Department of Homeland Security

Performance Budget Overview
Appendix A

Fiscal Year 2007
Congressional Budget Justification

Performance Budget Overview

Appendix A: Verification and Validation of Measures

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

- Reliable – 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 and 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. If data is classified as reliable an explanation follows in the tables of how data is verified.
- 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.

Descriptions of the means used to verify and validate data for each performance measure are presented by DHS strategic goal in the order of the Performance Budget Overview.

STRATEGIC GOAL - 1. AWARENESS - Identify and understand threats, assess vulnerabilities, determine potential impacts and disseminate timely information to our homeland security partners and the American public.

Performance Measure	Percent of Federal, State and local agencies that maintain connectivity with the Homeland Security Operations Center (HSOC) via 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 - Analysis and Operations
Scope	The scope of this measure is all nation-wide targeted agencies for connectivity with the Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN).
Data Source	The data results from counting the organizations participating as recorded in the HSIN database, and dividing that by the number of targeted participant organizations.
Collection Method	Data will be collected manually and tracked manually using an Excel - based tracking log.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Reliable data has been available since FY 2005. The data is verified manually by making telephone calls to each HSIN user to verify that they are in fact connected. Other cross - checking methods include verifying collected numbers against paid HSIN - user invoices, or printing a copy of available users by search of an HSIN address file via the network.

Performance Measure	Number of successful attacks resulting from mishandling or misinterpreting intelligence information received by TSA intelligence service.
Organization and Program	Intelligence - Transportation Security Administration
Scope	This measure incorporates any successful attack to the transportation system that the Transportation Security Administrations intelligence program was given prior notice of and had the ability to prevent with available resources.
Data Source	Intelligence data received through secure channels and classified reports that include all attacks that have occurred to the transportation system.
Collection Method	An analyst reviews classified reports of successful attacks and then references those attacks to previously held intelligence data to determine if in fact, the data was mishandled in some way so that the preventable attack was not prevented.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Source data undergoes vetting and review throughout the intelligence community. Transportation Security Administration intelligence program supervisory and management levels review analysis and conclusions. In addition, it is anticipated that for major incidents external entities similar to the 911 Commission for the events leading to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, will review the data to determine if the intelligence program mishandled or misinterpreted information that should have been disseminated to prevent any applicable threat.

Performance Measure	Number of cases encountered involving a terrorist or criminal nexus which denies an individual a benefit or access to the nation's transportation system.
Organization and Program	Transportation Vetting and Credentialing - Transportation Security Administration
Scope	This measure captures the number of persons (cases per 100,000 persons) denied a benefit or access to the nations transportation system as a result of the threat assessment methodologies utilized by the Transportation Threat Assessment Credentialing (TTAC) office and its programs.
Data Source	TTAC programs are required to maintain records on all persons that have been reviewed for a benefit or access to the nation's transportation system.
Collection Method	TTAC prepares a weekly report which summarizes the activity of each program.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The TTAC programs were established to specifically reduce the probability of a successful terrorist or other criminal attack to the transportation system. Since this is the core mission requirement for all of TTAC the results of all cases are thoroughly reviewed and adjudicated before a final outcome is issued.

Performance Measure	Percentage of individuals who have undergone a background investigation through one of the Transportation Vetting and Credentialing programs, and who pose no identified threat to the transportation system.
Organization and Program	Transportation Vetting and Credentialing - Transportation Security Administration
Scope	This measure includes all individuals that apply and pass a background investigation conducted through the Transportation Vetting and Credentialing program.
Data Source	The Program Management Offices of each program in the Transportation Vetting and Credentialing program. Transportation Vetting and Credentialing program programs are required to maintain records on all persons that have been reviewed for a benefit or access to the nation's transportation system.
Collection Method	Data is collected through the program management offices for each program within the Transportation Vetting and Credentialing program. The Transportation Vetting and Credentialing office prepares a weekly report which summarizes the activity of each program.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Transportation Vetting and Credentialing programs were established to specifically reduce the probability of a successful terrorist or other criminal attack to the transportation system. Since this is the core mission requirement, the results of all cases are thoroughly reviewed and adjudicated before a final outcome is issued.

STRATEGIC GOAL - 2. PREVENTION - Detect, deter and mitigate threats to our homeland.

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	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 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	Percent of canines 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' twice yearly evaluation results have been kept over time and clearly show the history, success, and high standards of this program. 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 FY05 the Automated Targeting System (ATS) will be used by the port members to input this data.
Collection Method	CSI Port Team Leaders track statistics using an existing Excel spreadsheet. Data is collected daily and reported weekly. In FY05 these statistics will be 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 available currently.

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	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) Technologies.
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	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	Apprehensions and seizures at checkpoints - effectiveness of checkpoint operations in apprehensions and seizures as they relate to border enforcement activities.
Organization and Program	Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry - Customs and Border Protection
Scope	The measure compares the number of apprehensions and seizures at interior checkpoints to the number of apprehensions and seizures through all other operational pursuits.
Data Source	Summary records from Border Patrol Sectors for Checkpoint Activity from FY2000 through 2004. Data are maintained in two databases: ENFORCE, BPETS.
Collection Method	Primary apprehension and seizure data are recorded by Border Patrol Agents in ENFORCE and used to update the Border Patrol statistics (BPETS - Border Patrol Enforcement Tracking System).
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Multiple levels of review of BPETS and ENFORCE data are conducted by Supervisory Border Patrol Agents first at the Station level (primary) and then again by second level Supervisory Agents in the Sectors before a final review and reliability check is conducted at Headquarters. Data are analyzed for completeness and accuracy.

Performance Measure	Border Miles Under Operational Control.
Organization and Program	Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry - Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Number of miles under Operational Control, as defined in the National Strategic Plan, is the ability to detect, respond to, and interdict border penetrations in areas deemed as high priority for threat potential or other national security objectives. Operational Control will be achieved in a tactical zone when the level of border security (controlled, managed, monitored) in that specific zone matches the level of threat/risk (High, Medium, or Low).
Data Source	Sectors' yearly operational plans, after action reports, and daily activity reports. Additional sources for verification and input include, but are not limited to Uniform Crime Reports (UCRs), other Agency reports for verification, IDENT (the automated Biometric Identification System - used in the US VISIT program), ENFORCE, (Enforcement Case Tracking System) which processes cases and management functions in a single system.
Collection Method	Border Patrol Agents record data as activities occur. Verification of event records and data collected from outside sources are through formal liaison relationships with other local, state, or federal law enforcement agencies.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	After field agents collect data on such activity as apprehensions, turn - backs and gotaways, local field managers determine the extent of operational control present in their area of responsibility and then use independent third party indicators to validate their conclusions. These results are reviewed and questioned by senior field and headquarters managers as a second and third level of data control.

Performance Measure	Percent of internal population 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	Percent 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 divided by the total number of expected ACE Trade accounts.
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	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.
Data Source	Topaz (a COTS software solution developed by Mercury Interactive). Topaz 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 problems.
Collection Method	"Utilizing data collected from its monitoring components, Topaz will: 1. Capture typical US VISIT passenger query session into a script. 2. Parameterize the script for general use. 3. Establish thresholds for service levels. 4. Eliminate unnecessary hardware components. 5. Capture metrics (Topaz transactions) 6. Develop a baseline site for comparison.7. Employ distributed monitoring. 8. Implement reporting and notification processes.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Verification and validation is assessed by a system called TOPAZ which measures TECs availability to end users by making continuous contact attempts to ascertain whether the system is available. Failures are confirmed by TECs managers. Availability metrics from Topaz were validated against currently obtained metrics which are based on an aggregation of component availability for the application, and were congruent. During implementation, field sites were appraised of the effort with Topaz and provided access to the Topaz reporting system, which matched response times and availability metrics measured manually at the field sites which were taking measurements. Network and system internal metrics were used for validation. The next phase of Topaz end - user monitoring, currently underway, will focus on the 54 US Visit land border sites.

Performance Measure	Percentage of no - launches to prevent acts of terrorism and other illegal activities arising from unlawful movement of people and goods across the borders of the United States.
Organization and Program	Air and Marine Operations - Customs and Border Protection
Scope	Air and Marine Operations (AMO) 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 AMO 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	Percentage of Architecture layers assessed.
Organization and Program	Systems Engineering and Architecture - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	The scope of the data is a final written annual report by the Office of Systems Architecture. The report reviews the layers of the architecture, and the layers of capabilities of the global nuclear detection system.
Data Source	The data source will be the Office of Systems Architecture's annual Global Nuclear Detection Architecture Report.
Collection Method	Each year the Resource Manager is scheduled to receive an unclassified copy of the report for their review.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The reliability of data (layers assessed) is verified by the Resource Manager's review of the annual written report prepared by the Lead Systems Architect.

Performance Measure	Number of Architecture layers defined.
Organization and Program	Systems Engineering and Architecture - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	The scope of the data is a final written report by the Office of Systems Architecture. The report outlines the layers of the architecture, and the layers of capabilities of the global nuclear detection system.
Data Source	The data source will be the Office of Systems Architecture's Global Nuclear Detection Architecture Report.
Collection Method	Each year the Resource Manager is scheduled to receive an unclassified copy of the report.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The reliability of data is verified by the Resource Manager who receives and reviews a copy of the annual written report to determine that the architecture has been defined. The report prepared by the Lead Systems Architect will outline and discuss all nine layers of the architecture.

Performance Measure	Number of next generation detection systems acquired.
Organization and Program	Systems Development and Acquisition - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	The range of data includes the acquisition of approximately 1200 Advanced Spectroscopic Portal Monitors over a five year period, with an estimated annual acquisition schedule of 100 to 300 units. These Advanced Spectroscopic Portal Monitors support both fixed and mobile applications replacing and augmenting the current generation of technology employed by Customs and Border Protection at U.S. port of entries.
Data Source	The source of the data is from the manufacturer that produces the Advanced Spectroscopic Portal Monitor. When the manufacturer ships the finished unit they issue a Material Inspection Report, DD Form 250 to the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office government Contracting Officer's Technical Representative. Also, at the deployment location the operating agency (end user) must submit to the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office Deployment Manager a signed test report.
Collection Method	The Contracting Officer's Technical Representative receives the signed Material Inspection Report and the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office Deployment Manager receives signed test reports from the operating agencies (end users) certifying that each deployed monitor is operational.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Domestic Nuclear Detection Office Contracting Officer's Technical Representative along with the Contracting Specialist reviews each contract to ensure completeness of all deliverables and for compliance with the legal requirements of the contract.

Performance Measure	Number of individual Urban Area Security Designs prepared for the Securing the Cities Program.
Organization and Program	Systems Development and Acquisition - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	In FY 2006, there are 35 high risk urban areas in the United States. In the first year of the program, a generic Area Security Design will be developed and offered for implementation to State and local organizations in three of the 35 areas. Data required for a Security Design include population, population density, road and rail traffic volumes and corridors (including natural and manmade chokepoints), maritime commercial activity, infrastructure investments (especially oil and chemical industries), etc.
Data Source	Source information will come from available Federal agencies (Office of Information Analysis Infrastructure Protection and Transportation Security Administration, The Department of Homeland Security; United States Geological Survey, The Department of Interior), 26 states and local governments for the high risk urban areas.
Collection Method	After an agreement is reached with an urban area on the development of a Security Design, a Memorandum of Agreement will be created between the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office and the urban areas representatives to specify the nature and types of data to be collected by each party and the types of research and analyses for developing needed information for the Design. The Memorandum of Agreement will specify when reports are to be completed and submitted to the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	The Program Manager will compile these reports into a data base that will allow various reports to be run so that information can be easily accessed and validated.

Performance Measure	Number of multi agency working group program reviews held for the Securing the Cities Program.
Organization and Program	Systems Development and Acquisition - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	The number of agency meetings will range from three to six annually.
Data Source	The source of the data will include schedules, briefings, correspondence, memoranda for the record, and other records of the program reviews.
Collection Method	The Program Manager will ensure that all briefings are confirmed with a memoranda for the record or attendance rosters to reflect the date and subject topic.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Program Manager will maintain files that will be available on request for review by participants. The Program Manager also produces a weekly status report to the Assistant Director, Office Systems Development and Acquisition. In this report, the Assistant Director is notified on the status of the working program reviews.

Performance Measure	Number of Cargo Advanced Automated Radiography Systems acquired.
Organization and Program	Systems Development and Acquisition - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	Develop and test zero to three Cargo Advanced Automated Radiography Systems prototypes. Conduct high fidelity testing at the Nevada Test Site. Once the prototype is determined that it meets the requirements of the contract, the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office will initiate a contract to procure Cargo Advanced Automated Radiography Systems.
Data Source	The source of the data is from the manufacturer that produces the Cargo Advanced Automated Radiography Systems prototypes. When the manufacturer ships the prototype they issue a Material Inspection Report, DD Form 250 to the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office government Contracting Officer's Technical Representative. Also, once the prototype is tested, the independent vendor must submit to the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office Deployment Manager a signed test report.
Collection Method	The Contracting Officer's Technical Representative receives the signed Material Inspection Report and the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, Program Manager receives signed test reports from the independent vendor.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Domestic Nuclear Detection Office Contracting Officer's Technical Representative along with the Contracting Specialist reviews each contract to ensure completeness of all deliverables and for compliance with the legal requirements of the contract.

Performance Measure	Percent of proposals awarded.
Organization and Program	Transformational Research and Development - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	The data can range from 0 to 100 percent. The range would vary depending on the number of proposals that are awarded contracts to pursue further research, and the total number of proposals that were submitted.
Data Source	The number of proposals actually submitted for review can be found at the Transformational Research and Development Office's website.
Collection Method	All candidates must enter proposals into the Transformational Research and Development Office's website. The website will contain all proposals, and a detailed report can be run and reviewed by the Office. Once the population of eligible proposals is identified, that figure is divided into the proposals that are awarded contracts. The result would be the success rate (i.e. percentage).
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Transformational Research and Development Office's website will contain all submitted proposals eligible for tracking. In addition, the proposals that are selected for further development are done through actual contract awards. The Website administrator will run an annual report identifying all proposals submitted, and forward it to the Deputy Assistant Director of the Office of Transformational Research and Development for their review. All proposals that are selected for further development will be tracked through the use of assigned contract award numbers.

Performance Measure	Number of advanced detection technologies successfully demonstrated.
Organization and Program	Transformational Research and Development - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	The scope (range) of the data will include one to two successful Advanced Technology Demonstrations approved annually. These approved Advanced Technology Demonstrations will identify those innovative technologies that merit further development.
Data Source	The independent vendor, in their written report, will prove that the prototypes demonstrated are technically sound, have technical merit, and meet the specific deliverables outlined in the contract.
Collection Method	Once the independent vendor has completed the Advanced Technology Demonstration, the vendor, in their written report, is responsible for demonstrating to the Program Manager that all the specific deliverables in the contract have been met.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Program Manager reviews the Advanced Technology Demonstration and decides that the independent vendor has met all the deliverables within the contract. Then, the Advanced Technology Demonstration is sent to the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, Office of Transformational Research and Development; and the Contracting Officer for their final approval.

Performance Measure	Number of tests conducted annually to assess system capability.
Organization and Program	Assessments - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	The range of data will vary depending on the number of tests performed annually. This can range from zero to two tests conducted annually.
Data Source	Contracts are awarded to individual vendors to perform test and evaluation analysis on specific technologies. After completion of test and evaluation analysis, the contractors are required to provide an independent report describing the test conditions, data measured, and conclusions.
Collection Method	The Resource Manager will be responsible for collecting the test and evaluation reports provided by the contractors after each test and evaluation.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Net Assessment Cell representative (Database Analyst) will be responsible for gathering, reviewing, and conducting an analysis of test data for completeness and accuracy. Once the test data has been verified and validated for accuracy, it will then be entered into the established database by the Database Analyst. The Net Assessment Cell Supervisor will personally review all the test data and make an entry in a log book attesting to the number and accuracy of the tests conducted.

Performance Measure	Number of Red Teaming exercises conducted.
Organization and Program	Assessments - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	The range of data will vary depending on the number of exercises actually conducted. This can range from zero to two exercises annually.
Data Source	At the completion of each Red Teaming exercise, the Red Teaming Office is required to produce an After Action Review document. The purpose of the After Action Reviews is to develop lessons learned, and recommend strategies to mitigate system vulnerabilities.
Collection Method	Each year the Resource Manager will collect and count all completed After Action Reviews in order to determine the number of Red Teaming exercises performed during the year.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The data is reliable because after each test/exercise an After Action Report must be completed along with conducting a lessons learned session. The reports will then go through a formal review and approval process conducted by the Program Manager, and the Assistant Director, Office of Assessments, prior to being completed and submitted as part of the overall verification process.

Performance Measure	Number of Net Assessments performed.
Organization and Program	Assessments - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	The range of data will vary depending on the number of assessments performed. This can range from zero to one assessment conducted annually.
Data Source	Prior to the initiation of a Red Teaming exercise, the Net Assessment Office is required to develop a "Playbook" (operational plan) which is used to control and coordinate all exercise operations.
Collection Method	Each year the Resource Manager will collect and count all "playbooks" (operational plan) produced by the Net Assessment Office.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The data is reliable because a formalized "Playbook" (operational plan) must be developed prior to engaging in Red Teaming exercises. The Resource Manager will be an active participant, and have input and knowledge of the overall verification process. Prior to final submission of a Playbook (operational plan) by the Resource Manager, the Assessment supervisor will conduct a personal review and conduct a session to address any clarification/accuracy matters.

Performance Measure	Number of personnel trained in radiological and nuclear preventive detection skills.
Organization and Program	Operations Support - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	The pool of training recipients (law enforcement and first responder personnel) is nationwide. This year will serve as a pilot training year to evaluate curriculum with representative audiences of targeted training recipients ranging from 1000 to 1200 recipients annually.
Data Source	The training will be conducted by Operations Support, Training and Exercise Unit personnel or by a designated contractor. The training data will be collected via the Training and Exercise Unit within the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office. The data collected will reflect enrollment totals and provide necessary training census data information, i.e. profession and location of recipients.
Collection Method	Data collection will be collected via attendance rosters from each training event.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data originally collected via the attendance rosters will be transferred to an excel spreadsheet that will become the database used to validate data, retain pertinent information, and run various reports. Training and Exercise Unit personnel and the contractor will follow a set course schedule. At the end of each course, the Resource Manager will verify the submitted attendance rosters against the course schedule to ensure all attendance rosters are submitted and accounted for.

Performance Measure	New Program for FY 2007; Measure to be developed.
Organization and Program	Radiological and Nuclear Forensics and Attribution - Domestic Nuclear Detection Office
Scope	TBD
Data Source	TBD
Collection Method	TBD
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Reliable data will be available no later than 2 quarters after the measure is developed, and the methodology by May, 2006.

Performance Measure	Total number of programs accredited and re - accredited through Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation (FLETA).
Organization and Program	Accreditation - Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
Scope	Most Significant Program Measure. This measure identifies the number of programs accredited through FLETA. The application process begins when the organizational leader submits a completed application identifying a specific federal law enforcement training program or course for accreditation and an individual designated as the Accreditation Manager (AM). The process initiates commitment from both the submitting organization and the Executive Director of the Office of Accreditation (OA), who issues the start - up materials, the FLETA Standards Manual, and assigns a program specialist (OA staff member) to assist the AM through the process. The training and services provided by the OA are at no charge to the applicant. Accredited Federal Law Enforcement Training programs ensure the programs are well - developed, delivered and evaluated. Program graduates are expected to have the knowledge and skills to fulfill their responsibilities in a safe and highly proficient manner.
Data Source	The source for this measure is a file containing completed application forms.
Collection Method	The Executive Director of the Office of Accreditation collects the information from the Applications File and compiles it into the Applicant Tracking Report which shows where each applicant is in the Accreditation process. The report is provided to the FLETA Board for review at regularly scheduled meetings.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The OA personnel verify the data through periodic manual reviews. No known data integrity problems exist.

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 Center aspires.
Collection Method	The SQTS is part of the FLETC Automated Testing and Evaluation System (FATES), which entails the (1) the 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) the 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 express an agree or strongly agree on the Partner Organization Satisfaction Survey (POSS).
Organization and Program	Law Enforcement Training - Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
Scope	The results of the survey 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	On an annual basis, 100% of FLETC partner organizations are surveyed using the Partner Organization Satisfaction Survey (POSS). The survey uses a modified six - point Likert scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Slightly Agree, Slightly Disagree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree).
Collection Method	Completed surveys are returned to the FLETC, electronically scanned using Optical Character Recognition (OCR) software and the results are calculated.
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.

Performance Measure	Number of aliens with a final order removed in a quarter/Number of final orders that become executable in the same quarter (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. When the measure is less than one, it shows DRO is removing fewer aliens than are issued removal orders by an immigration judge during the same period. When the measure is greater than one, DRO is removing those aliens and others in the fugitive population (Aliens issued final orders of removal in absentia, having failed to appear in court, fall into the category of fugitives.) Heavy clerical workloads at DROs 22 field offices account for predictable gaps between the date of an aliens removal from the U. S. and the date that removal is entered into DRO's data system. Analysis has shown the number of removals recorded for a reporting period may increase up to 6%, as completed case files are closed in the system. Normally, data from DRO is compared against the Executive Office of Immigration Reform (EOIR) data.
Data Source	Currently, these data are collected from the Deportable Alien Control System (DACS), then compared with data from the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR). When the ENFORCE Removal Module (EREM) deploys, data for this measure will be collected from EREM and then compared against data from EOIR.
Collection Method	Data are entered into DACS (soon to be ENFORCE Removal Module (EREM)) at field offices. The compiled data is then retrieved from DACS/EREM 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. Furthermore, due to recent data clean - up efforts for the move to the ENFORCE Removals Module (EREM); DRO has more confidence now in the data than any other time since DACS was deployed. As part of the migration to EREM, many known data errors in DACS will be corrected before implementation. This effort will significantly improve the overall data integrity of DACS and EREM. New policies and procedures will be implemented to require greater supervisory oversight of data within the system. Supervisors will be required to review more cases within the system for accuracy and completeness.

Performance Measure	Percent of closed investigations which have an enforcement consequence (arrest, indictment, conviction, seizure, fine or penalty).
Organization and Program	Office of 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	Number of biometric watch list hits for visa applicants processed at consular offices.
Organization and Program	Screening Coordination and Operations Office (SCO) - Screening Coordination Operations
Scope	The Department of State (DoS) has deployed a biometric capture capability, known as the BioVisa Program, in all consular offices worldwide as of October 26, 2004. This measure provides a count of the number of BioVisa non - immigrant/immigrant visa applications resulting in biometric only hits.
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 DoS - CLASS hit is "No" value in the IDENT BioVisa Biometric hit log.
Collection Method	Data is extracted from the IDENT system 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 and analyzed and collected for weekly, monthly, and quarter reporting and review.

Performance Measure	Ratio of adverse actions to total biometric watch list hits at ports of entry.
Organization and Program	Screening Coordination and Operations Office (SCO) - Screening Coordination Operations
Scope	Ratio of the number of verified biometric hits in secondary inspection referred to passport control secondary resulting 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 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.

Performance Measure	Number of biometric watch list hits for travelers processed at ports of entry.
Organization and Program	Screening Coordination and Operations Office (SCO) - Screening Coordination Operations
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 in secondary for which there were no associated TECS biographic hits.
Data Source	Data is drawn from the US - VISIT Consolidated Report Data file, which reports data extracted from the IDENT system Biometric Hit Log where TECS hits is "No" value for required reporting period.
Collection Method	Data is extracted from the IDENT system 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.

Performance Measure	Number of bioaerosol collectors deployed in the top threat cities.
Organization and Program	Biological Countermeasures - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The additional collectors will be deployed in the top threat cities to improve the spatial coverage and to provide flexibility for covering special venues and events. The cities will have the highest priority say as to where they feel additional coverage is necessary. Detailed site planning will be done by DHS. These negotiations, decisions, and site studies will occur through 2Q FY 2006 resulting in the majority of actual deployments occurring in 3 - 4Q FY 2006.
Data Source	Contractor reports of actual number of additional collectors deployed to high threat cities.
Collection Method	On - site validation on an annual basis of additional collectors that are operational or ready for special use.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Percent completion of an effective restoration capability to restore key infrastructure to normal operation after a chemical attack.
Organization and Program	Chemical Countermeasures - 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, and 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 method used will be to obtain and compile written documentation from interagency partners of central relevance to component milestones, augmented by minutes of record generated at regular meetings of approximately monthly periodicity.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	This measure is considered reliable because it addresses a key national capability gap and is the subject of considerable and frequent interaction among the interagency through several working groups.

Performance Measure	Cumulative number of air cargo and rail passenger explosives screening pilots initiated.
Organization and Program	Explosives Countermeasures - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The purpose of the pilot is to demonstrate the feasibility of incorporating additional security requirements in air cargo and rail passenger screening both effectively and efficiently. Each pilot that is initiated and counted in the measure must meet minimum standards and specifications developed by the program.
Data Source	The source of the data is based on the program manager report that demonstrates that the pilot meets the standards and specifications and has begun.
Collection Method	The data will be collected, stored, and monitored using an internal database by ST program managers.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Average of expert reviews of improvement in the national capability to assess threats of terrorist attacks.
Organization and Program	Threat Awareness Portfolio - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	Ten (10) categories will be assessed for each sponsored effort. There will be an overall score given to each effort on a scale from 1 to 10.
Data Source	The data source will be the annual review by the Expert Advisory Board. The Board will review information about each of the ten research areas.
Collection Method	Data will be collected by program managers, who will be guided by the scope and focus of the review and by specific questions from the Board.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Percent of standards introduced that are adopted by Department of Homeland Security and partner agencies.
Organization and Program	Standards - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	Adopted standards are standards that 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	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Number of Department of Homeland Security official technical standards introduced.
Organization and Program	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, stored, and monitored using an internal database.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Percentage of program funding dedicated to developing technologies in direct response to DHS components' requirements.
Organization and Program	Support to Department of Homeland Security Components - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The data will be gathered from subprograms approved by the ST Requirements Council (SRC) and the Support to Components program expenditures and obligations.
Data Source	The source includes the SRC - approved subprograms and budget documentation.
Collection Method	The data will be collected, stored, and monitored using an internal database.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

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. At a minimum, experts will review each Center of Excellence by the end of its second full year of inception.
Data Source	The data source will be the External Review Panel scores.
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	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Average customer satisfaction rating with risk assessments to identify potential future threats.
Organization and Program	Emerging Threats - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The data used will be an annual documented assessment of customer satisfaction. Customers include other portfolio managers within the Science and Technology (ST) Directorate and the ST Directorate's Senior Management.
Data Source	The data source will be a customer satisfaction survey with questions evaluated on a scale of 1 to 10 designed to solicit customer comments not only as to their satisfaction with the risk assessments, but also to identify additional information of value and other factors that would make the risk assessment more useful.
Collection Method	The collection methodology will be an annual documented customer satisfaction survey.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	The customer survey will provide direct assessment of whether desired outcomes are being met. Projects in capability development to meet emergent threats and high - risk, high - pay off basic technology research are monitored and reviewed individually by Federal program managers and the portfolio manager to ensure that each project is performing per contractual agreement and whose results support the Emerging Threats long - term goals. A data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Number of prototypes delivered through DHS funded projects through Technical Support Working Group (TSWG), Rapid Technology Application Program (RTAP) and Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program.
Organization and Program	Rapid Prototyping - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The data are the actual number of prototypes delivered through RTAP, TSWG and SBIR. The term "delivered" is defined as an actual prototype delivered for operational testing and evaluation.
Data Source	The source of the data/information is the RTAP, TSWG and SBIR Program Managers who tracks and reports on the overall status of the RTAP, TSWG, and SBIR program on a monthly basis and conducts reviews of individual projects on a periodic basis, but yearly as a minimum.
Collection Method	The method used will be to obtain, compile, and analyze written documentation from the RTAP, TSWG, SBIR Program Manager on a quarterly basis.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Actual number of prototypes delivered through RTAP, TSWG, and SBIR will provide direct assessment of whether desired outcomes are being met. RTAP, TSWG and SBIR programs are monitored and reviewed individually by Federal program managers and the portfolio manager to ensure that each project is performing per contractual agreement and whose results support the Rapid Prototyping long - term goals. A data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Number of operational flight hours of Counter - MANPADS system conducted in a commercial aviation environment.
Organization and Program	Counter Man - Portable Air Defense System (MANPADS) - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	This measure tracks all Counter - MANPADS flight hours in the commercial airline environment.
Data Source	Counter - MANPADS flight hours will be tracked and reported in the monthly OM report by the contractors.
Collection Method	Raw data is collected, monitored, and reported using reports from contractors formatted in MS Office products. Data is tailored by the DHS SPO for presentation purposes.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Increase in Mean Flight Hours Between Failure (MFHBF) from Phase II to Phase III.
Organization and Program	Counter Man - Portable Air Defense System (MANPADS) - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The Observed MFHBF will be determined by collecting all Counter - MANPADS System fielded operating hours, laboratory operating hours, and failure reporting data. This data will be converted to the MFHBF statistic using standard reliability analysis methods
Data Source	Contractors submit quarterly reports document operational and test hours completed and observed MFHBF vs. target goals on a reliability growth curve.
Collection Method	Raw data is collected, monitored, and reported using reports from contractors formatted in MS Office products. Data is tailored by the DHS SPO for presentation purposes.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Percent of grant programs for public safety wireless communications that include "SAFECOM" Federal standards - approved grant guidance.
Organization and Program	Interoperability Compatibility - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The range of data is up to 100% of federal agencies awarding grants for interoperability and compatibility to emergency response communities that incorporate SAFECOM's grant guidance.
Data Source	OIC will inventory the federal interoperability grant programs and ensure SAFECOM - approved grant guidance appears in the grant requirements.
Collection Method	Data will be collected and reported using an Excel spreadsheet.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

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	Interoperability Compatibility - 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	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Number of analyses/simulations completed on the Critical Infrastructure Protection - Decision Support System (CIP - DSS) to provide actionable information to help protect U. S. critical infrastructure.
Organization and Program	Critical Infrastructure Protection - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The CIP - DSS program has defined standards that signal the completion of a modeling capability of specific scenario. The total number of completed scenarios is collected for this measure.
Data Source	Reports generated 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	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Cumulative number of cyber security data sets contained in protected repository.
Organization and Program	Cyber Security - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The total number of stored data sets is collected for this measure.
Data Source	Monthly reports submitted by independent contractor.
Collection Method	Data is collected and reviewed using an Excel spreadsheet.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Percentage of full applications that receive liability protection under the SAFETY Act.
Organization and Program	SAFETY Act - 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, reviewed, and reported in an Excel spreadsheet.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	A data verification process will be established by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Average customer satisfaction with risk assessments and prototypical technology deliverables.
Organization and Program	Emergent and Prototypical Technology - Science and Technology Directorate
Scope	The data used will be an annual documented assessment of customer satisfaction. Customers include other portfolio managers within the Science and Technology (ST) Directorate and the ST Directorate's Senior Management.
Data Source	The data source will be a customer satisfaction survey with questions evaluated on a scale of 1 to 10 designed to solicit customer comments not only as to their satisfaction with the risk assessments and Technology Clearinghouse and prototypes delivered, but also to identify additional information of value and other factors that would make the products of this portfolio more useful.
Collection Method	The collection methodology will be an annual documented customer satisfaction survey.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	The customer survey will provide direct assessment of whether desired outcomes are being met. Projects are monitored and reviewed individually by Federal program managers and the portfolio manager to ensure that each project is performing per contractual agreement and whose results support the Emergent and Prototypical Technology Portfolio long - term goals. A data verification process will be in place by May 31, 2006.

Performance Measure	Percent of the nationally critical aviation transportation assets or systems that have been assessed during the fiscal year and have mitigation strategies in place to reduce risk.
Organization and Program	Aviation Security - Transportation Security Administration
Scope	All aviation assets listed on the Nationally Critical Transportation Assets list.
Data Source	Vulnerability assessments conducted at the aviation assets listed on the Nationally Critical Transportation Assets list by subject matter experts.
Collection Method	Data are collected in - person, through field visits; teams of subject matter experts from TSA along with representatives from the Federal Bureau of Investigation identify and conduct joint vulnerability assessments through standardized methodologies at the aviation assets listed on the Nationally Critical Transportation Asset list.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The results of the vulnerability assessments are reviewed by higher - level subject matter experts (SMEs) at the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) Head Quarters (HQ). Each vulnerability assessment is reviewed based on seven broad areas of security measures that look at physical security at transportation facilities. SMEs go through multiple training courses for Aviation Security Inspectors and Criminal Investigator Training at the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to ensure consistency among risk assessments.

Performance Measure	Passenger screening covert test results (percent of screeners correctly identifying and resolving).
Organization and Program	Aviation Security - Transportation Security Administration
Scope	Covert tests for passenger screening at the security screening checkpoints of the nation's commercial airports are conducted by TSA in an unannounced systematic manner at select airports that are tested multiple times. The covert tests are designed to evaluate whether screeners properly identify prohibited items placed on the person or in their carry - on baggage and whether the screeners follow Standard Operating Procedures until the issues are fully resolved.
Data Source	Data are obtained from Covert Tests conducted at the passenger screening checkpoints of the nation's commercial airports by individuals unknown to the screeners.
Collection Method	Observational data is collected during special operation covert tests using rigorous standard operating procedures to introduce up - to - date, real life, terrorist threat objects to the screener workforce to identify vulnerabilities
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Post test reviews ensuring correctness are conducted by all special operation teams on classified reports ensuring correctness. These reports are issued to senior TSA management and identify reasons for failure and recommend corrective action.

Performance Measure	Level of the Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI - A) for Aviation Operations.
Organization and Program	Aviation Security - Transportation Security Administration
Scope	The Customer Satisfaction Index for Aviation (CSI - A) is an index designed to incorporate three distinct measures of customer satisfaction for TSA's customers screened through the checkpoints at the nations commercial airports. These three measurements include: Results from an annual random customer intercept survey, the results from the Household Omnibus Survey sponsored by the Department of Transportation, and the trend in complaints and compliments received by TSA.
Data Source	Data is obtained using an annual intercept survey conducted at the nation's commercial airports from a random sample of persons going through the screening checkpoints, the results from the Department of Transportations Omnibus Household Survey, and complaints and compliments received by TSA from the public.
Collection Method	Data from the customer intercept survey is collected through postage - paid cards handed out through a pre - determined randomized procedure at each checkpoint by trained administrators. The cards are received by a third - party, tabulated and the results provided to TSA. Approximately 25% of the cards are returned for tabulation. Because the samples are so large and consistent, the confidence interval is in excess of 95%. Data from the Omnibus Household Survey is provided to TSA following the annual survey. That survey is conducted by telephone, again to a randomized sample. Complaints and compliments are recorded by TSA and provided for the trend (i.e., +, - or no change), but do not enter into the calculations themselves.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Each of the parts of the CSI - A is based on a statistically - reliable random survey. The Omnibus Survey questions are vetted by psychometricians to ensure lack of bias.

Performance Measure	Baggage screening covert test results (percent of screeners correctly identifying and resolving.
Organization and Program	Aviation Security - Transportation Security Administration
Scope	Covert tests for baggage screening at the baggage security screening checkpoints of the nation's commercial airports are conducted by TSA in an unannounced systematic manner at select airports that are tested multiple times. The covert tests are designed to evaluate whether screeners properly identify prohibited items placed in the travelers' baggage and whether the screeners follow Standard Operating Procedures until the issues are fully resolved.
Data Source	Data are obtained from Covert Tests conducted at the baggage screening checkpoints of the nation's commercial airports by individuals unknown to the screeners.
Collection Method	Observational data is collected during special operation covert tests using rigorous standard operating procedures to introduce up - to - date, real life, terrorist threat objects to the screener workforce to identify vulnerabilities.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Post test reviews are conducted by all special operation teams on classified reports. These reports are issued to senior TSA management and identify reasons for failure and recommend corrective action.

Performance Measure	Percent of nationally critical surface transportation assets or systems that have been assessed during the fiscal year and have mitigation strategies in place to reduce risk.
Organization and Program	Surface Transportation Security - Transportation Security Administration
Scope	Vulnerability assessments completed by agencies of the Federal government of the surface assets listed on the Nationally Critical Transportation Assets list that have implemented mitigation strategies.
Data Source	Vulnerability assessments completed by the Office of Security Assessments, TSA, and stored in RMRS.
Collection Method	Data are collected through TSA - facilitated assessments through vulnerability assessment tools, and entered into RMRS.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data are collected by trained facilitators, while reviews are completed by Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) and risk related entities within TSA.

Performance Measure	Number of successful terrorist and other criminal attacks initiated from commercial passenger aircraft cabins with Federal Air Marshal Service (FAMS) coverage.
Organization and Program	Federal Air Marshal Service - Transportation Security Administration
Scope	Within the context of each Federal Air Marshal Service (FAMS) primary mission to detect, deter and defeat hostile acts that occur on U.S aircraft, it is expected that FAMs will actively engage terrorist/criminal attackers 100% of the time they occur on any aircraft for which they are providing coverage.
Data Source	Office of Flight operations
Collection Method	FAMs are required to routinely report all incidents and suspicious activities (issues that do not rise to the level of an incident) that occur in aircraft or airports while they are in mission status. These reports are directly input, when they occur, by FAMs into the Service's automated Surveillance Detection System.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Office of Flight Operations is responsible to track and report this data. Subject to continuous FAMS management oversight.

Performance Measure	Percentage level in meeting Federal Air Marshal Service (FAMS) mission and flight coverage targets for each individual category of identified risk.
Organization and Program	Federal Air Marshal Service - Transportation Security Administration
Scope	Addresses general flight FAM coverage. Target performance is a uniform percentage level in meeting each individual coverage level for the risk categories, e.g., actual coverage reached (SSI - classified) % of coverage target.
Data Source	Systems Operation Control Division (SOCD) and Mission Operations Center (MOC).
Collection Method	The Systems Operations Control Division (SOCD) automated scheduling system employs aviation industry accepted SABRE systems that archives 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. FAMS leadership reviews the previous month 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.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Targeted coverage data is contained in the Service's automated scheduling system. Once a month, these scheduled targets are compared to actual performance data that are generated to support activities of FAMs to assess the completion rates that support targeted objectives.

Performance Measure	Maritime Injury and Fatality Index.
Organization and Program	Marine Safety - United States Coast Guard
Scope	This measure is an index comprised of the five year average of US maritime industry injuries and fatalities and the annual number of recreational boating fatalities. This index is primarily included to provide one external reporting measure for this program. The two sub - measures are separate and their effect on this larger index needs to be examined separately, as the approaches to reducing each have different aspects.
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 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.

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	Political climates, historical flows, and the latest trends figure into the calculations. The potential flows are validated against other flow estimates where available; they are usually found to be more conservative than the other sources. 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.
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.

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	Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE).
Collection Method	Data obtained from the Coast Guard Planning and Assessment.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data obtained from the CG Planning 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	Navy Status Of Resources and Training System (SORTS).
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	Conduct Benefit Fraud Assessment on X Form Types and report as percentage of fraudulent cases found.
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 material to the adjudication of the application/petition. A range of systems checks will be conducted. Site visits/interviews will also be performed to gather information needed to identify/verify fraud for any discrepant information or material fact that cannot be verified through systems checks.
Data Source	Based on 6 month sample derived from receipts. The sample universe was derived in coordination with the DHS Office of Immigration Statistics, who deems sampling a six month period 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 material to the adjudication of the application/petition. A range of systems checks will be conducted. Site visits/interviews will also be performed to gather information needed to identify/verify fraud for any discrepant information or material fact that cannot be verified through systems checks.
Data Source	Tracking of proposed procedural and/or legislative changes to counteract fraud as a result of Benefit Fraud Assessments. Internal manual tracking is used to document proposed changes made in BFA final reports. If a proposal requires 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.

STRATEGIC GOAL - 3. PROTECTION - Safeguard our people and their freedoms, critical infrastructure, property and the economy of our nation from acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies.

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	Number of communities taking or increasing action to reduce their risk of natural or man - made disaster.
Organization and Program	Mitigation - Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	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	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 NEMIS and E - grants.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Validated data totals and projections by comparing current projections against previously reported data and against previously reported GPRA milestones and IFMIS funding reports. Utilize our Systems Evaluation and Technical assists as independent third party checks for program quality assurance.

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 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	Percent of respondents reporting they are better prepared to deal with disasters and emergencies as a result of training.
Organization and Program	Readiness - Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	Approximately 8,000 students attend courses at Emergency Management Institute (EMI) resident training facilities every year, and an additional 1 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 asked to complete a long term evaluation questionnaire.
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	Percent of Federal, State, Local and Tribal Governments compliant with the National Incident Management System (NIMS).
Organization and Program	Readiness - Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	Performance measure will include 100% from data inputs, performance reports, objective subjective assessments, site monitoring visits, review of after - action reports, and statistics on training.
Data Source	Federal, state, Local and Tribal entities.
Collection Method	Performance reports, web - based data collection tools, objective and subjective assessments, site monitoring and review of after - action reports.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Selective data audits, field monitoring and continuous refinements on reporting metrics to identify inconsistencies and errors.

Performance Measure	Percent of fully operational Continuity of Government (COG) capabilities.
Organization and Program	National Security - Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	This measure assess the percent of federal 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 classified communications capabilities data base is maintained by the contractor and FEMA. The five year training plan and the proposed and actual Annual Training Calendar will support the training component.
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 Security - Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	FEMA will determine the percentage of federal departments and agencies with fully operational COOP capabilities based on criteria derived from documents such as Presidential Decision Directive 67, Enduring Constitutional Government and Continuity of Operations, numerous classified Operational Plans, and other guidance documents and matrices. The criteria include: (1) documentation incorporating current policies and programs, (2) adequate alternate facilities and ancillary equipment, (3) identification and protection of vital records, (4) interoperable communications, and (5) development and implementation of an effective Training and Exercise program. Though the assessments of operational capability will be somewhat subjective, a team of federal officials will help ensure consistency in making the determinations.
Data Source	The data for the assessments comes from a number of sources and it will eventually be compiled into the Readiness Reporting System (RRS) currently under development within FEMA's Office of National Security Coordination. The sources for the percentage of federal departments and agencies with fully operational capabilities include: (1) self - assessments by the Federal D/As, (2) participation in training events and exercises, (3) real world events and activities such as 9/11/01, and (4) assessments conducted by FEMA.
Collection Method	Federal agency - wide exercises provide the ability to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the overall continuity programs. The initial fielding and successful testing and validation of the RRS in FY05 will allow data transmission on a regular basis through secure computers by the Federal D/As as events and activities occur which impact their operational capabilities. 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.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The reliability of communications data will be verified by continuous communications testing plans with other D/As. The training data is verified by the actual training events logs and continued feedback from training events for refinement of content and training opportunities which maintained by the training personnel. The documentation data is verified by the deliverables from contractual vendors and feedback from training and exercise events toward the adequacy of support documentation. No sampling is utilized in any of these measures and the only subjectivity is the weighting factors for documentation items and determinations for what is essential for training as well as documentation items. The time to collect the information is relatively brief and won't constitute any lengthy delays with real time measurements and determinations.

Performance Measure	Effectiveness of Federal Protective Service 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.

Performance Measure	Percent of recommendations made by reviewing authorities (i.e., IG, OMB, GAO) that are implemented within 1 year.
Organization and Program	National Preparedness Integration and Coordination - Preparedness
Scope	The data for this measure consists of recommendations from reports published by Federal reviewing authorities (e.g. Department of Homeland Security Inspector General (IG), Government Accountability Office (GAO), Office of Management and Budget (OMB)). In addition, data for this measure includes recommendations made in independent evaluations sponsored by the Office of Grants and Training (GT).
Data Source	Supporting data is derived from published reports by Federal reviewing authorities (Department IG, GAO, and OMB) and from independent evaluations sponsored by GT. Recommendations are tracked in a spreadsheet maintained by GT.
Collection Method	GT reviews all recommendations from independent evaluations and collects information on each recommendation in a continuously updated spreadsheet. On a regular basis, GT evaluates whether programs have implemented the recommendations. The total number of recommendations implemented in one year is divided by the total number recommendations to yield an overall percentage.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	GT continuously reviews recommendations made in independent evaluations for inclusion in this measure. GT coordinates with its program offices to assess whether recommendations have been implemented, and whenever possible, GT collects evidence (e.g. Inspector General review closeout letters) to confirm implementation of recommendations.

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 - Preparedness
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	Percent of high - priority critical infrastructure for which a Buffer Zone Protection Plan (BZPP) has been implemented.
Organization and Program	Infrastructure Protection - Preparedness
Scope	Each year, PSD develops a Buffer Zone Protection Program List (i.e. FYxx BZPP List) in support of the following fiscal year program. This is a prioritized list of CI/KR assets for which development of a Buffer Zone Protection Plan is deemed appropriate. The criteria upon which this prioritization is done includes relative importance assessments, consequence of attack analyses and BZP Program budget limitations. The total number of assets on the FYxx 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 re - allocation. This total number of assets on the list forms the baseline for this performance measure. For the purposes of this performance measure, a BZP Plan is considered to be implemented when the PSD BZP Plan assessment team classifies the plan as being complete and releases it to the acquisition team (i.e. release into the grant process).
Data Source	The FYxx BZPP List is developed and maintained by the Strategic Information Management Branch within PSD. The status of the BZP Plan development for each of the assets on the BZPP List is tracked by the PSD Program Execution Branch and reported in the BZPP Progress Report, which is updated weekly. The FY05 target value for this measure is 70%.
Collection Method	PSD Performance Management has access to the latest issue of the PSD lists and reports noted above via the PSD Local Area Network.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	This data collection and reporting process was initiated and refined throughout FY04.

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 - Preparedness
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 obtainingVAs 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 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 goals and objectives identified in Regional Transit Security Strategies addressed by grantee projects.
Organization and Program	Infrastructure Protection - Preparedness
Scope	The Office of Grants and Training requires all Transit Security Grant Program recipients to complete a Regional Transit Security Strategy (RTSS), outlining a timeline for completing goals and objectives. The data set for this measure includes available RTSSs that were compiled to determine the planned schedule for implementing goals and objectives.
Data Source	Regional Transit Security Strategies (RTSSs)
Collection Method	Grant recipients goals and objectives were collected from their individual Regional Transit Security Strategies. These data were then analyzed by compiling all target deadlines and classifying them by fiscal quarter to determine grant recipients progress.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	The Office of Grants and Training (GT) ensures data reliability by requiring grantees to participate in a Regional Transit Security Working Group (RTSWG) that coordinates the formulation of the RTSS. The goals and objectives outlined in RTSSs first meet the approval of the RTSWG and are further reviewed and approved by GT prior to awarding the grant. GT program managers and support staff also review the raw data and calculations to ensure completeness and accuracy of the results.

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	Infrastructure Protection - Preparedness
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	Government Emergency Telecommunications (GETS) call completion rate during periods of network congestion.
Organization and Program	Cyber Security Telecommunications - Preparedness
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 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.

Performance Measure	Percent of targeted stakeholders who participate in or obtain cyber security products and services.
Organization and Program	Cyber Security Telecommunications - Preparedness
Scope	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.
Data Source	Each National Cyber Security Division (NCSD) branch will be responsible to capture required data at the time of each event (if appropriate) or obtain it from web sites, repositories, system logs, and other sources. Each branch will also be responsible for working with outside stakeholders to obtain required data, if necessary. The data will be reviewed by branch management to validate its accuracy and then provided to a data analyst for aggregating at the NCSD level.
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	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Reliable data will be available after baseline information is collected in March 2006. National Cyber Security Division (NCSD) expects to collect reliable data in time for June 2006 reporting.

Performance Measure	Percent of jurisdictions demonstrating acceptable performance on applicable critical tasks in exercises using Grants and Training approved scenarios.
Organization and Program	Grants, Training Exercises - Preparedness
Scope	The data set consists of all available after - action reports (AARs) that include analysis of Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) critical task performance from Office of Grants and Training (GT) - funded and supported national - level, Federal, State, and local exercises. All AARs that meet these criteria and that are shared through the GT portal are included in the data set. 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 National Exercise Program (NEP).
Data Source	Supporting data is derived from homeland security exercise AARs that are submitted to the GT portal for GT review. All AARs in the data sample are in GTs HSEEP format (i.e. the AAR includes analysis of jurisdictions performance on critical tasks).
Collection Method	GT reviews HSEEP - compliant AARs submitted by participating State and local jurisdictions. Critical task analyses included in the AARs are evaluated using Exercise Evaluation Guides to determine whether the jurisdictions performance met expectations or required improvement. Jurisdictions performance on each critical task is analyzed by comparing the results documented in the AAR to the expected outcome described in the EEG. For each of the 62 critical tasks, the percent of jurisdictions performing as expected is calculated by dividing the number of jurisdictions performing as expected by the total number of jurisdictions that exercised each task. The resulting percentages for each critical task are averaged to yield the percent of jurisdictions demonstrating acceptable performance on applicable critical tasks in exercises using GT - approved scenarios.
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 critical task 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. To streamline the AAR production, submission, and analysis process, GT is developing an automated tool to assist jurisdictions in developing AARs (including conducting critical task analysis). 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, Training Exercises - Preparedness
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. 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.
Data Source	Data for this measure is derived from Biannual Strategy Implementation Reports (BSIRs).
Collection Method	States receiving State Preparedness grants identify goals and objectives in their State Homeland Security Strategies. Grantees must tie specific grant - related projects to these goals and objectives and then report on the progress and impact of the projects through the BSIR. Grant recipients progress towards their identified goals and objectives is calculated using this self - reported data found in the BSIRs.
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. 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 undergoes a review and approval process by GT.

Performance Measure	Average percentage increase in Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and other knowledge skills, and abilities of state and local homeland security preparedness professionals receiving training from pre and post assessments.
Organization and Program	Grants, Training Exercises - Preparedness
Scope	Supporting data includes evaluations of all trainees' 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. 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 trainees' 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.

Performance Measure	Percentage of homeland security strategies that are compliant with DHS planning requirements at the submission date.
Organization and Program	Grants, Training Exercises - Preparedness
Scope	The program collects and tracks information on all homeland security strategies submitted by States and urban areas. Depending on the Office of Grants and Training (GT) requirements, the number of strategies submitted for review each year varies widely.
Data Source	Homeland security strategy review board data.
Collection Method	Through its strategy review board process, the program collects and tracks information on homeland security strategies submitted for approval and the number meeting DHS planning requirements. For each year, raw data on homeland security strategy submissions are reviewed to calculate the percent of strategies that are compliant with DHS planning requirements.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	To ensure the reliability of the data, GT uses a strategy review board process through which submitted homeland security strategies are reviewed against a set of criteria. GT program managers and support staff review raw data and calculations to ensure completeness and accuracy of the results.

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, Training Exercises - Preparedness
Scope	The Office of Grants and Training (GT) requires grant recipients to develop an Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy that identifies goals and objectives to improve homeland security capabilities. In addition, all grant recipients must complete a Biannual Strategy Implementation Report (BSIR) every six months in an award year. 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.
Data Source	Data for this measure is derived from Biannual Strategy Implementation Reports (BSIRs).
Collection Method	Urban areas receiving UASI grants identify goals and objectives to improve homeland security in their Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies. Grantees must tie specific grant - related projects to these goals and objectives and then report on the progress and impact of the projects through the BSIR. Grant recipients progress towards their identified goals and objectives is calculated using this self - reported data found in the BSIRs.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	GT ensures data reliability and consistency by issuing detailed guidance to grantees on developing Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies and reporting information through BSIRs. All BSIR data is collected through a standard, web - based Grant Reporting Tool. In addition, all information provided by grantees in Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies and BSIRs undergoes a review and approval process by GT.

Performance Measure	Percent of agencies providing timely bio - surveillance information to National Biosurveillance Integration System (NBIS).
Organization and Program	Medical Coordination - Preparedness
Scope	The NBIS will provide early detection and characterization of a biological attack. This necessitates timely sharing of all relevant surveillance, monitoring and threat information among the participating agencies. The initial NBIS architecture has been based on 14 partner federal agencies. Each agency must create or revise existing standard operating procedures (SOPs) to enable this data and information transfer with the NBIS, both incoming and outgoing. The NBIS operations staff, along with the SMEs, will establish an incoming data timeliness criteria. All incoming transfers will be categorized as timely, not timely or indeterminate. For the purpose of this performance measure, any partner agency having 30% or less of their data submittals classified as not timely will be considered as an agency providing timely information to NBIS.
Data Source	All data and information transfers to and from the NBIS will be logged by source and time - stamped by the NBIS. Each transfer will be classified based upon NBIS standard operating procedures. On a periodic basis, the NBIS staff will issue a summary report indicating the total number of data and information submittals made to the NBIS by each of the participating agencies for each of the categories of timely, not timely and indeterminate.
Collection Method	Risk Management Division Performance Management staff will solicit this NBIS Timeliness Summary Report (or equivalent) from the Program Manager on a monthly basis to support performance reporting requirements.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Performance measure data will be available for reporting within 3 months of the NBIS achieving IOC. Reliability of data will be directly impacted by having a clear and useful criteria for timeliness. The initial NBIS architecture has been based on 14 partner federal agencies. Each agency must create or revise existing standard operating procedures (SOPs) to enable this data and information transfer with the NBIS, both incoming and outgoing. These incoming and outgoing message logs from the partner agencies will be cross - referenced as a means to verify the reliability of the information. Identified discrepancies will be resolved wherever possible and practical.

Performance Measure	The number of agencies participating in the Integrated Medical Readiness Network (IMRN).
Organization and Program	Medical Coordination - Preparedness
Scope	All participants and/or agencies who participates in any conference that is recognized by the Integrated Medical Readiness Network (IMRN).
Data Source	Source will be attendance rosters of conferences.
Collection Method	The attendance data will be collected in a database in Excel that will store all participants and/or agencies who participates in any conference that is recognized by the Integrated Medical Readiness Network (IMRN).
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	By May, 2006 procedures and reliability checks will be developed.

Performance Measure	Ratio of on - scene fire incident injuries to total number of active firefighters.
Organization and Program	Fire and Emergency Assistance - Preparedness
Scope	The Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG) sent a voluntary survey to AFG recipients, asking them to report the number of firefighter injuries and the total number of active firefighters in their jurisdiction.
Data Source	Information on firefighter injuries was provided by AFG recipients through a voluntary online survey, the results of which were reviewed by the Office of Grants and Training (GT) to ensure quality. GT also provided data collected in previous years for comparison.
Collection Method	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	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	To ensure the reliability of the data, responses are reviewed by GT personnel for consistency. In addition, the program compares its survey findings to publicly available information on firefighter injury ratios published by the United States Fire Administration (USFA) and the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA). In addition, survey data are compared to firefighter injury data provided by AFG applicants to further ensure reliability.

Performance Measure	Percent reduction in the rate of loss of life from fire-related events.
Organization and Program	Fire and Emergency Assistance - Preparedness
Scope	The annual loss of life from fire - related events is the estimated total number of fire deaths that occur within the United States and Washington, DC during the calendar year. A death is defined as a direct result of a fire that is fatal or becomes fatal within one year. The annual percentage of loss of life reduction is based on a ten year best - fit linear trend analysis (starting with the 2000 baseline figure of 3,809) that presents the change over time based on this trend line. The National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) mortality data has the benefit of being a census of all deaths in the U.S. and is therefore virtually complete. The certificates are filled out by a range of physicians, medical examiners, and coroners whose detail and methodology in documenting each condition on the death certificate will vary. There is a two - to three - year time lag from the time of NCHS data collection to data dissemination.
Data Source	The data sources used in measuring the performance goals are the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) mortality data and U.S. Census Bureau population estimates.
Collection Method	The National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) mortality data is obtained annually from all deaths certificates in the United States. The information from each death certificate is coded by NCHS based on the International Classification of Diseases (ICD) codes. The numbers of fire related deaths are extracted from the NCHS database and then tallied in an Excel spreadsheet. The percentage reduction in the rate of loss of life is computed based on per million population.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Loss of life data from the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) are also compiled and reviewed by the National Fire Data Center. Statistical weighting and comparison of these data are done in conjunction with the National Fire Protection Association's data to check for accuracy. A comparison with these data to the NCHS mortality data is conducted for consistency and relative veracity.

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	The compliance rate is obtained directly from the Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) database and 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	Ports, Waterways, and Coastal Security Risk Index reduction to that terror related Maritime Risk the Coast Guard is able to impact.
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	Percentage of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely.
Organization and Program	Domestic Protectees (DP) - United States Secret Service
Scope	The security of protectees is the ultimate priority of the Secret Service. 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. There is no error rate for this measure.
Data Source	This program measure originates from the protective event or visit.
Collection Method	Results from Protective Operations, as well as any incident that may occur, are immediately reported.
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 security of protectees is the ultimate priority of the Secret Service. 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. There is no error rate for this measure.
Data Source	This program measure originates from the protective event or visit.
Collection Method	Results from Protective Operations, as well as any incident that may occur, are immediately reported.
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. 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 (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.(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 security of protectees is the ultimate priority of the Secret Service. 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. There is no error rate for this measure.
Data Source	This program measure originates from the protective event or visit.
Collection Method	Results from Protective Operations, as well as any incident that may occur, are immediately reported.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Any breach of Protective Operations would be immediately known and subject to a thorough investigation.

STRATEGIC GOAL - 4. RESPONSE - Lead, manage and coordinate the national response to acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies.

Performance Measure	Average percent of response teams reported at operational status.
Organization and Program	Response - Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	Four types of teams are included in the measure; the 52 Disaster Medical Assistance Teams (DMATs) within the National Disaster Medical System (NDMS); 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	The National Disaster Medical System (NDMS) obtains source data from the assessment of each team's appropriate staffing level, by medical specialty, and the availability of basic load equipment caches. 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	The National Disaster Medical System (NDMS) collects data from team personnel and equipment reports. 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	Final operational status for the National Disaster Medical System (NDMS) is reviewed at four levels, including the Disaster Medical Assistance Team (DMAT) Commander, Cadre Management, Program Manager, and finally the Chief, NDMS Section. For Urban Search Rescue task forces, hard copies of submitted self - assessments are archived at the Program Office. 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 reliable; however the data source and methodology for data collection are subject to change as the FIRSTs become fully operational.

Performance Measure	Average response time in hours for emergency response teams to arrive on scene.
Organization and Program	Response - Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	Four types of teams are included in this measure; the 52 Disaster Medical Assistance Teams (DMATs) within the National Disaster Medical System (NDMS); 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). NDMS assesses the average length of time (in hours) from the moment NDMS medical response teams are ordered to deploy until they arrive at the scene where they will be utilized. USR assesses the average length of time (in hours) from the moment USR task force are activated to deploy by the USR Program Office until they arrive at the scene where they will be staged or assigned. The performance measure also includes response times for the five MERS detachments. Response time for Federal Incident Response Support Teams begins when the FIRSTs are ordered to deploy by FEMA Headquarters or Regions and ends with the team's arrival on scene.
Data Source	For the National Disaster Medical System (NDMS), data is derived from reports kept at the National Disaster Medical System (NDMS) Operations Support Center (OSC). Urban Search and Rescue includes response times for all major USR exercises or mission responses. The dominant data source for the Mobile Emergency Response Support (MERS) detachments is the external evaluations (including the REDCAP exercise) performed quarterly by Office of the National Security Council. Regional All - hazards exercises also provide data input, these exercises are conducted by MERS personnel. The Federal Incident Response Support Teams (FIRSTs) will track response time data at the team level, as well as within the National Response Coordination Center (NRCC), and/or the Regional Response Coordination Center (RRCC).
Collection Method	The Operations Service Center (OSC) continuously tracks the deployed National Disaster Medical System (NDMS) teams from deployment start date/time through arrival at the deployment site. Urban Search and Rescue (USR) task force data is derived from major USR exercises or mission responses. Activation orders are issued by the USR Program Office, and arrival times for each task force are tracked by the Incident Support Team (IST) and USR ESF - 9 Desk in the FEMA National Emergency Operations Center (NEOC). For the Mobile Emergency Response Support (MERS) detachments, data is collected, documented and presented during After Action Reviews (AAR). Final AARs formally document shortcomings and remedial actions. The Federal Incident Response Support Teams (FIRSTs) will track response time data at the team level, as well as within the National Response Coordination Center (NRCC), and/or the Regional Response Coordination Center (RRCC).
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Operations Service Center (OSC) continuously tracks the deployed National Disaster Medical System (NDMS) teams from deployment start date/time through arrival at the deployment site. This arrival time is verified with the Management Support Team (MST) to which the deploying team reports upon arrival in the field. Urban Search and Rescue data is reviewed and recorded in an Excel database maintained by the USR Program Office. The Mobile Emergency Response Support (MERS) data sources and findings are very reliable and independently verifiable. Customer survey questionnaires and Government Performance Results Act Field Operating Site Setup Records provide adequate double - checks on system performance. The Federal Incident Response Support Teams (FIRSTs) anticipate source data collected and analyzed will be reliable, however data sources and collection methodology is subject to change when the FIRST teams become operational.

Performance Measure	Average time in hours to provide essential logistical services to an impacted community of 50,000 or fewer.
Organization and Program	Response - Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	Data is collected from the Resource Tracking spreadsheets maintained by the persons assigned the Resource Tracking responsibility during deployments. 100% of the spreadsheet rows are queried for useable data. Included in the calculation parameters are the following: Rows with Actual Shipping Times and Actual Arrival Times, Rows with Actual Shipping Times and Requested Arrival Times.
Data Source	Data is collected on the Resource Tracking spreadsheet maintained by the Federal Coordinating Officers (FCO) designee. Also used are the shipping reports which contain resources shipped, received, etc., from sources including our Logistics Centers (such as Logistics Center Atlanta, Fort Worth, Data Information Clearinghouse System (DISC), Moffett, Frederick, Cumberland, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Guam); Other Federal Agencies (such as the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Defense Logistics Agency, etc), and from the private sector vendors (including Americold Logistics, and Lipsey Mountain Spring Water System), and include Federal Operational Staging Areas.
Collection Method	Standard operating manuals require data collected from the Resource Tracking spreadsheets maintained by the persons assigned the Resource Tracking responsibility during deployments. 100% of the spreadsheet rows are queried for useable data.
Reliability	Inadequate
Actions being taken to make reliable	Currently, data collection and cross - referencing is an entirely manual process, and allows for the possibility of many undetectable errors. Additionally, data completeness often suffers during disasters, resulting in inadequate usable data to calculate response times. The risk for potentially large variations in reported actuals exists, and no expectation of solid reliability can be given assuming the tools in use today. Due to the volume of transactions and multiple manual cross - references, improvement in reliability can only come through technological advances. Logistics foresees a Total Logistics Management System that would support many needs, including this measure requirement. The Logistics Resource Center (LRC) Coordination Planning Chief and the Deputy Chief are responsible for overseeing the collection and processing of data as prescribed in standard operational procedures.

Performance Measure	Percent of mariners in imminent danger saved.
Organization and Program	Search and Rescue (SAR) - United States Coast Guard
Scope	100% of the maritime distress incidents reported to the Coast Guard are collected in the MISLE database. Those case reports are then narrowed to include only cases where there was 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	It is possible that some MISLE 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 sophisticated program logic and comprehensive user guides ensure that data from MISLE is highly reliable.

STRATEGIC GOAL - 5. RECOVERY - Lead national, state, local and private sector efforts to restore services and rebuild communities after acts of terrorism, natural disaster, or other emergencies.

Performance Measure	Percent of customers satisfied with Public Recovery Assistance.
Organization and Program	Recovery - Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	The data used to calculate customer satisfaction is based on surveys of 100% of Public Assistance customers.
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.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Survey data are collected, analyzed and reported by outside contractors using methods that guarantee both validity and reliability.

Performance Measure	Percent of customers satisfied with Individual Recovery Assistance.
Organization and Program	Recovery - Federal Emergency Management Agency
Scope	The data used to measure progress toward the multi - dimensional Recovery long - term performance goal include results of surveys of random Individual Assistance customer samples.
Data Source	Customer satisfaction data are derived from statistical reports from regular surveys of the customer population in the Individual Assistance program.
Collection Method	The customer satisfaction survey data is collected by telephone and mail surveys.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Survey data are collected, analyzed and reported by outside contractors using methods that guarantee both validity and reliability.

STRATEGIC GOAL - 6. SERVICE - Serve the public effectively by facilitating lawful trade, travel and immigration.

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.

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. 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 via 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 via 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 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 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	Number of refugee interviews conducted.
Organization and Program	Adjudication Services - United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Scope	Prior to FY 2004, each USCIS overseas district office recorded performance statistics in the Performance Analysis System (PAS). The PAS did not effectively reflect the officer refugee processing workload within given time periods. Unlike PAS, the Worldwide Refugee Admissions Processing System (WRAPS) records every case in which a USCIS officer interviewed an applicant for refugee status, even if the case was pending the completion of functions unrelated to USCIS responsibilities, and better reflects the number of refugee adjudications performed within a given reporting period. USCIS will continue to use WRAPS to generate statistical information.
Data Source	Department of State (DOS) Worldwide Refugee Admissions Processing System (WRAPS).
Collection Method	WRAPS tracks every case in which a USCIS officer interviewed an applicant for refugee status, even if the case was pending the completion of functions unrelated to USCIS responsibilities, such as security advisory opinion clearances (a non - USCIS clearance). This system accurately reflects the number of refugee adjudications performed within a given reporting period. WRAPS is a web - based program and USCIS has direct access to it through the internet. In the event that data is unavailable due to technical issues, the DOS WRAPS staff is very responsive to USCIS requests for data.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Department of State (DOS) statistics are independent measures that are gathered without USCIS input. DOS implemented a new integrated data base management system known as the Worldwide Refugee Admissions Processing System (WRAPS). This system is now the prime source of refugee processing statistics for the U.S. Refugee Program that enables USCIS to obtain more complete performance statistics. Furthermore, WRAPS records information with more specific categories that differentiates between the various reasons why cases are pending completion. Because WRAPS data can be sorted in a multitude of ways, USCIS is able to verify information by comparing WRAPS data with USCIS officers' experience.

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	Asylum Officers update the Refugees, Asylum, and Parole System (RAPS) with their decision on an Asylum claim.
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 telephones 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	Significant Outreach per FTE
Organization and Program	Citizenship - United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Scope	The frequency of outreach actions in the field is limited to the 19 cities across the country in which Community Liaison Officers (CLOs) are located. The Office of Citizenship budget cannot accommodate travel to every event to which a CLO may be invited to make a presentation or attend.
Data Source	The data is collected from weekly reports prepared in the field and sent to Headquarters.
Collection Method	The Outreach reports are collected weekly. On a weekly basis the Headquarters Office collects the data from individual CLO sites and compiles the weekly report for the entire field. This will be done internally on an EXCEL spreadsheet. Then, the staff at Headquarters will calculate the number of outreach actions that occur in a given time period, based on the descriptive weekly reports.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	To ensure reliability and quality control, the office of Citizenship conducts a supervisory review of the individual CLO Outreach Activity reports, the HQ weekly report of all CLO activity, and the quarterly report on the number of outreach actions.

STRATEGIC GOAL - 7. ORGANIZATIONAL EXCELLENCE - Value our most important resource, our people. Create a culture that promotes a common identity, innovation, mutual respect, accountability, and teamwork to achieve efficiencies, effectiveness, and operational synergies.

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 is 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 is 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 is validated through investigative process.

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 - Management Directorate
Scope	This measure pertains to information obtained from the business cases for major departmental information technology investments. The business cases provide budget justification and reporting requirements for investments. These projects are considered major because of high cost or importance to the Department. Beginning in fiscal year 2006, quarterly reviews of all Level 1 investments will be reported on. Level 1 investments are characterized by the following: contract costs exceed 100 million and have high sensitivity or interest. Data reported upon represents 87 investment comparisons for cost and schedule variances. This data will have to be verified and analyzed using quarterly reporting data in fiscal year 2006.
Data Source	The OMB Exhibit 300's, Section I.H.2 - I.H.4. This information is provided by the individual Project Managers at the Department's Component level.
Collection Method	Exhibit 300s containing the information are submitted to the Department's Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO). The OCIO extracts the cost and schedule variance data contained in the Exhibit 300s.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The data collected from the Exhibit 300 is prepared by Project Managers and certified by the CFO of the Components submitting the Exhibits. This information is then sent to OMB for further review and inclusion in the President's budget each year. Quarterly reports beginning in FY 2006 will enhance the reliability of the data.

Performance Measure	Percent of qualifying reimbursements that are made with established standards of timeliness and proper authorization.
Organization and Program	Counterterrorism Fund - Management Directorate
Scope	This measure covers all appropriate reimbursements under qualifying requests.
Data Source	The source of information will be the financial records maintained by the DHS CFO. Appropriate payments will be defined as those properly approved and forwarded to the DHS CFO. Timeliness of payments will be governed by the acquisition lead times defined in Policy Procedures Memorandum No. 1.2, in which interagency agreements (money being transferred to other agencies) much meet the acquisition lead time standard of 30 days.
Collection Method	The percent will be calculated as the number of payments made appropriately and timely divided by the total number of payments.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	A quality check will be made by person other than the one authoring the disbursement.

Performance Measure	Percent of DHS strategic objectives with programs that meet their associated performance targets.
Organization and Program	Office of the Secretary and Executive Management - Management Directorate
Scope	Each of the 75 programs within the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is linked to DHS strategic goals and objectives and has specific performance measures. Quarterly, Components submit performance data indicating whether or not they have met their performance targets.
Data Source	The source of information is derived from quarterly performance reports from DHS Components regarding whether or not they have met their quarterly performance targets. All data is captured in the Department's Future Year Homeland Security Program System (FYHSP).
Collection Method	Quarterly data calls are made to DHS Components to report quarterly performance targets in the FYHSP system. All data is due in the FYHSP system no later than two weeks after the end of the quarter.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Quarterly performance data is validated through the Component's Planning offices, vetted through their leadership, and coordinated by the Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation.

Performance Measure	Percent of Under Secretary of Management programs that meet their associated performance targets.
Organization and Program	Office of the Under Secretary for Management - Management Directorate
Scope	Each program (office) within the Under Secretary for Management has established performance goals and measures to gauge their progress in ensuring the provision of high - quality, efficient, and integrated management services to DHS.
Data Source	The data is derived from quarterly performance reports from the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (CFO), Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), Chief Procurement Officer (CPO), the Chief Information Officer (CIO), the Office of Security (OS), and the Office of Human Capital - MaxHR (CHCO). All data is captured in the Department's Future Year Homeland Security Program System (FYHSP).
Collection Method	Quarterly data calls are made to DHS offices to report quarterly performance targets in the FYHSP system. All data is due in the FYHSP system no later than two weeks after the end of the quarter.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Quarterly performance data is validated through the Program's Financial and Planning offices, vetted through leadership, and coordinated by the Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation.

Performance Measure	Percentage decrease in the number of the previous year's reportable conditions that are considered to be material weaknesses at the consolidated audit level.
Organization and Program	Office of the Chief Financial Officer - Management Directorate
Scope	The scope of data will be the audit results within the annual Performance and Accountability Report of the Department of Homeland Security.
Data Source	Source of the information is the independent auditor's report outcomes as reported in the Performance and Accountability Reports.
Collection Method	Government financial statement auditing principles will be the standard for the audits themselves. The auditors finding in the Performance and Accountability Report will be reviewed by staff of the Program Analysis and Evaluation Office who will derive the results.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The review and determination of results based on a review of the auditor’s reports by a member of the Program Analysis and Evaluation Office will be verified by a second member of the office.