Department of Homeland Security

Performance Budget Overview

Appendix A
Verification and Validation of Measured Values

Fiscal Year 2008
Congressional Budget Justification

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Appendix A: Verification and Validation of Measured Values

For each performance measure presented in the Performance Budget Overview and its appendices there follows in tabular format a description of the means used to verify and validate measured values. Included are the source of the data, how it is collected, and an assessment of the reliability of data. Reliability is classified either as:

- **Reliable** – reliability is determined by Office of Management and Budget guidance. At minimum, performance data are considered reliable if agency managers and decision makers use the data on an ongoing basis in the normal course of their duties. At minimum, performance data are considered reliable if transactions and other data that support reported performance measures are properly recorded, processed, and summarized to permit the preparation of performance information in accordance with criteria stated by management. Performance data need not be perfect to be reliable, particularly if the cost and effort to secure the best performance data possible will exceed the value of any data so obtained.
- **Inadequate** – the data does not meet the standard for reliable. In this instance, an explanation of plans to make the information reliable is included.
- **T. B. D. New Measure** – a new measure for which reliability will be determined.

Verification and validation descriptions are grouped by component as identified in the Table of Contents below. To further assist in locating specific measures, an alphabetical index of all measures is provided beginning on the next page.

Table of Contents

Index of Measures

Analysis and Operations

Performance Measure	Percent of DHS information sources accessible to internal stakeholders.
Organization and Program	Analysis and Operations Program-Analysis and Operations Component
Scope	The scope is (A) the total number of critical information stakeholders identified within DHS as the denominator to derive the percentage, and (B) how many documented information sharing relationships (ISAAs) are in place as the numerator. Percent ISAA utilization = A/B. A = number of formal ISAAs in place grouped by stakeholder and B = number of critical information sharing stakeholders.
Data Source	All DHS components submit any ISAAs (to include Memorandums Of Understanding (MOUs), Memorandums Of Agreement (MOAs), Letters Of Intent (LOIs), Letters Of Understanding (LOUs), etc.) to the DHS Intelligence and Analysis component for inclusion in an ISAA repository.
Collection Method	DHS IA will survey component leadership to determine the number of critical stakeholders with whom information should be shared (representing the total number of ISAAs that are needed). Secondly, IA will review ISAAs in the ISAA repository. IA will collect information on informal ISAAs through a working group. The number of ISAAs in place over the total number needed yields the percent of HDS information sources accessible to internal stakeholders.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Percent of Federal, State and local agencies that are active users of the National Operations Center (NOC) Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN) and participate in information sharing and collaboration concerning infrastructure status, potential threat, and incident management information.
Organization and Program	Analysis and Operations Program-Analysis and Operations Component
Scope	Includes federal, state, local, tribal, etc. users that have accessed the system during the reporting period.
Data Source	DHS Operations Directorate uses a software tool to identify specific users that have accessed a given HSIN site.
Collection Method	Once the specific users that have accessed a given HSIN site have been collected, the data is manually aggregated. This figure divided by the total number of users yields the percent of agencies that are active users.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Verification is achieved through performing a validation check on the data provided by the tools to ensure the numbers are reasonable with the systems performance. The tools used to run the usage report have undergone configuration and testing to ensure accurate data is supplied.

Customs and Border Protection

Performance Measure	Advanced Passenger Information System (APIS) Data Sufficiency Rate. (Percent)
Organization and Program	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Information is transmitted to and processed by the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) National Data Center. Once the data in CBP's Automated Commercial System has been verified by Inspection personnel at the Ports of Entry an automated report is generated by the Interagency Border Inspection System (IBIS).
Data Source	The airline passenger and crew manifest data.
Collection Method	Data is extracted from the APIS system, processed by IBIS and displayed in a report format.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	APIS data is initially entered by air carriers, verified by CBP Officers during daily operations and further assessed for accuracy by National APIS Account Managers on a weekly basis.

Performance Measure	Air Passengers Compliant with Laws, Rules, and Regulations (%).
Organization and Program	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Individual inspectors working at the 12 largest Airport Ports of Entry receiving International travelers gather data on the proportion of air travelers in compliance with Customs regulations. Passengers are selected in a random sample, for roughly 1/8000 passengers totaling approximately 12,000 passengers annually at each of the 12 airports.
Data Source	The percent of compliant passengers in the Air/Land Passenger environment is obtained from Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS), Category I violations, and Category II violations.
Collection Method	Individual inspectors working at Airport Ports of Entry receiving International travelers gather compliance rate data while processing passengers entering the U.S. These data are entered into the Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECs) by each Inspector. Individual compliance rate data entered in TECs is then extracted by a specialist at CBP- HQ to an Excel spreadsheet where the compliance rate is calculated by applying a statistically valid formula (including confidence intervals on the results) to determine the rate of compliance.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Verification of the data is conducted by making extractions from the Operations Management Report (OMR), Automated Targeting System (ATS), and the Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECs). These data extractions are then reviewed by the headquarters program officers against hard copy records to verify the accuracy of the reported data and identify any anomalies or inconsistencies.

Performance Measure	Border Vehicle Passengers in Compliance with Agricultural Quarantine Regulations (percent compliant).
Organization and Program	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The range of data includes the percent of passengers in the air environments in compliance with the Agricultural Quarantine Regulations. Compliance rates are based on statistical sampling; the margin of error is 0.5 percent. The actual

	performance results reported are the midpoint of the range.
Data Source	Data are taken from the WADS (Work Accomplishment Data System), maintained by USDA and entered by CBP Agricultural Specialists.
Collection Method	The program collects data used for this measure through Agricultural Quarantine Inspection (AQI) Monitoring activities. Compliance data are recorded at the ports of entry (POEs) by Agriculture Specialists for the air passenger, border vehicle, and cargo pathways of vehicles.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	National and regional managers work with the ports to continually monitor and improve data quality. Identified data quality issues will be addressed by the appropriate managers. Efforts made throughout 2005 resulted in improved data quality and are maintained by quarterly senior management reviews.

Performance Measure	International Air Passengers in Compliance with Agricultural Quarantine Regulations (percent compliant).
Organization and Program	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The range of data includes the percent of passengers in the air environments in compliance with the Agricultural Quarantine Regulations. Compliance rates are based on statistical sampling; the margin of error is 0.5 percent. The actual performance results reported are the midpoint of the range.
Data Source	Data are taken from the WADS (Work Accomplishment Data System), maintained by United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and entered by CBP Agricultural Specialists.
Collection Method	The program collects data used for this measure through Agricultural Quarantine Inspection (AQI) Monitoring activities. Compliance data are recorded at the ports of entry (POEs) by Agriculture Specialists for the air passenger, border vehicle, and cargo pathways of vehicles.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	National and regional managers work with the ports to continually monitor and improve data quality. Identified data quality issues will be addressed by the appropriate managers. Efforts made throughout 2005 resulted in improved data quality and are maintained by quarterly senior management reviews.

Performance Measure	Land Border Passengers Compliant with Laws, Rules, and Regulations (%)
Organization and Program	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Individual inspectors working at the 12 largest land Ports of Entry gather compliance rate data while processing vehicles entering the U.S. Vehicles are selected in a random sample, for roughly 1/4000 vehicles totaling approximately 12,000 vehicles annually at each of the 12 land POEs.
Data Source	The percent of compliant passengers in the Air/Land Passenger environment is obtained from Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS).
Collection Method	Individual inspectors working at land Ports of Entry in gather compliance rate data while processing vehicles entering the U.S. These data are entered into the Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECs) by each Inspector. Individual compliance rate data entered in TECs is then extracted by a specialist at CBP-HQ to an excel spreadsheet where the compliance rate is calculated by applying a statistically valid formula (including confidence intervals on the results) to determine the rate of compliance.
Reliability	Reliable

How data is verified	Verification of the data is conducted by making extractions from the Operations Management Report (OMR), Automated Targeting System (ATS), and the Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECs). The extracted data are reviewed against hard copy records to verify the accuracy of the reported data and identify any anomalies or inconsistencies.

Performance Measure	Percent of active commissioned canine teams with 100% detection rate results in testing of the Canine Enforcement Team.
Organization and Program	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Annual measures of all CBP detector dogs' results have been kept over time and clearly show the history, success, and high standards of this program. CBP detector dogs are evaluated twice a year. All dogs must successfully detect 100% of all hidden training aids, a raised standard that is met by no other entity in government or the private sector.
Data Source	Data are maintained at the Canine Enforcement program on each dog evaluated by Canine Enforcement Team (CET) Supervisory personnel. Data recorded include training completion date, dogs' name, and identification number for all dogs that complete the training.
Collection Method	Data are recorded by Canine Enforcement Team (CET) Supervisory personnel as part of the evaluation process.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Dogs are evaluated by multiple evaluators ensuring the reliability of the evaluations as well as of the data recorded.

Performance Measure	Number of foreign mitigated examinations waived through the Container Security Initiative.
Organization and Program	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The measure will be the number of examinations waived due to host nation intelligence.
Data Source	A Container Security Initiative (CSI) port team member inputs this data into an excel spreadsheet daily. Total numbers are extracted weekly from this spreadsheet for required reports to the CSI Division. In FY 2005 the Automated Targeting System (ATS) was used by the port members to input waived data.
Collection Method	CSI Port Team Leaders track statistics using an existing excel spreadsheet. Data is collected daily and reported weekly. Starting in FY 2005 these statistics have been collected using a new Automated Targeting System (ATS) Exam Findings module available to the port team.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Reliability of the data is verified and evaluated by the CSI Port Team Leader. Reliable data is currently available.

Performance Measure	Percent of worldwide U.S. destined containers processed through Container Security Initiative (CSI) ports
Organization and Program	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	This measure will utilize the annual volume of U.S. destined containers processed through all CSI ports prior to lading and divide it by the annual worldwide number of U.S. destined containers.
Data Source	Two sources are used to develop this statistic. The first is the excel spreadsheet used by each port to document the shipping volume (as expressed through Bills

	of Lading) processed through the port. The second is the total annual volume arriving in the U.S. as tracked by the Port Import Export Reporting Service (PIERS) subscription service. A third source is under development; the Automated Targeting System (ATS).
Collection Method	CSI Port Team already tracks and documents the shipping volume processed through each port using an Excel spreadsheet. Data on the total annual volume arriving in the U.S. will be extracted from PIERS and/or ATS by EAB.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The CSI Port Team Leader is responsible for verifying the statistics regarding shipping volume in their respective port. The PIERS data is a subscription service with independently verified data.

Performance Measure	Average CBP exam reduction ratio for Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT) member importers compared to Non-C-TPAT importers.
Organization and Program	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Data includes national import totals and exam results from U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Automated Commercial System (ACS) data.
Data Source	CBP ACS transaction data.
Collection Method	Exam results data is entered by CBP field Officers and then extracted using Dataquery and Datareporter software to extract and summarize the ACS data from the CBP mainframe.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Entry of exam data has several checks built into its processing, including maintenance of an audit trail within ACS, mandatory supervisory review of exam override actions, random samples associated with compliance measurement and the self-inspection program.

Performance Measure	Compliance rate for Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT) members with the established C-TPAT security guidelines.
Organization and Program	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Supply chain security specialists examine the compliance rate of CTPAT members that scores and weight CTPAT members' compliance with the standards of security practices. The measure represents the pass/fail results of the CTPAT validation process.
Data Source	Individual data are collected from C-TPAT validation reports, summarized and a collection rate is calculated.
Collection Method	Data are collected by CBP C-TPAT Supply Chain Security specialists as part of their documentation of validation results. Collection is currently done using a manual process with paper documents. This reporting and collection process is expected to be automated.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Validation results and associated documentation are collected by Supply Chain Specialists and reviewed by their supervisor, often assisted by an additional supervisor who had oversight over the actual validation. Validation reports are further reviewed by a Headquarters program manager who analyzes and addresses overall anomalies.

Performance Measure	Percent of Sea Containers Examined using Non-Intrusive Inspection Technology (NII).
Organization and Program	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The percentage of NII examinations performed of the total number of sea containers arrived; representing the total number of examinations conducted using NII technology in the sea environment versus the total number of sea containers arrived.
Data Source	Operations Management Reports (OMR) Data Warehouse.
Collection Method	Customs Officers enter the data into Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECs), a comprehensive database maintained by the Office of Field Operations. Data are migrated to a permanent data warehouse where they are verified and compiled.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Verification is regularly done by supervisors. Data are reviewed for anomalies, outliers, and inconsistencies in data records. Any discrepancies are investigated and resolved as necessary.

Performance Measure	Percent of Truck and Rail Containers Examined using Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII)
Organization and Program	Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The percentage of NII examinations performed of the total number of containers arrived at land borders, representing the total number of examinations conducted using NII technology in the land border environment versus the total number containers arrived at land borders.
Data Source	Operations Management Reports (OMR) Data Warehouse.
Collection Method	Customs Officers enter the data into TECs (Treasury Enforcement Communications System), a comprehensive database maintained by OFO. Data are migrated to a permanent data warehouse where they are verified and compiled.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Check Verification is regularly done by supervisors. Data are reviewed for anomalies, outliers, and inconsistencies in data records. Any discrepancies are investigated and resolved as necessary.

Performance Measure	Border Miles Under Effective Control (including certain coastal sectors).
Organization and Program	Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Border miles under control as defined in the National Strategic Plan, is when the appropriate mix of personnel, equipment, technology, and tactical infrastructure has been deployed to reasonably ensure that when an attempted illegal alien is detected, the Border Patrol has the ability to identify, classify and respond to bring the attempted illegal entry to a satisfactory law enforcement resolution. Control will be achieved in a tactical zone when the level of border security (initial control, capabilities established, less monitored and remote/ low activity) in that specific zone matches the level of threat/risk.
Data Source	The Operational Requirements Based Budget Program (ORBBP) is used to link Sector/Station level planning, operations, and budget to established operational requirements to achieve control in any given area. This planning process requires identification of resources to incrementally improve border enforcement and security capability through prioritization of resources to respond to credible

	information of an imminent threat of a terrorist incursion or attack.
Collection Method	Border Patrol Agents record data as activities occur. Verification of event records and data collected from outside sources is through formal liaison relationships with other local, State, or Federal law enforcement agencies.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Sector Operational Plans are developed based on current situations, operational assumptions and budget requirements. An extensive review is conducted by Headquarters to ensure accuracy and compliance with national strategic goals. Sector budgets are adjusted and distributed by Headquarters in accordance with OBP program initiatives and priorities. Results for levels of control are measured bi-annually to measure progress and ensure compliance and accountability.

Performance Measure	Percentage of total number of narcotic seizures at Border Patrol checkpoints compared to the total number of narcotic seizures nation-wide by the Border Patrol.
Organization and Program	Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The number of narcotic seizure events at the 35 permanent and 75 tactical (temporary) Border Patrol Checkpoints are compared to the number of narcotic seizure events by Border Patrol nation-wide to determine what percentage of events take place at Border Patrol Checkpoints.
Data Source	The number of narcotic seizure events are obtained through the Checkpoint Activity Report (CAR). The number of narcotic seizure events nation-wide are obtained through ENFORCE/BPETS. ENFORCE is the enforcement case tracking system which is the official database of record utilized of each individual arrested by the Border Patrol. BPETS is the Border Patrol Enforcement Tracking System or database utilized as a collection receptacle for other necessary information in the execution of Border Patrol operations.
Collection Method	Seizure event data are recorded daily by Border Patrol Agents in the Checkpoint Activity Report (CAR) at each Checkpoint in operation as well as in ENFORCE/BPETS and used to gather and update Border Patrol statistics.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Multiple levels of review of CAR/ENFORCE/BPETS data are conducted by Supervisory Border Patrol Agents first at the Station level (primary) and by second level Supervisory Agents in the Sectors before a final review reliability check is conducted at Headquarters. Data are analyzed for compliance of established data protocols and accuracy.

Performance Measure	Percent of cases referred for prosecution to the U.S. Attorney's office related to traffic checkpoints.
Organization and Program	Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The number of cases referred to prosecutions related to checkpoint enforcement activity is compared to all apprehension activity at Border Patrol Checkpoints to determine what percentage of all apprehensions are referred for prosecution as criminal cases. The cases referred are broken down into four categories; Alien Smuggling, Drugs/Narcotics, Fraudulent Documents and Other (captured all other criminal cases referred). The number of cases referred do not represent the number of cases accepted for prosecution. While cases referred may meet the Border Patrol criteria for referral, they may not fully meet guidelines for prosecution by the US Attorney.
Data Source	The number of cases referred for prosecution are obtained through the Checkpoint Activity Report (CAR). The number of apprehension are also

	obtained through the Checkpoint Activity Report (CAR).
Collection Method	The number of cases referred to the US Attorney for prosecution and the number of apprehensions are recorded daily by Border Patrol Agents in the Checkpoint Activity Report (CAR).
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Multiple levels of review of CAR/ENFORCE/BPETS data are conducted by Supervisory Border Patrol Agents first at the Station level (primary) and by second level Supervisory Agents in the Sectors before a final review reliability check is conducted at Headquarters. Data are analyzed for compliance of established data protocols and accuracy.

Performance Measure	Percent of apprehensions at Border Patrol checkpoints.
Organization and Program	Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	A summary of records is completed and the percentages are obtained from the actuals entered from the Checkpoint Activity Report (CAR) completed daily by Border Patrol Agents for all Checkpoints in operation. A summary of records is completed for all apprehensions nation-wide obtained from ENFORCE, BPETS.
Data Source	Summary records from the Checkpoint Activity Report (CAR) and ENFORCE, BPETS.
Collection Method	Apprehension data are recorded by Border Patrol Agents in the Checkpoint Activity Report (CAR) and ENFORCE/BPETS and used to update the Border Patrol statistics.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Multiple levels of review of CAR/ENFORCE/BPETS data are conducted by Supervisory Border Patrol Agents first at the Station level (primary) and by second level Supervisory Agents in the Sectors before a final review reliability check is conducted at Headquarters. Data are analyzed for compliance of established data protocols and accuracy.

Performance Measure	Number of First Responder Border Safety Trained Personnel.
Organization and Program	Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The measure will track the number of First Responders trained and certified to respond to medical emergencies within the Southwest Border Sectors to show overall improvements in the level of border response capabilities.
Data Source	The number of agents trained and certified is entered and can be obtained through ENFORCE/BPETS. The numbers will be cross referenced by Headquarters Number of First Responders collection template.
Collection Method	The number of agents trained and certified is entered by Supervisory Border Patrol Agents in the field as training is completed and can be obtained through ENFORCE/BPETS. Additionally, a quarterly collection template for number of agents trained and certified as First Responders is completed by sectors and submitted via data call from Headquarters.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Multiple levels of review of ENFORCE/BPETS data are conducted by Supervisory Border Patrol Agents first at the Station level (primary) and by second level Supervisory Agents in the Sectors before a final review reliability check is conducted at Headquarters. Data are analyzed for compliance of established data protocols and accuracy and crossed referred with First Responder Collection template.

Performance Measure	Total number of cumulative miles of permanent tactical infrastructure constructed.
Organization and Program	Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Permanent infrastructure is defined by Border Patrol as permanent fencing, all-weather roads, vehicle barriers and permanent lighting installed in the border areas to support enforcement activities and serves as an important piece of Border Patrol's strategy to gain operational control. The placement of additional permanent infrastructure is measured as a cumulative total for miles of fencing, lighting, vehicle barriers or all-weather roads installed.
Data Source	Permanent tactical infrastructure implementation plans and installation progress as reported by Asset Management and Border Patrol field personnel.
Collection Method	Weekly reports are submitted by each sector location and purchases are inputted into SAP, tracked in ORBBP and reported in ENFORCE.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Various management controls are in place to review data in ORBBP, SAP, ENFORCE, BPETS

Performance Measure	Percent of CBP workforce using ACE functionality to manage trade information.
Organization and Program	Automation Modernization-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The data used will include the number of all internal (government) users of ACE, excluding those users accessing the system from the information technology community for system administration purposes.
Data Source	ACE system-use metrics generated automatically by the system.
Collection Method	ACE tracks and reports the number of users, over time, by user type. The CBP Modernization Office (CBPMO) team performs analysis of the reported data to assess program performance and the attainment of Program Objectives, and to identify corrective actions if necessary.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	User data is created with each user log-on and use. Reports are generated by the system to capture this data and provide an audit trail. CBPMO team regularly reviews these reports and associated user logs to analyze and resolve anomalies.

Performance Measure	Number of trade accounts with access to ACE functionality to manage trade information
Organization and Program	Automation Modernization-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Number of ACE accounts established.
Data Source	Data is manually gathered monthly by the CBP Modernization Office personnel as they establish new accounts for companies moving goods through borders nation-wide.
Collection Method	The data is collected in a spreadsheet and displayed graphically. The CBP Modernization Office team performs analysis of the reported data to assess program performance and the attainment of Program Objectives, and to identify corrective actions if necessary.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Accounts are tracked by contractor teams establishing accounts and verified by the government CBP Modernization Office leaders.

Performance Measure	Total number of linked electronic sources from CBP and other government agencies for targeting information
Organization and Program	Automation Modernization-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The number of linked data sources
Data Source	The number of linked data sources is identified in system documentation and is generated by the ACE systems then manually tabulated and reported by the CBP Modernization Office team.
Collection Method	The data will be collected from the ACE system and manually tabulated and graphed over time.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The CBP Modernization Office team will crosscheck the number of systems linked to ACE as part of the monthly system review.

Performance Measure	Percent (%) of time the Treasury Enforcement Communication System (TECS) is available to end users.
Organization and Program	Automation Modernization-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The range of data is a sample population. An operational end-user availability data collection capability was implemented at 18 of the busiest airports as defined by US VISIT Ports of Entry Documentation and is in the process of deploying this capability to 54 land border POE's. The data reflect the combined availability of underlying system, task, subsystems and processes which make up the TECS applications, e.g. CICS, Datacom Databases, MQ subsystems, LEDM processor, etc.
Data Source	The data source is a web-based application that enables users to track and analyze the performance of business processes and network infrastructure, and diagnose the cause of end-user performance as well as process monitoring and automation.
Collection Method	CA OPS/MVS monitors all system log and task activity at a low level within the operating system, and has been customized to timestamp and log all down and up-times associated with a subsystem or process as well as the host system.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	All data logged are reviewed for accuracy and comments are added by Computer Operations staff as part of their procedures. Discrepancies caused by rare events such as overall system hangs or failures in CA OPS/MVS are corrected by Operations personnel.

Performance Measure	Percent of network availability.
Organization and Program	Automation Modernization-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Information is recorded for the following CBP applications: ACE, ICE, US-Visit, and CPB Network. PNR Network and others as requested, including, all Routers; all Switches-not yet loaded but w/capability for all; network nGenus probes; Network Analysis Module Traffic data and RMON1 and RMON2 data; new Packet Shapers for traffic analysis; server Agent or SNMP messaging; other communications devices with SNMP capability on the device. Live Health Allows the following Functions; live Health Monitoring; exceptions against thresholds; live monitoring; trending over time; multi-Layered Management pre-defined network performance. Trend and real-time reporting/monitoring in graphical and textual formats of these circuit/device parameters by device interface: CPU utilization, errors, availability, bandwidth utilization, discarded packets, que drops, collisions, power, temperature, frame discards, latency, buffer status/utilization, other reports for features of a switch or router/server/probe.

Data Source	SNMP data source is directly retrieved from managed device.
Collection Method	SNMP polling of supported variables.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Performance related alerts can be verified by running a real-time report and check against monitored device.

Performance Measure	Number of airspace incursions along the southern border. (Extending the physical zone of security beyond the borders)
Organization and Program	CBP Air and Marine-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The number of Targets of Interest (TOI) that are denied the use of airspace for acts of terrorism or smuggling using intelligence and threat assessments through strategic surveillance and tactical responses by CBP interceptors and patrols.
Data Source	Performance data are captured routinely as part of the normal work process. Data are reported through the Treasury Enforcement Communication System (TECS) and input to the Air and Marine Operations Report (AMOR). Data are available in real-time and are continuously validated within CBP Air and Marine. CBP Air and Marine use these routine reports to measure efficiency and effectiveness. The current data system enables CBP Air and Marine to measure the activities necessary to manage and improve performance.
Collection Method	SAP, CARMAC, APATS, CAMITS generated reports in conjunction with analyst developed excel spreadsheets are routinely used to determine the locations and costs associated with relocation of assets.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data reliability is routinely reconciled manually by contractor and FTE staff on a monthly and/or quarterly basis.

Performance Measure	Achieve an annual "no launch" rate of 5% or less.
Organization and Program	CBP Air and Marine-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Air and Marine (AM) has a portion of its aircraft fleet on ready alert status depending on the field location's risk assessment. As radar detects unauthorized intrusions along US borders, the AM location is contacted to launch for interdiction. AMO has established a maximum time limit of 8 minutes for the aircraft to be airborne (from the time contacted to time leaving the ground).
Data Source	AMO inputs and extracts data from the Air and Marine Operations Reporting System (AMOR). This system is used exclusively for Operations type data entry. Data from this system is used in annual reports to OMB and in preparation of the President's Budget.
Collection Method	Data is input into the AMOR system daily by Air and Marine Operations Center (AMOC) personnel requesting the launch and verified by their Supervisors. (Communications are continuous throughout the mission and times are recorded by AMOC.)
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Input is routed to and approved by supervisors daily. The AMOR system and its data reliability was reviewed by Customs, Office of Investigations and Office of Information Technology in FY 02, and found to be reliable.

Performance Measure	Percent of at-risk miles under strategic air surveillance. (Strategic air coverage)
Organization and Program	CBP Air and Marine-Customs and Border Protection
Scope	This measure shows the progress made toward expanding strategic air surveillance coverage along the borders and approaches to the borders of the U.S. by the end of the decade. The measure is the percent of border miles at-risk that is under surveillance by CBP patrol-type aircraft (including unmanned

	aircraft systems). Measuring surveillance is an evolving metric. In FY03 and FY04 metrics were based on the measurement of 7200 P-3 flight hours provided in support of drug enforcement. In FY05, the UAV was introduced and added to these total hours. Effective FY07 the measure will be represented by the miles of at risk borders under strategic air surveillance in response to the anti-terrorism mission.
Data Source	SAP, CARMAC, APATS, CAMITS generated reports in conjunction with analyst developed excel spreadsheets are routinely used to determine the locations and costs associated with relocation of assets.
Collection Method	Performance data are captured routinely as part of the normal work process. Data are reported through the Treasury Enforcement Communication System (TECS) and input to the Air and Marine Operations Report (AMOR). Data are available in real-time and is continuously validated within CBP Air and Marine. CBP Air and Marine use these routine reports to measure efficiency and effectiveness. The current data system enables CBP Air and Marine to measure the activities necessary to manage and improve performance. Maintenance records as to the availability of aircraft are maintained in CARMAC.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The reliability of data is routinely reconciled manually by contractor and FTE staff on a monthly and/or quarterly basis.

Departmental Management and Operations

Performance Measure	Number of President's Management Agenda (PMA) initiatives whose score improved over the prior year or were rated green in either status or progress.
Organization and Program	Departmental Management and Operations-Departmental Management and Operations
Scope	This measures the Department's performance as an agency in each of the five PMA initiatives: 1) Human Capital; 2) Competitive Sourcing/Procurement; 3) Improved Financial Performance; 4) Expanded Electronic Government; and 5) Budget Performance and Integration. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) rates the Department quarterly against specified criteria, as either red, yellow, or green in both status and progress. The measure will report as of Fiscal Year end standings.
Data Source	The source of information is quarterly reports issued by OMB, scoring DHS in each of the five initiative areas.
Collection Method	OMB reports to DHS on its overall performance in each of the five initiative areas in both status and progress. This report will be used to determine the number of areas increasing status year to year and the number of PMA areas with a green progress score.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The base report is developed by OMB and "double checked" and reviewed by OMB for accurate reflection of the current status. The percent allocation is made and "double checked" by the DHS Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation.

Performance Measure	Percent improvement in favorable responses by DHS employees agency-wide (strongly agree/agree) on the section of the Federal Human Capital Survey that addresses employee sense of accomplishment
Organization and Program	Departmental Management and Operations-Departmental Management and Operations
Scope	This measure reflects the survey findings regarding DHS employees' perceptions on the quality of their work environment by assessing the number survey respondents who are DHS employees and who either agree or strongly agree with the following statement: "My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment."
Data Source	The source of information is the most recent Federal Human Capital Survey, which the Office of Personnel Management conducts every two years. (The most recent survey took place in 2006 and the results will be published in 2007.) Every other year, the Department conducts an internal human capital survey, intended to supplement the OPM survey and address issues specific to DHS.
Collection Method	The Office of Personnel Management publishes the results of its survey in January of the following year. This measure specifically examines the results of DHS employees' assessment of the following statement, as it pertains to their individual situation: "My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment." My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Office of Personnel Management conducts the survey and publishes the data.

Performance Measure	Total instances of material weakness conditions identified by the independent auditor in their report on the DHS financial statements.
Organization and Program	Departmental Management and Operations-Departmental Management and Operations
Scope	The Office of Financial Management in the Office of the Chief Financial Officer monitors the number of material weaknesses throughout the Department. This measure examines the instances of each weakness, as reported by the audit results within the annual Performance and Accountability Report.
Data Source	The independent auditor reports on the status and instances of material weaknesses throughout the Department in the annual Performance and Accountability Report.
Collection Method	Government financial statement auditing principles will be the standard for the audits themselves. The Office of the Program Analysis and Evaluation will review the auditors' finding in the Performance and Accountability Report and will derive the annual performance.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The review and determination of results-based on a review of the auditors' reports by a member of the Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation -will be verified by a second member of the office.

Performance Measure	Percentage of major IT projects that are within 10% of cost/schedule/performance objectives.
Organization and Program	Office of the Chief Information Officer-Departmental Management and Operations
Scope	All major investments (Levels 1, 2, and 3 Information Technology) that are in development milestone decision phases (Capability Development and Demonstration, Production and Deployment) must submit Earned Value Management (EVM) data indicating investment program variances. Analyzing these submitted data enables the calculation of a percentage.
Data Source	Data are collected via the Periodic Reporting Excel template or through the Periodic Reporting System (PRS). Both entry methods collect the exact same information.
Collection Method	DHS requests quarterly data from Component Periodic Reporting Points of Contact, who distribute the data call to relevant Program Managers. Data are entered into the Periodic Reports, vetted, and approved by Components, and then submitted to DHS. The DHS Chief Information Office reconciles the data submitted against headquarters records, analyzes the data, and produces a variety of reports for both internal and external customers.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Per regulations, components review the data reported to DHS for accuracy and reliability prior to submittal. Future EVM data reported on appropriate contracts will need to meet the DHS requirements for compliance and surveillance reviews against the American National Standards Institute/Electronic Industries Alliance (ANSI/EIA) standard.

Domestic Nuclear Detection Office

Performance Measure	Number of individual Urban Area Security Designs completed for the Securing the Cities Program.
Organization and Program	Domestic Nuclear Detection-Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	In FY 2006, there are 35 high risk urban areas in the United States.
Data Source	Source information will come from available Securing the Cities program management.
Collection Method	DNDO and regional partners, at the culmination of a successful design, will enter into a cooperative agreement (or other contractual mechanism) to begin implementation of the design. This data will be collected by the DNDO Securing the Cities staff.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The efficacy of regional strategies will be evaluated by subject matter experts (principally DNDO and other Federal staff) prior to the award of any funds to State and local agencies for implementation of strategies.

Performance Measure	Percentage of cargo, by volume, that passes through radiation portal monitors upon entering the Nation.
Organization and Program	Domestic Nuclear Detection-Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	All containerized cargo entering the U.S.
Data Source	Weekly scripts provided by the installation agent, the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL). This data is provided in tabular form, based on new installations completed in a given week. Volume calculations are based on 2006 port volume data provided by CBP to PNNL.
Collection Method	Weekly scripts are provided to both DNDO and Customs and Border Protection which summarize installation progress for the last week and any changes to the overall volume of cargo being scanned. This data will be used to report progress quarterly.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Information provided in weekly "scripts" will be continuously monitored and verified by DNDO and CBP program managers, and validated by field inspections when necessary.

Federal Emergency Management Agency

Performance Measure	Percent of jurisdictions demonstrating acceptable performance on applicable critical tasks in exercises using Grants and Training approved scenarios.
Organization and Program	Grants Program-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	The data set consists of all available after-action reports (AARs) which meet Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) criteria and are posted to the Office of Grants and Training (GT) secure portal. GT funds and supports exercises at the national, Federal, State, and local levels and requires that these exercises follow HSEEP guidance and processes. Vendors are required to post HSEEP-compliant AARs to the GT portal for every direct support exercise. State and local jurisdictions are encouraged to post HSEEP-compliant AARs for all exercises funded or supported by the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) and the HSEEP. GT conducts analysis of each analyzed capability in the exercise AARs and places the performance of each capability in a category such as acceptable, partially acceptable, or unacceptable.
Data Source	Supporting data is derived from homeland security exercise AARs that are submitted to the GT portal for GT review. Vendors are required to post HSEEP-compliant AARs to the GT portal for every direct support exercise. State and local jurisdictions are encouraged to post HSEEP-compliant AARs for all exercises funded or supported by the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) and the HSEEP. All AARs in the data sample follow the prescribed HSEEP format which requires an AAR to include analysis of how jurisdictions participating in the exercise performed on capabilities.
Collection Method	GT reviews HSEEP-compliant AARs submitted by participating State and local jurisdictions. Capability analyses included in the AARs are evaluated using Exercise Evaluation Guides and the Target Capabilities List (TCL) to determine whether the jurisdictions performance met expectations or required improvement. Jurisdictions performance on each capability is analyzed by comparing the results documented in the AAR to the expected outcome described in the EEG. For each of the 37 target capabilities in the TCL, the percent performed acceptably is calculated by dividing the number of instances in which a capability was performed acceptably by the total number of instances a capability was exercised. The resulting percentage represents the percent of analyzed capabilities performed acceptably in exercises.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The quality and consistency of after-action reports (AAR) is ensured through the HSEEP exercise evaluation process. A team of independent, expert evaluators is recruited and trained for each exercise to assess critical task performance in accordance with HSEEP EEGs. This process ensures that multiple evaluations of capability performance are included in AARs. Exercise planners also develop standard forms to capture observation and data analysis to ensure certain areas of observation are completed by all evaluators. GT program managers and support staff review raw data and calculations to ensure completeness and accuracy of the results.

Performance Measure	Percent of state and local homeland security agency grant recipients reporting measurable progress towards identified goals and objectives to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks.
Organization and Program	Grants Program-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	The Office of Grants and Training (GT) requires grant recipients to develop a State Homeland Security Strategy that identifies goals and objectives to improve homeland security capabilities. Each State and territory develops and maintains a State Homeland Security Strategy, resulting in 56 such strategies, each with

	corresponding goals and objectives. In addition, all grant recipients must complete a Biannual Strategy Implementation Report (BSIR) every six months in an award year. In the BSIRs, grant recipients outline how they are spending grant money, tie funded projects to goals and objectives identified in the State Homeland Security Strategy, and estimate the overall impact of grant funding on addressing identified goals and objectives. Throughout the grant period, the staff conducts programmatic monitoring activities including review of data provided in BSIRs in order to determine what progress the State or territory is making toward its identified goals and objectives.
Data Source	Data for this measure is derived from programmatic monitoring conducted by Preparedness Officers. In programmatic monitoring, Preparedness Officers evaluate progress by the State or territory on each of its identified goals. Each goal is evaluated on progress in the categories of plans, organization, equipment, training, exercises, and other factors supporting that particular goal. Progress in each of these categories is rated using a 5 point scale. Scores for progress in the categories are averaged to provide an overall measure of progress for each goal. The scores for each goal are then averaged to provide a measure of progress for the state or territory as a whole against the goals it identified in the State Homeland Security Strategy.
Collection Method	State Preparedness grantees identify goals and objectives in their State Homeland Security Strategies. Grantees tie specific grant-related projects to these goals and objectives and then report on the progress and impact of the projects through the BSIR. Progress towards identified goals and objectives is calculated based on programmatic monitoring including review of BSIR data. Preparedness Officers conduct programmatic monitoring of grantees and measure progress on a scale of 0-5 using the following criteria: 0=no effort or system underway nor recognition of need; 1=recognition of need but no effort or resources to accomplish the output; 2=initial efforts and resources underway to achieve output; 3=Moderate progress towards accomplishing the output; 4=Sustained efforts underway and output nearly fulfilled; 5=Output achieved and resources devoted to sustain the effort. Measurable progress is defined as an increase from a previous average monitoring score using the same scale.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	GT ensures data reliability and consistency by issuing detailed guidance to grantees on developing State Homeland Security Strategies and reporting information through BSIRs. GT also develops an annual monitoring plan and provides detailed protocols for monitoring to staff. All BSIR data is collected through a standard, web-based Grant Reporting Tool. In addition, all information provided by grantees in State Homeland Security Strategies and BSIRs, as well as monitoring reports undergo a review and approval process by GT.

Performance Measure	Average percentage increase knowledge, skills, and abilities of state and local homeland security preparedness professionals receiving training from pre and post assessments.
Organization and Program	Grants Program-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	Supporting data includes evaluations of all trainee's knowledge, skills, and abilities in a particular homeland security/preparedness subject area both before and after delivery of the Office of Grants and Training (GT) training courses. Individuals receiving training are state and local personnel representing one or more of the following response disciplines: emergency management, emergency medical services, fire service, governmental administrative, hazardous materials, health care, law enforcement, public health, public safety communications, public works, and the private sector. For each participant, pre- and post-evaluations are compared to determine the percent increase in knowledge, skills,

	and abilities due to delivery of training.
Data Source	Supporting data is derived from evaluation forms administered by GT training partners. Each individual trainee completes these forms that assess subject-matter knowledge, skills, and abilities at the beginning and conclusion of each GT training course.
Collection Method	Before and after each training course, trainees are asked to assess their knowledge, skills, and abilities in the subject area in which they are receiving training. Trainee responses are entered either manually by GTs training partners or are transmitted electronically to GT via a database. Pre- and post-course assessments are compared to determine the percentage increase in trainee's knowledge, skills, and abilities related to the training course subject area. These individual percentage increases are then averaged across all trainee responses.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Self-reported trainee evaluations are somewhat subjective but constitute an efficient method of collecting information on all trainees' progress in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities. GT collects self-assessments on 100% of the professionals enrolled in GT training courses, improving data consistency and reliability. In addition, the risk of including clearly erratic or unreliable evaluation responses in the data set is mitigated through a review process. GT supervisors review data tabulations performed by GT analysts before releasing results. Data is estimated because partners are not required to submit data until 30 days after the end of the quarter and it takes 15 days to compile and verify the data for reporting. Actual results will be reported in the FY 2007 PAR.

Performance Measure	Percent of participating urban area grant recipients reporting measurable progress made towards identified goals and objectives to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks.
Organization and Program	Grants Program-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	Urban Area Security Initiative grantees develop and maintain an Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy that identifies goals and objectives to improve homeland security capabilities. Eligible urban areas are determined based on the estimated relative risk of a successful terrorist attack using a common definition for the footprint of an urban area. The number of eligible urban areas in FY06 and FY07 is 46 and 45 respectively, each with a corresponding strategy. Grantees complete a Biannual Strategy Implementation Report (BSIR) every six months. In the BSIR, grant recipients outline how they are spending grant money, tie funded projects to goals and objectives identified in the Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy, and estimate the overall impact of grant funding on addressing identified goals and objectives. Staff conduct programmatic monitoring activities including review of BSIR data to determine what progress Urban Areas are making toward their identified goals and objectives.
Data Source	Data for this measure is derived from programmatic monitoring conducted by preparedness officers. In programmatic monitoring, Preparedness Officers evaluate progress by the urban area on each of its identified goals. Each goal is evaluated on progress in the categories of plans, organization, equipment, training, exercises, and other factors supporting that particular goal. Progress in each of these categories is rated using a 5 point scale. Scores for progress in the categories are averaged to provide an overall measure of progress for each goal. The scores for each goal are then averaged to provide a measure of progress for the urban area as a whole against the goals it identified in the Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy.
Collection Method	Urban Area grantees identify goals and objectives in their Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies. Grantees tie specific grant - related projects to these goals and objectives and then report on the progress and impact of the projects through the BSIR. Progress towards identified goals and objectives is

	calculated based on programmatic monitoring including review of BSIR data. Preparedness Officers conduct programmatic monitoring of grantees and measure progress on a scale of 0-5 using the following criteria: 0=no effort or system underway nor recognition of need; 1=recognition of need but no effort or resources to accomplish the output; 2=initial efforts and resources underway to achieve output; 3=Moderate progress towards accomplishing the output; 4=Sustained efforts underway and output nearly fulfilled; 5=Output achieved and resources devoted to sustain the effort. Measurable progress is defined as an increase from a previous average monitoring score using the same scale.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	GT ensures data reliability and consistency by issuing detailed guidance to grantees on developing State Homeland Security Strategies and reporting information through BSIRs. GT also develops an annual monitoring plan and provides detailed protocols for monitoring to staff. All BSIR data is collected through a standard, web-based Grant Reporting Tool. In addition, all information provided by grantees in State Homeland Security Strategies and BSIRs, as well as monitoring reports undergo a review and approval process by GT.

Performance Measure	Percent of Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program communities with a nuclear power plant that are fully capable of responding to an accident originating at the site.
Organization and Program	National Preparedness-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	REPP responsibilities impact a very large number of facilities and constituents. There are currently 64 operating commercial nuclear power plants. Approximately 400 State and local government jurisdictions are involved in radiological emergency planning and preparedness around these 64 sites. Approximately 3.5 million people live within 10 miles of a commercial nuclear power plant in the U.S. This large number jurisdictions and population indicates the magnitude of REPP's responsibilities inherent in reviewing, evaluating, approving, and exercising REPP plans and procedures.
Data Source	REP bases its findings and determinations of the adequacy of State and local radiological emergency preparedness and planning on the results of exercises at all 64 licensed commercial nuclear power plants. REP has been working with the State and local governments surrounding nuclear power plants for over 25 years.
Collection Method	The method of collection is by evaluating exercises at each nuclear power plant every 2 years. These exercises test the capabilities of State and local governments to protect the health and safety of the public in the event of an emergency at the plant. The results of these exercises are documented and REPP uses them in its reasonable assurance determinations to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	REPP makes findings and determinations as to the adequacy and capability of implementing offsite plans, and communicates those finding and determinations to the NRC. The NRC reviews these findings and determinations in conjunction with the NRC onsite findings for the purpose of making determinations on the overall state of emergency preparedness.

Performance Measure	Percent of Federal, State, Local and Tribal Governments compliant with the National Incident Management System (NIMS)
Organization and Program	National Preparedness-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	Federal Agencies, State, local and tribal governments were required to implement the NIMS into their response programs beginning in FY 2005 based

	on annual requirements sent to the directors of each agency and the Governors of all 56 States and territories. These requirements specify the 33 actions that agencies and the 56 State and Territorial governments and their subordinate jurisdictions must take to be NIMS compliant.
Data Source	Federal, state.
Collection Method	White House collects and reviews for Federal Agency NIMS compliance information. States input data into the NIMCAST system.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The NIC verifies all Federal agency implementation plans for effective implementation of NIMS with the Federal agencies in quarterly meetings and is establishing a Peer Review and Assistance Program. The DHS Office of Grants and Training (OGT) and the NIMS Integration Center monitor NIMS implementation within the 56 States and Territories.

Performance Measure	Percent of respondents reporting they are better prepared to deal with disasters and emergencies as a result of training
Organization and Program	National Preparedness-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	Approximately 14,000 students attend courses at Emergency Management Institute (EMI) resident training facilities every year, and an additional 3 million complete distance learning courses. Participants include Federal, State, local and tribal officials and responders. Typically, 35% of the long term follow-up evaluation questionnaires are completed and returned.
Data Source	Data are obtained from post-course evaluations sent to students.
Collection Method	All students are asked to complete post-course or end-of-course evaluation questionnaires at the conclusion of their training. Approximately 3 months following the training course, students are mailed a follow-on survey and return envelope to complete and return to EMI's Classroom Editorial Support contractor who collects and summarizes the data in quarterly reports.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Typically, 35% of the long term follow-up evaluation questionnaires are completed and returned. The data is reliable because it is collected directly from the students receiving the training. All data is collected and reviewed by a contractor for completeness prior to report compilation and production.

Performance Measure	The per capita loss of life due to fire in the U.S.
Organization and Program	Fire and Emergency Assistance-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	The annual civilian fire death rate is based upon the total number of civilian fire deaths that occur within the U.S. during the calendar year, and U.S. Census Bureau population estimates for that year. Civilian fire death rates are measured in deaths per million population. A death is defined as a civilian fatality as reported to the National Fire Protection Association's (NFPA) National Fire Experience Survey (NFPA Survey) for a given calendar year. Estimates from the NFPA Survey are generally available in Sept. for the preceding year (i.e. fatality estimates for Calendar Year 2005 were available in Sept 2006).
Data Source	The data sources used in measuring the performance goals are responses to the NFPA Survey, as described above, and U.S. Census Bureau population estimates.
Collection Method	NFPA Survey data are collected through a probability sample using the NFPA Fire Service Inventory as the data frame. Census Bureau population estimates are generated annually, estimating the population on July 1 of the relevant year. NFPA Survey data are analyzed to produce estimates of fire related civilian fatalities which are used for numerator data; Census Bureau population estimates are used for denominator data. The annual target reflects a 1% per year

	reduction in the rate of loss of life from fire-related events, originally starting with the year 2000 estimate of 14.3 deaths per million population. For 2007, the targets were re-evaluated based on the average of prior year historical data to establish a new target.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Loss of life data from the National Fire Incident Report System (NFIRS) are also complied and reviewed by the National Fire Data Center. Statistical weighting and comparison of these data as well as with National Centers for Health Statistics (NCHS) mortality data are done to check for accuracy. A comparison of these data sets to the NFPA fatality data is conducted for consistency and relative veracity.

Performance Measure	Ratio of on-scene fire incident injuries to total number of active firefighters.
Organization and Program	Fire and Emergency Assistance-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	The National Fire Protection Association conducts an annual voluntary survey of fire departments on line of duty fire fighter injuries. Line of duty categories collected include: fireground, responding or returning, on-scene non fire, training, and other on-duty. The NFPA surveys approximately 8,000 fire departments across the nation representing a cross section of the urban, suburban, rural, volunteer, paid, and combination departments. If any large departments (Chicago, Miami, etc.) do not respond, then NFPA contacts them by telephone and conducts the survey via telephone interview to ensure there are no major gaps in the sample data.
Data Source	Information on firefighter injuries was provided by fire departments through the National Fire Incident Reporting System and the National Fire Protection Association annual survey.
Collection Method	The National Fire Protection Association conducts an annual voluntary survey of fire departments on line of duty fire fighter injuries. The National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) is the standard national reporting system used by U.S. fire departments to report fires and other incidents to which they respond and to maintain records of these incidents in a uniform manner. (The Office of Grants and Training asked AFG recipients to complete a voluntary survey on the number of firefighter injuries and the total number of active firefighters in each jurisdiction receiving AFG funds.) Data collected from survey responses was then combined to determine an overall ratio of firefighter injuries to total number of active firefighters for AFG recipients.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Explanation of reliability check: Data is reported annually by the National Fire Protection Association and is based on the results of a survey representing a cross section of urban, suburban, rural, volunteer, paid, and combination departments. If any large departments do not respond, NFPA contacts them and conducts the survey by telephone to ensure there are no major gaps in the sample data. The National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) is the standard national reporting system used by U.S. fire departments to report fires and other incidents to which they respond and to maintain records of these incidents in a uniform manner. NFIRS compares the results of the NFPA survey with their own data. NFIRS data is derived from incident reports received directly from fire departments and allows NFIRS to determine national trends. The corroboration of trends indicated by NFPA and NFIRS is the data verification. Reporting to NFIRS is voluntary, but follows a prescribed format.

Performance Measure	Average time in hours to provide essential logistical services to an impacted community of 50,000 or fewer.
Organization and Program	Logistics Management-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	This measure was established to track the amount of time it takes to deliver disaster commodities including: water, ice, emergency meals, plastic sheeting, tarps, generators, cots, blankets, and other disaster response assets to from the field to disaster victims.
Data Source	Resource Tracking spreadsheets maintained by the Field Coordinating Officers designee.
Collection Method	Data is collected from the Resource Tracking spreadsheet maintained by the person assigned Resource Tracking responsibility during deployments. 100% of the spreadsheet rows are queried for useable data and included in the calculation as follows: 1) Rows with Actual Shipping Times and Actual Arrival Times. 2) Rows with Actual Shipping Times and Estimated Arrival Times. Logistics is currently implementing Total Assets Visibility (TAV) and e-tasker, along with other technological advances, as a major component of a Total Logistics Management System that will allow FEMA to track disaster assets from mobilization, to arrival, demobilization, and departure. The new system will provide transparency and visibility of commodities and material throughout the chain, from source to end-user.
Reliability	Inadequate
Actions being taken to make reliable	Reliability is based on manual data collection and cross matching of reference numbers. This allows for the introduction of many errors that can go undetected. Logistics is currently implementing Total Assets Visibility (TAV) and e-tasker, along with other technological advances, as a major component of a Total Logistics Management System that will allow FEMA to track disaster assets from mobilization, to arrival, demobilization, and departure. The new system will provide transparency and visibility of commodities and material throughout the chain, from source to end-user.

Performance Measure	Percent of fully operational Continuity of Government (COG) capabilities
Organization and Program	National Continuity Programs-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	This measure assesses the percent of Federal Executive Branch Departments and Agencies (D/As) with operational Continuity of Government (COG) capability based on the priorities of (1) program training and (2) communications capabilities established by the Enduring Constitutional Government Coordination Council (ECGCC). The following indicators have been adopted: (1) Training opportunities provided to designated D/A personnel, based on three essential categories with an annual training calendar and five year training plan, and documentation support to D/As, which is measured based on the essential policy and operations doctrine in the domestic COG documentation requirements.; and (2) percentage of applicable D/As with designated interagency communications capability. Each category of documentation is weighted to determine an overall percentage value.
Data Source	The data sources used to validate the above performance measure include but are not limited to the Corrective Action Program and the operations information systems.
Collection Method	The classified communications capabilities data base is maintained on a spreadsheet. The training component of the performance measure is collected from the Training Plan and the proposed and actual Annual Training Calendars, which are developed from an analysis of the Mission Essential Task List (METL), Professional Qualification Standards, and various feedback tools (which are completed for every event).
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Surveys of communications capabilities are verified by technical representatives

	from an independent organization. Information is classified and will be available for properly cleared personnel upon completion of initial site surveys. The proposed and actual training calendars are maintained by FEMA. Feedback mechanisms are in place for every training event and maintained in a Corrective Action/Remedial Action data base.

Performance Measure	Percent of Federal Departments and Agencies with fully operational Continuity of Operations (COOP) capabilities
Organization and Program	National Continuity Programs-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	FEMA will determine the percentage of the 30 Federal departments and agencies listed in the COOP for COGCON matrix with fully operational COOP capabilities based on criteria derived from documents such as Federal Preparedness Circular (FPC) 65, Presidential Decision Directive 67, Enduring Constitutional Government and Continuity of Operations, numerous classified Operational Plans, and other guidance documents and matrices. These criteria include: Federal Departments and Agencies participation in annual federal COOP training and/or exercises to demonstrate their ability to achieve full operational COOP capability, participation in quarterly alert and notification tests, deployment of their emergency relocation teams, and testing of their ability to perform essential functions from an alternate facility.
Data Source	The data sources for the percentage of federal departments and agencies with fully operational capabilities include: reports generated from the FEMA Operations Center (FOC), self-assessments by the Federal D/As, participation in training events and exercises, real world events and activities, and assessments conducted by FEMA.
Collection Method	Internal and Inter-Agency exercises provide the ability to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the overall continuity programs. This information is notated in After Action Reports generated after training and exercises. This data will be verified through periodic assessments involving interviews with the Federal D/As to analyze the validity and accuracy of the self-generated reports and through regularly scheduled government wide evaluated COOP exercises, such as Forward Challenge. Also, The FOC generates a Qualification and Exception Report that gives the percentage of responses/non-responses from the alert and notification testing.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The reliability of communications data will be verified by continuous communications testing plans with other D/As and the quarterly alert and notification results form the FOCs Qualification and Exception Reports. The training and exercise data is verified by the FEMA 75-5 training registration forms, Training Information Access Database maintained by EMI, and Federal Department and Agency After Action Reports from exercise events.

Performance Measure	Percent of the national population whose safety is improved through the availability of flood risk data in Geospatial Information System (GIS) format.
Organization and Program	Mitigation-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	Because the National Flood Insurance Program and Map Modernization are organized around community participation, this goal is measured in terms of communities mapped to date. A community's population is counted when they receive preliminary maps based on FEMA's Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map standards. Mapping activities are focused in areas containing flood risk (i.e., populated areas and those areas where there is expected growth subject to flooding).
Data Source	The Map Modernization Project Management Plan includes extensive applications and management systems that will track the progress made toward

	achieving the milestones and goals for Map Modernization. The tracking systems will also measure intermediate costs, schedules, and performance. The project management follows the earned value management criteria established by Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).
Collection Method	Census of all map modernization contracts and major activities through the project management tracking applications.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Utilize our Systems Evaluation and Technical assists as independent third party checks for program quality assurance.

Performance Measure	Potential property losses, disasters, and other costs avoided
Organization and Program	Mitigation-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	National Emergency Management Information System (NEMIS) and E-grants disaster and project grant data (1990-present). Dollars of losses avoided based on the amount of grant funds awarded and number of communities taking action.
Data Source	National Emergency Management Information System (NEMIS) and E-grants disaster and project grant data.
Collection Method	Queries using MT Data Mart and E-grants were used to collect grants data from National Emergency Management Information System (NEMIS) and E-grants.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data totals and projections are validated against previously reported data and funding by comparing our current projections against previously reported milestones and FEMA's Integrated Financial Management Information System (IFMIS) funding reports.

Performance Measure	Percent of response teams reported at operational status.
Organization and Program	Disaster Operations-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	Three types of teams are included in the measure; the 28 task forces of Urban Search and Rescue (USR); the five Mobile Emergency Response Support (MERS) detachments, and the two Federal Incident Response Support Teams (FIRSTs). Operational readiness is defined for each of the four team types as teams having the necessary staffing, equipment and training required for response to a disaster or incident. The criteria and source data for this determination is particular to each team type.
Data Source	Staffing and equipment levels are provided by status reports that are collected periodically. Urban Search Rescue derived source data from Task Force Self-Evaluations. The Federal Incident Response Support Teams (FIRSTs) data is collected and tracked in reports maintained by the Field Operations Section Chief and staff.
Collection Method	Urban Search and Rescue (USR) task forces receive comprehensive self-evaluations by March 1 of each year. Task force Program Managers must complete and return the self-evaluations to the USR Program Office at FEMA by June 1. USR Program Office staff compiles task force submission in a spreadsheet, which is utilized for reporting data for this performance measure. The Federal Incident Response Support Teams (FIRSTs) collects and tracks data continuously using reports maintained by the Field Operations Section Chief and staff.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	For Urban Search Rescue task forces, hard copies of submitted self-assessments are verified and archived at the Program Office by. Additionally, results are assessed with respect to the monthly online readiness questionnaires completed

	by each task force for consistency. The data collected and tracked by the Federal Incident Response Support Teams (FIRSTs) is verified by the Field Operations Section Chief.

Performance Measure	Percent of customers satisfied with Public Recovery Assistance
Organization and Program	Disaster Assistance-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	To track improvement in the operations of the PA Program and to identify areas in need of additional attention, FEMA conducts a series of Program Evaluation and Customer Satisfaction Surveys for each Fiscal Year to gather data on customer satisfaction with performance in specific program areas, represented by performance standards and their targets. The performance standards are: Overall Program and Process, Project Worksheet (PW) Process, Information Dissemination, PA Administrative Burden, Timely Service and Staff Performance. Grantees (State) and sub-grantees (local applicants) are the two types of customers for whom this report analyzes satisfaction. The annual report, which is derived from, the Customer Service Survey summarizes customer satisfaction results from disaster surveyed during the past fiscal year and compares them to the PA Programs performance targets and the previous Fiscal Years survey.
Data Source	Customer satisfaction data are derived from statistical reports from regular surveys of the customer population in the Public Assistance program.
Collection Method	The customer survey data is collected by an independent contractor via telephone and mail surveys. The number of responses is based upon the number of federally declared disaster in the previous fiscal year. State and local applicants involved in a federally declared disaster are invited to participate in the customer survey process.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Survey data are collected, analyzed and reported by outside contractors using methods that guarantee both validity and reliability. The verification of the reliability of information collected is considered complete based on the data collection method used, which includes the allowance for all grantees and sub-grantees to respond to the survey with no sampling and the voluntary basis for responses from grantees and sub-grantees.

Performance Measure	Percent of customers satisfied with Individual Recovery Assistance
Organization and Program	Disaster Assistance-Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	The customer is the individual disaster applicant who has registered with FEMA and received assistance. The calculation is based on a random sample of applicants who were surveyed between October 1st and September 30th and who responded positively to the question Overall, how would you rate the information and support you received from FEMA since the disaster occurred Would you say it's been: Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Below Average or Poor. For FY 2006, the top three positives responses reflect a 91% customer satisfaction score from those who received assistance.
Data Source	Customer satisfaction data are derived from statistical reports from regular surveys of the customer population in the Individual Assistance program. For this performance measurement, a random sample of applicant data is extracted from the National Emergency Management Information System (NEMIS) database and imported to the survey tool. Based on the date of registration, two segments of applicants are called: the first after the first fifteen days of registration and the second thirty days after the close of the application period.
Collection Method	Customer satisfaction survey data is collected by telephone for each IA declaration. For FY 2006, 23 declared IA disasters were surveyed. 5,656 applicants completed the phone survey designated for measuring the annual

	performance. Of those, 2,666 received assistance from the Individuals and Households Programs and scored FEMA at 91% satisfaction.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	To verify data, surveyors are monitored for quality assurance by listening to their calls to be sure the disaster applicant is not influenced in their response and by simultaneously viewing the data entry screens for accurate collection of information by using Systems Management Server (SMS) software.

Federal Law Enforcement Training Center

Performance Measure	Percent of students that express "excellent" or "outstanding" on the Student Quality of Training Survey (SQTS).
Organization and Program	Law Enforcement Training-Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
Scope	The percent is calculated as the number of students that rate their overall training experience as excellent or outstanding divided by the total number of students responding. The survey is distributed to students by FLETC staff with a virtually 100% response rate.
Data Source	The Student Quality of Training Survey (SQTS) is used to determine the level of student satisfaction for this measure. Students respond to a modified 5-point Likert scale (Outstanding, Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Poor). The ratings of outstanding and excellent were combined to form the measure of excellence to which the FLETC aspires.
Collection Method	The SQTS is part of the FLETC Automated Testing and Evaluation System (FATES), which entails the (1) collection, analysis and presentation of student feedback information (SQTS); (2) development, maintenance, scoring, and analysis of all written tests; and (3) collection and analysis of feedback from graduates and their supervisors regarding the effectiveness of training programs in preparing graduates to perform their law enforcement duties
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The survey was developed using contemporary survey methods comparable to those used by the military services and other major training organizations. Training programs begin and end continually throughout the fiscal year; the data analysis for statically significant changes is also conducted on a continual basis. No known data integrity problems exist.

Performance Measure	Percent of federal supervisors that rate their FLETC basic training graduate's preparedness as "good" or "excellent."
Organization and Program	Law Enforcement Training-Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
Scope	This measure reflects the percentage of federal supervisors of FLETC basic training graduates who, after eight to twelve months of observation, indicate their law enforcement officers or agents are highly prepared to perform their entry-level duties and responsibilities. The percentage is calculated as the number of federal supervisors that rate their FLETC basic training graduate's preparedness as good or excellent divided by the total number of federal supervisors responding.
Data Source	The FLETC uses a modified 5-point Likert scale (Unsatisfactory, Marginal, Satisfactory, Good, and Excellent) survey for the federal supervisor to evaluate their FLETC basic training graduate's preparedness to perform the duties and responsibilities as law enforcement officers or agents.
Collection Method	The data for this measure is captured by FLETC Automated Testing and Evaluation System (FATES), which entails the (1) collection, analysis and presentation of student feedback information; (2) development, maintenance, scoring, and analysis of all written tests; and (3) collection and analysis of feedback from graduates and their supervisors regarding the effectiveness of training programs in preparing graduates to perform their law enforcement duties (Continuous Validation Process).
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Surveys are issued continually throughout the fiscal year. The data analysis for statistically significant changes is also conducted on a continual basis. The Continuous Validation Process (CVP) surveys are developed using contemporary survey methods comparable to those used by the military services and other major training organizations. No known data integrity problems exist.

Performance Measure	Percent of Partner Organizations (POs) that respond "agree" or "strongly agree" on the Partner Organization Satisfaction Survey (POSS) to their overall satisfaction with the training provided by the FLETC.
Organization and Program	Law Enforcement Training-Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
Scope	The focus of this measure is PO satisfaction with training provided by FLETC. The results of the measure provide on-going opportunities for improvements that are incorporated into FLETC training curricula, processes and procedures. The calculated percentage is the number of partners who agree or strongly agree divided by the number of partners who responded.
Data Source	All of FLETC partner organizations are surveyed using the Partner Organization Satisfaction Survey (POSS) on an annual basis. The measure uses the question: Overall, my agency is satisfied with the training FLETC provides. The survey uses a modified six-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Slightly Agree, Slightly Disagree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree) for this question.
Collection Method	Surveys are completed using web-based survey software. The software tabulates and calculates the results.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The survey was developed using contemporary survey methods comparable to those used by the military services and other major training organizations. FLETC leaders conduct verbal sessions with PO key representatives to confirm and discuss their responses. Continually, throughout the year other formal and informal inputs are solicited from the PO representatives and used to validate the survey results. No known integrity problems exist.

Inspector General

Performance Measure	Percentage of recommendations made by the Office of Inspector General (OIG) that are accepted by the Department of Homeland Security.
Organization and Program	Audit, Inspections, and Investigations Program-Inspector General
Scope	OIG performs independent and objective reviews of DHS program and operations and keeps the Secretary and Congress fully informed of problems, deficiencies, and the need for corrective action. Once a DHS program is selected for an audit, inspection or evaluation, a letter is sent describing the forthcoming audit scope, objectives and timeframe. Next, a formal conference is scheduled, and the collection of data through interviews, review of documentation, physical and statistical evidence begins. This determines whether to proceed with an audit or not. If an audit is to be performed, interim memorandums will be provided to the auditees for informal comments on the findings. This is followed by a report submitted to the management official responsible for implementing corrective action. The Department should reply in 30 days and indicate actions taken and planned; target dates for any uncompleted actions; and rational for any disagreements with the findings or recommendations.
Data Source	Which DHS programs are selected for audit, inspection or evaluation relate to how vulnerable the operation is to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement and whether there is a legislative or regulatory audit requirement. This information is collected and compiled by OIG auditors, inspectors, or information technology personnel who not only conduct interviews and review documentation but also collect physical and statistical evidence. This information is collected from audits, program evaluations, computer security evaluation and the detection of security weaknesses. The Department provides the requested information in response to formal communication from OIG headquarters. Additionally, the Office of Investigations maintains a hotline designed to support our efforts in the detection and elimination of fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. All the data collected are tracked electronically as to whether the recommendations have been accepted, implemented, or declined.
Collection Method	OIG will track the formal recommendations made to the Department and whether or not the recommendations have been accepted and implemented. In tracking this information, OIG auditors, inspectors and investigators will employ the use of Microsoft office products, Visio, IDEA, Teammate and other software applications to collect and report their findings. The OIG is moving towards database consolidation in this area.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data from Department information systems are one type of evidence collected in an OIG review. For all types of evidence, various tests are used: sufficiency, competence, and relevance, to assess whether the Government Auditing Standards for evidence are met. Auditors and inspectors generally apply GAO's risk-based framework for data reliability assessments. The framework is built on making use of all existing information about the data, performing at least a minimal level of data testing, and applying professional judgment. When an initial draft report is issued, the Department is granted 30 days to review and comment on the findings and recommendations presented. The Department either concurs or opposes these recommendations in writing. Similarly, investigators are responsible for covering elements of specific charges. The PCIE sets quality standards for investigations and how the resulting data is to be maintained. Data are validated through investigative process.

National Protection and Programs Directorate

Performance Measure	Percent of high-priority critical infrastructure/key resources (CI/KR) sites at which a vulnerability assessment (VA) has been conducted.
Organization and Program	Infrastructure Protection and Risk Management-National Protection and Programs Directorate
Scope	The identification and assessment of vulnerabilities of CI/KR to specific threat conditions is essential to the development of an optimal set of protective measures and to the effective deployment and implementation of those measures. Although it varies by sector/segment, a two-year VA update cycle has generally been deemed appropriate. For the purpose of this performance measure, high-priority CI/KR sites will be those sites that meet the criteria for this designation, as put forth by PSD. This total number of designated high-priority CI/KR sites forms the baseline for this performance measure. To determine the value of this measure, the total number of these sites at which a vulnerability VA, including Vself-As, has been conducted within the past two years, will be compared to the baseline value to establish a percentage.
Data Source	The information needed to support this performance measure must come from the CI/KR owners/operators. Various means will be employed by PSD for the purpose of obtaining VAs and Vself-As. PCII issues may significantly impact the number of Vself-As actually received by PSD from the private sector. Data calls may be used as an alternative approach to at least solicit confirmation of the existence of Vself-As as well by their completion date.
Collection Method	A computer-based tracking log will be developed and maintained by PSD on an on-going basis to track the receipt of and/or the issue date of VAs and Vself-As for the designated high-priority CI/KR sites. PSD Performance Management staff will solicit VA status information from the PSD Vulnerability ID Section on a monthly basis to support performance reporting requirements.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	As part of their routine interfacing with CI/KR owners/operators, the Protective Security Advisors (PSAs) will verify that VAs have been conducted as and where reported by the Sector Specific Agencies (SSAs). For CI/KR sites at which RMD participated in or otherwise supported the VA effort, the RMD records will be checked to confirm VA completion.

Performance Measure	Percent of high-priority critical infrastructure for which a Buffer Zone Protection Plan (BZPP) has been implemented.
Organization and Program	Infrastructure Protection and Risk Management-National Protection and Programs Directorate
Scope	Each year, the Risk Management Division (RMD) develops a Buffer Zone Protection Program List (i.e. FY06 BZPP List) in support of the following fiscal year program. This is a prioritized list of CI/KR assets for which development of a BZP is deemed appropriate. The criterion upon which this prioritization is done includes consequence of attack analyses and BZPP budget limitations. The total number of assets on the BZPP List will vary from year to year and may change during the fiscal year in response to a criteria change, such as a budget reallocation, threat information, and agency focus. This total number of assets on the list forms the baseline for this performance measure. For the purposes of this performance measure, a BZP is considered to be implemented when the RMD BZP review team accepts the plan as being complete and releases it to the Office of Grants and Training, acquisition team (i.e. release into the grant process).
Data Source	The FY06 BZPP List is developed and maintained by the Risk Analysis and Technology Branch within RMD.

Collection Method	The training and execution of the BZP development for each of the assets on the BZPP List is tracked by the RMD Field Operations Branch and reported in the BZPP Progress Report, which is updated weekly.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The data collected is verified with the RMD Field Operations Branch Manager for accuracy before distributing the report.

Performance Measure	Percent of identified high-priority critical infrastructure/key resources sites at which at least two suitable protective actions (PA) have been implemented.
Organization and Program	Infrastructure Protection and Risk Management-National Protection and Programs Directorate
Scope	The identification and assessment of vulnerabilities of Critical Infrastructure/Key Resource (CI/KR) to specific threat conditions is essential to the development of an optimal set of protective actions (PAs) and to the effective deployment and implementation of those PAs. Although it varies by sector/segment, a three-year PA update cycle has generally been deemed appropriate. For the purpose of this performance measure, high-priority CI/KR sites forms the baseline for this performance measure. To determine the value of this measure, the total number of these sites at which at least two PAs have been implemented or enhanced during the period, will be compared to the baseline value to establish a percentage.
Data Source	The information needed to support this performance measure must come from the Critical Infrastructure/Key Resource (CI/KR) owners/operators. Various means will be employed by Risk Management Division (RMD) for the purpose of obtaining Protective Action (PA) implementation information. These will include using CI/KR information in the National Asset Database (NADB), RMD conducted site security visits and information obtained by the Protective Security Advisors (PSAs). Protecting Critical Infrastructure Information issues may significantly impact the reporting of protective action implementation from the private sector.
Collection Method	A computer-based tracking log will be developed and maintained by RMD on an on-going basis to track the receipt of PA implementation information for the designated high-priority CI/KR sites. Data calls to the Sector Specific Agencies (SSAs) will be used as these entities are stood up.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Risk Management Division conducted site security visit information and information obtained by the Protective Security Advisors (PSAs) will be used to verify the CI/KR PA implementation information obtained from other sources.

Performance Measure	Number of biometric watch list hits for travelers processed at ports of entry.
Organization and Program	US-VISIT-National Protection and Programs Directorate
Scope	Provides a count of the number of verified United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT) Automated Biometric Identification (IDENT) System biometric watch list hits at ports of entry for which there were no associated TECS biographic hits. TECS, the Treasury Enforcement Communications System, is a text-based automated system operated by Customs and Border Protection (CBP-formerly U.S. Customs Service) that contains information and lookouts on suspect individuals, businesses, and vehicles.
Data Source	Data is drawn from the US-VISIT Consolidated Report Data file, which reports data extracted from the IDENT system Biometric Hit database. The data reflects biometric watch list hits that have no associated biographic watch list records (i.e. there was no corresponding watch list record in TECS).
Collection Method	Data is extracted from the IDENT system via a standard query through the

	IDENT reporting tool.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	This specific metric (number of biometric watch list hits for travelers processed at ports of entry) is a cumulative total for the number of biometric watch list hits for the reporting period. Watch list hits are identified by DHS automated fingerprint identification system (IDENT), which is by design a highly accurate, largely automated system. Cumulative metrics, such as the number of biometric watch list hits for travelers processed at ports of entry, are however, analyzed by the US-VISIT Law Enforcement and Intelligence Group and data trends are also researched by the US-VISIT Performance Measurement Group within the Office of Budget.

Performance Measure	Ratio of adverse actions to total biometric watch list hits at ports of entry.
Organization and Program	US-VISIT-National Protection and Programs Directorate
Scope	Ratio of the number of verified biometric hits in secondary inspection referred to the CBP secondary inspection process that result in immigration-related violations, to the number of verified Automated Biometric Identification (IDENT) System biometric watch list hits in secondary.
Data Source	Data is drawn from the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT) Consolidated Report Data file, which reports data extracted from the IDENT system.
Collection Method	Data is extracted from the IDENT system by the IDENT Operations and Maintenance team via a standard query through the IDENT reporting tool.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data is generated daily and data trends are reviewed monthly. Data aberrations are researched. Watch list hits and resulting adverse actions are reported based on site specific processing for entry transactions (including land border ports). The information is collected, reported, and analyzed daily. The data is consolidated for weekly, monthly, and quarterly reporting and review. The data is analyzed daily by the US-VISIT Law Enforcement and Intelligence Group. Data trends are also researched by the US-VISIT Performance Measurement Group within the Office of Budget.

Performance Measure	Number of biometric watch list hits for visa applicants processed at consular offices.
Organization and Program	US-VISIT-National Protection and Programs Directorate
Scope	This data provides the number of BioVisa non-immigrant/immigrant visa applications resulting in biometric only hits. To provide this capability, on October 26, 2004, the Department of State (DOS) deployed a biometric capture capability known as the BioVisa Program in all consular offices worldwide.
Data Source	Data is drawn from the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT) Consolidated Report Data file, which reports data extracted from the Automated Biometric Identification (IDENT) System Biometric hit log where the DoS-CLASS (Consular Lookout and Support System) hit is a "No" value in the IDENT BioVisa Biometric hit log. The CLASS system is a DoS information system which is used in the BioVISA application and issuance process. A "No" value in one of the CLASS data fields is simply a mechanism used by the IDENT OM team to determine which BioVISA biometric HITS reported by DoS had a corresponding HIT in IDENT.
Collection Method	Data is extracted from the IDENT system by the US-VISIT Law Enforcement and Intelligence Group via a standard query through the IDENT reporting tool.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data on watch list hits are collected from each consular office and vetted

	through both the Department of State and US-VISIT to determine accuracy. The information is provided, reviewed, analyzed, and collected for weekly, monthly, and quarterly reporting and review. DoS captures and reports BioVISA biometric hit information which is shared with US-VISIT. US-VISIT also captures BioVISA biometric hit information and compares that information with DoS's report.

Performance Measure	Percent of targeted stakeholders who participate in or obtain cyber security products and services.
Organization and Program	Cyber Security and Communications-National Protection and Programs Directorate
Scope	This measure counts the overall number of cyber security products and services NCSD produces and delivers, for the purpose of reducing vulnerabilities and minimizing the severity of cyber attacks. The stakeholders who receive these products and services include Federal agencies; state, local and tribal governments; non-governmental organizations such as industry and academia; and individual users.
Data Source	A sample from all National Cyber Security Division (NCSD) branches will be used to report this measure. The data to be used in computing this performance measure are: number of active users/subscribers to alerts/bulletins/web pages, number of other agency participants in NCSD-held/delivered/chaired interagency or working groups/conferences/workshops/training/speeches/briefings; number of requests for and/or downloads of the developed and delivered methodologies/guidance/frameworks and major reports/plans.
Collection Method	The data/information will be collected internally within NCSD from each branch using a standardized Excel data collection spreadsheet. It will then be aggregated into a summary sheet for reporting.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Each National Cyber Security Division (NCSD) branch is responsible for capturing required data at the time of each event (if appropriate) or obtain it from web sites, repositories, system logs, and other sources. Each branch is also responsible for working with outside stakeholders to obtain required data, if necessary. The data is reviewed by branch management to validate its accuracy.

Performance Measure	Government Emergency Telecommunications Service (GETS) call completion rate during periods of network congestion.
Organization and Program	Cyber Security and Communications-National Protection and Programs Directorate
Scope	Government Emergency Telecommunications (GETS) Percentage of Calls Completed measures the ability for the GETS calls to reach the destination end office without encountering network blockage. It represents the expected call completion probability a GETS caller would experience if calling into an area affected by network congestion.
Data Source	ATT reports which represent a majority of Government Emergency Telecommunications (GETS) calls.
Collection Method	The information is collected through the ATT computer and reports which are provided to the NCS.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The ATT data is recorded, processed, and summarized on a quarterly basis in accordance with criteria stated by management. The data collection has been ongoing for several years, and any new data collected is compared against results from previous quarters.

Office of Health Affairs

Performance Measure	Probability of detecting the release of a biological agent.
Organization and Program	Medical and Biodefense Programs-Office of Health Affairs
Scope	This data is based on modeling and assessment of threats, probable delivery methods, population densities and vulnerabilities, and environmental factors. Increasing the probability of detection of a terrorist release of a biological agent results in the reduction of the public health consequences of an attack. The transition to fully autonomous detection systems coupled with greater numbers of units will enable this measure to be met. This data is based on modeling and assessment of the threat, probable delivery methodologies, population densities and vulnerabilities, and environmental factors.
Data Source	Use of sophisticated modeling tools available through the National Laboratories will determine if the collector/sensor numbers and locations are sufficient to meet the measure. In addition, the modeling will be based upon historical meteorological conditions, hypothetical terrorist release scenarios, and actual GPS coordinates of deployed collectors/sensors taken as they are put into operation.
Collection Method	Historical meteorological data will be obtained from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), release scenarios will be obtained from the National Laboratories, and GPS coordinates will be obtained from the BioWatch jurisdictions. The data is then input into a model to determine the probability of detecting the release of a biological agent.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Percent of the U.S. population covered by biological collectors/detectors.
Organization and Program	Medical and Biodefense Programs-Office of Health Affairs
Scope	This data is based on modeling and assessment of threats, delivery methods, population densities and vulnerabilities, environmental factors and spatial coverage of each unit in the system. The number of collectors deployed and the ability to provide coverage for special venues and events contribute to this data and the success of this measure. Placing of additional collectors is performed in close collaboration with the jurisdictions that provide input as to where additional coverage is necessary.
Data Source	Use of sophisticated modeling tools available through the National Laboratories to determine if the collector/sensor locations are sufficient to meet the population covered measure based upon historical meteorological conditions, hypothetical terrorist release scenarios, and actual GPS coordinates of deployed collectors/sensors taken as they are put into operation.
Collection Method	Historical meteorological data will be obtained from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), release scenarios will be obtained from the National Laboratories, and GPS coordinates will be obtained from the BioWatch jurisdictions. The data is then input into a model to determine the percent of the of the U.S. population covered.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Number of bioaerosol collectors employed in the top threat cities.
Organization and Program	Medical and Biodefense Programs-Office of Health Affairs
Scope	Additional collectors will continue to be employed in the ten top threat cities to improve the spatial coverage and to provide the capability for the local jurisdiction to provide coverage for special venues and events. Placement of additional collectors will be decided in close collaboration with the jurisdictions that will provide input as to where additional coverage is necessary. Detailed site planning will be done by the Department of Homeland Security. These negotiations, decisions, and site studies will occur through the 2nd quarter of FY 2006 resulting in the majority of actual deployments occurring in the 3rd and 4th quarters of FY 2006.
Data Source	The jurisdictions receiving the collectors report on the actual number of collectors deployed.
Collection Method	Data collection for this measure relies on reporting from the jurisdictions on a quarterly basis of additional collectors deployed. The Office of Health Affairs will collect this data and gather all information in a spreadsheet. Laboratory analysis reports will provide confirmation as the number of samples analyzed correlates to the number of collectors operating.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Systems Engineering and Development onsite contractor conducts an annual evaluation of all BioWatch sites at which time they also inventory the deployed BioWatch collectors. This serves as an independent double check to ensure that the information on deployed collectors is correct.

Performance Measure	Percent of annual milestones that are met for the National Biosurveillance Integration System.
Organization and Program	Medical and Biodefense Programs-Office of Health Affairs
Scope	The National Biosurveillance Integration System (NBIS) will be established and improved over a five year timeframe. The program plan includes multiple yearly milestones for the development of information streams, analytical methodology development, product development, information technology tool development and spiral upgrades. In each of the five years, NBIS will measure its progress against specific milestones. The information streams will initially include five partner agencies and then will expand to include state, local and private entities.
Data Source	The source of this data will come from an independent analysis of the progress of the system development. This will be derived by two methods: first, from semiannual program reviews and, secondly, a firsthand review of the protocols, design documentation, and active agency agreements.
Collection Method	Data collection will be from program reviews and verified by independent evaluation of the progress of the system, protocols, and methodologies.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Number of agencies who have agreed to provide information to the National Biosurveillance Integration System (NBIS).
Organization and Program	Medical and Biodefense Programs-Office of Health Affairs
Scope	The National Biosurveillance Integration System will establish, over the long term, partnerships with multiple Federal agencies as well as State, local, and private entities. The initial five partners form the core of NBIS and will bring direct expertise, data streams, analytical skills, and defined product needs to the system. In future years it is envisioned that additional Federal, State, local, and

	private entities will contribute relevant information to strengthen the knowledge base and speed of the analysis.
Data Source	The data source will be the actual documentation that defines the level of agency participation, data submittal, and product needs. These documentations may be in the form of Memorandums of Understanding, Interagency Agreements, Memorandums of Agreement, cooperative agreements, or other similar documents.
Collection Method	The agreements will be kept on file by the program and the Office of Health Affairs to ensure complete visibility to the terms and conditions and the overall health of the program.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Science and Technology

Performance Measure	Percentage of milestones that are met, as established in the fiscal years budget execution plan.
Organization and Program	Chemical and Biological-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	
Data Source	
Collection Method	
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Percent completion of an effective restoration technology to restore key infrastructure to normal operation after a chemical attack.
Organization and Program	Chemical and Biological-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	Based on completed analyses and scenarios, the requirements for an effective capability have been developed and translated to specific system requirements. New information from analyses being conducted may result in changes to the system requirements and will be addressed at the subprogram level. Assessment data describes meeting program milestones characterizing component capabilities. Component capabilities are developed as prototypes and transitioned to Environmental Protection Agency for further use and capability expansion. Scope of effort being measured provides capability for DC and NYC regions.
Data Source	The assessment data consists of judgments made by interagency partners in the effort, to include Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Defense, Centers for Disease Control. Data is collected on a continuous basis due to the collaborative nature of the effort, with the data of greatest weight occurring at dates associated with component milestones.
Collection Method	The program obtains and compiles written documentation from interagency partners of central relevance to component milestones, as well as minutes of record generated at regular meetings of approximately monthly periodicity.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The prototype of an effective capability that can restore key infrastructure to normal operations after a chemical attack which is currently under development is the product of considerable and frequent interaction among components within the Department, as well as other agencies in the Federal government. Those components that participate in the working groups that oversee the prototype validate the data.

Performance Measure	Percentage of milestones that are met, as established in the fiscal years budget execution plan.
Organization and Program	Explosives-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	
Data Source	
Collection Method	
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Number of new or improved technologies available for transition to the customers at a TRL 6 or above.
Organization and Program	Explosives-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	
Data Source	
Collection Method	
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY 2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Number of Department of Homeland Security official technical standards introduced.
Organization and Program	Testing and Evaluation and Standards-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The range of data includes the total number of standards developed in a fiscal year.
Data Source	The data will be collected using information gathered and reported by the subprogram managers.
Collection Method	The data will be collected by subprogram managers, stored, and monitored using an internal database.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	In addition to our own internal database of standards in the adoption process, Science and Technology (ST) has drafted a charter for the Department of Homeland Security Standards Council, which will be "a body of science and technology managers that serves as an advisory board to the Standards Program Manager and is comprised of ST staff members who represent the threat areas, the operational directorates, and state and local interests." Their responsibility is to serve as an advisory board to the Standards Portfolio Manager and the AS-ST on the ST Standards Portfolio. The council minutes will record the number of introduced and accepted standards. The council began regular meetings as of July 2006.Approved standards are placed on the standards webpage http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/interapp/editorial/editorial0420.xml

Performance Measure	Percent of standards introduced that are adopted by Department of Homeland Security and partner agencies.
Organization and Program	Testing and Evaluation and Standards-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	Adopted standards are those that have been introduced and have received formal approval from Department of Homeland Security or a relevant independent standards body.
Data Source	The sources for the data include Department of Homeland Security and other relevant standards bodies (e.g., National Institute of Standards and Technology, American National Standards Institute) who have adopted the standards developed by this program. The performance data will be collected regularly.
Collection Method	The data will be collected, stored, and monitored using an internal database.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	In addition to our own internal database of standards in the adoption process, Science and Technology (ST) has drafted a charter for the Department of Homeland Security Standards Council, which will be "a body of science and technology managers that serves as an advisory board to the Standards Program Manager and is comprised of ST staff members who represent the threat areas, the operational directorates, and State and local interests." Their responsibility is to serve as an advisory board to the Standards Portfolio Manager and the AS-ST on the ST Standards Portfolio. The council minutes will record the number of introduced and accepted standards. The council began regular meetings as of July

	2006. Approved standards are placed on the standards webpage http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/interapp/editorial/editorial0420.xml

Performance Measure	Percentage of milestones that are met, as established in the fiscal years budget execution plan.
Organization and Program	Testing and Evaluation and Standards-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	
Data Source	
Collection Method	
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Percentage of transition program funding dedicated to developing technologies in direct response to DHS components' requirements.
Organization and Program	Borders and Maritime Security-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The percentage of funding that is reported for this measure is calculated based on the amount of funding committed or obligated towards those programs in the ST Federal Financial Management System (FFMS).
Data Source	The data are gathered from subprograms approved by the ST Requirements Council (SRC) and the Support to Components program expenditures and obligations. The source also includes budget documentation.
Collection Method	The data are collected from subprograms, stored, and monitored using an internal database.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The ST Federal Financial Management System is the financial record of the Directorate and the official source of financial information regarding commitments and obligations that have received funds certification. Once the system calculates this percentage, ST headquarters validates the number.

Performance Measure	Percentage of milestones that are met, as established in the fiscal years budget execution plan.
Organization and Program	Borders and Maritime Security-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	
Data Source	
Collection Method	
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Percent of peer review adjectival ratings on University Programs' management and research and education programs that are "very good" or "excellent."
Organization and Program	University Programs-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	External expert panels will assess all University Programs on a rotating basis and rate them on quality, relevance, and effectiveness. At a minimum, experts will review each Center of Excellence by the end of its second full year of inception.
Data Source	External expert panels will rate all Department-funded University research, development, and education programs and submit the results to the Directorate.
Collection Method	The Department of Homeland Security will compile the summary ratings of the review panel for the programs under evaluation in a given fiscal year.
Reliability	Reliable

How data is verified	There are less than 10 external reviewers providing adjectival ratings. Internal verification procedures have been established to ensure the ratings are reported accurately.

Performance Measure	Percentage of milestones that are met, as established in the fiscal years budget execution plan.
Organization and Program	University Programs-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	
Data Source	
Collection Method	
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Percentage of milestones that are met, as established in the fiscal years budget execution plan.
Organization and Program	Command, Control and Interoperability-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	
Data Source	
Collection Method	
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Percent of states that have initiated or completed a statewide interoperability plan, such as the Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP).
Organization and Program	Command, Control and Interoperability-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The range of data includes all 50 states.
Data Source	The Office of Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC) contracts with several policy academies that assist states in developing interoperability plans. As part of the grant process, states must develop an interoperability plan. In addition, the Preparedness grant process may yield additional statewide plans.
Collection Method	The policy academies are required to submit reports to OIC. OIC will consult with the Preparedness Directorate to collect available statewide interoperability plans. Data will be collected and reported using an Excel spreadsheet.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	SAFECOM has directly supported the development of statewide plans in three states. SAFECOM has also established a Cooperative Agreement with the National Governors Association (NGA) to help 10 states develop or enhance their statewide plans over 2 years. The NGA will report to SAFECOM regularly and provide final copies of the plans. Further, the Department of Homeland Security Office of Grants and Training (GT) has required every state to develop and adopt a statewide plan by the end of 2007 to remain eligible for interoperability grants. SAFECOM will obtain copies of those plans from GT as they are submitted, and the information will be included in the calculation of the performance measure.

Performance Measure	Cumulative number of cyber security data sets contained in protected repository.
Organization and Program	Command, Control and Interoperability-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The total number of stored data sets is collected for this measure.
Data Source	The independent contractor regularly provides information on the number of

	data sets stored.
Collection Method	The independent contractor supporting the program submits monthly reports on the number of data sets stored. Data is collected and reviewed using an Excel spreadsheet.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Reliable data is provided by the PREDICT (Protected Repository for the Defense of Infrastructure against Cyber Threats) Coordinating Center (PCC) that is run by RTI International, a non-profit organization with extensive experience in handling sensitive research data. As part of its contract with Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the PCC collects statistical information including the number of data sets, and provides this information to DHS in monthly reports, and on an as needed basis. DHS conducts regular audits of the PREDICT project to ensure compliance with PREDICT operating procedures and contractual provisions.

Performance Measure	Percentage of milestones that are met, as established in the fiscal years budget execution plan.
Organization and Program	Infrastructure and Geophysical-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	
Data Source	
Collection Method	
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Number of scenarios completed on the Critical Infrastructure Protection-Decision Support System (CIP-DSS) that provide actionable information to help protect U.S. critical infrastructure.
Organization and Program	Infrastructure and Geophysical-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The Critical Infrastructure Protection-Decision Support System program has defined standards that signal the completion of a modeling capability of specific scenario. The measure examines the total number of completed scenarios.
Data Source	The Critical Infrastructure Protection-Decision Support System generates reports for each scenario that is analyzed.
Collection Method	Analysis is performed on the output of each model, and a report is generated by the analysts within the National Laboratory consortium. Official copies of the reports are delivered to the DHS Program Manager, and Critical Infrastructure Protection Plans, Programs and Requirements (PPR) Manager.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Analysis of specific scenarios is required by the Modeling, Simulation, and Analysis program and additional requirements for analysis are developed through the Focused Sector and Risk Reduction Technologies program. Results of analysis are released in an official report form to the Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) Decision Support System Program Manager, and the CIP RD Program Manager. These analyses are held on file, and distributed to appropriate entities.

Performance Measure	Percentage of milestones that are met, as established in the fiscal years budget execution plan.
Organization and Program	Transition-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	
Data Source	

Collection Method	
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Percentage of full SAFETY Act applications that have been processed and feedback provided to applicant when package has been disapproved.
Organization and Program	Transition-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The range of data includes the total number of full SAFETY Act applications received by the Science and Technology Directorate.
Data Source	The source of the data will be from the www.safetyact.gov web site, where all full applications are stored. Applications are submitted electronically and via US mail. Each application is given a unique identifier and is tracked electronically.
Collection Method	The measurement data is collected from the website, reviewed, and reported in an Excel spreadsheet.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The information is captured through the website (www.safetyact.gov) designed specifically for application processing and information. The website "feeds" the information to the programs business process management software system. From this system, various weekly reports are generated in hard copy, which are reviewed and verified by the Program Director.

Performance Measure	Percentage of milestones that are met, as established in the fiscal years budget execution plan.
Organization and Program	Innovation-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	
Data Source	
Collection Method	
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Percentage of milestones that are met, as established in the fiscal years budget execution plan.
Organization and Program	Human Factors-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	
Data Source	
Collection Method	
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Performance Measure	Percentage of milestones that are met, as established in the fiscal years budget execution plan.
Organization and Program	Laboratory Facilities-Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	
Data Source	
Collection Method	
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is a new performance measure in FY2007 and its verification and validation methodology will be finalized by May 1, 2007.

Transportation Security Administration

Performance Measure	Percentage of individuals undergoing a Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing (TTAC) security threat assessment (STA)
Organization and Program	Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing -Transportation Security Administration
Scope	Data is collected detailing the number of new individuals vetted and the number of individuals perpetually vetted for all functional vetting programs. TTAC's total defined population receiving an STA currently includes international flight crews, aviation workers, hazardous material drivers, and non-US citizens receiving flight instruction at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) certified flight schools in the US and abroad.
Data Source	Classified Reports and monthly vetting and credentialing data.
Collection Method	Each program collects data detailing the number of individuals vetted. The assessment of vetting programs may come from the existing programs such as HAZMAT, Alien Flight Student Pilot (AFSP), Crew Vetting (CV) and, Registered Traveler (RT) and other vetting programs.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Procedures for reliability checks will be finalized no later than May 1, 2007. Data collected reports the number of individuals vetted by each program is closely monitored by TTAC and is reported monthly in TSA's Management Review metrics report.

Performance Measure	Percentage of screeners scoring above the national standard level of Threat Image Projection (TIP) performance
Organization and Program	Aviation Security-Transportation Security Administration
Scope	The TIP Performance Score is a measure to determine the overall effectiveness of Transportation Security Officers (TSO) to correctly identify threats presented in carry on baggage. TSA calculates this measure using data from TSOs who view at least 50 projections. Calculating results by including TSOs who view fewer projections would introduce unreliability of data and imprecise performance estimates. This metric is sensitive to the breakout of presentations by airport size and machine type but has exhibited stability over the last two years.
Data Source	Data is obtained through a computer tracking system which is a component of every X-ray machine in operation at every federalized airport.
Collection Method	Every airport uploads data monthly for compilation. The data is then consolidated and imported to an Oracle database for analysis by TSA.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Event data and daily counts are aggregated and compared against monthly data files to ensure internal consistency. All data files are text files and are highly resistant to tampering.

Performance Measure	Increase the number of positive responses on the following TSA survey question, "How confident are you in the ability of the flight crew to keep air travel secure and to defend the aircraft and its passengers from individuals with hostile intentions"
Organization and Program	Aviation Security-Transportation Security Administration
Scope	The Department of Transportation collects random nationwide telephone survey data. A statistically significant sample is collected and responses are weighted and analyzed. The survey is administered to the American public, and response is voluntary. Selected participants who choose to provide feedback will provide

	insight into the public's confidence of transportation systems.
Data Source	The Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Department of Transportation (DOT), conducts an annual statistically valid randomly selected household telephone survey.
Collection Method	The DOT uses standard survey methodology. After computing the data, DOT provides the data to TSA on a CD-ROM, at which point TSA analyzes the data to compile a trend analysis report. The BTS Omnibus Survey data is expected every April of the following year.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The questions have been psychometrically validated and the information validated by DOT and provided to TSA on a CD-ROM for analysis.

Performance Measure	Percentage of nationally critical surface transportation assets or systems that have been assessed and have mitigation strategies developed based on those assessments.
Organization and Program	Surface Transportation Security-Transportation Security Administration
Scope	The universe consists of all surface assets and systems listed on the Top 100 nationally critical Transportation Assets List (which contains well over 100 listings, including aviation as well as surface-mode assets and systems). The list is used as a starting place to assess the top transportation assets and systems. Each year additional assessments of items listed in the Top 100 are conducted. The Top 100 list is to be revised in spring 2007, per Executive Order. The new number of items in the Top 100, i.e. the denominator of this percentage, may change. FY06 actual contains data from aviation related infrastructure.
Data Source	Assessments of transportation assets and systems are conducted by or on behalf of, or are accepted by, both TSA and various other federal agencies. Assessments may consist of, but are not limited to, site visits and field examinations. TSA tracks assessments and information is shared within federal agencies through mechanisms such as participation in the Federal Risk Assessment Working Group (FRAWG). Sponsored by DHS Science and Technology, FRAWG is a federal risk assessment information clearinghouse that shares information about completed assessments through meetings and a web site that memorializes the assessment date and location information.
Collection Method	TSA collects data from its own assessments as well as from assessments conducted by or on behalf of, or accepted by, other federal agencies.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Information about conducted assessments (although not always the assessment itself) is shared throughout the federal government as well as with owner-operators of the assets and/or systems that are assessed.

Performance Measure	Percentage level in meeting Federal Air Marshal Service (FAMS) coverage target for each individual category of identified risk.
Organization and Program	Federal Air Marshal Service -Transportation Security Administration
Scope	Coverage is essentially provided using a risk-based management approach for mission planning. Coverage is provided to those flights that have been identified as Targeted Critical Flights for deployment under 10 individual risk categories that were identified in the FAMS Concept of Operations (CONOPS). Specific information related to the identification of these risk categories, targeted coverage and the resources needed to provide this coverage is classified. Calculation: Total missions divided by total critical flights for each of 10 risk categories; expressed as a percentage of target goals, then combined into a singular overall metric. The range is the deviation between the max and min of the 10 individual risk categories, with a smaller range being preferable.

Data Source	Data is obtained from the FAMS AirCrew Database.
Collection Method	The Systems Operations Control Division (SOCD) automated scheduling system employs aviation industry accepted Semi-Automated Business Reservation Environment (SABRE) systems that archive all information on the Targeted Critical Flights covered on a daily basis. On a monthly basis (or as needed) the SOCD accesses the SABRE database through SQL queries and Crystal Reports to identify FAMS performance in both scheduling and flying missions on each cover level of the Targeted Critical Flights.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data in support of this measure is closely monitored by FAMS management and the OLE/FAMS Office of Flight Operations. FAMS senior managers/leadership reviews the previous month's performance by the 5th of each month and validates the coverage levels and/or provides guidance on any actions that should be taken to increase any performance measure if deemed appropriate. In addition, FAMS procedures require ongoing quality control steps that include monthly validation checks of between 400 and 500 randomly selected individual flights by Headquarters personnel auditors to validate a reported FAM coverage on a targeted critical flight.

Performance Measure	Percentage of systems certified based on Federal Information System Management Act (FISMA), as accepted by DHS and accredited as designated by CIO.
Organization and Program	Transportation Security Support-Transportation Security Administration
Scope	The data calculation is based on an aggregation of 11 certification values which includes: FIPS 199, contingency plan and testing, privacy impact assessment, e-authentication, risk assessment, system security plan, security testing and evaluation plan, security assessment report, ATO letter, and annual assessments.
Data Source	Data is based upon the successful fulfillment of FIPS 199, contingency plan and testing, privacy impact assessment, e-authentication, risk assessment, system security plan, security testing and evaluation plan, security assessment report, ATO letter and annual assessments.
Collection Method	Data is obtained through the certification accreditation process and entered into the DHS Trusted Agent FISMA application. An automated system provides continuous updates.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data is based upon the successful fulfillment of FIPS 199, contingency plan and testing, privacy impact assessment, e-authentication, risk assessment, system security plan, security testing and evaluation plan, security assessment report, ATO letter and annual assessments.

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services

Performance Measure	Percent of fraud cases found in conducting Benefit Fraud Assessments on USCIS form types.
Organization and Program	Immigration Security and Integrity-United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Scope	Cases accepted over the previous six months will be selected using a random sampling formula provided by DHS Office of Immigration Statistics. The Benefit Fraud Assessment (BFA) sampling size of 230-260 cases for each form type will be determined from a Rate of Occurrence not more than 20%, Confidence Level of 95%, and reliability factor of +/-5%. Fraud Detection and National Security (FDNS) Information Officers and Intelligence Research Specialists will determine if the BFA cases reach the minimum threshold of fraud, defined as entailing any manifestations that amount to an assertion not in accordance with the facts, an untrue statement of fact, or an incorrect/false representation of material to the adjudication of the application/petition.
Data Source	Based on a 6 month sample derived from receipts. The sample universe was derived in coordination with the DHS Office of Immigration Statistics, which has determined that a sampling period of 6 months is valid.
Collection Method	All data collection and analysis will be reviewed by HQ FDNS to ensure uniformity and consistency, and to make the final determination on each inquiry. The FDNS data system will facilitate tracking of leads and cases of suspected and validated fraud through referral to ICE, and return to USCIS for final adjudicative decision. The quarterly reporting of performance will be based on the number of cases in the FDNS data system compared to the number of applications in the Computer Linked Application Information Management System and the Refugees, Asylum, and Parole System for certain form types for the same period. Since cases identified in the BFA were determined in a statistically valid manner, this will provide a statistically valid estimate of the amount of fraud present in these form types. FDNS will expand the BFA process to additional form types in future years, and will also expand data mining capabilities to help immediately identify suspect applications and petitions.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	100% review of all determinations by HQ FDNS.

Performance Measure	Number of form types where procedural and/or legislative changes to counteract fraud are proposed as a result of Benefit Fraud Assessments.
Organization and Program	Immigration Security and Integrity-United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Scope	Cases accepted over the previous six months will be selected using a random sampling formula provided by DHS Office of Immigration Statistics. The Benefit Fraud Assessment (BFA) sampling size of 230-260 cases for each form type will be determined from a Rate of Occurrence not more than 20%, Confidence Level of 95%, and reliability factor of +/-5%. Fraud Detection and National Security (FDNS) Information Officers and Intelligence Research Specialists will determine if the BFA cases reach the minimum threshold of fraud, defined as entailing any manifestations that amount to an assertion not in accordance with the facts, an untrue statement of fact, or an incorrect/false representation of material to the adjudication of the application/petition.
Data Source	Tracking of proposed procedural and/or legislative changes to counteract fraud as a result of Benefit Fraud Assessments. The Office of Fraud Detection and National Security manually documents and tracks proposed changes made in

	BFA final reports. If a proposal requires a change to USCIS policy, a memorandum is written for the internal memorandum clearance process. If a proposal involves regulatory change, it goes through the proposed rule process.
Collection Method	All data collection and analysis will be reviewed by HQ FDNS to ensure uniformity and consistency, and to make the final determination on each inquiry. The FDNS data system will facilitate tracking of leads and cases of suspected and validated fraud through referral to ICE, and return to USCIS for final adjudicative decision. The quarterly reporting of performance will be based on the number of cases in the FDNS data system compared to the number of applications in the Computer Linked Application Information Management System and the Refugees, Asylum, and Parole System for certain form types for the same period. Since cases identified in the BFA were determined in a statistically valid manner, this will provide a statistically valid estimate of the amount of fraud present in these form types. FDNS will expand the BFA process to additional form types in future years, and will also expand data mining capabilities to help immediately identify suspect applications and petitions.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	100% review of all determinations and proposed procedural and/or legislative changes by HQ FDNS.

Performance Measure	Percent of Employment Eligibility Verification (EEV) queries that required manual review that are later resolved as "Employment Authorized."
Organization and Program	Immigration Status Verification-United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Scope	The measure is calculated as follows: (total number of monthly manual ISV reviews that later resolve as Employment Authorized / the total monthly number of EEV initial verification queries submitted through VIS. The data measure the completeness of the VIS information.
Data Source	Status and employment eligibility verification data is collected in the Verification Information System (VIS). VIS has three components: 1) the Customer Processing System (CPS)-used by Federal, State, and local government agencies to perform electronic immigration status verification for non-citizens applying for benefits/licenses; 2) the Employment Eligibility Verification program-used by employers participating in the EEV program to verify the employment eligibility of all newly hired employees; and 3) the Status Verification System (SVS)-used by ISVs to respond to automated additional verification requests and to log manual G-845 requests and responses.
Collection Method	VIS reports have been developed, and are generated monthly to provide data needed to report on these measures.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Verification Information System (VIS) keeps an audit trail of all initial and additional verification requests. When an initial verification is performed, VIS keeps a record of who did the query, what date/time the query was done, and what information was provided back to the user agency/employer including the system message. When a user agency/employer submits an additional verification request, VIS keeps a record of who submitted the request, the date/time the request was submitted, the information provided by the user agency, the Immigration Status Verifier who responded to the request, the date/time they responded to the request, and the response provided back to the user agency. The process is automated and the data used to report on the measures is generated from the VIS audit trail records.

Performance Measure	Percent of Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) queries requiring manual review that are later resolved as lawful status.
Organization and Program	Immigration Status Verification-United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Scope	The measure is calculated as follows: (total number of monthly manual reviews that later resolve as Lawful Status/ the total monthly number of SAVE initial verification queries submitted through VIS. The data measure the completeness of the VIS information.
Data Source	Status and employment eligibility verification data is collected in the Verification Information System (VIS). VIS has three components: 1) the Customer Processing System (CPS)-used by Federal, state, and local government agencies to perform electronic immigration status verification for non-citizens applying for benefits/licenses; 2) the Employment Eligibility Verification program-used by employers participating in the EEV program to verify the employment eligibility of all newly hired employees; and 3) the Status Verification System (SVS)-used by ISVs to respond to automated additional verification requests and to log manual G-845 requests and responses.
Collection Method	VIS reports have been developed, and are generated monthly to provide data needed to report on these measures.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Verification Information System (VIS) keeps an audit trail of all initial and additional verification requests. When an initial verification is performed, VIS keeps a record of who did the query, what date/time the query was done, and what information was provided back to the user agency/employer including the system message. When a user agency/employer submits an additional verification request, VIS keeps a record of who submitted the request, the date/time the request was submitted, the information provided by the user agency, the Immigration Status Verifier who responded to the request, the date/time they responded to the request, and the response provided back to the user agency. The process is automated and the data used to report on the measures is generated from the VIS audit trail records.

Performance Measure	Actual cycle time to process form I-485 (Application to Register for Permanent Residence or to Adjust Status).
Organization and Program	Adjudication Services-United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Scope	Actual Cycle Time is calculated by counting back the number of preceding months until the sum of the monthly receipts equals the current month's End Pending. USCIS has begun to remove from the calculated backlog work it cannot complete because of factors outside its control, such as applications awaiting customer responses to requests for information, applications awaiting an FBI name check or other outside agency action. At the end of the second quarter of FY 2006, USCIS removed 74,088 applications from its I-485 backlog for these reasons. Because current systems do not capture the filing date for these applications, USCIS is unable to adjust the cycle time calculation to account for their removal from the backlog. Because of this effect, we will see greater than six month cycle times when the backlog reaches zero.
Data Source	Automated counts and manual case counts, which are reported monthly through the automated Performance Analysis System (PAS) database.
Collection Method	On a monthly basis, USCIS collects performance data on applications received, completed, and pending through its Performance Analysis System (PAS). Receipts are entered into case management systems through lockbox processing or e-filing. For lockbox cases, applications are scanned and data is sent electronically to the Computer Linked Application Information Management System (CLAIMS3). When cases are filed via e-filing, data elements get pushed to CLAIMS3 to populate the data fields. Individual adjudicators count the

	number of applications approved and denied, and record the information. Each office subsequently aggregates individual reports and enters them into PAS. At Service Centers, most data is collected and entered directly into PAS from automated systems supporting casework, including CLAIMS3.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	USCIS instituted monthly data reconciliation and review activities to maximize the integrity of the data reported. USCIS uses PAS and CLAIMS data on a daily basis. In addition, the Director meets regularly with the Director of the Performance Management Division and senior agency managers to review performance on backlog elimination and reducing case cycle times, and to provide direction for future activities. Executive staff meetings are held weekly. Performance information is used in conjunction with other data, such as application receipts and revenue projections, to manage and plan for future staffing and workload requirements, and inform decisions in other areas of USCIS operations.

Performance Measure	Actual cycle time to process form I-129 (Petition for Nonimmigrant Worker).
Organization and Program	Adjudication Services-United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Scope	Actual Cycle Time is calculated by counting back the number of preceding months until the sum of the monthly receipts equals the current month's End Pending. Note: Prior to FY 2005, USCIS measured and reported timeliness in terms of Average Cycle Time, which was calculated by dividing the number of cases pending by average monthly receipts over the last 12 months. Most of the time the Average Cycle Time and Actual Cycle Time give the same results. However, Actual Cycle Time calculation will allow for more accurate and timely distribution of resources in local offices as backlogs fall and workloads among form types shift. FY04 actuals calculated using Actual Cycle Time had no reportable difference from Average Cycle Time calculations.
Data Source	Automated counts and manual case counts, which are reported monthly through the automated Performance Analysis System (PAS) database.
Collection Method	On a monthly basis, USCIS collects performance data on applications received, completed, and pending through its Performance Analysis System (PAS). Receipts are entered into case management systems through lockbox processing or e-filing. For lockbox cases, applications are scanned and data is sent electronically to the Computer Linked Application Information Management System (CLAIMS3). When cases are filed via e-filing, data elements get pushed to CLAIMS3 to populate the data fields. Individual adjudicators count the number of applications approved and denied, and record the information. Each office subsequently aggregates individual reports and enters them into PAS. At Service Centers, most data is collected and entered directly into PAS from automated systems supporting casework, including CLAIMS3.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	USCIS instituted monthly data reconciliation and review activities to maximize the integrity of the data reported. USCIS uses PAS and CLAIMS data on a daily basis. In addition, the Director meets regularly with the Director of the Performance Management Division and senior agency managers to review performance on backlog elimination and reducing case cycle times, and to provide direction for future activities. Executive staff meetings are held weekly. Performance information is used in conjunction with other data, such as application receipts and revenue projections, to manage and plan for future staffing and workload requirements, and inform decisions in other areas of USCIS operations.

Performance Measure	Actual cycle time to process form N-400 (Application for Naturalization).
Organization and Program	Adjudication Services-United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Scope	Actual Cycle Time is calculated by counting back the number of preceding months until the sum of monthly receipts equals the current month's End Pending. USCIS has begun to remove from the calculated backlog work it cannot complete due to factors outside its control, such as applications awaiting customer responses to requests for information, applications in suspense to afford customers another opportunity to pass the naturalization test, applications awaiting FBI name check or other outside agency action, or where USCIS has determined a case is approvable but remains pending only for the customer to take the oath. At the end of 2nd Qtr FY06, USCIS removed 84,276 applications from its N-400 backlog for these reasons. Since current systems do not capture filing dates for applications, USCIS is unable to adjust the cycle time calculation to account for their removal from the backlog. Due to this effect, we will see greater than six month cycle times when the backlog reaches zero.
Data Source	Automated counts and manual case counts, which are reported monthly through the automated Performance Analysis System (PAS) database.
Collection Method	On a monthly basis, USCIS collects performance data on applications received, completed, and pending through its Performance Analysis System (PAS). Receipts are entered into case management systems through lockbox processing or via e-filing. For lockbox cases, applications are scanned and data is sent electronically to the Computer Linked Application Information Management System (CLAIMS4). When cases are filed via e-filing, data elements get pushed to CLAIMS4 to populate the data fields. Individual adjudicators count the number of applications approved and denied, and record the information. Each office subsequently aggregates individual reports and enters them into PAS. At Service Centers, most data is collected and entered directly into PAS from automated systems supporting casework, including CLAIMS4.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	USCIS instituted monthly data reconciliation and review activities to maximize the integrity of the data reported. USCIS uses PAS and CLAIMS data on a daily basis. In addition, the Director meets regularly with the Director of the Performance Management Division and senior agency managers to review performance on backlog elimination and reducing case cycle times, and to provide direction for future activities. Executive staff meetings are held weekly. Performance information is used in conjunction with other data, such as application receipts and revenue projections, to manage and plan for future staffing and workload requirements, and inform decisions in other areas of USCIS operations.

Performance Measure	Percent of asylum reform referrals (at local offices) completed within 60 days of receipt.
Organization and Program	Adjudication Services-United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Scope	The data represent a percentage of the Asylum reform referrals that the office can complete within the target timeframe of 60 days. This data is subject to the limitation of staffing shortages and other complexities, requiring the office to exempt 25% of its referral pool from consideration.
Data Source	RAPS-The Refugees, Asylum, and Parole System is an Integrated Data Base Management System/Relational (IDMS/R) resident on a mainframe computer at the Justice Data Center-Dallas.
Collection Method	Asylum Officers update RAPS with their decision on an I-589 Asylum claim. RAPS calculates the date the case is filed to the date a Notice to Appear (NTA) is served, minus any delays caused by the applicant. RAPS generates a weekly, monthly, and annual report that measures the timeliness of case processing by asylum officers by separating out those cases referred to the Immigration Judge

	within 60 days, from those cases referred to the Immigration Judge in more than 60 days.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Current policy requires 100% supervisory review of system entries.

Performance Measure	Customer satisfaction rate with USCIS phone centers.
Organization and Program	Information and Customer Service-United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Scope	Random samples of customers are called to rate their experience with USCIS. The customer satisfaction rate measures the customer experience at all levels of interaction with the USCIS telephone center to include the IVR (automated services), Tier 1 (contract employees), and Tier 2 (Immigration Information Officers). The survey measures the customers' level of satisfaction based on a range of responses to include those customers who indicated they were at least minimally satisfied, to those customers who either expressed a minimal level of dissatisfaction or gave a neutral answer.
Data Source	Responses to phone survey of a random sample of customers.
Collection Method	Source data is collected from a telecommunications network that captures telephone numbers of all customers calling the 800-line. Upon contact by contracted employees, responses are input into a database which houses current and historical responses allowing for trending and analysis of data for accuracy.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Reliability of the data is checked by trending data against previous quarterly data collected. Significant changes in levels of performance may reflect a need to validate responses.

Performance Measure	Percent of targeted language populations with access to citizenship educational materials in their native language.
Organization and Program	Citizenship-United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Scope	The percent of targeted populations who have access to Welcome to the United States: A Guide for New Immigrants in their native language. Calculation: Number of targeted languages into which the new immigrant guide has been translated and made available to the public, divided by the total number of targeted languages].
Data Source	Inventory of targeted languages available to the public.
Collection Method	Inventory of targeted languages available to the public.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The number of targeted languages available to the public can be readily verified on the USCIS.gov website.

Performance Measure	Percent of DHS strategic objectives with programs that meet their associated performance targets.
Organization and Program	Departmental Management and Operations-Departmental Management and Operations
Scope	Each of the 75 programs within DHS has specific performance measures and targets. Each program is also linked to the Department's strategic goals and objectives. Quarterly, components submit performance data indicating whether or not they have met their targets, as specified in the Performance Budget Overview.

Data Source	The source of information is derived from quarterly performance reports submitted by DHS Components. These reports detail whether or not programs have met their performance targets. All data are captured in the Department's Future Year Homeland Security Program System (FYHSP).
Collection Method	DHS Components report quarterly on performance targets to the Office of the Program Analysis and Evaluation, as well as in the FYHSP system. All data are due in the system no later than two weeks after the end of the quarter, unless otherwise directed.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Quarterly and annual data performance data for each program are validated through the component's Planning offices, vetted through their leadership, and supported by the Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation. Data are indicated as estimated if some of the underlying data reported were estimated. Some year-end results are reported as estimates because the time it takes to collect actuals exceeds the 45 day time limit to issue the Performance and Accountability Report after the end of the fiscal year. When actual data are collected, they will be reported in the following year's Performance and Accountability Report.

United States Coast Guard

Performance Measure	Maritime Injury and Fatality Index
Organization and Program	Marine Safety-United States Coast Guard
Scope	This measure is an index of the moving five-year average of mariner, passenger and recreational boating deaths and injuries. This represents a valid outcome measure of the Coast Guard's success in ensuring the safety of persons embarked on both commercial and recreational vessels.
Data Source	Notices of commercial Passenger and Mariner casualties are recorded in the Coast Guards Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) database, while recreational Boating Accident Reports are recorded in the Coast Guards Boating Accident Report Database (BARD).
Collection Method	Commercial Passenger deaths and injuries include reportable casualties of commercial passengers on U.S. vessels operating in any waters and commercial passengers on foreign vessels operating in U.S. waters. Commercial Passenger deaths, disappearances or injuries associated with diving activities are excluded.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Notices of recreational boating casualties recorded in the BARD, and commercial passenger and mariner casualties recorded in the MISLE database, are generally complete when the database is accessed. Some incidents are never reported, however, and some information is delayed in reaching the Coast Guard. Previously published data is therefore subject to change; the greatest impact occurring over the most recent 5 months. It is also possible that some information is inaccurately reported to the Coast Guard. Duplicate information may occasionally be entered or an incident inadvertently omitted or incorrectly coded. Formal verification procedures strive to rectify any errors, and program logic and comprehensive user guides have been developed to ensure that data is highly reliable.

Performance Measure	Removal rate for cocaine that is shipped via non-commercial maritime means.
Organization and Program	Drug Interdiction-United States Coast Guard
Scope	This measure includes the amount of all cocaine physically seized/weighed (and assigned a Federal drug identification number) by the USCG, as well as drugs intentionally destroyed by smugglers (and not physically recovered by the USCG) while being pursued. Smugglers increasingly destroy contraband to avoid prosecution; including the total cocaine removed (vice just seizures) more accurately accounts for the program's effectiveness. The amount of cocaine destroyed/jettisoned during a smuggling event is determined externally to the USCG through the Consolidated Counter-Drug Database (CCDB). CCDB uses intelligence information, video from pursuits, and jettisoned drugs relocated by interdiction units to determine the actual amount of drugs in a given load. Strict rules are employed to avoid inflating non-recoverable drug amounts. USCG does not include seizures of other drugs (i.e. marijuana) in this measure, as cocaine is the predominant drug interdicted in the maritime transit zone.
Data Source	Both the "physically seized" and the "jettisoned or destroyed" components of this measure are tracked, collected, and analyzed by Coast Guard Headquarters' Office of Law Enforcement (G-RPL). The non-commercial maritime flow component of this measure is provided by the IACM, which has Coast Guard representation. Since the IACM report is not available until several months after the end of the fiscal year (typically in the Summertime), only estimated performance results are available at the end of the fiscal year. Seizures (not the removal rate) are provided in various reports until the IACM is available later in the year, and can be used to compute the actual removal rate.
Collection Method	Both classified and unclassified Coast Guard IT systems will be utilized to manage this measure.

Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Removal rate includes cocaine seized as well as that confirmed as jettisoned, sunk or otherwise destroyed. Jettison, sunk and otherwise destroyed cocaine data is verified through the consolidated counter-drug data base run by the United States Interdiction Coordinator. CG Seizure data continues to be tracked and verified by Federal Drug Identification Numbers. The non-commercial maritime flow data continues to be provided by the annual Interagency Assessment of Cocaine Movement report. Therefore, we are confident that the measure is accurate, materially adequate and the data sources are reliable. Data is reported as estimated because the maritime flow estimates are not available in time to calculate the removal rate for this report. When the flow rate becomes available the removal rate will be calculated and reported in the following Performance and Accountability Report.

Performance Measure	Percentage of undocumented migrants who attempt to enter the U.S. via maritime routes that are interdicted or deterred.
Organization and Program	Migrant Interdiction-United States Coast Guard
Scope	The measure only tracks Cubans, Dominicans, Haitians, and Chinese at this time. A small number of migrants (approximately 10%) from various source countries are not included because formal flow estimates of migrants leaving these countries are not available. Using the number of potential migrants in the denominator helps address the deterrence value of Coast Guard operations, but could lead to confusion of this measure with a simple interdiction rate. Political climates, historical flows, and the latest trends figure into the calculations.
Data Source	Data obtained from Coast Guard and the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services.
Collection Method	The success rate is an indicator of the number of migrants entering the U.S. by maritime routes compared against the number of migrants that would attempt to enter with no interdiction presence. Flow estimates (provided by the USCG Intelligence Coordination Center) are compiled with interdiction and arrival information (provided by the Coast Guard Marine Safety and Law Enforcement Database (MISLE) and the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services, respectively) through Excel and Access databases. These systems are managed by the Program Manager, G-RPL.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The numbers of illegal migrants entering the U.S. and the numbers of potential migrants are derived numbers subject to estimating error. Because of the speculative nature of the information used, and the secretive nature of illegal migration, particularly where professional smuggling organizations are involved, the estimated potential flow of migrants may contain significant error. The potential flows are validated against other flow estimates where available; they are usually found to be more conservative than the other sources.

Performance Measure	Number of incursions into the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone.
Organization and Program	Other LE (law enforcement)-United States Coast Guard
Scope	This measure includes incursions of foreign fishing vessels detected by the Coast Guard or other sources that results in either: 1. significant damage or impact to U.S. fish stocks (based on volume extracted or status of stock targeted); 2. significant financial impact due to volume and value of target fish stocks; 3. significant sovereignty concerns due to uncertainty or disagreement with foreign neighbors over the EEZ border. Standard rules of evidence (i.e. positioning accuracy) do not apply in determining detections; if a detection is reasonably believed to have occurred, it is counted. Reports of foreign fishing vessels illegally fishing inside the US EEZ are counted as detections when these

	reports are judged by operational commanders as being of sufficient validity to order available resources to respond.
Data Source	Data for the measure are collected through the Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) system and from USCG units patrolling the EEZ. The information is consolidated at USCG HQ through monthly messages from the Area Commanders.
Collection Method	Data obtained from the Coast Guard Planning and Assessment.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data obtained from the CG Planning and Assessment System is validated by program managers. Resource data is entered at the field level with two-person integrity, including the Commanding Officer. Field level data entry provides the highest degree of reliability and confidence, can be entered shortly after it happens and is backed up by unit logs which detail the mission of the boat/cutter/aircraft. Once data enters the AOPS system, it becomes visible up the chain of command. Program managers and the chain of command have independent data validity responsibilities. Areas, Districts, and HQ review the entries in AOPS, perform gross error checks against other reports (i.e. MISLE or trip reports) and provide feedback to the field. A second level of data validation occurs that is focused on database integrity. HQ performs bimonthly checks to verify that reporting is timely, excessive mission hour attribution is not occurring and that the CO is performing their approval functions properly.

Performance Measure	Percent of time that Coast Guard assets included in the Combatant Commander Operational Plans are ready at a Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) rating of 2 or better.
Organization and Program	Defense Readiness-United States Coast Guard
Scope	All (100%) of Coast Guard units that are designated by DOD operational plans are measured. The data includes readiness information about the unit's people (such as training and billet-fill), equipment (physical operating condition), and health of its supplies and logistics-in essence, all pertinent information that could bear on a unit's warfighting capability. No pertinent data is excluded. Data is always current; the automated collection system is required to be updated immediately upon a change in readiness. There are no limitations (with regard to timeliness, completeness, or accuracy, etc.) to using this data for measurement purposes.
Data Source	The measure's data source is the Navy Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) database, which is populated in the field by carefully-reviewed submissions from each unit's commanding officer.
Collection Method	Electronically; the data is uploaded by every applicable Coast Guard unit via an automated system.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data obtained from the Status of Readiness and Training System (SORTS) is maintained by the Department of Defense. The Coast Guard ensures the accuracy of the data by subjecting it to multiple levels of review. All SORTS reports must be personally approved by each unit's commanding officer; the data is uploaded by a highly structured and automated system which minimizes data entry errors. Furthermore, the Coast Guard publishes "Credibility and Consistency Criteria", enclosure 9 to COMDTINST 3501.2H, which outlines the procedures by which SORTS data is verified.

Performance Measure	Percent of fishermen complying with federal regulations.
Organization and Program	Living Marine Resources (LMR)-United States Coast Guard
Scope	The performance metric for Living Marine Resources (LMR) is the percent of fishermen complying with federal regulations.
Data Source	Boardings and violations are documented by USCG Report of Boarding Forms

	and entered into the Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) database. Data is also collected from the Coast Guard Law Enforcement Planning and Assessment System.
Collection Method	Coast Guard units enter their enforcement data directly into this database after completion of fisheries enforcement boardings. District, Area, and Headquarters law enforcement staffs review, validate, and assess the data on a quarterly basis as part of the Law Enforcement Planning and Assessment System.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The program manager (G-OPL) reviews entries into MISLE database monthly and compares to other sources of information (i.e., after-action reports, message traffic, etc.) to assess reliability of the database.2000: 95.8% Compliance Rate2001: 98.6% Compliance Rate2002: 97.3% Compliance Rate2003: 97.1% Compliance Rate2004: 96.3% Compliance Rate

Performance Measure	Percent reduction in the Maritime terrorism risk over which the Coast Guard has influence
Organization and Program	Ports Waterways and Coastal Security (PWCS)-United States Coast Guard
Scope	The data that comprises this measure comes from an annual quantitative self - assessment of the Coast Guard's activities with regard to risk-reduction. The baseline for this measure was set at the end of FY 2005. There are no significant limitations to the data except for the fact that it is a self assessment.
Data Source	The data source is subject matter expert evaluation of PWCS program stakeholders.
Collection Method	The input from several workshops (comprised of subject matter experts) is fed directly into a tightly-controlled excel spreadsheet. Round-table discussions focus on particular attack scenarios and the type and level of Coast Guard activities that were brought to bear each to reduce their risk. Discussions are informed by official reports of Coast Guard activities: both regulatory-regime and operationally oriented. Consensus agreement on the likely percent reduction in risk (by scenario) is recorded and reviewed by the Coast Guard's leadership. For the first iteration of this process (for FY 2005) no external validation was possible. The Coast Guard intends to seek external participation and validation in subsequent year's assessments.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The data which comprise the PWCS outcome measure are checked for reliability by comparing them to data from similar risk assessments of the maritime domain. Data is verified to ensure consistency in several areas including levels of threat, vulnerability, and consequence. Inconsistencies are noted, and subsequently, resolved or documented.

Performance Measure	Percent of mariners in imminent danger saved.
Organization and Program	Search and Rescue (SAR)-United States Coast Guard
Scope	One hundred percent of the maritime distress incidents reported to the Coast Guard are collected in the MISLE database. These case reports are then narrowed to include only cases where there was a positive data element in the field lives saved, lives lost before notification, or lives lost after notification. The scope of this data is further narrowed by excluding any case reports that have eleven or more lives saved and/or lost in a single incident. Data accuracy is limited by two factors. The first is the rescuers subjective interpretation of the policy criteria for the data point lives saved (For instance, was the life saved or simply assisted Would the individual have perished if aid had not been rendered). The second limitation is human error during data entry.
Data Source	Various CG databases: Search and Rescue Management Information System (SARMIS) I and II, Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE)
Collection Method	Since FY 2003, operational units input SAR data directly into MISLE. Program

	review and analysis can be conducted at higher levels (Districts, Areas, HQ).
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data is verified quarterly by the program manager (G-OPR) via data extraction and checks for anomalies within the data. Checks on data input are also made by individual case owners during case documentation processes prior. The database includes built-in prompts to check questionable data.

Performance Measure	The five-year average number of U.S. Coast Guard investigated oil spills greater than 100 gallons and chemical discharges into the navigable waters of the U.S. per 100 million short tons of chemical and oil products shipped in U.S. waters.
Organization and Program	Marine Environmental Protection (MEP)-United States Coast Guard
Scope	The performance metric for Marine Environmental Protection (MEP) is the five-year average number of U.S. Coast Guard investigated oil spills greater than 100 gallons and chemical discharges into navigable waters of the United States per 100 million short tons of chemicals and oil products shipped in U.S. waters.
Data Source	Vessel or facility operators are required by 40 CFR 300 to notify the Coast Guard of any discharge of oil or oil products that causes a sheen, discoloration, sludge or emulsion, and of any hazardous substance discharge that equals or exceeding the reportable quantity listed in 40 CFR 302. The Coast Guard has investigative jurisdiction for spills into or upon the navigable waters of the United States, adjoining shorelines, waters of the contiguous zone, Deepwater Ports, the Continental Shelf and other designated areas. The MEP metric is the sum of Coast Guard investigations of reportable chemical discharge incidents and investigations of incidents where 100 gallons or more of oil or oil products are discharged. Discharges onto land, into the air, into enclosed spaces, non-maritime sources (i.e. vehicles rail cars), naval public vessel, fixed platforms, pipelines as well as those from unspecified, unclassified, and unknown sources are also excluded.
Collection Method	The MEP metric is relative to the volume of Oil and Chemical shipping in U.S. waters. Data for the denominator is obtained from the annual report of the Waterborne Commerce of the United States compiled by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Coast Guard's Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement database is used to obtain spill quantities. The aggregate of all chemical spill investigations and investigations of oil spills greater than or equal to 100 gallons is used as this provides a broader indication of Marine Environmental Protection than just one or the other. It is important to note that all chemical spill investigations are counted as these are triggered by explicit reportable quantities while only investigations of oil spills greater than or equal to 100 gallons are counted, as this reduces the potential for year-to-year variability in the reporting of nominal oil spills.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	This measure evaluates how well the Coast Guard prevents discharges of chemicals or oil into U.S. navigable waters by comparing the current period to those of previous periods. Information recorded in the Coast Guard's Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement database is generally complete when the database is accessed. Some incidents are never reported, however, and some information is delayed in reaching the Coast Guard. Performance data will be revised as U.S. Army Corps shipping volume data becomes available. Duplicate information may occasionally be entered or an incident inadvertently omitted or incorrectly coded. Formal verification procedures strive to rectify any errors, and program logic and comprehensive user guides have been developed to ensure that data is highly reliable. The revised performance data will be available at the end of FY07 and available in next year's Performance and Accountability Report.

Performance Measure	Five-Year Average of Number of Collisions, Allisions, and Groundings (CAG)
Organization and Program	Aids to Navigation (AtoN)-United States Coast Guard
Scope	The performance measure for the Aids to Navigation (AtoN) program is a five-year average of collision, allision (vessel striking a fixed object), and grounding incidents (CAGs). The measure is the sum of all distinct CAG events involving commercial vessels operating on U.S. navigable waters for a given five-year period divided by five. Excluded from this data are CAGs between non-commercial vessels. A collision between a non-commercial vessel and a commercial vessel, however, would count as one CAG. Data reliability is impacted by lags in incident reporting, any failure of responsible parties to report casualties as required, and any errors in recording incidents.
Data Source	Data is obtained from the Coast Guard Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) database from December 2001 onward prior to that date, data was obtained from MISLE's predecessor, the Marine Safety Information System (MSIS)].
Collection Method	Sources of reports are most often vessel masters, operators, owners, or insurance companies, as well as other mariners. CAG incidents are required to be reported under 46 CFR 4.05.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Checks on data input are made by individual case owners during case documentation. The database includes drop-down menus and built-in prompts to check questionable data. Data is later formally verified for reliability and accuracy by G-PCA.

Performance Measure	Limit the number of days critical waterways are closed due to ice to 2 days in an average winter and 8 days in a severe winter.
Organization and Program	Ice Operations-United States Coast Guard
Scope	The performance metric for domestic Ice Operations is the number of days critical waterways are closed due to ice conditions. This is also based on the severity of the winter. Seven waterways have been identified as critical to Great Lakes icebreaking based on historical ice conditions, volume of ship traffic, and potential for flooding. Winter conditions are defined by a severity index (6.2 or milder defines average severity; more than 6.2 defines severe). The performance metric for polar Ice Operations is the percentage of requests for ice breaking support met by the Coast Guard. Coast Guard activity in this mission ensures the mobility needed to achieve the scientific research and logistics replenishment desired by other agencies operating in the polar regions.
Data Source	Domestic icebreaking: Data is obtained from Coast Guard and Army Corps of Engineers sources and validated at the Coast Guard District level. The Headquarters program managers also review the data when compiling the End of Season report. Polar icebreaking: Data comes from Coast Guard records of requests and daily operational status messages from each polar icebreaking cutter and is validated at the Coast Guard Headquarters level.
Collection Method	Domestic icebreaking: Winter conditions are defined by a severity index. Polar icebreaking: data comes from a comparison of interagency agreement on operational requirements of each support request against operational reports from ice breakers stating percent of support actually achieved for each request.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data is obtained from the Coast Guard and the Army Corps of Engineers. District offices validate the data. Program managers also review the data while compiling the End of Season summary report.

United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement

Performance Measure	Number of aliens removed as a percent of the total number ordered to be removed annually. (Number of aliens with a final order removed annually/Number of final orders that become executable in the same year-demonstrated as a percent).
Organization and Program	Detention and Removal-United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Scope	This measure demonstrates Detention and Removal Operations' overall productivity. The targets are set at a 10% increase from the FY 2006 actual.
Data Source	Currently, these data are collected from the Deportable Alien Control System (DACS).
Collection Method	Data are entered into DACS at field offices. The compiled data are then retrieved from DACS and Headquarters, Detention and Removal Operations (HQDRO). For quality control, data from DACS are matched against case records from EOIR.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The data integrity of DACS falls within the acceptable limits of any IT system. DRO drops data outside the norms or that is known to be faulty. This creates data that DRO considers highly reliable. This type of "normalization or cleaning" is done every day with every type of data. DRO has enough confidence in the data to use it for executive decision-making and for Congressional reporting. A system that will join apprehension data from the Enforcement Integrated Database (EID) with DACS data is in development. This improved system and will enable DRO to monitor and fully analyze the detention and removal process from the point of an alien's apprehension to their point of departure from the United States, as well as to provide data that will enable HQDRO and field managers to assess and correct data quality issues.

Performance Measure	Percent of closed investigations which have an enforcement consequence (arrest, indictment, conviction, seizure, fine or penalty).
Organization and Program	Investigations-United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Scope	Percent of closed cases worked by the Office of Investigations in a selected fiscal year that produced an enforcement consequence (e.g., arrest, indictment, conviction, seizure, fine and/or penalty).
Data Source	Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS)
Collection Method	TECS will be used to retrieve and mine the data elements for the number of closed cases and to produce the number that have enforcement consequences in relation to the cases worked.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Ad hoc reports generated through TECS are saved and repeated, as necessary, to ensure consistency of reporting. Results are compared with prior "like" reports to check for anomalies. Any geographic specific information with significant deviation is verified through the entering location. The measure was changed from active cases to cases closed so that multi-year cases would be counted only once (upon closure).

Performance Measure	Effectiveness of Federal Protective Service (FPS) operations measured by the Federal Facilities Security Index.
Organization and Program	Protection of Federal Assets-Federal Protective Service-United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Scope	The Federal Facilities Security Index is made up of 3 components: 1) How effective the FPS is in implementing security threat countermeasures (by

	comparing actual countermeasure implementation); 2) How well the countermeasures are working (by testing of countermeasures); and 3) How efficient FPS is in responding to incident calls for law enforcement by measuring response time. The security countermeasures that will be measured are guard services, x-ray machines, magnetometers, cameras, and other security devices/systems. The FPS Security Tracking System captures planned countermeasure deployment dates thereby eliminating estimated results. Planned countermeasure implementation versus actual implementation is estimated to be met 90% of the time. FPS has four Mega Centers that provide a response time report, which indicates the time, location, offense, and status on all incidents. This data will be analyzed to generate the effectiveness and efficiency of the performance measure.
Data Source	Federal Protective Service regional offices and headquarters.
Collection Method	On a quarterly basis, there will be a collection of data on the countermeasure implementation, field tests of countermeasure effectiveness, and FPS Law Enforcement response time. Quarterly comparison of regional performance against established target goals will be performed.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Verification/validation of countermeasures implementation will be done against implementation records. The countermeasures effectiveness will be verified against surveys and quality assurance audits to ensure that the procedures and scoring criteria are accurately applied.

United States Secret Service

Performance Measure	Percentage of instances protectees arrive and depart safely.
Organization and Program	Domestic Protectees (DP)-United States Secret Service
Scope	The Secret Service protects the President and Vice President and their families, former Presidents and their spouses, and other designated individuals. Program management continually monitors and reviews performance, including all instances of arrival and departure. There is no error rate for this measure.
Data Source	This program measure originates from every protective event or visit. The Secret Service conducts after action reviews to gauge performance of specific protective operations. These reviews are used to measure how successfully the Secret Service performed its mission and what can be done to increase efficiency without compromising a protectee or event
Collection Method	Results from Protective Operations, as well as any incident that may occur, are immediately reported by detail leaders to the Special Agent in Charge.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Any breach of Protective Operations would be immediately known and subject to a thorough investigation.

Performance Measure	Percentage of instances protectees arrive and depart safely-Foreign Dignitaries.
Organization and Program	Foreign Protectees and Foreign Missions (FP/FM)-United States Secret Service
Scope	The Secret Service protects visiting heads of state, heads of government, and their spouses and other distinguished visitors to the United States as directed by the President. The program also provides external security to foreign diplomatic embassies and missions in the Washington, D.C., area (and other limited areas, consistent with statute). Program management continually monitors and reviews performance, including all instances of arrival and departure. There is no error rate for this measure.
Data Source	This program measure originates from every protective event or visit. The Secret Service conducts after action reviews to gauge performance of specific protective operations. These reviews are used to measure how successfully the Secret Service performed its mission and what can be done to increase efficiency without compromising a protectee or event.
Collection Method	Results from Protective Operations, as well as any incident that may occur, are immediately reported by detail leaders to the Special Agent in Charge.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Any breach of Protective Operations would be immediately known and subject to a thorough investigation.

Performance Measure	Number of Protective Intelligence cases completed.
Organization and Program	Protective Intelligence (PI)-United States Secret Service
Scope	Protective intelligence cases are the highest priority cases worked by the Secret Service. Because they may directly impact the safety of our protectees, all cases are referred for investigation and tracked until completion. Overall error rates are less than one percent. Error is due to lag time in data entry or corrections to historical data.
Data Source	The Intelligence Program measure is collected from the Master Central Index (MCI) System. This system is used by all Secret Service investigative field offices, and provides a means of record keeping for all case and subject information.
Collection Method	The MCI database is comprised of case and arrest information, which is entered by USSS personnel.
Reliability	Reliable

How data is verified	MCI has many features built into it in order to provide the most accurate data possible. Along with the mainframe security features, there are many edit checks built into the application to ensure the accuracy and validity of the data. Only authorized headquarters and field personnel have access to the application, and they are governed by specific procedures to input case and arrest data.

Performance Measure	Counterfeit passed per million dollars of genuine U.S. currency.
Organization and Program	Financial Investigations (FI)-United States Secret Service
Scope	This measure is an indicator of the proportion of counterfeit currency relative to the amount of genuine U. S. currency in circulation. The measure reports the dollar value of counterfeit notes passed on the public per million dollars of genuine currency. Past audits indicate that overall error rates are less than one percent. Error is due to lag time in data entry or corrections to historical data.
Data Source	All Counterfeit program measures are collected from the Counterfeit/Contraband System (CCS). This system is used by all Secret Service investigative field offices, and provides a means of record keeping for all case and subject information.
Collection Method	The CCS database is comprised of global counterfeit activity on US currency, which is entered by USSS personnel.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	CCS has many features built into it in order to provide the most accurate data possible. Along with the mainframe security features, there are many edit checks built into the applications to ensure the accuracy and validity of the data. Only authorized headquarters and field personnel have access to the applications, and they are governed by specific procedures to input case and arrest data. Recurring verification reports are generated and reviewed to ensure data accuracy.

Performance Measure	Financial crimes loss prevented through a criminal investigation (in billions).
Organization and Program	Financial Investigations (FI)-United States Secret Service
Scope	This measure reports an estimate of the direct dollar loss prevented due to Secret Service intervention/interruption of a criminal venture through a criminal investigation. Error is due to lag time in data entry or corrections to historical data.
Data Source	The Financial Crimes Loss Prevented measure is collected from the Master Central Index (MCI) System. This system is used by all Secret Service investigative field offices, and provides a means of record keeping for all case and subject information.
Collection Method	The MCI database is comprised of case and arrest information, which is entered by USSS personnel.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	MCI has many features built into it in order to provide the most accurate data possible. Along with the mainframe security features, there are many edit checks built into the applications to ensure the accuracy and validity of the data. Only authorized headquarters and field personnel have access to the applications, and they are governed by specific procedures to input case and arrest data. An annual audit is conducted and recurring verification reports are generated and reviewed to reduce errors and ensure data accuracy.

Performance Measure	Financial crimes loss prevented by the Secret Service Electronic Crimes Task Forces (in millions).
Organization and Program	Infrastructure Investigations-United States Secret Service
Scope	This measure reports an estimate of the direct dollar loss prevented due to the Secret Service's Electronic Crimes Task Forces' investigations. Error is due to lag time in data entry or corrections to historical data.
Data Source	The Financial Crimes Loss Prevented measure is collected from the Master Central Index (MCI) System. This system is used by all Secret Service investigative field offices, and provides a means of record keeping for all case and subject information.
Collection Method	The MCI database is comprised of case and arrest information, which is entered by USSS personnel.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	MCI has many features built into it in order to provide the most accurate data possible. Along with the mainframe security features, there are many edit checks built into the applications to ensure the accuracy and validity of the data. Only authorized headquarters and field personnel have access to the applications, and they are governed by specific procedures to input case and arrest data. An annual audit is conducted and recurring verification reports are generated and reviewed to reduce errors and ensure data accuracy.

Performance Measure	Percentage of instances protectees arrive and depart safely.
Organization and Program	Campaign Protection-United States Secret Service
Scope	The CP program protects major Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates and nominees and their spouses, and President-elect and Vice President-elect and their immediate families. Program management continually monitors and reviews performance, including all instances of arrival and departure. There is no error rate for this measure.
Data Source	This program measure originates from every protective event or visit. The Secret Service conducts after action reviews to gauge performance of specific protective operations. These reviews are used to measure how successfully the Secret Service performed its mission and what can be done to increase efficiency without compromising a protectee or event.
Collection Method	Results from Protective Operations, as well as any incident that may occur, are immediately reported by detail leaders to the Special Agent in Charge.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Any breach of Protective Operations would be immediately known and subject to a thorough investigation.