Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting

Indicator: DFWP - Programs Implemented (#)

The data quality for this indicator is considered (**Check one**):

[X] **MEDIUM** – Some weaknesses exist but the data is of sufficient quality to manage the program.

[ ] **LOW** – Data quality is insufficient for this data to be used to manage the program; i.e., the results for this indicator should NOT be publicly reported.

The data provided represent (Check one)[ ] Actual or [ ] Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Although measures were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data being reported is accurate, the data, procedures and/or source documentation contains the following weaknesses disclosed below.

1. Identify known or suspected weaknesses in the data being reporting (e.g., limitations in the verification procedures; weaknesses in the data collection process; known flaws in the data):

The SBA has no recourse to verify if these numbers are correct, however, we place great emphasis on trusting that the grantees are reporting accurately.

2. Describe procedures currently being applied to mitigate the weaknesses:

None

3. Describe actions planned to improve the quality of the data in future reporting cycles:

None

ANTONIO DOSS	1/8/09
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	AA/OSBDC
Signature	Title

Chris 1/9/09

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

Enter Office name: Small Business Development Centers - DFWP

Performance Indicator Title	The total number of businesses establishing a Drug Free Workplace program
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: Improve economic environment for all businesses. Strategic Objective: Increase the positive impact of SBA assistance upon the number and success of small business start-ups; Maximize the sustainability and growth of existing small business assisted by the SBA; Significantly increase successful small business ownership within segments of society facing special competitive opportunity gaps.
Why chose this indicator	This indicator measures major contributions that the program makes to the achievement of SBA's outcomes.
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	The main goal of the program is to have a great number of small businesses implement a DFWP. This indicator is evidence of that goal.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	None. Even though the SBA is unable to force small businesses to implement a DFWP, the information is used for establishing goals and monitoring performance of the Grantees.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☒ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Increase in the number of small businesses facing special competitive opportunity gaps receiving SBA assistance.
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	The SBA has no recourse to verify if these numbers are correct, however, we place great emphasis on trusting that the grantees are reporting accurately.
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	N/A
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	N/A
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the	

10-2

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured: 3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	1. An SBA DFWP grantee schedules a series of meeting with a specific small business to start the process of implementing a DFWP. 2. When a small business completes the implementation process. 3. Data is reported quarterly to the SBA. 4. The lag time is the time between the completion of the implementation and the reporting date. Can vary widely from the beginning of a quarter to the end. 5. The DFWP has its own web based database through the GLS system.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	January 1
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	None
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	The SBA has no recourse to verify if these numbers are correct, however, we place great emphasis on trusting that the grantees are reporting accurately.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	N/A
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	None
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	N/A

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting

INDICATOR: **7 (j) – SB Assisted (#)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☑ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Joseph P. Loddo	Director for BD
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	1/6/09
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name:
Office of Business Development
7(j) Technical & Management Assistance

Performance Indicator Title	**Face to Face Training**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: Increase small business success by bridging competitive opportunity gaps facing entrepreneurs Strategic Objective: To provide training to the 7(j) eligible community.
Why chose this indicator	**Provides a business development training to 8(a) Eligible Firms**
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	It measures the program's contribution to SBA outcomes.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	This indicator measures the number of firms receiving 7(j) face-to-face training.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: [X] Output [ ] Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Provides businesses with the knowledge base to increase revenue and increase job creation – OUTCOME
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	~~N/A~~ NONE
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	o Number of events to the number of entrepreneurs trained. o Number of attendance to each of the five different courses offered
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	~~N/A~~ ACTUAL NUMBER
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	N/A
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured:	1a) In class training 1b) DVD training 2a) 7(j) provider will provide the number of courses taught to date, to include number at firms in attendance 2b) Districts will provide the number of firms trained using the DVD training package

11-1

3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	3a) Monthly progress reporting 3b) Weekly updates on training and number of attendees 4a) Progress reporting will have a lag time up to 30 days 4b) Weekly training reports will have a 7 day lag time 5) 7(j) Provider will be providing reports to both the Office of Business Development and to the Office of Field Operations concurrently. ~~No~~ An tracking system has been created ~~to date~~ To Account for Training Events and Re
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Fiscal Year End Reporting will be available by the week of November 3, 2008
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Contract close-out reporting procedures for final invoicing
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	No on-line tracking system is currently being used to prevent constant real time reporting
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	N/A
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	Nothing planned to date. A Share Point Tracking System can be created to assist in this area of concern
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	New 7(j) Provider being used this year.

Excel

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting

INDICATOR: **8 (a) – SB Assisted (#)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☑ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Joseph P. Loddo	Director for BD
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	1/6/09
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name:
Office of Business Development
8(a) Business Development

Performance Indicator Title	~~Face to Face Training~~ SB ASSISTED (#)
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: Increase small business success by bridging competitive opportunity gaps facing entrepreneurs Strategic Objective: Maximize the sustainability and growth of existing small businesses assisted by SBA
Why chose this indicator	**Provides business development to 8(a) Eligible Firms**
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Indicates the number of small businesses ~~certified~~ ASSISTED as 8(a) BD during the fiscal year
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	This indicator measures the number of small businesses ~~certified~~ ASSISTED as 8(a) BDfirms. This contributes to SBA's outcomes
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: [X] Output [ ] Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Indicates the net number of small businesses ~~certified~~ ASSISTED in the 8(a) Business Development Program during the fiscal year. (OUTPUT) Promote business development to small businesses with have a better opportunity to ~~grow~~ INCREASE their revenue ~~and sustain it.~~ JOB CREATION (OUTCOME)
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	~~Based on historical data with 5% growth added each year.~~ NONE
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	~~o Each time a firm is approved for certification the Office of Certification and Eligibility inputs the data into the 8(a) Tracking Tool data base.~~ ~~o The New Tracking Tool within Share Point offers tracking cradle to grave tracking of each application package~~ ~~o The New Tracking Tool identifies duplicate applications within the system~~ The NEW BDMIS Documents the progress of EACH firm through the Required ANNUAL Review
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	~~The tracking system uses all the dates associated within the business rules to indicate compliance and non-compliance~~ 8(A) AND NON 8(A) Revenue
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	N/A

Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured: 3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	1a) Case received 1b) Case Screened 1c) Case returned to applicant 1d) Case returned to SBA 1e) Case screened 1f) Case placed into Processing 1g) Case returned, Denied or Approved 1h) Annual Reviews 2) Each data field requires an input action by the analyst working the case and/or team leader 3) Data is captured on a daily basis 4) Data is captured on a daily basis and uploaded into the Share Point Master file at the end of the day. (one day lag time) and to official data base called e-Oracle. 5) The system of record is the BD MIS; however, we are also using in conjunction the Share Point Tracking Tool.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Fiscal Year End Reporting will be available the next business day after the FYE
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	The analyst and the team leaders certify the accuracy of their reporting
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	~~Dual tracking tool being used in conjunction with the BD MIS~~ NONE
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	~~Reliability of the information, which is being resolved by the tracking tool and new BD~~ MIS None
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	~~The Share Point Tracking System is being merged into the BD MIS to be fully automated~~ None
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	~~BD MIS was being used and is being updated with the new BD MIS with our new Tracking Tools.~~ The BDMIS system has been automated and deployed on July 28, 2008.

13-1

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting

INDICATOR: SB Assisted

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses; accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date <u>one</u> of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

<u>The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**"</u>.

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

MARIANA PARDO	HUBZone Prog. – Acting Director
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	1/8/09
Signature	Date

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting

13-1

The data quality for this indicator is considered (**Check one**):

☒ **MEDIUM** – Some weaknesses exist but the data is of sufficient quality to manage the program.

☐ **LOW** – Data quality is insufficient for this data to be used to manage the program; i.e., the results for this indicator should NOT be publicly reported.

The data provided represent (Check one)☐ Actual or☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Although measures were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data being reported is accurate, the data, procedures and/or source documentation contains the following weaknesses disclosed below.

1. Identify known or suspected weaknesses in the data being reporting (e.g., limitations in the verification procedures; weaknesses in the data collection process; known flaws in the data):

   - GAO audit and forensic investigations as well as the HUBZone Program independent audit revealed several potential weaknesses in the data currently available due to the program's flawed business processes.

2. Describe procedures currently being applied to mitigate the weaknesses:

   - HUBZone is undergoing a full business process reengineering, which will include a plan to restore integrity into the portfolio.

3. Describe actions planned to improve the quality of the data in future reporting cycles:

   - Action plan will be available by 5/09. The business process reengineering will be completed by 4/09 and the implementation project plan will be developed by 5/09.

MARIANA PARDO	1/8/09
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	HUBZone Program - ACTING DIRECTOR
Signature	Title

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name: HUBZone Program

Performance Indicator Title	**Small Businesses Assisted (PAR measure)**
SB Assisted	
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: to measure the total number of firm certifications and re-certifications processed by HUBZone Strategic Objective: to track the total volume of clients in the HUBZone program
Why chose this indicator	This measure allows HUBZone to track its total volume of clients.
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	This measure tracks the number of business that connect with the HUBZone Program office seeking HUBZone certification and allows the program office to allocate the necessary resource to service these businesses.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	To ascertain resources.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☒ Output ☐ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Job creation and revenue growth
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	N/A
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Sum of all program certifications and re-certifications
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	Total certifications plus total re-certifications
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	There has been a backlog in the processing of re-certifications and this has increased the number of annual program certification actions.
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan):	 A firm applies for certification or re-certification.

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

2. Identify how the data record is captured: 3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	The data is stored in HUBZone Certification Tracking System. The data is captured quarterly immediately. None HCTS
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Available 5 business days after end of fiscal year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	The data is captured and stored in HCTS.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	GAO has revealed several potential weaknesses in the data currently available due to the program's flawed business processes. To correct these weaknesses, HUBZone is undergoing a full business process reengineering, has reviewed all of its member firms, and has petitioned for a full-time staff economist to review its metrics and improve data quality.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	The GAO has recommended that HUBZone completely re-engineer all of its business processes, and this would include the certification/re-certification process. This activity is ongoing.
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	HUBZone plans to review its measures after it has completed its business process re-engineering and after it has hired an economist to analyze the date. The economist will either approve the current measures or create new ones to improve the quality of the data that HUBZone collects.
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	There has been a backlog in the processing of re-certifications and this has increased the number of annual program certification actions.

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting

HUBZONE

INDICATOR: Annual Value of Federal Contracts

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

MARIANA PARDO	HUBZone Prog. - Acting Director
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	1/8/09
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name: HUBZone Program

Performance Indicator Title	**Program certification actions**
Annual Value of Federal Contracts	
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: to measure the total amount of dollars in contract awards to HUBZone firms Strategic Objective: to track the total volume of dollars awarded in contracts to HUBZone firms
Why chose this indicator	It determines the number of federal dollars awarded to HUBZone firms.
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	HUBZone firms are eligible for federal contracts and this measure tracks the total value of the contracts awarded to HUBZone firms.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	It will be used to determine statutory compliance.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: [X] Output [ ] Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Job creation, revenue growth
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	N/A
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Total sum of dollars in federal contracts awarded to all HUBZone firms
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	Sum of dollars in federal contracts awarded to all HUBZone firms
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	N/A
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured:	 A contract is awarded to a HUBZone firm. The data is stored in FPDS.

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	Annually 6 months – Government Contracting must receive certification of the contracting data from procuring agencies to validate amount reported FPDS
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	2/09
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Government Contracting received certification from procuring agencies.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	N/A
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	N/A
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	N/A
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	N/A

INDICATOR: Prime Contracting – Fed Contract Dollars Awarded to SB ($ Billions)

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "HIGH".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☑ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

DAVID LOINES	A Deputy Director Ofc Gov Contracting
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	
Signature	Date 1-8-9

19

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name: Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, Office of Government Contracting

Performance Indicator Title	Increase number of Federal Contract dollars awarded to small businesses
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: 1 Strategic Objective: 1.6
Why chose this indicator	Data is available that reflects award of contracts to small businesses.
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	We believe there is a direct positive relationship between the receipt of increased Federal contract revenue and revenue growth reported to small firms.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Results are used to guide program emphasis in annual operating plan.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☐ Outcome X
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	By 2009, small businesses assisted by Federal agencies benefiting from Federal contracts or from international assistance will exceed the national average revenue growth rate.
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	There are no known limitations to the relationship between this PI and the outcome. PI will be examined under a planned evaluation of procurement assistance programs.
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Dollars in billions
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	The value of total contract actions awarded to small businesses in a given fiscal year is divided by the value of total contract actions awarded to small businesses in the preceding fiscal year.
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No changes required
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan):	 Award of contracts are recorded in the Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation

	(FPDS-NG).
2. Identify how the data record is captured:	Data is entered into FPDS-NG by the contracting officer or other acquisition staff, manually or by transmission from contract writing system.
3: Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly):	Ongoing
4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year):	Data is not available until the 2nd or 3rd quarter of the next fiscal year.
5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	GSAs Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG)
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Data has historically become available during the second or third quarter of the next fiscal year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Responsibility for determining the accuracy, reliability, and quality of data reported in FPDS-NG rests with reporting agencies and GSA. However, SBA routinely reviews FPDS-NG data and provides guidance to agencies to increase data reliability and timeliness. Agencies must attest to data reliability to the Director of Office of Federal Procurement Policy.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	Responsibility for data integrity rests with reporting agencies and GSA. Data is entered into FPDS-NG by import from contract writing applications and manually. It is subject to data entry error. Logical edits are built into the system to mitigate some data limitations. Migration from manual data entry to importation of data from contract writing applications will substantially curtail opportunity for inaccuracy.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	We are working with the Office of the Inspector General and agencies to ensure contracts in FPDS-NG as awards to small businesses are, in fact, awarded to eligible concerns.
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	Annually agencies are required to attest to the completeness and accuracy of the information entered into the system. With GSA, SBA routinely reviews FPDS-NG data and provides guidance to agencies to increase the reliability of reported data.
If this indicator was used in the prior year	N/A

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting 14- 2

INDICATOR: **Prime Contracting – Jobs Created/Retained (#)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "HIGH".

The data provided represent (Check one) [V] Actual or [ ] Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

David Loines	A Deputy Director OfC Gov Contracting
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	1-8-9
Signature	Date

14 2

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

Enter Office name: Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, Office of Government Contracting

Performance Indicator Title	Job Created/Sustained
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: 1 Strategic Objective: 1.6
Why chose this indicator	Reliable data is available on both contract activity and employment that will reflect the relationship between the two.
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	We believe there is a direct relationship between the number of jobs created or retained in the small business sector and the value of Federal contract awards to small businesses.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Results are used to guide program emphasis in annual operating plans.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☐ Outcome X
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	The number of jobs created or sustained by award of Federal contracts to small businesses.
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	There are no known limitations to the relationship between this PI and the outcome. This PI will be examined under a planned evaluation of procurement assistance programs.
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Number of jobs
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	The value of contract awards to small businesses, published in the Annual Goaling Report, is divided by the average revenue supported by one employee.
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No changes required.
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan):	Creation of contracting records in data system.

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

14-2

2. Identify how the data record is captured:	Contracting data is extracted from data system through generator of Small Business Goaling Report. Employment data is captured from U.S. Census Bureau.
3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly):	Collection of contracting data is dynamic, while the reporting upon which this PI is based is annual.
4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year):	Data is not available until the 2nd or 3rd quarter of the next fiscal year.
5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	GSAs Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG)
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Data has historically become available during the second or third quarter of the next fiscal year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Contracting data in FPDS-NG upon which this PI is calculated is certified by acquisition agencies as to completeness and accuracy.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	Records in FPDS-NG may be incorrectly characterized as contracts having been awarded to small businesses, when they may have been awarded to large concerns. Inaccurate coding may result in understatement of award to small businesses.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	We have worked with the Office of the Inspector General to ensure contracts characterized in FPDS-NG as award to small businesses are awarded to eligible concerns. This has been largely accomplished through issuance of regulations stipulating periodic recertification of size on long-term contracts.
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	Continued monitoring of the quantity of contracting data in FPDS-NG.
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	None

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting

INDICATOR: **SDB – SB Certified (#)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date <u>one</u> of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

<u>The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".</u>

The data provided represent (Check one) ☑ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Joseph P. Loddo	Director for BD
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	1/6/09
Signature	Date

15-1

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name:
Office of Business Development
Small Disadvantaged Business Program

Performance Indicator Title	Small Business Certification
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: Improve the economic environment for small business Strategic Objective: Increase the opportunities for small businesses to receive open and fair access to Federal contracts
Why chose this indicator	**Provides subcontracting and prime contract opportunities to small disadvantaged businesses**
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Indicates the number of small businesses certified as Small Disadvantaged Businesses during the fiscal year
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	This indicator measures the number of small businesses certified as SDB firms. This contributes to SBA's outcomes
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☒ Output ☐ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	SDB certified small businesses have a better opportunity to receive subcontracts from prime contractors, because the prime contractors receive contracting incentives to include them in their subcontracting plans. The more contracts a small business receives, the more jobs it can sustain. SDB Certified small businesses have a better opportunity to grow their revenue and sustain it, because their SDB certification enables them to have an advantage against non-SDB certified firms to obtain some types of contracts since the Federal agencies do have an SDB goal to reach each year.
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	The connection is more anecdotal and presumed than based upon scholarly research
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	o Each time a firm is approved for certification the Office of Certification and Eligibility inputs the data into the SDB Tracking System data base. o The New Tracking Tool within Share Point offers tracking cradle to grave tracking of each application package o The New Tracking Tool identifies duplicate applications within the system

15-1

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	The tracking system uses all the dates associated within the business rules to indicate compliance and non-compliance
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	N/A
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured: 3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	1a) Case received 1b) Case Screened 1c) Case returned to applicant 1d) Case returned to SBA 1e) Case screened 1f) Case placed into Processing 1g) Case returned, Denied or Approved 2) Each data field requires an input action by the analyst working the case and/or team leader 3) Data is captured on a daily basis 4) Data is captured on a daily basis and uploaded into the Share Point Master file at the end of the day. (one day lag time) 5) The system of record is the BD MIS; however, we are also using in conjunction the Share Point Tracking Tool.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Fiscal Year End Reporting will be available the next business day after the FYE
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	The analyst and the team leaders certify the accuracy of their reporting
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	Dual tracking tool being used in conjunction with the BD MIS
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	Reliability of the information, which is being resolved by the tracking tool and new BD MIS
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy	The Share Point Tracking System is being merged

15-1

or completeness of data	into the BD MIS to be fully automated
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	BD MIS was being used and is being updated with the new BD MIS with our new Tracking Tools.

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting   18 - 1

Indicator: OFO-Annual 8(a) Reviews (%)

The data quality for this indicator is considered (**Check one**):

☑ **MEDIUM** – Some weaknesses exist but the data is of sufficient quality to manage the program.

☐ **LOW** – Data quality is insufficient for this data to be used to manage the program; i.e., the results for this indicator should NOT be publicly reported.

The data provided represent (Check one) ☐ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Although measures were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data being reported is accurate, the data, procedures and/or source documentation contains the following weaknesses disclosed below.

1. Identify known or suspected weaknesses in the data being reporting (e.g., limitations in the verification procedures; weaknesses in the data collection process; known flaws in the data): The information is provided by the 8(a) firm. There could be errors in the information provided or a problem with the timeliness of the information

2. Describe procedures currently being applied to mitigate the weaknesses:
new BDMIS system have program participant enter data into the system. This will improve quality of data.

3. Describe actions planned to improve the quality of the data in future reporting cycles:

Bridget Bean	DAA/OFO
Name (printed)	Title
Bridget Bean	DAA/OFO
Signature	Title

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

1	**Office**	**Full name of the office**
2	Program	**Office of Field Operations**
3	Performance Indicator (PI)	Annual 8(a) Reviews
4	Strategic Goal	Agency compliance and statutory requirements.
5	Long Term Objective	Maintain program integrity
6	Nature of the PI	Indicate whether PI is an (X) Output (2) Outcome (3) Intermediate Outcome
7	Qualitative definition of PI	The PI represents the number of Annual Reviews completed on 8(a) firms.
8	Indicate if indicator is a key performance indicator	(X) Yes ( ) No
9	Indicate criteria making indicator a key performance indicator. X measures major contributions that your program makes to the achievement of SBA's outcomes ☐ used for managing a program ☐ used for justifying budget requests	
10	SBA Outcome(s) this PI contributes to	By FY 2008, increase to 8112 the program integrity.
11	Explain for each outcome its connection with the PI	There is believed to be a positive correlation between the number of firms reviewed and program integrity.
12	Verification (done or planned) of the outcome/PI connection	E 8(a) reports
13	Limitations of the PI connection with the outcome	None
14	Describe plans to address limitations to the connection	None needed
15	Data source for PI (name of report and Data System)	Agency Reporting Systems
16	Frequency of collection and reporting	As needed
17	By the end of this FY, the PI's value will be identified as either an estimate or actual	Actual
18	Methodology used for setting target values	Annual Goals process
19	Describe any issues with completeness of data	None
20	Methods used to determine accuracy of data	System edits
21	Limitations to accuracy of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	None
22	Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy of data	None needed
23	Formula to calculate the PI (if appropriate)	N/A
24	Are all the contributors to this PI using the same definitions?	Yes
25	Were all data points for this PI produced during the current FY?	NO
26	How is this PI being used for program management decision making?	National Goal Setting
27	Limitations to the PI use for program management decisions	None

18-1

Instructions for Completing Data Validation

28	Plans to address limitations to PI use for program management decisions	None Needed
29	Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that may affect this PI	None

The data quality for this indicator is considered (**Check one**):

☑ **MEDIUM** – Some weaknesses exist but the data is of sufficient quality to manage the program.

☐ **LOW** – Data quality is insufficient for this data to be used to manage the program; i.e., the results for this indicator should NOT be publicly reported.

The data provided represent (Check one) ☐ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Although measures were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data being reported is accurate, the data, procedures and/or source documentation contains the following weaknesses disclosed below.

1. Identify known or suspected weaknesses in the data being reporting (e.g., limitations in the verification procedures; weaknesses in the data collection process; known flaws in the data):

Client information is entered at every district office, so there may be inconsistency in the way information is reported. SBA + its resource partners could enter information on the same client + because they are identified by a client # there could be double counting.

2. Describe procedures currently being applied to mitigate the weaknesses:

1. Enhancements to to EDMIS
2. Working w/ resource partners to share more client information.

3. Describe actions planned to improve the quality of the data in future reporting cycles:

Bridget Bean	1/12/09
Name (printed)	Title
Bridget Bean	1/12/09
Signature	Title

18 2

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

1	**Office**	**Full name of the office**
2	Program	**Office of Field Operations**
3	Performance Indicator (PI)	SB Assisted – Counseling and Training
4	Strategic Goal	Increase small business success especially targeting underserved markets.
5	Long Term Objective	Objective 2.2: Maximize the sustainability and growth of existing small businesses assisted by SBA.
6	Nature of the PI	Indicate whether PI is an (X) Output (2) Outcome (3) Intermediate Outcome
7	Qualitative definition of PI	The PI represents the number of counseling and training received.
8	Indicate if indicator is a key performance indicator	(X) Yes ( ) No
9	Indicate criteria making indicator a key performance indicator. X measures major contributions that your program makes to the achievement of SBA's outcomes ☐ used for managing a program ☐ used for justifying budget requests	Explain in which way criteria is met by this indicator. Through counseling and training efforts SBA assists and trains small businesses.
10	SBA Outcome(s) this PI contributes to	This PI contributes to the success of the success of the Agency mission.
11	Explain for each outcome its connection with the PI	There is believed to be a positive correlation between the training and counseling and small business success.
12	Verification (done or planned) of the outcome/PI connection	N/A
13	Limitations of the PI connection with the outcome	None
14	Describe plans to address limitations to the connection	None needed
15	Data source for PI (name of report and Data System)	EDMIS II reports
16	Frequency of collection and reporting	As needed
17	By the end of this FY, the PI's value will be identified as either an estimate or actual	Actual
18	Methodology used for setting target values	Annual Goals process
19	Describe any issues with completeness of data	None
20	Methods used to determine accuracy of data	System edits
21	Limitations to accuracy of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	None
22	Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy of data	None needed
23	Formula to calculate the PI (if appropriate)	N/A
24	Are all the contributors to this PI using the same definitions?	Yes

18-2

25	Were all data points for this PI produced during the current FY?	NO
26	How is this PI being used for program management decision making?	National Goal Setting
27	Limitations to the PI use for program management decisions	None
28	Plans to address limitations to PI use for program management decisions	None Needed
29	Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that may affect this PI	None

INDICATOR: **Disaster – Disaster Having Field Presence Within 3 Days (%)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Herbert L. Mitchell	AA/DA
Name (printed)	Title
Herbert L. Mitchell	1/8/2009
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name: Office of Disaster Assistance

Performance Indicator Title	**Disasters having field presence within 3 days (%)**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: **Disasters having field presence within 3 days (%)** Strategic Objective: 3.1 Maximize the timely restoration of businesses and homes following a disaster. 3.2 Provide courteous and professional customer service.
Why chose this indicator	
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Coordinate SBA response and promote SBA disaster loan program after a declared disaster.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Determine loan processing staff requirements and training needs. Determine budget requests.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: [X] Output [ ] Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Promote SBA disaster program in disaster area.
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	SBA staff deployed to disaster area immediately after a disaster to coordinate SBA response and promote SBA disaster loan program.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No change
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 16. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 17. Identify how the data record is captured: 18. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly):	Disaster response creates data record. Record captured by Disaster Field Office certification. Monthly certification

19-1

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

19. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year):	Certification of Field presence is submitted within the first week of the month.
20. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	Disaster Office certification
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Data is available the first week of the new fiscal year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Disaster Office certification is correct and complete.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	No issues
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	No issues
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No change

INDICATOR: Disaster – Loans With Initial Disbursements Within 5 Days of Loan Closing (%)

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Herbert L. Mitchell	AA/DA
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	1/8/2009
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

Enter Office name: Office of Disaster Assistance

Performance Indicator Title	**Loans with initial disbursements within 5 days of loan closing (%)**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: **Loans with initial disbursements within 5 days of loan closing (%)** Strategic Objective: 3.1 Maximize the timely restoration of businesses and homes following a disaster. 3.2 Provide courteous and professional customer service.
Why chose this indicator	
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Provides for timely start of replacing or rebuilding disaster damaged property.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: [X] Output [ ] Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Replace or rebuild disaster damaged property.
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Unit of measure is %
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No change
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 21. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 22. Identify how the data record is captured:	 Data record created by SBA receiving signed and dated loan closing documents from Borrower. Loan closing document information manually entered into DCMS.

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

23. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly):	Data capture is immediately after loan closing documents are entered into DCMS.
24. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year):	Reports are generated within the first week of month.
25. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	Data is reported on DCMS reports #200 Monthly Report and #201Cumulative Report.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Reports are generated within the first week of month.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Reports reviewed by management.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	No issues
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	Data is correct and complete
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No issues

INDICATOR: **Disaster – Time to Process 85% of Home Applications (Days)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Herbert L. Mitchell — AA/DA
Name (printed) — Title

[signature] — 1/9/2009
Signature — Date

19-3

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name: Office of Disaster Assistance

Performance Indicator Title	**Time to process 85% of home applications (days)**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: **Time to process 85% of home applications (days)** Strategic Objective: 3.1 Maximize the timely restoration of businesses and homes following a disaster. 3.2 Provide courteous and professional customer service.
Why chose this indicator	
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Restore homes affected by disaster.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: [X] Output [ ] Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Home reconstruction or restoration.
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Unit of measure is #
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No change
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 26. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan):	Loan application creates data record.
27. Identify how the data record is captured:	DCMS captures record at loan processing decision.
28. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly):	Data is captured immediately.

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

29. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year):	Reports are generated within the first week of month.
30. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	Data is reported on DCMS reports #200 Monthly Report and #201Cumulative Report.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Reports are generated within the first week of month.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Reports reviewed by management.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	No issues
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	Data is correct and complete
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No issues

INDICATOR: **Disaster – Time to Process 85% of Business Physical Applications (Days)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Herbert L. Mitchell	AA/DA
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	1/8/2009
Signature	Date

19-4

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name: Office of Disaster Assistance

Performance Indicator Title	**Time to process 85% of business physical applications (days)**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: **Time to process 85% of business physical applications (days)** Strategic Objective: 3.1 Maximize the timely restoration of businesses and homes following a disaster. 3.2 Provide courteous and professional customer service.
Why chose this indicator	
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Restore businesses affected by disaster.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: [X] Output [ ] Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Job retention, job creation, and revitalize business
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Unit of measure is #
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No change
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 31. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan):	Loan application creates data record.
32. Identify how the data record is captured:	DCMS captures record at loan processing decision.
33. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly):	Data is captured immediately.

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

34. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year):	Reports are generated within the first week of month.
35. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	Data is reported on DCMS reports #200 Monthly Report and #201Cumulative Report.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Reports are generated within the first week of month.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Reports reviewed by management.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	No issues
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	Data is correct and complete
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No issues

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting 19 - 5

INDICATOR: **Disaster – Time to Process 85% of EIDL Applications (Days)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Herbert L. Mitchell	AA/DA
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	1/9/2009
Signature	Date

19-5

(19)

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name: Office of Disaster Assistance

Performance Indicator Title	**Time to process 85% of EIDL applications (days)**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: **Time to process 85% of EIDL applications (days)** Strategic Objective: 3.1 Maximize the timely restoration of businesses and homes following a disaster. 3.2 Provide courteous and professional customer service.
Why chose this indicator	
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Restore businesses economically affected by disaster.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: [X] Output [ ] Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Job retention, job creation, and revitalize business
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Unit of measure is #
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No change
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 36. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan):	Loan application creates data record.
37. Identify how the data record is captured:	DCMS captures record at loan processing decision.
38. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly):	Data is captured immediately.

19-5

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

39. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 40. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	Reports are generated within the first week of month. Data is reported on DCMS reports #200 Monthly Report and #201Cumulative Report.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Reports are generated within the first week of month.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Reports reviewed by management.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	No issues
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	Data is correct and complete
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No issues

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting

INDICATOR: **Disaster – SB Sustaining Economic Injury that Remain Operational 6 Months After Final Disbursement (%)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Herbert L. Mitchell	AA/DA
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	1/8/2009
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

19-6

Enter Office name: Disaster

Performance Indicator Title	**SB sustaining economic injury that remain operational six months after final disbursement (%)**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: **SB sustaining economic injury that remain operational six months after final disbursement (%)** Strategic Objective: 3.1 Maximize the timely restoration of businesses and homes following a disaster. 3.2 Provide courteous and professional customer service.
Why chose this indicator	
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	measures customer service that program makes to the achievement of SBA's outcomes
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Evaluate disaster loan program impact.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☒ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Survey of disaster loan applicants and borrowers conducted by ACSI in conjunction with the University of Michigan.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	N/A
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No change
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured:	ACSI Survey – ODA provides a random sample of loans by type and by approval / decline decision for ACSI to conduct survey. Data is collected on yearly basis. ACSI will survey disaster loan applicants and

19-6

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	Surveyors need to contact applicants or borrowers for sufficient sample to calculate survey percentages. ACSI provides a written report to SBA Disaster Assistance program.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	End of Fiscal Year or first month of new Fiscal Year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	SBA has used ACSI survey since 2003
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	No issues.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	No issues
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No Change

INDICATOR: **Disaster – SB Sustaining Physical Damage Restored within 6 Months After Final Disbursement (%)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Herbert L. Mitchell	AA/DA
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	1/8/2009
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

19-7

Enter Office name:

Performance Indicator Title	**SB sustaining physical damage restored within six months after final disbursement (%)**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: **SB sustaining physical damage restored within six months after final disbursement (%)** Strategic Objective: 3.1 Maximize the timely restoration of businesses and homes following a disaster. 3.2 Provide courteous and professional customer service.
Why chose this indicator	
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	measures customer service that program makes to the achievement of SBA's outcomes
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Evaluate disaster loan program impact.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: [ ] Output [X] Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Survey of disaster loan applicants and borrowers conducted by ACSI in conjunction with the University of Michigan.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	N/A
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No change
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 6. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan):	ACSI Survey – ODA provides a random sample of loans by type and by approval / decline decision for ACSI to conduct survey.
7. Identify how the data record is captured:	Data is collected on yearly basis.

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

immediate, weekly, quarterly): 9. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 10. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	the end of the Fiscal Year. Surveyors need to contact applicants or borrowers for sufficient sample to calculate survey percentages. ACSI provides a written report to SBA Disaster Assistance program.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	End of Fiscal Year or first month of new Fiscal Year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	SBA has used ACSI survey since 2003
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	No issues.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	No issues
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No Change

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting

INDICATOR: **Disaster – Homeowners Restoring Their Homes Within 6 Months of Final Disbursement (%)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date <u>one</u> of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

<u>The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**"</u>.

The data provided represent (Check one) [X] Actual or [ ] Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Herbert L. Mitchell	AA/DA
Name (printed)	Title
Herbert L. Mitchell	1/8/2009
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

Enter Office name:

Performance Indicator Title	Homeowners restoring their homes within six months of final disbursement (%)
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: **Homeowners restoring their homes within six months of final disbursement (%)** Strategic Objective: 3.1 Maximize the timely restoration of businesses and homes following a disaster. 3.2 Provide courteous and professional customer service.
Why chose this indicator	
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	measures customer service that program makes to the achievement of SBA's outcomes
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Evaluate disaster loan program impact.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☒ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Survey of disaster loan applicants and borrowers conducted by ACSI in conjunction with the University of Michigan.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	N/A
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No change
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 11. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 12. Identify how the data record is captured: 13. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g.,	ACSI Survey – ODA provides a random sample of loans by type and by approval / decline decision for ACSI to conduct survey. Data is collected on yearly basis. ACSI will survey disaster loan applicants and borrowers and provide a written report to ODA at

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

14. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 15. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	Surveyors need to contact applicants or borrowers for sufficient sample to calculate survey percentages. ACSI provides a written report to SBA Disaster Assistance program.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	End of Fiscal Year or first month of new Fiscal Year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	SBA has used ACSI survey since 2003
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	No issues.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	No issues
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No Change

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting 19 - 9

INDICATOR: **Disaster – Renters Restored Within 6 Months After Final Disbursement (%)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Herbert L. Mitchell	AA/DA
Name (printed)	Title
Herbert L. Mitchell	1/8/2009
Signature	Date

19-9

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

Enter Office name: Disaster

Performance Indicator Title	**Renters restored within six months after final disbursement (%)**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: **Renters restored within six months after final disbursement (%)** Strategic Objective: 3.1 Maximize the timely restoration of businesses and homes following a disaster. 3.2 Provide courteous and professional customer service.
Why chose this indicator	
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	measures customer service that program makes to the achievement of SBA's outcomes
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Evaluate disaster loan program impact.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☒ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Survey of disaster loan applicants and borrowers conducted by ACSI in conjunction with the University of Michigan.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	N/A
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No change
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 16. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 17. Identify how the data record is captured: 18. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g.,	ACSI Survey – ODA provides a random sample of loans by type and by approval / decline decision for ACSI to conduct survey. Data is collected on yearly basis. ACSI will survey disaster loan applicants and borrowers and provide a written report to ODA at

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

	Surveyors need to contact applicants or borrowers for sufficient sample to calculate survey percentages.
19. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year):	ACSI provides a written report to SBA Disaster Assistance program.
20. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	End of Fiscal Year or first month of new Fiscal Year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	SBA has used ACSI survey since 2003
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	No issues.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	No issues
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No Change

Certification of Data Quality for Public Reporting 19 - 10

INDICATOR: **Disaster – Customer Satisfaction Rate (%)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Herbert L. Mitchell	AA/DA
Name (printed)	Title
Herbert Mitchell	1/8/2009
Signature	Date

19 - 10

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name: Office of Disaster Assistance

Performance Indicator Title	**Customer Satisfaction Rate**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: **Customer Satisfaction Rate** Strategic Objective: 3.1 Maximize the timely restoration of businesses and homes following a disaster. 3.2 Provide courteous and professional customer service.
Why chose this indicator	
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	measures customer service that program makes to the achievement of SBA's outcomes
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Used to Determine Training Needs
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☑ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Survey of disaster loan applicants and borrowers conducted by ACSI in conjunction with the University of Michigan.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	N/A
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No change
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan):	ACSI Survey – ODA provides a random sample of loans by type and by approval / decline decision for ACSI to conduct survey.
2. Identify how the data record is captured:	Data is collected on yearly basis.
3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly):	ACSI will survey disaster loan applicants and borrowers and provide a written report to ODA at the end of the Fiscal Year.

19-10

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year):	Surveyors need to contact applicants or borrowers for sufficient sample to calculate survey percentages.
5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	ACSI provides a written report to SBA Disaster Assistance program.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	End of Fiscal Year or first month of new Fiscal Year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	SBA has used ACSI survey since 2003
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	No issues.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	No issues
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No Change

INDICATOR: **Advocacy -- Published Research Reports (#)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) [x] Actual or [ ] Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Shawne Carter McGibbon	Acting Chief Counsel
Name (printed)	Title
Shawne C. McGibbon	01-08-09
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure 16-1
Enter Office name: Office of Advocacy

Performance Indicator Title	**Published Research Reports**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: Improve the economic environment for small business Strategic Objective: Minimize the regulatory burden on small business through effective advocacy
Why chose this indicator	Best available measure
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Measure is an indicator of productivity (and budget), and a measure of fulfilling statutory mandates on producing small business research.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Resources will be needed to continue conducting in-house research and contract research; resources will also be used to print, publish, distribute and publicize research products.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: [√] Output [ ] Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Greater understanding of small business issues by policymakers, small business stakeholders and academia.
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	The number of research reports published annually is a direct reflection of the budget allocated to the office; also, the scope, significance and content of each report varies.
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Each time a unique/new research product is published, it is counted. Some of the products include updated quarterly publications, some are annual reports to Congress & the President, some are one-time reports on current small business issues. Advocacy's research was mandated by Congress when the office was created in 1976. See 15 USC § 634a et seq.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	Counting number of reports published annually.
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	No change.
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan):	1. When a new research product is completed and published.

2. Identify how the data record is captured: 3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	2. The data is captured in an internal database. 3. The data is captured as soon as the research product has been completed and published; it is presented quarterly in a report. 4. Quarterly. 5. Internal database
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Year-end data is available on or about the last day of the fiscal year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Report goes through an internal clearance process to ensure accuracy.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	None.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None.
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	N/A
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No changes.

16-2

Indicator: Advocacy - Regulatory Cost Savings to SB ($ Billions)

The data quality for this indicator is considered (**Check one**):

[x] **MEDIUM** – Some weaknesses exist but the data is of sufficient quality to manage the program.

[ ] **LOW** – Data quality is insufficient for this data to be used to manage the program; i.e., the results for this indicator should NOT be publicly reported.

The data provided represent (Check one) [ ] Actual or [x] Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Although measures were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data being reported is accurate, the data, procedures and/or source documentation contains the following weaknesses disclosed below.

1. Identify known or suspected weaknesses in the data being reported (e.g., limitations in the verification procedures; weaknesses in the data collection process; known flaws in the data):

Advocacy calculates cost savings by comparing the cost of a proposed rule prior to our intervention and the cost of a final rule after our intervention. Advocacy does not create the data; the data mostly comes from other sources such as agency economic analyses contained in the rulemaking docket or industry research studies. This is generally the best data available and eliminates the perception that Advocacy artificially inflates the number. The cost savings number is not a complete reflection of Advocacy's effectiveness because data is not always available and because some of Advocacy's interventions occur at the confidential interagency stage (prior to rule proposal) and cost savings cannot be revealed publicly.

2. Describe procedures currently being applied to mitigate the weaknesses:

Weaknesses cannot be mitigated by Advocacy since they are controlled by outside factors. Advocacy constantly urges agencies to publish more complete data, however, agency compliance cannot be guaranteed. Generally, Advocacy's final cost savings estimate is conservative.

3. Describe actions planned to improve the quality of the data in future reporting cycles:

Advocacy will continue to provide the best data available.

Shawne Carter McGibbon	Acting Chief Counsel
Name (printed)	Title
Shawne C. McGibbon	01-8-09
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure 16-2
Enter Office name: Office of Advocacy

Performance Indicator Title	**Regulatory Cost Savings to Small Entities ($ Billions)**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: Improve the economic environment for small business Strategic Objective: Minimize the regulatory burden on small business through effective advocacy
Why chose this indicator	Best available measure
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Advocacy's intervention during the rulemaking process results in cost savings for small business; the annual cost savings achieved by Advocacy far exceed the cost of the program; Small business dollars saved by not having to comply with unnecessary federal regulations and be used to grow or maintain affected small businesses.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Advocacy will continue its statutorily-mandated regulatory interventions in order to achieve cost savings that benefit small entities.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☑ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	N/A
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	The indicator is difficult to predict for goal-setting purposes despite methodology for establishing target values; there is no way to determine in advance what rules will cost in any given year or what cost saving modifications will be made based on Advocacy's intervention; Advocacy must generally rely on federal agency or industry-supplied data as Advocacy does not create the data.
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Indicator measured in billions of dollars based on a goal of $5.5 billion annually.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	An average of 6 years' cost savings, minus outliers equals the goal of $5.5 billion annually.
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	In previous 5 years, measure was based on the average of existing years' savings, minus outliers, increasing at a rate of 10% annually; new indicator is based on an average of 6 years' savings, minus outliers (with no annual increase predicted).
Section II: Indicator Quality	

Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured: 3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	1. When an Advocacy intervention (comment letter, congressional testimony, or other action) results in federal agency action to reduce small business regulatory burden which can be disclosed publicly (--some cost savings occur during confidential interagency negotiations and cannot be disclosed publicly) 2. The data is captured in an internal database. 3. The data is captured quarterly, but further validated/verified throughout the year. 4. Final data is reported annually in the Jan/Feb timeframe when Advocacy submits its report on Regulatory Flexibility Act compliance by federal agencies to Congress. 5. Internal database
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Year-end data is available in Jan/Feb of each year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Report goes through an internal clearance process to ensure accuracy.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	Advocacy does not create the data and must rely on industry or federal agency-supplied data. The data is only as complete and accurate as those sources provide. In many cases, federal agencies underestimate the cost of regulations, therefore the savings calculated may also be an underestimate; Not all cost savings can be included in the final tabulation because the savings are a result of confidential interagency communications and cannot be made public.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None.
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	Currently using the best available measure.
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No changes.

INDICATOR: **Advocacy -- Regulatory Staff with In-House Regulatory Flexibility Act Expertise (#)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) [x] Actual or [ ] Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Shawne Carter McGibbon	Acting Chief Counsel
Name (printed)	Title
Shawne C. McGibbon	01-08-09
Signature	Date

Enter Office name: Office of Advocacy

Performance Indicator Title	**Regulatory Staff with In-House Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) Expertise**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: Improve the economic environment for small business Strategic Objective: Minimize the regulatory burden on small business through effective advocacy
Why chose this indicator	Best available measure
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Measure is an indicator of productivity and fulfilling executive order mandate to train federal agencies on how to comply with the RFA.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Indicator is used to increase level of federal agency expertise in understanding the RFA; and ultimately, to minimize the burden of regulations on small entities as the regulations are being drafted.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☑ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	The number of regulatory staff trained is based on federal agency cooperation in agreeing to training; although Advocacy is required to conduct the training, federal agencies are not required to take it.
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Each time a federal employee is trained (at a 3.5-hour training session), it is counted. Training is required by Executive Order 13272.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	Counting number of employees trained annually.
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	For the previous 5 years the measure counted agencies that promulgate regulations impacting small businesses; the new indicator is based on the number of employees trained (since most agencies have had at least one training session and agencies have requested repeat training for new employees).
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan):	1. When a new training session is completed.

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure 16-3

2. Identify how the data record is captured: 3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	2. The data is captured in an internal database. 3. The data is captured as soon as the training session occurs; it is presented quarterly in a report. 4. Quarterly. 5. Internal database
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Year-end data is available on or about the last day of the fiscal year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Report goes through an internal clearance process to ensure accuracy.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	None.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None.
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	N/A
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No changes.

INDICATOR: **Advocacy – States Considering Legislative/Executive Regulatory Flexibility Action (#)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) [x] Actual or [ ] Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Shawne Carter McGibbon	Acting Chief Counsel
Name (printed)	Title
Shawne C. McGibbon	01-08-09
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure 16-4
Enter Office name: Office of Advocacy

Performance Indicator Title	**States Considering Legislative/Executive Regulatory Flexibility Action**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: Improve the economic environment for small business Strategic Objective: Minimize the regulatory burden on small business through effective advocacy
Why chose this indicator	Best available measure
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Will help ensure that each state is equipped with the education and the necessary laws to reduce small business regulatory burden.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Indicator used to help manage regional advocate outreach activities and travel budget.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☑ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	N/A
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Success of the indicator cannot be predicted with accuracy; there is no guarantee that legislation or an executive order can be achieved despite Advocacy's efforts; for instance, the political climate in a particular state may impact success of the indicator.
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Each time legislation or an executive order is introduced, or each time there is an example of successful state implementation of existing laws, it is counted.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	Counting.
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	Previous 5 years used a measure of the number of new states considering regulatory flexibility legislation or executive orders. New indicator includes amendments to previously enacted legislation, re-introduced legislation, and executive orders converted into legislation; also includes examples of successful state implementation of regulatory flexibility.
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a	 1. When legislation is introduced, an

data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured: 3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	executive order is drafted or when there is an example of successful implementation of existing laws 2. The data is captured in an internal database. 3. The data is captured when the trigger for counting occurs; it is presented quarterly in a report. 4. Quarterly. 5. Internal database.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Year-end data is available on or about the last day of the fiscal year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Report goes through an internal clearance process to ensure accuracy.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	None.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None.
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	N/A
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No changes.

INDICATOR: **Advocacy – Research Publications and Data Reports in Curricula (#)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) [x] Actual or [ ] Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Shawne Carter McGibbon	Acting Chief Counsel
Name (printed)	Title
Shawne C. McGibbon	01-08-09
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure 16-5
Enter Office name: Office of Advocacy

Performance Indicator Title	**Research Publications and Data Reports Used in Curricula**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: Improve the economic environment for small business Strategic Objective: Minimize the regulatory burden on small business through effective advocacy
Why chose this indicator	Best available measure
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Increases the number of academic institutions with access to vital small business data; increases number of students/institutions interested in the study of small business issues and entrepreneurship; increases the body of research in the field by spurring similar research
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Gaps in usage of research/data will determine where outreach resources should be spent; budget resources are needed to ensure that Advocacy's regional team can travel to universities to conduct lectures and/or encourage use of Advocacy research products in the classroom.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☑ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	N/A
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	Some institutions may not use Advocacy's research or data despite Advocacy's outreach efforts.
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Each time there is a demonstrated use of our research products in college/university curricula, it is counted.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	Counting.
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	Previous 5 years used number of universities from *Entrepreneur* magazine's top 100 entrepreneurship universities/colleges; new indicator includes all universities/colleges (beyond top 100), and includes repeat universities/colleges if a new use is demonstrated.
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator:	

1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured: 3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	1. When a university/college uses Advocacy research products in their curricula. 2. The data is captured in an internal database. 3. The data is captured when the trigger for counting occurs; it is presented quarterly in a report. 4. Quarterly. 5. Internal database.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	Year-end data is available on or about the last day of the fiscal year.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Report goes through an internal clearance process to ensure accuracy.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	None.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	None.
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	N/A
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	No changes.

INDICATOR: **Advocacy – Cost per $1 Million Savings ($)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☐ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Bruce Crippen	Financial Specialist
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	1/08/09
Signature	Date

INDICATOR: **BGateway – Hours Saved (# in Millions)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☑ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Christine H. Liu	Chief Information Officer
Name (printed)	Title
Christine H. Liu	1/8/2009
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

Performance Indicator Title	**Hours Saved (cumulative for the fiscal year)**
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: Improve the economic environment for small businesses Strategic Objective: LTO 1.1. – Minimize the regulatory burden on small businesses
Why chose this indicator	This indicator reflects businesses' view of how Business.gov is helping them.
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	This indicator most closely relates to the ultimate objective of Business.gov web site – saving businesses time and money. If businesses truly feel that the information available on the site is useful and helps them do well in business, then the program has succeeded.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Information on hours saved is used to determine if the format and content of the site is appropriate.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☑ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Not applicable
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	The approach for collecting this information is statistically valid, although the hours saved are self reported rather than an exact measure.
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Number of hours saved by businesses completing a survey.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	An average of the hours saved for each reported number is calculated. This is then multiplied by the number of respondents for that category to arrive at a total hours saved for each. These hours are then summed. The number of respondents is then summed and the summed hours saved are divided by the summed respondents to come up with an average number of hours saved. Visitors are calculated by looking at number of visitors presented with the ACSI survey divided by the sampling percentage. This then equals the number of users who were presented with the number of pages indicated by the loyalty factor (in this case 2 pages). The average hours saved is then multiplied by the number of visitors to come up with the hours saved.
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with	This indicator was used in the previous reporting cycle. There are no changes to the definition that would impact comparability.

17-1

the prior year's data.	
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 6. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 7. Identify how the data record is captured: 8. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly; quarterly): 9. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 10. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	The American Customer Satisfaction Index is used on Business.gov to measure overall customer satisfaction with the site. The methodology requires that certain questions be asked of survey respondents, although additional "custom" questions can be included. The Business Gateway team added a question: *By visiting Business.gov today, about how many total hours do you think you saved?* The survey is set to "pop up" to 30% of visitors who have viewed 2 or more pages on the site. A total of three hundred responses are necessary to generate survey results. The lag time to receive survey results is a factor of how many visitors come to Business.gov and how frequently those visitors complete the survey when it is presented. An additional lag time is incorporated for the company managing the survey results to develop their report. From the time, the 300 survey responses are completed to the time we receive the report is usually 1 month.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	The data is available now.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	The ACSI methodology is a widely used approach for measuring customer satisfaction. It is used in both the public and private sectors.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	Because information is self-reported in the ACSI survey, there is the possibility for bias to be introduced in the responses.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	There are no outstanding OIG or GAO findings or recommendations affecting this indicator.
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	There are no current plans to change the process for collecting this information.
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	This indicator was used in the prior year. There are no changes that affect the data quality.

INDICATOR: **BGateway – Customer Satisfaction (%)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☑ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Christine H. Liu	Chief Information Officer
Name (printed)	Title
Christine H. Liu	1/8/2009
Signature	Date

(17) 2

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

Performance Indicator Title	Customer Satisfaction (at end of the fiscal year)
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: Improve the economic environment for small businesses Strategic Objective: LTO 1.2 - Simplify interaction with federal government through the use of the Internet and information technology
Why chose this indicator	Customer satisfaction is a common measurement of web sites.
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	In order for Business.gov to be useful to businesses and save them time and money, visitors must be satisfied with the site and what they find there. The ACSI score is one of several factors that help us understand the public's opinion of the site.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	The ACSI score is used to gauge whether businesses are finding useful information when they visit the site. We closely monitor what folks are searching on and then add specific featured content on those topic
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☑ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Not applicable
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	There are studies that content that surveys of this nature may not accurately portray customer satisfaction since those most likely to complete the pop-up survey are either very happy or very unhappy. Accordingly, we use this as only one indicator of overall satisfaction with the site.
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Measure of customer opinion across several factors (e.g., design, search, etc.) of the web site. The individual measures are aggregated into a single index number.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	Index is calculated by the software tool that administers the survey and reported to SBA.
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	This indicator was used in the previous reporting cycle. There are no changes to the definition that would impact comparability.
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator:	The Foresee Results survey tool is integrated into the Business.gov web site. Triggers are set that cause the survey to pop up to 30% of visitors to the

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

11. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 12. Identify how the data record is captured: 13. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 14. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 15. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	site. Additionally, before the survey displays, the visitor must go to 2 pages (i.e., not just the home page.) Three hundred responses must be received in order for the index to be calculated. After the first 300 were collected, the index is recalculated for every 60 new responses (i.e., the oldest 60 responses are dropped and the newest 60 responses are added to what remains.) When a sufficient sample size has been met, the software calculates a new index. Reports on all factors of the index are available electronically any time the Business Gateway Team logs into the vendor's web site.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	The data is available now.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	The ACSI methodology is a widely used approach for measuring customer satisfaction. It is used in both the public and private sectors.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	While the results of the survey are considered to be statistically valid, because information is self-reported there is the possibility for bias to be introduced in the responses.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	There are no outstanding OIG or GAO findings or recommendations affecting this indicator.
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	There are no current plans to change the process for collecting this information.
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	This indicator was used in the prior year. There are no changes that affect the data quality.

INDICATOR: **BGateway – Referrals to Partner Sites per Month (%)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☑ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Christine H. Liu	Chief Information Officer
Name (printed)	Title
Christine H. Liu	1/8/2009
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

17 3

Performance Indicator Title	Percentage of referrals to partner sites (per month)
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: Improve the economic environment for small businesses Strategic Objective: LTO 1.2 - Simplify interaction with federal government through the use of the Internet and information technology
Why chose this indicator	While not a guarantee, the premise that a business could successfully find useful links through Business.gov and follow those links to another agency is one that indicates success for the web site.
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	At this point, Business.gov is primarily a linking site. This means that in order for a Business to actually obtain information, they need to go to the link within another agency. If a customer is clicking on a link, we presume that they are indeed finding the information they are seeking which means we are meeting our objective.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	The percentage of referrals, or "click thrus", is one of the indicators used to determine if relevant information is available on the site. Additionally, it shows the partner agencies how businesses are using Business.gov to get to their information.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: [X] Output [ ] Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	Not applicable
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	While the fact that a visitor clicked on a link is a sign that the information appeared to be relevant, it does not tell us for certain that the information was what they needed.
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Number of links clicked on in a given month of time
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	Not applicable
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	This indicator was used in the previous reporting cycle. There are no changes to the definition that would impact comparability.
Section II: Indicator Quality	

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

17.3

Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 16. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 17. Identify how the data record is captured: 18. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 19. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 20. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	Data is collected as soon as a user clicks on an external link, using an online tool called ~~Google Analytics~~ Coremetrics. The information is logged continually. Reports are generated daily. Our team aggregates this information to create the monthly statistics. The time lag between capture of the data and review of the statistics is a factor of the files being loaded into the tool the day after the data is gathered.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	The data is available now.
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	A second tool, WebTrends, is used to monitor other customer trends on Business.gov. It also logs the number of hits. A comparison of the statistics between WebTrends and Google Analytics is done routinely to ensure the numbers are reasonable.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	We are not aware of any limitations.
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	There are no outstanding OIG or GAO findings or recommendations affecting this indicator.
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	There are no current plans to change the process for collecting this information.
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	This indicator was used in the prior year. There are no changes that affect the data quality.

INDICATOR: **OCIO – IT Systems Availability (%)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☑ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Christine H. Liu	Chief Information Officer
Name (printed)	Title
Christine H. Liu	1/8/2004
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name: Office of the Chief Information Officer

20

OC 10

Performance Indicator Title	*Systems Availability*
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: *4.2 – Safe, secure IT environment supporting business decisions & operations* Strategic Objective:
Why chose this indicator	**Shows readiness of most commonly used IT systems within Agency**
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	**Delivery of key agency programs is tied to the use of Internet, databases, applications & E-mail**
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	**Systems availability is a broad health indicator that signals when attention to the most-used IT resources and systems is needed.**
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☑ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	• **In some instances, will measure availability but not actual usage.**
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	• **The measure is based on automated monitoring of IT systems that alert when a system resource becomes unavailable to intended users.**
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	• **Average of seven individual availability measures: e-mail, PDA, mainframe, databases, applications, Internet and Portal, as reported monthly.**
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	• **Not reported in prior cycle.**
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured:	 1. Systems monitoring devices report failures or anomalous performance 2. By e-mail, system recording, warning message or other alert notification

20-1

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly): 4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	3. Immediate for all monitored systems. **4. Lag time ranges between immediate and 4 hours depending on the IT system and frequency of human monitoring.** **5. E-mail system plus several contractor-attended IT operations not themselves within a system of record.**
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	• **At month or year end, plus 2 weeks**
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	• **Standard quality assurance methods; review of all customer reported problems; cross checking using othe automated tools for anomaly detection.**
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	• **None indicated**
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	• **None indicated**
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	• **None indicated**
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	• **No changes**

INDICATOR: **OCIO – Unauthorized Network or Data Breaches (#)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☑ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

Christine A. Liu	Chief Information Officer
Name (printed)	Title
Christine H. Liu	1/8/2009
Signature	Date

(20) 2

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name: *Office of the Chief Information Officer*

Performance Indicator Title	***Unauthorized Network and Data Breaches***
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: *4.2 – Safe, secure IT environment supporting business decisions & operations* Strategic Objective:
Why chose this indicator	A Standard measure of IT network safety
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	IT networks safe from intrusion (breach) can reliably be used by customers; consistently safe use is the primary goal of IT security efforts
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	Occurrence of breaches signal a treatable weakness that would have to be promptly addressed
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☒ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	This type of indicator signals a problem after it occurs, but typically will not give warning of an impending problem
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Unique events, non-conforming patterns, or pattern anomalies are the characteristics of information security breach indicators
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	NA
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	Significant information security breaches are reported through US CERT by law. SBA's ability to detect breaches has been strengthened by adopting several technical tools that detect anomalous events in ways SBA previously lacked
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured: 3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly):	1. Machine and network performance as monitored by software tools 2. Data is reported to authorized operators through the software tool(s) as part of their normal operation. 3. Data is collected at varied intervals: daily, bi-weekly or monthly depending on tools and systems in question. The results of most reports are

	available immediately but certain data is evaluated at bi-weekly or monthly intervals. Summary reports are prepared at specified intervals, normally monthly.
4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	4. Generally, this data is collected continuously and accessed by operators on a regular basis, sometimes daily, with alerts generated if an unusual condition presents itself. 5. Information is derived from SBA's IT infrastructure. i.e., IT networks, and selected devices such as database servers, communications routers and agency-owned computer hardware.
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	By October 20 annually
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Reported information is examined by professional staff and researched if "false positive" signs are suggested; data is taken directly from machine-generated reports with no editing possible.
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	Some limitations conceivably could exist as a result of outdated software, monitoring devices improperly installed or installed but not consistently monitored by attendants
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	Previous OIG audit findings have emphasized the need for continuous monitoring of IT networks aimed at detecting anomalous events or other indicators that may signal attempts to inappropriately access IT networks, data or resources..
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	Review of software product to ensure installation of current version(s); analysis of any presumed false positive signals generated by reports or logs.
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	Not previously used as performance indicator

INDICATOR: **OCFO – Unqualified Opinions for Audit Year (Yes/No)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

BRUCE CRIPPIN	FINANCIAL SPECIALIST
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	12\29\2008
Signature	Date

Enter Office name: Office of the Chief Financial Officer 21-1

Performance Indicator Title	Unqualified Opinion for Audit Year
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: 4 Strategic Objective: 4.3
Why chose this indicator	It is an independent evaluation of the quality and accuracy of the SBA's financial statements.
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	It is an independent evaluation of the quality and accuracy of the SBA's financial statements.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	The goal is to have clean opinions. If we do not, we must work to get it.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☒ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Unique event. An independent audit is held every year to determine the accuracy and quality of the SBA's financial statements.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured: 3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly):	The independent auditors will issue an opinion on the accuracy of the financial statements at the conclusion of their annual audit.

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	11/15 of each year
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Annual independent financial statement audit
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	

INDICATOR: **OCFO – Number of Material Weaknesses (#)**

Program offices are responsible for the quality of data that they provide for reporting in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report. Data quality has the following characteristics:

VALID: The indicator is relevant to program; steps were taken to assure that the data is complete, the data covers the entire fiscal year and; the indicator can be used by decision makers to manage the program.

VERIFIABLE: Documentation is maintained that allows an independent third party review to conclude that the results are accurately reported.

Accordingly, the Performance Management Office requires program managers to rate the data quality for each indicator confirming that the data quality is high or disclose any known or suspected weaknesses.

Data quality rated:

"High" – Has no known weaknesses, accurately represents the results of the program and may be independently verified.

"Medium" – Has some known or suspected weaknesses but is of sufficient quality to manage and/or represent the program results and may be independently verified.

"Low" – Has significant weaknesses and cannot be used to manage or represent the results of the program. Data rated "Low" will not be used for reporting in the PAR.

For each indicator you are requested to complete, sign and date one of the two statements below (the box directly following for indicators with "High" quality ratings, or the box on the next page for indicators with a "Medium" or "Low" quality rating).

The data quality for this indicator is considered "**HIGH**".

The data provided represent (Check one) ☒ Actual or ☐ Estimated results for the fiscal year.

In event of an audit, documentation is being maintained to allow an independent third party to: (1) verify that actions were taken to provide reasonable assurance that the data is accurate, and (2) confirm the data being reported.

BRUCE CRIPPIN	FINANCIAL SPECIALIST
Name (printed)	Title
[signature]	12/29/2008
Signature	Date

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure
Enter Office name: Office of the Chief Financial Officer

Performance Indicator Title	Number of Material Weaknesses identified in the annual financial audit
Section I: Indicator Definition and Relevance	
Identify the Strategic Goal and Objective that the indicator measures	Strategic Goal: 4 Strategic Objective: 4.3
Why chose this indicator	It is an independent evaluation of the quality and accuracy of the SBA's financial statements.
Briefly describe relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	It is an independent evaluation of the quality and accuracy of the SBA's financial statements.
Briefly describe how this indicator is used or will be used to manage the program	The goal is to have no material weaknesses. If we do not, we must work to get it.
Indicator measures an output (process) or outcome (result)	Check One: ☐ Output ☒ Outcome
If an output, list the outcome(s) this PI contributes to, e.g., job creation, revenue growth	
If applicable, describe any limitations on the relevance of this indicator for measuring program success	
Detailed definition of indicator. E.g.: o Units of measure ($, #'s) o Unique events versus duplicative; e.g., unique clients trained versus total trained. o Inclusions/exclusions; e.g.: definition of underserved market used	Unique event. An independent audit is held every year to determine the accuracy and quality of the SBA's financial statements.
Formula used to calculate the indicator (if appropriate)	
If this indicator was used in the last reporting cycle, identify any changes in the indicator definition that would impact comparability with the prior year's data.	
Section II: Indicator Quality	
Describe the data collection process for the indicator: 1. Identify the event or action that creates a data record (e.g., an approved loan): 2. Identify how the data record is captured: 3. Identify the frequency of data capture (e.g., immediate, weekly, quarterly):	The independent auditors will issue an opinion on the accuracy of the financial statements and identify material weaknesses at the conclusion of their annual audit.

Validation of Data Used in Performance Measure

4. Identify the reporting lag time between an event/action and the availability of data reporting (e.g., the number of days/weeks/months it takes to close a fiscal year): 5. ID the system of record for the indicator, e.g., what system did the information come from?	
Identify the date that actual year-end data will be available for reporting.	11/15 of each year
Describe the process to ensure that the reported data is complete and accurate	Annual independent financial statement audit
Describe any limitations to accuracy or completeness of data (records without data, wrong data, double counting, etc.)	
Describe any outstanding OIG or GAO recommendation that affect this indicator	
Describe plans to address limitations to accuracy or completeness of data	
If this indicator was used in the prior year reporting cycle, describe any changes affecting data quality.	