector Consequence Delivery System, Analysis of Alternatives Re-evaluation and Distribution
Page 2

The Border Patrol's CDS is quickly becoming a model for U.S. Customs and Border Protection and is being considered by the Department of Homeland Security as a best practice. I look forward to working with you to implement and further improve this process.

As always, I am available to answer any questions you may have at (202) (b)(6) (b) Staff may direct specific questions to Assistant Chief (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) or Operations Officer (b)(6) (b)(6) (b) of the Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division at (202) (b)(6) (b)

Attachments

TUCSON SECTOR CONSEQUENCE DELIVERY SYSTEM GUIDE

	OASISS	Std Pros	Streamline	Reinstate	Quick Court	WA/NTA	MIRP	ER	ATEP	VR
First Apprehension (BP)			•		•	•	•	•	•	•
Family Unit				•		•	•	•		•
Second/Third Apprehension (BP)		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Persistent Alien		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Suspected Guide/ Mule	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Targeted Guides	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	
Criminal Alien		•	•	•	•	•		•		

* *This Consequence Delivery System Guide is to be utilized for the processing of illegal aliens. The combination of any of the above consequences is encouraged, especially when the best/most effective consequence can not be applied. OBP is dividing apprehended aliens into these groups in order to analyze and determine the best combination of consequences to be applied to affect an alien's decision to attempt any additional illegal entry into the United States.*

** *This chart is **Not** meant to be inclusive of every illegal alien arrested or consequence available, as there will be special cases in each category.*

■ Best Consequence/ Most Effective	□ Preferred over a Voluntary Return
■ Less than Best Consequence/ Effective	■ Least Preferred/ Least Effective
□ More Effective than Remaining Alternatives	▨ Not Applicable**



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

For Use During FY2012
For Official Use Only



EVALUATION PROCESS

STEP 1

Record Checks

- e3
- Fed Query
- FinsLink
- TRACS

STEP 2

Review History

- Prior Criminal
- Prior Immigration
- Prior Consequences
- Outcome(s)

STEP 3

Review Nexus

- Criminal Organization
- Target /Focus Area
- Targeted Demographic

STEP 4

Classify/Verify Entrant Classification

- First Apprehension (BP)
- Family Unit
- Second/Third Apprehension (BP)
- Persistent Alien
- Suspected Guide/ Mule
- Targeted Guides
- Criminal Alien

STEP 5

Review Consequence Delivery

- Previous Actions
- Expected Outcomes
- Possible Path Forward
- Best Available CDS

STEP 6

Execute

- Record Disposition
- Place Alert
- Information Sharing with Strategic Partners



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

For Official Use Only



000089
 Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Category Weight

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

BBT Sector
 June 2012

FIRA		Factor Weight
Alien Classification		
Alternative		
	W/NTA	
	ER	
	Std. Prosecution	
	Reinstate	
	VR	

51%							21%			28%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)

000090
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

BBT Sector
 June 2012

FMUA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
W/NTA	
ER	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

51%							21%			28%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

000081
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

BBT Sector
 June 2012

SOTA
 Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
WA/NTA	
ER	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight →

Factor Weight →

51%							21%			28%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

BBT Sector
June 2012

Category Weight	51% Performance										21% Schedule					28% Costs					100% Total Weight		Field Scores	
	Recidivism Rate	Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological / Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile	Total Weight	100.00%	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total				
	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	100.00%	100.00%	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)					
	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA	PERA				
	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative	Alternative				
	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA	WA/NTA				
	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER				
	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution	Std. Prosecution				
	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate	Reinstate				
	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR	VR				

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 BBT Sector
 June 2012

SGDA
 Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
WA/NTA	
ER	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight		51%							21%			28%			100%	Field Scores			
		Performance							Schedule			Costs			Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total		
		Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien				Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile
		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%		
		(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)																(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

000004
Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
 Consequence Delivery System Analysis
 BBT Sector
 June 2012

TGDA	
Alien Classification	
Alternative	Factor Weight
WA/NTA	
ER	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

51%										21%			28%				100%	Field Scores	
Performance										Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing	Cost per Border Mile					
(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)															100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)		

Score each alternative within each factor from a scale of 1-5 and enter the score into the appropriate cell using the following scoring scheme:

- 1 - Limited performance but has some adverse operational impact within the factor
- 2 - None/Low measurable performance within the factor
- 3 - Performance is effective but has limited operational impact within the factor
- 4 - Effective performance with positive within the factor
- 5 - Performance is high with significant operation impact within the factor

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Consequence Delivery System Analysis

BBT Sector
June 2012

CRMA

Alien Classification

Alternative	Factor Weight
WA/NTA	
ER	
Std. Prosecution	
Reinstate	
VR	

Category Weight

Factor Weight

51%							21%			28%				100%	Field Scores		
Performance							Schedule			Costs				Total Weight	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total	
Recidivism Rate	Reapprehension Rate	Avg. Number of Apps per Recidivist	Awareness / Messaging / Psychological Deterrence Factor	Displacement	% of Amenable Aliens Processed into the Program	Severity of Consequence	Avg. Time Between Initial Apprehension and Reapprehension	Man-Hours per Case	Avg. Time Required for BP to Process	Dedication and Contribution of Strategic Partners	BP Staffing to the Program	BP Cost per Alien	Cost per Hour of BP Processing				Cost per Border Mile
(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)														100.00%	(b)(5)	(b)(7)(E)

Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
Consequence Delivery System Analysis

BBT Sector
June 2012

Field Scores	
Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total

SUMMARY

Alien Classification

Alternative	Raw Score Total	Weighted Score Total
WA/NTA	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)
ER	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)
Std. Prosecution	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)
Reinstate	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)
VR	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)	(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)