

Performance Data and Analysis

Results at a Glance

Table 2-1 presents the Department's performance results in detail, charting Interior targets as they are tied to our end outcome goals, mission areas, and strategic goal of management excellence. Because this is only the second year that we are measuring our performance using targets from our FY 2003-2008 Strategic Plan, trend data are generally not meaningful, although there are a few exceptions for those measures that were carried over from our previous Strategic Plan to the current plan. Data presented in *Table 2-1* include (1) the measure ID number (which corresponds to references to these measures in the MD&A section); (2) a description of the performance measure; (3) historical data for FY 2004 and prior years, if available; (4) the planned performance target for FY 2005; (5) the actual results for FY 2005; (6) an explanation, if applicable, of why we either exceeded or fell short of performance and how we plan to improve in the future; and (7) data sources used to validate reliability.

Data Verification and Validation

To credibly report progress toward intended results and to be able to use data in decision-making, Interior needs to ensure that its performance information is sufficiently accurate, reliable, and sound. GPRA requires agencies to describe the means used to verify and validate measured performance as part of annual performance reports. Verification includes assessing data completeness, accuracy, and consistency and related quality control practices. Validation is the assessment of whether the data are appropriate to measure performance.

The Department of the Interior requires the full implementation of data validation and verification criteria to ensure that information is properly collected, recorded, processed, and aggregated for reporting and use by decision-makers. In January 2003, the Department issued a memorandum requiring that a data verification and validation (V&V) process to be put into place and used effectively by all bureaus and offices collecting and reporting performance data. A data V&V assessment matrix, developed in cooperation with departmental bureaus and offices, including the Office of the Inspector General, was issued with the

memorandum. The matrix has been used successfully as a tool to elevate data V&V procedures to an acceptable functional level within an organization or to detect potential problem areas in well-established bureau/office data V&V systems.

Interior uses four categories of performance data throughout its performance verification and validation process:

1. Final. All data are available, verified, and validated for the measure. Actual numbers are reported. Performance analysis can be completed. This includes the characterizing of data as “goal met,” “exceeded,” or “not met,” along with comparing the result with the target and describing why the result meets, exceeds, or falls short of the target.

2. Preliminary. All data are available but are not verified and validated for the measure. No analysis should be conducted (i.e. these data reports are considered similar to a “no report” in that the data are not verifiable either directly or via a valid, documented, repeatable estimation methodology, and therefore cannot be factored as either goal met/exceeded or not met); these data are reported as preliminary.

3. Estimated. Some data are unavailable, unverified, and not validated for the measure. A reasonable methodology should be developed and applied to estimate the annual performance. Once the estimation methodology is documented and is proven repeatable and valid, estimated data can be factored into the “goal met/exceeded” or “not met” aggregation.

4. No Data. Data are unavailable and there are insufficient sources to develop a reasonable estimate. No report on the measure can be made.

Data Completeness and Reliability

Performance data included in Interior’s FY 2005 PAR are considered complete and reliable and contain no material inadequacies.

Interior performance data for FY 2005 are presented as actual data for the entire fiscal year, as estimated year-end results, or as preliminary or incomplete data. Interior defines a “Goal Met” if the actual data are within 5% of the target. In cases where our target took the form of establishing a baseline, we report the

goal met if the baseline was established in the reporting year. The methodology used for the estimate projection is documented within the “Performance Report and Discussion” field of the data tables.

In FY 2005, there were 20 instances in which no data could be reported. Explanations for the unavailability of final data are provided in every instance. Final performance data for estimated and unreported data will be included in the FY 2007 President’s Performance Budget or no later than FY 2006.

Performance Data Sources

A key element of reporting valid, accurate, and reliable performance data is ensuring that sources of data are documented and available. Interior bureaus and offices are continuing to improve their data management processes by developing better sources of data and by linking with current data sources that already have reporting, verification, and validation procedures in place. For example, the Bureau of Reclamation maintains an internal data/Internet site containing data on projects, dam and power facilities, and water-related statistics to verify annual performance data. Data from regions and area offices are reviewed quarterly to ensure that BOR is on track and reporting consistently. The BLM requires its State and field offices to maintain documentation to support the performance measurement reported by each office, and to enter supporting data into its Management Information System. OSM collects information from internal operations and from States and Indian Tribes. Abandoned Mine Land Program information is generally collected through the Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System (AMLIS). AMLIS is a computer database used by the State Reclamation Programs and maintained by OSM.

This year, data sources for each of our measures are shown in our Goals at a Glance Tables as an additional column.

Key to Table 2-1

One of three summary conclusions is reported for each measure that presents actual or estimated results data: Goal Met; Goal Not Met; or Goal Exceeded. Given statistical uncertainties, “Goal Met” is reported if the actual or estimated performance result is from 95% to 105% of the performance target. If the sum-

mary conclusion for a measure is “Goal Met,” “Goal Exceeded,” or “Baseline Established,” then the result is visually depicted by a checkmark placed in a separate column. No summary conclusion is presented for measures that report preliminary data (i.e., data that were collected but not verified as being accurate) or incomplete data because the GPRA implementation guidelines do not allow agencies to compare these types of data with performance goals. An “(E)” is included in the “FY 2005 Actual” column if the result presented is an estimate. A “(P)” in this column indicates that the result presented is based on preliminary data.

Program Evaluations

Program evaluations are an important tool in analyzing the effectiveness and efficiency of our programs, and in evaluating whether they are meeting their intended objectives. Our programs are evaluated through a variety of means, including performance audits, the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), financial audits, management control reviews, and external reviews from Congress, OMB, OIG, and other organizations, such as the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) and the National Academy of Sciences (NAS). We use self-assessments to verify that performance information and measurement systems are accurate and support our strategic direction and goals. Data collection and reporting processes are further reviewed and improved through the use of customer and internal surveys.

Examples of some of the program evaluations conducted for each of Interior’s bureaus during FY 2005 follow in *Table 2-2*. (Note - this table includes PART assessments conducted during FY 2005 for Budget Year 2007). *Table 2-3* lists all PARTs conducted during FY 2003 for Budget Year 2005, while *Table 2-4* shows all PARTs conducted during FY 2005 for Budget Year 2007.

In all cases, Interior program managers have developed action plans in response to OMB’s recommendations regarding the PARTed programs. These action plans were first implemented early in FY 2003 for programs assessed in FY 2002. While periodic progress reports have been provided to OMB, Interior program managers and executives are actively tracking progress toward implementing recommendations to improve their programs. Interior is using a Web-

based management system to track and monitor its progress, and formal progress reviews are conducted on a quarterly basis.

Copies of specific program reviews can be obtained by writing the Department of the Interior, Office of Planning and Performance Management, Mail Stop 5258, 1849 C Street, NW, Washington, DC 20240. Please be specific regarding the program review of interest.