

## A. Verification and Validation of Measured Values

### Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate

Performance Measure	Progress toward providing recovery assistance at the 2009 target level for performance in non-catastrophic disasters.
Scope	The Recovery Program seeks to improve its performance in all non-catastrophic disasters in order to provide the most appropriate assistance with the greatest economy of time and expenditure. Progress in this direction will be tracked by a weighted index of performance measures that include customer satisfaction, delivery time, unit cost, and completion of program assessments. The specific performance measures and their annual targets are shown in Appendix A. The individual weights for the performance measures in the index have been established by the program manager. Successful achievement of all performance targets included in the index for each year will represent success for that fiscal year. Targets for performance measures in the index are set to increase each year in order to arrive progressively at 100% achievement of FY 2009 performance.
Data Source	The data include reports of statistics representing levels of customer satisfaction with both the Individual Assistance and Public Assistance programs; hard data related to unit costs and timeliness of assistance delivery; and reports on the results of systematic evaluation of assistance programs.
Collection Method	Data used to measure progress against this long-term performance goal will be collected from the National Emergency Management Information System (NEMIS) data, the automated deployment database (ADD), Integrated Financial Management Information System, focus groups, operational evaluations, telephone and mail surveys, public opinion analysis. Full range of data source and collection method yet to be determined.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Cycle time data are reliable as verified by several years experience in use. We could also track an application manually at various steps in the processing, if necessary. Unit cost of service should be reasonably reliable in FY 2007. Validity and reliability are increased as technology updates and enhancements do occur. Survey data are collected by outside contractors and using methods which guarantee both validity and reliability.

Performance Measure	Percentage of (A) Federal Departments and Agencies with fully operational Continuity of Operations (COOP) capabilities and (B) States with established COOP plans.
Scope	(A) FEMA will determine the percentage of federal departments and agencies with fully operational COOP capabilities based on criteria that define fully operational capabilities. The criteria are derived from documents such as Presidential Decision Directive 67 Enduring Constitutional Government and Continuity of Operations -- which reaffirmed the United States policy to have in place a comprehensive and effective program to ensure survival of our constitutional form of government and continuity of essential Federal functions under all circumstances -- numerous classified Operational Plans, and other guidance documents and matrices. The criteria include: (1) documentation incorporating current policies and programs, (2) adequate alternate facilities and ancillary equipment, (3) identification and protection of vital records, (4) interoperable communications, and (5) development and implementation of an effective Training and Exercise (T&E) program. Though the assessments of operational capability will be somewhat subjective, a team of federal officials will be used to make the assessments to help ensure consistency in making the determinations. (B) State and Local governments must be able to perform their minimum essential functions throughout the spectrum of possible threats. State and Local government COOP planning goals should include an all-hazards approach, the ability to be operational within twelve hours, and the ability to sustain operations for up to thirty days. State and local government COOP planning status will be determined through a survey designed to establish which have viable, executable plans, those that have plans that need revision, and those that have no plans. Based on the results of this survey, planning guidance will be developed. The criteria for an effective COOP plan should include the following: establishment of lines of succession, identification of essential functions, identification and protection of vital records, selection, preparation, and activation of alternate facilities, development of a viable Test, Training, and Exercise (TT&E) program, and interoperable communications.
Data Source	(A) The data for the assessments comes from a number of sources and it will eventually be compiled into the Readiness Reporting System (RRS) currently under development within FEMA's Office of National Security Coordination. The sources for the percentage of federal departments and agencies with fully operational COOP capabilities include: (1) self-assessments by the Federal D/As, (2) participation in training events and exercises, (3) real world events and activities such as 9/11/01, and (4) COOP assessments conducted by FEMA. (B) The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Headquarters, in conjunction with its Regions, will conduct a review and assessment of state and local Continuity of Operations (COOP) plans.
Collection Method	(A) COOP data, and assessments of data, are collected through interviews and after action reviews following real world deployments. Additionally, after action reviews following Federal agency-wide exercises provide the ability to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the overall COOP programs. The fielding and successful testing and validation of the RRS in FY04 will allow data transmission on a regular basis through secure computers by the Federal Departments and Agencies as events and activities occur which impact their operational capabilities. This data will be verified through periodic COOP assessments involving interviews with the Federal Departments and Agencies to analyze the validity and accuracy of the self-generated reports. (B) Data, and assessments of data, are collected through interviews and a review of state and local government plans that are submitted for review and assessment.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	(A) Reliable data for COOP will be available in FY05 with the fielding of the RRS and its related COOP Assessments once the system has been validated and is fully operational. (B) FEMA Regional personnel with COOP expertise will be used to collect and assess State and local government COOP planning information.

Performance Measure	Non-cumulative percentage of (A) State, (B) Tribal and (C) County jurisdictions assessed under the National Emergency Management Baseline Capability Assessment Program.
Scope	Data reflects objective and subjective compliance with Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) Standard or other/additional succeeding nationally recognized standards. Limitations: (1) Data: EMAP data reflects a high level of subjectivity. (2) Reliability: Reliability of assessment data will evolve and improve over time, as standards and evaluation processes are adjusted and refined. It is anticipated that future guidance implementing the NIMS-related provisions of Homeland Security Presidential Directive #5 (HSPD-5) will establish new standards or nationalize existing standards. The assessment processes described above will be adjusted as necessary or appropriate to accommodate the evolving criteria. (3) Verification: Baseline funding levels allow for annual independent verification of only 15% of state-level jurisdictions and less than 1% annual independent verification of county and tribal jurisdictions. To achieve an ideal level of reasonable positive assurance, all jurisdictions would need to be independently evaluated against a common standard set every four years. Notes: (1) FEMA has agreed that States assessed in FY 2003 and 2004 will have the subsequent three years to build their capability before completing their next assessment. (2) Targets identified here are projected based on program funding remaining at FY 2003 levels. Increased funding will result in ability to achieve higher targets.
Data Source	Standards are developed by EMAP and/or other nationally recognized standards organizations or approving authorities. Self-assessment data is collected at the state, tribal or local (county) jurisdictional level. Independently verified assessment data is collected by impartial peer or other independent review teams through on-site assessments. Data is also collected from focus group meetings and existing standards utilized by the wildland community. Data sources include interviews, field reports, the review of incident reports, and input from the Federal, State, and Local incident managers.
Collection Method	Self-assessment data will be provided, beginning no earlier than FY05, through an as-yet-to-be-determined/negotiated process. Independent peer-evaluated reports will be provided to FEMA for analysis under the provisions of the existing National Emergency Management Baseline Capability Assessment Program (NEMB-CAP) or successor program. Long-term evaluation of training will be received in course feedback determining value of training. Collection methods will include interviews, field reports, the review of incident reports and input from the Federal, State and local incident managers.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Reliability of self-assessment data is validated by the level of authoritative recognition attributed to the standard(s) and associated measurement criteria. In other words, the measurement criteria associated with a standard are recognized as representationally accurate. Reliability of self-assessment data is verified through random, independent peer evaluation and subsequent comparative and consistency reviews by oversight committee(s) and program managers. Verification ability is contingent on funding, with reduced funding resulting in a smaller random sampling and increased funding providing for a larger sample size, and thus directly influencing the degree of verificational certainty.

Performance Measure	(A) Potential property losses, disaster, and other costs avoided; (B) Percentage of the population whose safety is improved through availability of accurate flood risk data in GIS format; (C) Number of communities taking or increasing action to reduce their risk of natural or man made disaster.
Scope	(A) The measurement of .potential property losses, disasters and other costs avoided. is drawn from the floodplain management activities of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and mitigation grant program activities. The NFIP floodplain management element of the .potential property losses, disasters and other costs avoided. measurement of this goal was based on three factors: (1) the number of Post-flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) structures in the Special Flood Hazard Areas by year; (2) the estimated percentage of those structures built in compliance with minimum NFIP requirements; and (3) the estimated reduction in average annual damages based on historical NFIP loss experience. The only limitation to this approach is that costs avoided are based on an .avoidance model. versus a .cost model. which GAO has reviewed. Cost avoidance is determined by a calculation of the difference in the average annual flood damage per \$1,000 of value for Pre-FIRM versus Post-FIRM structures applied to the estimated number of Post-FIRM structures that have been built since the inception of the NFIP. The .potential property losses, disasters and other costs avoided. performance measures for mitigation grant programs is determined by a calculation of the amount of mitigation grant funds awarded to States in a given fiscal year, and the average cost-benefit ratio. (B) The percentage of the population whose safety is improved through the availability of accurate flood risk data in GIS format is calculated based on the accuracy and revision to flood maps which is then compared to census data of the jurisdictions demographics to determine the percent of the population whose safety is improved. (C) The number of communities where actions are taken in a given fiscal year to reduce their risk of natural and manmade disaster is compiled by documented evidence of: (1) communities that conduct pre-disaster mitigation activities; (2) that join or increase their rating in the Community Rating System (CRS); (3) that join the NFIP; (4) that participate in a Cooperative Technical Partnership (CTP); or (4) that implement post-disaster mitigation projects.
Data Source	(A) Data for the flood plain management cost avoidance estimate are derived from the NFIP Actuarial Information System for loss and actuarial experience from participating Write Your Own (WYO) Insurance Companies, and from compilations of the Biennial Report data collected from each participating community. Data on mitigation grant programs is collected from States when applying for a grant. (B) The source of this data is the Map Service Center's Financial Accounting Management Inventory System (FAMIS) and Census data as a source of demographic information (population estimates). (C) States submit mitigation grant applications electronically on behalf of the local communities through FEMA's e-grant capability. FEMA regional staff enters paper applications from the State into the National Emergency Management Information System (NEMIS).
Collection Method	(A) Data in the NFIP Actuarial System and compilations of the Biennial Report data collected from each participating community. Mitigation grant program information is collected from FEMA's National Emergency Management Information System (NEMIS) and e-grants are used to process, award and monitor the implementation of hazard mitigation grants, and the approval of State and local mitigation plans. States when applying for a grant electronically enters data, or FEMA regional staff when processing .paper. grant applications. (B) The Map Service Center enters and tracks all updates, revisions and new maps by community number and compared to demographic population served by improved maps. (C) NEMIS and e-grants are used to process, award, and monitor the implementation of hazard mitigation grants and the approval of State and local mitigation plans. The CRS is utilized to determine the number of communities that adopted new floodplain ordinances and the number of communities that entered or increased their rating level in the CRS program.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	(A) For NFIP flood plain management activities: verification and validation of the cost avoidance model will be accomplished through the NFIP Program Assessment, currently underway. For mitigation grant program activities: NEMIS data is monitored quarterly to ensure accuracy and timeliness. Quarterly reports based on these quality assurance checks are distributed to regional offices for correction of any discrepancies identified. In addition, FEMA headquarters and regional staff periodically review NEMIS data against financial data contained in FEMA's financial management system (IFMIS) to reconcile any discrepancies between NEMIS and IFMIS. Verification and

	validation of cost avoidance is achieved through independent program assessments and from the NFIP Biennial Report. (B) Verification and validation of accurate information includes a review and reconciliation with the Community Map Action list (CMAL), which lists all updated and current maps. FAMIS also feeds flood hazard data to FEMA's Community Information System (CIS). A verification of the data to community tables in CIS is done monthly upon receipt of the data from FAMIS. (C) NEMIS data is monitored quarterly to ensure data quality and accuracy of information. Quarterly reports based on these quality assurance checks are distributed to regional offices for correction of any discrepancies identified.
--	---

Performance Measure	Maximum response time in hours for emergency response teams to arrive on scene.
Scope	The measure of successful deployment of FEMA's emergency teams is based on the number of hours from the decision to deploy to time of a team's arrival on-scene. The immediate hours after a disaster are the most critical in terms of life saving and other emergency response needs. Response times will be recorded for both exercises and actual response events. This performance measure applies to the following teams: Incident Management Teams (IMTs) Urban Search and Rescue (US), and Mobile Emergency Response System (MERS). Without funding above current levels, this measure will not apply to the National Disaster Medical System (NDMS) teams or the Hurricane Liaison Team (HLT). Applicability of this measure to the Nuclear Incident Response Team (NIRT) and the Domestic Emergency Response Team (DEST) are contingent on a transfer of program funds from the Department of Energy and the Department of Justice respectively.
Data Source	Internal information, records, rosters, exercise results and actual events will be used to track the response time of each event. An independent auditor will be sought to verify and evaluate data. An integrated database is being developed in the re-engineering process to track availability and response times for all emergency teams.
Collection Method	Measurement of times from decision to deploy to arrival on-scene will be measured to determine each event's timeliness. Tracking of official contracts and documents can be used to record the occurrences and response times.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Reliable data should be available in FY 2006.

**Federal Law Enforcement Training Center**

Performance Measure	The Number of Accreditation Managers Trained trained
Scope	Most Significant Program Measure. This workload measure identifies the number of accreditation managers actually trained during the fiscal year. The delivery of the AMTP facilitates uniform interpretation of the FLETA Standards and ensures consistent implementation of accreditation process requirements. Accredited Federal Law Enforcement Training programs can be considered well developed, delivered and evaluated. Graduates of training programs accredited by the FLETA are expected to have the knowledge and skills to fulfill their responsibilities in a safe manner and at the highest level of proficiency.
Data Source	The source for this measure is the internal-generated class roster.
Collection Method	The Office of Accreditation (OAC) personnel collects the data from the class roster of graduates attending the accreditation assessor training and is recorded in the FLETA Automated Tracking Operations and Management System (ATOMS) (currently under development).
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	The OAC personnel verify the data through periodic manual reviews. No known data integrity problems exist.

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

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

Performance Measure	Percentage of requested training programs conducted (Capacity Measure).
Scope	This measure compares the number of programs conducted during the fiscal year with the numbers requested in the April submission. Sufficient capacity to meet the training requirements for present and projected future FLETC training requirements.
Data Source	The data is captured as part of the Student Information System (SIS).
Collection Method	Calculation. The data is captured as part of the Student Information System. The Partner Organizations initially submit their requests for training in April for the following fiscal year. From that point forward (nearly to the end of the fiscal year in question), the requests are continually refined.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	The TMC personnel verify the data through periodic manual reviews. No known data integrity problems exist.

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

**Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate**

Performance Measure	Call completion rate during network degradation
Scope	Measures GETS/WPS call attempts across the nation through AT A new GETS/WPS metric, which shows the percentage of GETS/WPS calls that successfully completed through the PSN to the destination end office during an actual emergency
Data Source	AT Data reports
Collection Method	Reports collected from AT
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	New measure for which reliability of data is being established during baseline year. Reports on the GETS side have been verified as reliable however reliability of data still needs to be established with respect to WPS calls as that system is stood up throughout FY04.



Performance Measure	Percentage increase in time efficiency of issuance of information and warning advisories.
Scope	New measure and new program. Therefore no baseline data is available. Will examine the length of time between receipt of piece of information and release of that information in the form of an information or warning advisory.
Data Source	Homeland Security Operations Center (HSOC).
Collection Method	HSOC will record time cycles on data. Threat info is time stamped throughout verification cycle: upon original receipt, final verification of info, time of return receipt on info.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	New measure for which reliability of data is being established during baseline year. Data is available solely within IAIP, however still deciding on central data collection tool to aid analysis of data.

Performance Measure	Overall customer satisfaction rate for IAIP products
Scope	This is a new program there is no relevant baseline data available. Data will be collected through surveys of IAIP customers including but not limited to other federal government agencies, state-local agencies, and critical infrastructure owners/operators.
Data Source	The source of the data will be actual surveys conducted of IAIP customers and stakeholders.
Collection Method	Surveys will be sent to IAIP customers and stakeholders. IAIP will establish a database to collect survey results. Upon receipt the survey data will be collected within the CA survey database and necessary reporting features developed.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	New measure for which reliability of data is being established during baseline year. Data will be collected from IAIP stakeholders, initially plan to use microsoft office suite products to compile data until data collection tool is established.

Performance Measure	Time efficiency of issuance of information and warning advisories
Scope	New measure and new program. Therefore no baseline data is available. Will examine the length of time between receipt of piece of information and release of that information in the form of an information or warning advisory.
Data Source	Data will come from the Information Analysis side of IAIP.
Collection Method	Responsible divisions will keep records on time of receipt of data as well as time of dissemination of data.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	New measure for which reliability of data is being established during baseline year. Data is available solely within IAIP, however still deciding on central data collection tool to aid analysis of data.

Performance Measure	% of national strategies implemented within year of issuance of plan in which they are outlined.
Scope	As required by the Homeland Security Act an integrated national plan and cross-sector contingency plan must be developed monitored for implementation and reviewed for progress. The data consists of records on the number of strategies implemented within a period of 1 year after issuance of the plan. This is a new program beginning in FY04. Baseline data will become available from measurement starting in FY04.
Data Source	IAIP is required to track the progress of implementation of national plans and strategies. As such the data source will be within IAIP.
Collection Method	National Plans and Strategies internal database
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	New measure for which reliability of data is being established during baseline year. Data will be collected from IAIP stakeholders, initially plan to use microsoft office suite products to compile data until data collection tool is established.

Performance Measure	Percent of first tier key assets and critical infrastructure components that have threat level information completed for use by decision makers for deployment of assets
Scope	New measure and new program. Therefore no baseline data is available. Threat level reports will be completed for critical infrastructure components and key assets across the nation. Threat level reports will be available to decision makers after threat assessments are both completed and analyzed in context of vulnerabilities. Therefore time to collect threat assessments will affect the timeliness of threat level reports
Data Source	Information Analysis side of IAIP.
Collection Method	Will utilize information from the threat/vulnerability/asset database to compile threat level reports for decision makers.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Should be a reliable measure given that the data on how many threat level reports are completed is available within the IA side of IAIP as well as the necessary data on total first tier critical infrastructure and key assets to be evaluated. Threat level reports are produced and recorded within IA therefore reliability will be proved out, however we are allowing a year of baselining the measure before we declare it reliable.

Performance Measure	Reduction of general warnings, as compared to "at risk" warnings
Scope	New measure and new program. Therefore no baseline data is available. Will apply to all warnings issued from the Risk Assessment Division in IAIP. Time to collect will be short as records of warnings issued will be kept within IAIP
Data Source	Risk Assessment Division
Collection Method	Specific records management tool for warnings information is under development.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Reliability will be established after we finish our baseline year. However the data should be fully reliable as all data is accumulated within RAD. Can easily separate out those issuances sent to targeted stakeholders as a percentage of all warnings issued.

Performance Measure	Percentage of recommended protective actions implemented (per FY).
Scope	New measure and new program. Therefore there is no relevant baseline data available. Baseline will be established in FY05. As part of IAIP's Remediation and Protective Actions program protective actions will be recommended based upon the vulnerabilities identified during vulnerability assessments. These recommended protective actions will apply to critical infrastructure and key assets across the nation.
Data Source	Data will come from records compiled by the protective actions implementation task group within IAIP.
Collection Method	Protective action implementation task group will track protective actions accepted and implemented. Specific records management tools still under consideration.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	New measure for which reliability of data is being established during baseline year. During baseline year we will be examining the ability of the current data collection tool to contain as well as analyze the data.

Performance Measure	Percentage of recommended protective actions implemented (per FY).
Scope	New measure and new program. Therefore there is no relevant baseline data available. Baseline will be established in FY05. As part of IAIP's Remediation and Protective Actions program protective actions will be recommended based upon the vulnerabilities identified during vulnerability assessments. These recommended protective actions will apply to critical infrastructure and key assets across the nation.
Data Source	Data will come from records compiled by the protective actions implementation task group within IAIP.
Collection Method	Protective action implementation task group will track protective actions accepted and implemented. Specific records management tools still under consideration.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	New measure for which reliability of data is being established during baseline year. During baseline year we will be examining the ability of the current data collection tool to contain as well as analyze the data.

**Inspector General**

Performance Measure	Seventy-five percent of recommendations made by OIG are accepted and/or implemented by the Department of Homeland Security. (% increase over each prior year)
Scope	<p>The OIG performs independent and objective reviews of DHS program and operations and keeps the Secretary of DHS and Congress fully informed of problems, deficiencies, and the need for corrective action. Once a DHS program is selected for an audit, inspection or evaluation, an engagement letter is sent to the affected officials describing the forthcoming audit scope, objectives and time frame. Next, a formal entrance conference is scheduled with the management officials whose operations are to be audited. This is followed by the collection of data through interviews, review of documentation, physical and statistical evidence. Based on a review of the collected data, if it is determined that an audit is not required, a closed-out conference will be held, although minor deficiencies would be noted. Nevertheless, if an audit is to be performed, interim memorandums will be provided to the auditees for informal comments on the accuracy and completeness of the findings. Upon completion of the audit, an exit conference is held to summarize the issues previously brought to the auditees' attention, as well as any other findings and recommendations we have developed. This will be followed by a report submitted to the management official responsible for implementing corrective action. A written response is requested within 30 calendar days. The reply should include actions taken and planned; target dates for any uncompleted actions; and the reasons for any disagreements with the findings or recommendations. After careful analysis of the response, we will revise our report and incorporate the comments received as an appendix to the report. Every reasonable effort will be made by the OIG to resolve a disagreement with the appropriate officials. However, if an agreement is not reached, the final report will be issued with unresolved findings or recommendations. Within 30 days after issuance of a report with unresolved issues, the action official must send a written reply to the Deputy Secretary and IG explaining the reasons for the disagreement. The goal is to resolve the disputed findings or recommendations within 6 months after issuance of the final report. DHS officials and managers are responsible for implementing the agreed corrective actions while the OIG is responsible for monitoring the progress of such implementation. The OIG follow-up activity also includes assessing the accuracy of the tracking method used to track corrective actions on audit recommendations.</p>
Data Source	<p>Per the Inspector General's Act, the determination of which DHS programs are selected for audit, inspection or evaluation relate to how vulnerable the operation is to fraud, waste, and mismanagement and whether there is a legislative or regulatory audit requirement. This information is collected and compiled by OIG auditors, inspectors, investigators, and information technology personnel who not only conduct interviews and review documentation but also collect physical and statistical evidence. This information is collected from individual audits, program evaluations and assessments, evaluation of computer security and the detection of security weaknesses. The Department provides the requested information in response to formal communication from OIG headquarters. Additionally, the Office of Investigations maintains a hotline designed to support our efforts in the detection and elimination of fraud, waste, and abuse. All the data collected is tracked electronically as is whether the recommendations have been accepted, implemented, or declined.</p>
Collection Method	<p>OIG will track the formal recommendations made to the Department and whether or not the recommendations have been accepted and implemented. In tracking this information, OIG auditors, inspectors and investigators will employ the use of Microsoft office products, Visio, IDEA, Teammate and other software applications to collect and report their findings. The OIG is moving towards database consolidation in this arena.</p>
Reliability	<p>Reliable</p>
How reliability is verified	<p>Data from Department information systems is just one type of evidence collected in an OIG review. For all types of evidence, various tests are used.sufficiency, competence, and relevance.to assess whether the Government Auditing Standards for evidence standard are met. In reviewing Department programs, auditors and inspectors will generally apply GAO's risk-based framework for data reliability assessments. The framework is built on making use of all existing information about the data, performing at least a minimal level of data testing, and applying professional judgment. Similarly, investigators are responsible for covering elements of specific charges. The PCIE sets quality standards for investigations and how the resulting data is to be maintained. Data is validated through investigative process.</p>

**Management Directorate**

Performance Measure	Percent of President's Management Agenda initiatives rated Green.
Scope	The measure is of DHS as an agency in each of the five President's Management Agenda initiatives of 1) Human Capital 2)Competitive Sourcing/Procurement 3)Improved Financial Performance 4)Expanded Electronic Government 5) Budget and Performance Integration. Ratings are done quarterly by OMB as to red, yellow, or green. The measure will report as of Fiscal Yearend standings.
Data Source	The source of information is quarterly reports from the Office of Management and Budget which score DHS in each of the five criteria.
Collection Method	OMB reports to DHS on its standings in each of the five initiative areas. This report will be used to determine the percent of areas in current status and plans to achieve green. It will be calculated by the number rated green by OMB divided by the total number of ten.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	The base report is developed by OMB and "double checked" and reviewed by OMB for accurate reflection of the current status. The percent calculation is made and "double checked" by the DHS Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation.

Performance Measure	The percentage of major IT projects that are within 10% of cost/schedule/performance objectives.
Scope	Major IT projects are those projects that are at or above \$5m per year or \$20m lifecycle; have significant program or policy implications; have high executive visibility; are sensitive initiatives; have historically been rated as major projects; and/or, are related to enterprise architecture.
Data Source	Reports to the DHS Investment Review Board.
Collection Method	Manual calculation from the IRB report of the number of projects within 10% of targets divided by the total number of projects.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	The CIO will review these calculations, after they are prepared, to ensure they appear correct.

Performance Measure	Percent of qualifying reimbursements that are made within established standards of timeliness and proper authorization.
Scope	This measure covers all appropriate reimbursements under qualifying requests.
Data Source	The source of information will be the financial records maintained by the DHS CFO.
Collection Method	The percent will be calculated as the number of payments made appropriately and timely divided by the total number of payments.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	A quality check will be made by person other than the one authoring the disbursement.

**Office of Domestic Preparedness**

Performance Measure	Percent of jurisdictions over 500,000 that demonstrate performance of at least 90 percent of critical tasks within the expected range in a cycle of exercises using the DHS/ODP suite of scenarios.
Scope	Rating on how well critical tasks were performed during exercises
Data Source	Exercise AARs and Exercise Scheduling and Evaluation System
Collection Method	ODP has developed a methodology and tools for the evaluation of exercises. These tools will be refined over the next two years resulting in the ability to measure performance of critical tasks. The level of performance will be described in the exercise AAR.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	The Homeland Security Council is developing a suite of common scenarios that will be used to test preparedness. ODP is developing metrics to assess performance of critical tasks to respond to the scenarios. Reliability should be determined in 2007.

Performance Measure	Percent of jurisdictions over 500,000 that demonstrate performance of at least 90 percent of critical tasks within the expected range in a cycle of exercises using the DHS/ODP suite of scenarios.
Scope	Information on the number of agencies that participate at different levels of government to provide a coordinated response to the exercise scenario
Data Source	TOPOFF participant list
Collection Method	Extent of Play Agreements, Participant sign-in
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Data is compiled by ODP or its contractors

Performance Measure	Number of homeland security professionals trained.
Scope	Tracks number of individuals trained through the over 40 training course offered by ODP. Includes direct deliveries and individual deliveries under the train-the-trainer program
Data Source	Course participant data reported by ODP training procedures and the states
Collection Method	Currently data are obtained from monthly reports submitted by training providers and states. ODP is developing a training scheduling system that will provide on-line data submission tracking
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Reliable but not always timely. On-line system will improve timeliness

Performance Measure	Percent of jurisdictions over 50,000 that demonstrate performance of at least 90 percent of critical tasks within the expected range in a cycle of exercises using the DHS/ODP suite of scenarios.
Scope	Tracks number of individuals trained through the over 40 training course offered by ODP. Includes direct deliveries and individual deliveries under the train-the-trainer program
Data Source	Course participant data reported by ODP training procedures and the states
Collection Method	Currently data are obtained from monthly reports submitted by training providers and states. ODP is developing a training scheduling system that will provide on-line data submission tracking
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Reliable but not always timely. On-line system will improve timeliness

Performance Measure	Percent of jurisdictions over 500,000 population that have successfully demonstrated preparedness through the use of ODP's common suite of combating terrorism scenarios.
Scope	ODP tracks findings of recommendations from program evaluations and actions taken to address
Data Source	Program Evaluations Reports and feedback from states and local jurisdictions
Collection Method	Surveys with applicable state and local jurisdictions
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	The Homeland Security Council is developing a suite of common scenarios that will be used to test preparedness. ODP is developing metrics to assess performance of critical tasks to respond to the scenarios. Reliability should be determined in 2007.

Performance Measure	Number of fire department personnel formally trained in skills related to firefighting and fire related activities.
Scope	Number of fire department personnel trained.
Data Source	Course participant data reported by ODP training procedures and the states.
Collection Method	Currently data are obtained from monthly reports submitted by training providers and states. ODP is developing a training scheduling system that will provide on-line data submission tracking
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Reliable but not always timely. On-line system will improve timeliness.



Performance Measure	Percentage of fulfilled request from jurisdictions seeking to create an effective partnership.
Scope	Fulfilled requests from jurisdictions
Data Source	Feedback from jurisdiction that received assistance
Collection Method	Survey
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Responses are reviewed by evaluators and technical assistance branches. Evaluations staff follow-up by phone if clarification is required.

Performance Measure	Percent of the participating urban areas that demonstrated performance of at least 90 percent of critical tasks within the expected range.
Scope	Rating on how well critical tasks were performed during exercises
Data Source	Exercise AARs and Exercise Scheduling and Evaluation System
Collection Method	ODP has developed a methodology and tools for the evaluation of exercises. These tools will be refined over the next two years resulting in the ability to measure performance of critical tasks. The level of performance will be described in the exercise AAR.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	The Homeland Security Council is developing a suite of common scenarios that will be used to test preparedness. ODP is developing metrics to assess performance of critical tasks to respond to the scenarios. Reliability should be determined in 2007.

**Science and Technology Directorate**

Performance Measure	Development of protocols for the highest priority toxic industrial chemicals (TICs) and toxic industrial materials (TIMs).
Scope	This is a research and development program conducted by the Science and Technology Directorate. Chemical threat agents are the focus of DoD research; the focus of the DHS program will be on the vast quantities of toxic industrial chemicals and materials (TICs and TIMs) in use within private industry. TICs and TIMs are routinely stored and transported for use in U.S. industries; there is thus a potential threat that terrorists may seize and use TICs and TIMs in terrorist attacks. The program will be measured by the achievement of milestones. The milestone for FY2005 is the establishment of protocols for the highest priority TICs and TIMs -- that is, articulated standards and procedures for protecting these chemicals and materials so terrorists do not have access to them, and approaches and procedures for responding to and mitigating any attack using them. (Prioritization of TICs and TIMs will be accomplished in FY2003 and FY2004.)
Data Source	The data sources are the protocols themselves.
Collection Method	The protocols will be developed as deliverables for contracts issued by the Department.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Peer review will verify the reliability of the protocols initially. If demonstrations or simulations are deemed advisable, they will provide additional verification.

Performance Measure	Pilot tests of standoff detection technologies.
Scope	This is a research and development program conducted by the Science and Technology Directorate. At present the program complements research and development performed at the Transportation Security Laboratory. The program is a technology development program and, as such, is measured by milestones toward the goal of producing commercially feasible technologies. The milestone for FY2005 is to conduct pilot tests of standoff detection technologies. The results of these pilot tests will be used to determine which technologies should be further developed and tested.
Data Source	The data used in measuring performance will be the reports of the pilot tests.
Collection Method	The reports contain testing methods and data, along with a discussion of conclusions and results.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Pilot test data result from well-specified procedures and include instrument measurements as well as inspection data.

Performance Measure	Technologies prototyped or commercialized.
Scope	The Rapid Prototyping Portfolio is a research and development program conducted by the Science and Technology Directorate. The program will be measured by the number of technologies prototyped and commercialized. The targets for FY2005 are two technologies prototyped and one commercialized. The evaluation performed on candidate technologies will help to ensure that the prototyped and commercialized technologies will effectively reduce the vulnerability of the nation to terrorist attacks.
Data Source	The data source will be the program data.
Collection Method	The data on technologies prototyped and commercialized will be collected under contract to the Department.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	The data will be open to public scrutiny, ensuring its reliability.

Performance Measure	To increase the nation's science and technology workforce and research capability on issues related to homeland security. FY 2005: students supported/Centers of Excellence established.
Scope	The Fellowship Programs/University Programs Portfolio is a research and development program conducted by the Science and Technology Directorate. The program will be measured, at least initially, by the number of Scholars and Fellows supported and the number of University Centers of Excellence implemented. It is recognized that these are output measures and that outcome measures need to be developed as the program becomes established. The target for FY2005 is to support 100 Scholars and 100 Fellows, and to implement at least two Centers of Excellence.
Data Source	The data source will be DHS-S data on Scholars, Fellows, and Centers of Excellence.
Collection Method	Data on supported students and University Centers of Excellence will be generated and maintained within the Directorate.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	The Directorate has developed appropriate systems to track these data, which are open to public scrutiny and challenge.

Performance Measure	Technical standards and test/evaluation protocols will be established for WMD decontamination technologies and analysis tools. "Consumer's report" on radiation and bioagent detection devices for federal, state, and local users will be published.
Scope	The Standards and State/Local Programs Portfolio is a research and development program conducted by the Science and Technology Directorate. The program will be measured by the achievement of milestones. The milestone for FY2005 has two parts: (1) Develop and implement technical standards and test and evaluation protocols for weapons of mass destruction (WMD) decontamination technologies, and analysis tools that will provide confidence in mitigation tools and decrease recovery time from an incident. (2) Publish a .consumer's report. on high-profile radiation and bioagent detection devices for federal, state, and local users to guide procurement and deployment decisions.
Data Source	The data source will be the standards and the published "Consumer's Report."
Collection Method	The materials will be adopted and published using relevant processes and reviews, including public review.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Rounds of review and comment by experts, interested parties, and the general public, appropriately taken into consideration in published materials, will provide assurance of reliability.

Performance Measure	Federal, state and local sites that are integrated into an operational secondary reachback architecture to resolve radiological and nuclear alarms.
Scope	This is a technical support capability developed by the Science and Technology Directorate. The program will be measured by the number of sites where detector alarms are resolved by a DHS integrated system that includes secondary reachback.
Data Source	The data source will be the quarterly report from the secondary reachback program.
Collection Method	Reports and documentation of secondary reachback will be provided as deliverables to the portfolio manager.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	The integration among various DHS entities ensures that the determination of number of sites will be straightforward.

Performance Measure	Improvement in the national capability to assess threats and vulnerabilities to terrorist attacks: 10 categories to be assessed.
Scope	The Threat and Vulnerability, Testing and Assessment Portfolio is a research and development program conducted by the Science and Technology Directorate. The program covers a wide variety of activities associated with computer-assisted integration of threat and vulnerability information and critical infrastructure protection. Specific activities include development of a threat-vulnerability integrated system (TVIS), R associated with the TVIS, net assessments, WMD assessments, cybersecurity, advanced scientific computing, behavioral science contributions, biometrics, determination of intent, testbeds, and critical infrastructure. The program will be measured by an annual review conducted by an Expert Advisory Board. To be judged an adequate measure of the program, the review will include an evaluation of activities and in-depth constructive critique.
Data Source	The data source will be the annual review by the Expert Advisory Board. The Board will review information about each of the ten research areas.
Collection Method	Data will be collected by program managers, who will be guided by the scope and focus of the review and by specific questions from the Board.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Expert review is a widely used and reliable method of evaluating research and development programs.

Performance Measure	Improved capability of DHS Components to secure the homeland as measured by assessment of customer organizations in accomplishing agreed-upon areas of assistance.
Scope	The Support to DHS Components Portfolio is a research and development program conducted by the Science and Technology Directorate. The program will be measured by a customer survey conducted in all four components supported: Border and Transportation Security, Emergency Preparedness and Response, U.S. Coast Guard, and U.S. Secret Service.
Data Source	The data source will be customer survey data.
Collection Method	Collection methods may include interviews, or email and internet responses.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Accepted survey processes will be used to ensure the objectivity and reliability of the data.

Performance Measure	Improved capabilities to detect threats in urban areas (Urban Monitoring Program), measured by increased sampling coverage and frequency, and capability to detect additional threats. For FY2005, increase coverage in top threat cities.
Scope	The Urban Monitoring Program, including Biowatch, is a research and development program within the Science and Technology Directorate. Three types of data will be used: (1) the number of sensors in operation, which determines the amount of coverage; (2) operating costs for the system; and (3) the number of assays established. In FY2003, 15 sensors were deployed in selected urban areas of the United States as part of the Biowatch/Urban Monitoring program; this constitutes the baseline. Data collection and evaluation will be continued in FY2004, and 2 sensors will be added in FY2005, thus increasing coverage by 13%. Operating costs are tracked and reported; the first full reporting year will be FY2004, which will establish the baseline. By the end of FY2004, five assays will be established. In FY2005, five assays will be added, bringing the total to ten assays.
Data Source	The sources of the data are technical reports.
Collection Method	Reports are submitted monthly. The S&T portfolio manager and/or the contract technical monitor review the reports, request briefings and other information as necessary, and conduct a more extensive review annually.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	These reports are verified by S&T oversight of the program, review of invoices, and audits as necessary.

Performance Measure	New program resulting from transfer to S&T of R&D programs from other entities. Measure to be developed.
Scope	New program in FY 2005, measure to be determined.
Data Source	
Collection Method	
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	

Performance Measure	Increased interoperability across local, tribal, state, and federal public safety jurisdictions and disciplines. FY 2005: Based on FY 2004 baseline, improvements in 3 categories.
Scope	SAFECOM is a research and development program conducted by the Science and Technology Directorate. The program will be measured by the three elements: (1) Increased number of agencies that can communicate with one another, (2) reduced time needed for cross-jurisdictional and cross-disciplinary response to an event, and (3) increased number of wireless grant programs that include SAFECOM-approved guidance.
Data Source	Data will be generated by the program.
Collection Method	As a baseline is developed, methods for collecting reliable data will be established.
Reliability	Inadequate
Actions being taken to make reliable	Collecting and verifying data from the many and diverse state, local, tribal, and federal agency sources is a formidable task. Establishment of the baseline will improve the reliability of the data as well as assisting in future reliability based on improved collection methods.

Performance Measure	Effective technology/technologies for commercial aircraft to defeat man-portable anti-aircraft missiles identified. FY 2005: Technologies identified, and prototypes developed and tested.
Scope	The MANPADS Portfolio is a research and development program conducted by the Science and Technology Directorate. The program will be measured by the successful completion of prototype testing on at least two technologies.
Data Source	The data source will be prototype testing data.
Collection Method	Test data are routinely gathered and reported on prototypes.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Accepted science and technology procedures for designing and conducting tests will be used. Data will be validated.

Performance Measure	Improved capability to prevent terrorist attacks through annual emerging threat assessment report (% of responding recipients indicating the report is valuable).
Scope	The Emerging Threats Portfolio is a research and development program conducted by the Science and Technology Directorate. The program will be measured initially by an output measure, the issuance of an annual report.
Data Source	The data source will be the report itself, which will bring together disparate and perhaps unconventional information.
Collection Method	Data for the report will be generated from IAIP and other sources of intelligence, economic, behavioral, etc., information.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Initially, the reliability of the data will be unknown. The initial data will need to be verified as threats are realized. In the outyears, the program will assess the effectiveness of and accuracy of information in the annual reports.

**US VISIT**

Performance Measure	Percentage of foreign nationals entering the U.S. who have biometric and (or and/or) biographic information on file prior to entry including the foreign nationals that are referred to secondary inspection for further inspection actions and (or and/or) with fraudulent documents identified.
Scope	The foreign nationals entering the U.S. are aliens seeking to be admitted pursuant to a nonimmigrant visa who travel through designated air and sea ports. There are exemptions for aliens admitted on A-1, A-2, C-3 (except for attendants, servants or personal employees of accredited officials), G-1, G-2, G-3, G-4, NATO-1, NATO-2, NATO-3, NATO-4, NATO-5 or NATO-6 visas, unless the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security jointly determine that a class of such aliens should be subject to the rule; children under the age of 14; persons over the age of 79; classes of aliens the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State jointly determine shall be exempt; and an individual alien the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or the Director of Central Intelligence determines shall be exempt.
Data Source	Biometric and biographic information are obtained from the Arrival and Departure Information System (ADIS), the Passenger Processing Component of the Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS), and the Automated Biometric Identification System (IDENT).
Collection Method	The Passenger Processing Component of TECS consists of two systems; the Interagency Border Inspection System (IBIS) which support the lookout process and provide interfaces with the Interpol and National Crime Information Center (NCIC) databases, and the Advance Passenger Information System (APIS) which supports the entry process by receiving airline passenger manifest information. The ADIS system provides biometric and biographical travel history information to the Passenger Processing Component of TECS and IDENT, which collects biometric and biographic data for US-VISIT. Together, these systems support US-VISIT by recording information pertinent to arrival and departure of nonimmigrants to and from the United States, in addition to the data collected for DHS national security, law enforcement and other mission-related functions
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Method to verify reliability will be in place by October 1, 2004

**United States Citizenship and Immigration Services**



Performance Measure	Adjudicate refugee applications (I-590) referred to DHS/USCIS by the United States Refugee Program during a given fiscal year in a timely, accurate, consistent and professional manner.
Scope	Each overseas district office maintains a database of case receipts and completions. Only cases that have been interviewed, approved for refugee classification, and cleared for travel, or cases that have been interviewed and denied are counted as completions. Cases that have been interviewed but are pending security advisory opinion clearances (which is a non-USCIS clearance) or other administrative clearances are not counted until pending clearances are approved or denied. In addition, the U.S. Department of State, through its contractors, also maintains statistical databases that capture case processing information. *actual total includes 44,637 cases that were closed during a one-time special project to close a large backlog of old cases.
Data Source	PAS--The overseas district offices input refugee case processing statistics into a program known as the Performance Analysis System (PAS).
Collection Method	Each overseas district office is responsible for updating its refugee performance statistics in the PAS system on a monthly basis.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	The PAS system generally reflects the state of refugee processing on a monthly basis; however, due to new security measures recently implemented in the program, the system is in need of additional data categories to better explain the flow of the caseload. For example, the PAS system does reflect all cases that have been interviewed, approved for refugee classification, and cleared for travel, and all cases that have been interviewed and denied status. However, the PAS system does not clearly differentiate between cases that have been interviewed and are pending security advisory opinion clearances (which is a non-USCIS clearance) from those that are pending other types of clearances. As a result, the PAS system does not clearly show the total number of cases that have undergone the USCIS interview portion of the processing. The differences between the number of actual number of interviews conducted and the number of interviews reported in PAS are significant; however, management is able to obtain additional information as needed through direct contact with overseas staff to avoid any adverse effects. The DOS statistics are independent measures that are gathered without USCIS input. DOS is presently implementing a new integrated data base management system that is known as the Worldwide Refugee Admissions Processing System (WRAPS). Upon full implementation, this system may become the prime source of refugee processing statistics for the U.S. Refugee Program and should enable USCIS to obtain more complete performance statistics. Furthermore, WRAPS will record information with more specific categories that will differentiate between the various reasons why cases are pending completion.

Performance Measure	Complete 75% of asylum reform referrals (at local offices) within 60 days of receipt.
Scope	Asylum Officers update the Refugees, Asylum, and Parole System (RAPS) with their decision on an Asylum claim.
Data Source	RAPS - The Refugees, Asylum, and Parole System is an Integrated Data Base Management System/Relational (IDMS/R) resident on a mainframe computer at the Justice Data Center-Dallas.
Collection Method	Asylum Officers update RAPS with their decision on an I-589 Asylum claim. RAPS calculates the date the case is filed to the date a Notice to Appear (NTA) is served, minus any delays caused by the applicant. RAPS generates a weekly, monthly, and annual report that measures the timeliness of case processing by asylum officers by separating out those cases referred to the Immigration Judge within 60 days from those cases referred to the Immigration Judge in more than 60 days.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Current policy requires 100% supervisory review prior to system entry. Field supervisors review and analyze data reported to Headquarters. Headquarters staff reviews and analyzes field submissions for quality control.

Performance Measure	The Nonimmigrant Services program will achieve and maintain a processing time goal of 6 months or less for all Nonimmigrant services applications in all offices by FY 2006. (A revised backlog plan will be implemented with 04 and 05 targets. The original plan had the FY03 target indicated.)
Scope	This average is calculated by dividing the average of the past 12 months of completions into the number of pending applications at the end of September.
Data Source	Automated counts and manual case counts. Some data are collected locally under manual counts and reported monthly through the automated Performance Analysis System database. Automated systems supporting casework include the Computer Linked Application Information Management Systems (CLAIMS4 & CLAIMS3).
Collection Method	Individual adjudicators manually count the number of applications approved and denied, and record this information. Each District subsequently aggregates these individual reports and enters them into the Performance Analysis System.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	USCIS instituted monthly data reconciliation and review activities to maximize the integrity of the data reported. Data on the quality of case work is currently compiled by Quality Assurance Analysts and independent contractor(s) conducting quality reviews.

Performance Measure	Percentage of immigration benefit applications more than 6 months old.
Scope	This average is calculated by dividing the average of the past 12 months of completions into the number of pending applications at the end of September.
Data Source	Automated counts and manual case counts. Some data are collected locally under manual counts and reported monthly through the automated Performance Analysis System database. Automated systems supporting casework include the Computer Linked Application Information Management Systems (CLAIMS4 & CLAIMS3).
Collection Method	Individual adjudicators manually count the number of applications approved and denied, and record this information. Each District subsequently aggregates these individual reports and enters them into the Performance Analysis System.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	USCIS instituted monthly data reconciliation and review activities to maximize the integrity of the data reported. Data on the quality of case work is currently compiled by Quality Assurance Analysts and independent contractor(s) conducting quality reviews.

Performance Measure	The Immigrant Services program will achieve and maintain a processing time goal of 6 months or less for all immigrant services applications in all offices by FY 2006.
Scope	This average is calculated by dividing the average of the past 12 months of completions into the number of pending applications at the end of September.
Data Source	Automated counts and manual case counts. Some data are collected locally under manual counts and reported monthly through the automated Performance Analysis System database. Automated systems supporting casework include the Computer Linked Application Information Management Systems (CLAIMS4 & CLAIMS3).
Collection Method	Individual adjudicators manually count the number of applications approved and denied, and record this information on the PAS Form G22.3. Each District subsequently aggregates these individual reports and enters them into the PAS.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	USCIS instituted monthly data reconciliation and review activities to maximize the integrity of the data reported. Data on the quality of case work is currently compiled by Quality Assurance Analysts and independent contractor(s) conducting quality reviews.

Performance Measure	Achieve and maintain a 6-month processing time goal for all citizenship and naturalization applications in all offices by FY 2006.
Scope	This average is calculated by dividing the average of the past 12 months of completions into the number of pending applications at the end of September.
Data Source	Automated counts and manual case counts. Some data are collected locally under manual counts and reported monthly through the automated Performance Analysis System database. Automated systems supporting casework include the Computer Linked Application Information Management System (CLAIMS4), and the Redesigned Naturalization Casework System.
Collection Method	Individual adjudicators manually count the number of applications approved and denied, and record this information on the PAS Form G22.3. Each District subsequently aggregates these individual reports and enters them into the PAS.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	USCIS instituted monthly data reconciliation and review activities to maximize the integrity of the data reported. Data on the quality of case work is currently compiled by Quality Assurance Analysts and independent contractor(s) conducting quality reviews.

**United States Coast Guard**

Performance Measure	A. Number of incursions into the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone.
Scope	Data obtained from the Coast Guard Planning and Assessment System and validated by program managers.
Data Source	Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE).
Collection Method	Data obtained from the Coast Guard Planning and Assessment.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Validated by program managers.

Performance Measure	The 5-year average number of total of all chemical discharge incidents & oil spills >100 gallons per 100 million tons shipped.
Scope	The Marine Safety metric is the five-year average. The performance metric for Marine Environmental Protection (MEP) is the five-year average number of U.S. Coast Guard investigated chemical spills and oil spills greater than 100 gallons discharged into navigable waters of the United States per 100 million short tons of chemicals and oil products shipped in U.S. waters.
Data Source	Vessel or facility operators are required by 40 CFR 300 to notify the National Response Center (NRC) of any discharge of oil or oil products that causes a sheen, discoloration, sludge or emulsion, and of any hazardous substance discharge that equals or exceeding the reportable quantity listed in 40 CFR 302. The NRC relays discharge notifications to the appropriate federal agency, and the Coast Guard has investigative jurisdiction for spills into or upon the navigable waters of the United States, adjoining shorelines, waters of the contiguous zone, Deepwater Ports, the Continental Shelf and other designated areas. The MEP metric is the sum of Coast Guard investigations of reportable chemical discharge incidents and investigations of incidents where 100 gallons or more of oil or oil products are discharged. Only discharge incidents from maritime sources into U.S. waters are counted. Discharges onto land, into the air, or into enclosed spaces are excluded. Discharges from non-maritime sources such as aircraft, trucks & other vehicles, rail cars & rail equipment; naval and other public vessels; fixed platforms and pipelines are excluded. Discharges from unspecified, unclassified, and unknown sources are also excluded.
Collection Method	The MEP metric is relative to the volume of Oil and Chemical shipping in U.S. waters. Data for the denominator is obtained from the annual report of the Waterborne Commerce of the United States compiled by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Vessel-operating companies are required to report domestic commercial movements under 33 U.S.C. 555. Chapter 9, Title 13, U.S.C. requires that merchandize destined from one foreign country to another, which transits the United States, Puerto Rico or the U.S. Virgin Islands be declared. A five-year average is used to ensure that trends are apparent and to mitigate the impact of year-to-year variation. The aggregate of chemical spill investigations and investigations of oil spills greater than or equal to 100 gallons is used as this provides a broader indication of Marine Environmental Protection than just one or the other. All Chemical spill investigations are counted as these are triggered by explicit reportable quantities. Only investigations of oil spills greater than or equal to 100 gallons are counted, as this reduces the potential for year-to-year variability in the reporting of nominal oil spills. Marine chemical and oil discharge investigations are recorded in the Coast Guard's Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) database and information is generally complete when the database is accessed. Some incidents are never reported, however, and sometimes information needed to complete an investigation is delayed in reaching the Coast Guard. Previously published information is therefore subject to change. The greatest impact occurring over the most recent 5 months. Shipping information from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers not available until several months after the end of the most recent calendar year.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	It is possible that some MISLE information is inaccurately reported to the Coast Guard. Duplicate information may occasionally be entered or an incident inadvertently omitted or incorrectly coded. Formal verification procedures strive to rectify any errors, and sophisticated program logic and comprehensive user guides ensure that data from MISLE is highly reliable.

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

Performance Measure	Interdict or deter a certain percentage of undocumented migrants who attempt to enter the U.S. via maritime routes.
Scope	Political climates, historical flows, and the latest trends figure into the calculations. The potential flows are validated against other flow estimates where available; they are usually found to be more conservative than the other sources. While this measure captures the Coast Guard's success in interdicting migrants, it also reflects the significant deterrent effect that Coast Guard operations have on potential migrants. The measure only tracks four migrant groups at this time. A small number of migrants (approximately 10%) from various source countries are not included because formal flow estimates of migrants leaving these countries are not available. Using the number of potential migrants in the denominator helps address the deterrence value of Coast Guard operations, but could lead to confusion of this measure with a simple interdiction rate.
Data Source	Data obtained from Coast Guard and Immigration and Naturalization Service.
Collection Method	The success rate is an indicator of the number of migrants entering the U.S. by maritime routes compared against the number of migrants that would attempt to enter with no interdiction presence.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	The numbers of illegal migrants entering the U.S., and the numbers of potential migrants, are derived numbers subject to estimating error. Because of the speculative nature of the information used, and the secretive nature of illegal migration, particularly where professional smuggling organizations are involved, the estimated potential flow of migrants may contain significant error.

Performance Measure	(Interim) MARSEC level attainment percentage
Scope	The CG plans to report percent attainment of Maritime Security (MARSEC)level I.
Data Source	Tactical Commanders (Districts) via Operational/Theater Commanders (Atlantic & Pacific Area)
Collection Method	Classified & unclassified message reporting systems.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	As the Coast Guard continues to refine the PWCS standards based upon a better understanding of the critical and overall risks associated with this mission program, the reliability of this measure will improve accordingly. We anticipate transitioning to revised standards in September 2004.

Performance Measure	Percent of time that CG assets required by Navy O-Plans are ready at a Navy SORTS rating of 2 or better.
Scope	The overall combat readiness of particular Coast Guard assets as judged by the Department of Defense Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) criteria.
Data Source	Navy Status Of Resources and Training System (SORTS).
Collection Method	Number of days that a USCG asset is ready at a SORTS rating of C-2 or better divided by total number of required assets days. (The Navy defines category level 2 as "Unit possesses the resources and is trained to undertake most of the wartime mission(s) for which it is organized or designed.")
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Measure assesses the state of readiness of an asset in relation to its capabilities including: equipment, logistics, personnel, training, preparedness, etc. This is a standardized system that is applied throughout DOD. SORTS is a self evaluation performed periodically by the CO and personnel on the Coast Guard asset. This measure replaces the former measure that indicated how many requests by DOD for USCG core competencies were met. Both measures have targets of 100%. The new measure is a better indicator of readiness, and uses the standard SORTS system which is recognized throughout DOD.

Performance Measure	Removal rate for COCAINE that is shipped via non-commercial maritime means.
Scope	This is a new measure - very similar in design to our cocaine seizure rate - that we plan to transition to as our lead measure commencing in FY 2004. The Coast Guard has witnessed changes in smuggling activities in recent years wherein smugglers increasingly jettison or otherwise destroy the drugs they are carrying to prevent physical seizure by the Coast Guard. In certain instances, such as a high seas chase for example, bales of contraband are seen thrown overboard from smuggling vessels. The location of jettisoning is typically marked or noted, but by the time the chase is complete and the CG unit returns to the location of the drugs, some of them are unrecoverable due to sinking, sea conditions, or a general inability to relocate them. This measure seeks to account for the cocaine that is not recovered, since those drugs still speak to the Drug program's performance effectiveness.
Data Source	Both the "physically seized" and the "jettisoned or destroyed" components of this measure are/will be tracked, collected, and analyzed by Coast Guard Headquarters' Office of Law Enforcement (G-OPL). The non-commercial maritime flow component of this measure is provided by the IACM, which has Coast Guard representation.
Collection Method	Both classified and unclassified Coast Guard IT systems will be utilized to manage this measure.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	While the inclusion of a "jettisoned or destroyed" data component lacks the certainty of the "hands on" physically seized component, it is verified and validated via an Interagency process. Therefore, while this measure is new and the Coast Guard is adjusting from a policy, collection, and reporting perspective, we anticipate that it will prove to be a reliable measure.

Performance Measure	Save mariners in imminent danger.
Scope	Several factors compound the difficulty of successful response' untimely notification to the CG of distress, incorrect reporting of the distress site location, severe weather conditions at the distress site, distance to the scene, etc.
Data Source	Various CG databases
Collection Method	Input from operators
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Verified by program manager.



Performance Measure	Percent of fishermen complying with federal regulations.
Scope	The performance metric for Living Marine Resources (LMR) is the percent of fishermen complying with federal regulations.
Data Source	The compliance rate is obtained directly from the Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) database and from the Coast Guard Law Enforcement Planning and Assessment System.
Collection Method	Coast Guard units enter their enforcement data directly into this database after completion of fisheries enforcement boardings. District, Area, and Headquarters law enforcement staffs review, validate, and assess the data on a quarterly basis as part of the Law Enforcement Planning and Assessment System.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Validated by program manager.

Performance Measure	Maritime Injury and Fatality Index.
Scope	This measure is an index comprised of the five year average of US maritime industry injuries and fatalities and the annual number of recreational boating fatalities. This index is primarily included to provide one external reporting measure for this program. The two sub-measures are separate and their effect on this larger index needs to be examined separately, as the approaches to reducing each have different aspects.
Data Source	This measure combines data from the five-year average number of maritime industry injuries and fatalities with the annual number of recreational boating fatalities.
Collection Method	Combination of other data into one index.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	It should be noted that this measure combines a five-year average of deaths and injuries on US commercial vessels with an annual measure of recreational boating fatalities. Therefore, a sudden spike in the annual "rec boating" fatalities due to a unique event may unduly influence the reliability of the larger index even though commercial vessel injuries and deaths are slowly declining.

Performance Measure	Five-Year Average of Number of Collisions, Allisions, and Groundings (CAG)
Scope	The performance measure for the Aids to navigation (ATON) program is a five-year average of collisions, allisions (vessel striking a fixed object), and groundings (CAG). This measure will therefore represent the effectiveness of the ATON system in preventing CAG incidents.
Data Source	Data is obtained from the Coast Guard Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) database from December 2001 onward (prior to that date, data was obtained from MISLE's predecessor, the Marine Safety Information System (MSIS)).
Collection Method	Sources of reports are most often vessel masters, operators, owners, or insurance companies, as well as other mariners. CAG incidents are required to be reported under 46 CFR 4.05.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Major sources of uncertainty are: estimation error resulting from lags in data, response error when responsible parties fail to report casualties as required, and any errors in recording the actual nature of an accident (i.e., an accident is reported as a pollution event when it is later confirmed that the spill was caused by a CAG incident).

**United States Customs and Border Protection**

Performance Measure	Percent of Participating Government Agencies (PGA) forms filed electronically.
Scope	Information is extracted from ITDS Business Case.
Data Source	ITDS Business Case 300.
Collection Method	Verification method is pending.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Reasonable accuracy, but unable to determine the exact precision level.

Performance Measure	02) Advanced Passenger Information System (APIS) Data Sufficiency Rate. (Percent)
Scope	Information is transmitted to and processed by the CBP National Data Center. Once the data has been verified by Inspection personnel at the Ports of Entry an automated report is generated (function IOPM) by the Interagency Border Inspection System (IBIS).
Data Source	The airline passenger and crew manifest data.
Collection Method	Data is extracted from the APIS system, processed by IBIS and displayed in a report format (IOPM).
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Data is verified by the National APIS Account Managers.

Performance Measure	03) Outbound Currency Seizures. (millions of dollars)
Scope	Total Monetary Instrument Seizures is the total number and dollar value of seizures of monetary instruments for violations of the currency reporting regulations (31 USC 5316/5317) and the Bulk currency smuggling regulations (31 USC 5332).
Data Source	This data is drawn from the Customs and Border Protection Enterprise Data Warehouse reports. These reports are compiled on the basis of seizure information entered into the Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS) by CBP officers and reviewed/approved by their supervisors.
Collection Method	Seizure data is extracted from information collected from the Treasury Enforcement Communication System Clear Reports for violations of 31 USC 5316/5317 and 31 USC 5332. It is reviewed at input by supervisors as well as by National Data Owners for anomalies and adjustments are made as necessary.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	While this data can be considered very reliable, it is subject to error, such as input errors that are not caught by the reviewing and approving supervisor or duplicate reporting that is not identified through analyst review. Generally, however, errors which went unidentified, when later detected, were found to be minor.

Performance Measure	04) Counter Terrorism Qualitative Assessment.
Scope	A narrative assessment of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) efforts to identify, disrupt, and dismantle organizations that further terrorist activity.
Data Source	U.S. Customs Enterprise Data Warehouse reports, compiled on the basis of information entered into the Treasury Enforcement Communication System (TECS).
Collection Method	Customs officers enter the data. Verification of the data is done by their supervisors. Periodically, Customs personnel review the data for anomalies and adjustments are made as necessary.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Reasonable accuracy. While this data can be considered reliable, it is subject to error, such as input errors that are not caught by the reviewing and approving supervisor or duplicate reporting that is not identified through analyst review. Generally, however, errors which went unidentified, when later detected, were found to be minor.

Performance Measure	06a) Compliance Rate in the Air Passenger Environment (percent of travelers compliant).
Scope	Improvements are based largely on the systems for targeting and analysis request
Data Source	The percent of compliant passengers in the Air/Land Passenger environment is obtained from Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS), Category I violations, and Category II violations.
Collection Method	Verification of the data is extracted from OMR, ATS, and TECS.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Data is verified by the OMR data element owner/ Measurement Division.

Performance Measure	06b) Compliance Rate in the Vehicle Passenger environments (percent of travelers compliant).
Scope	The percent of compliant passenger data is a statistically valid estimate of the percentage of passengers (or vehicles) approaching the port-of-entry that are not in violation of any laws, rules, regulations, or agreements enforced by the United States Customs Service. The rate of compliance is determined by estimating the total number of violations present in the population of air passengers or vehicles approaching the port-of-entry and dividing it by the total number of air passengers or vehicles subject to random sampling at the port-of-entry.
Data Source	The percent of compliant passengers in the Air/Land Passenger environment is obtained from Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS).
Collection Method	Verification of the data is done annually by the National Data Element Owner (NDEO). Data is at the 90% confidence level. Data is updated monthly.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Data is verified upon input by supervisors and is updated monthly.

Performance Measure	07) Outbound Enforcement Targeting Effectiveness (percent effective).
Scope	Outbound Enforcement Targeting Effectiveness is the total number of positive examinations divided by the total number of targeted examinations conducted. This measure captures the targeting effectiveness for all manually targeted exams recorded in the Outbound Targeting and Tracking System (OTTS) and all other exams targeted by the Automated Export System (AES). Both sets of data are combined and a percentage expressed. Data supporting this measure is extracted into the OMR (Operations Management Report).
Data Source	Automated Export System examination report for AES and non-AES shipments.
Collection Method	Data is extracted from the Automated Export System examination reports function for AES and non-AES shipments.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Data is reviewed by supervisors upon entry and by National Data Owners annually.

Performance Measure	11) Outbound Licensing Violations (number of violations found).
Scope	Outbound Licensing Violations is the total number of seizures for violations of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), Export Administration Regulations (EAR) and the Office of Foreign Assets Controls sanctions.
Data Source	TECS seizure records
Collection Method	Data is extracted from information collected from the Treasury Enforcement Communications System Clear Reports for violations of 22 USC 401.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Verification of the data is done annually by the National Data Element Owners.

Performance Measure	12a) Inspection Narcotics Seizures (Legacy U.S. Customs Service Data Only).....Cocaine seized - thousands of pounds (at the ports of entry).
Scope	The amount of cocaine seized at the ports of entry by or with the participation of CBP officers. (Passengers, vehicles, commercial and private aircraft, vessels, trucks, cargo, and railcars entering the United States).
Data Source	This data is drawn from reports that are compiled on the basis of seizure information entered into the Treasury Enforcement Communications (TECS). In addition, the Customs Law Enforcement Activity Report (CLEAR) is utilized as a source.
Collection Method	Search, Arrest, Seizure (S/A/S) data entered into TECS.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	CLEAR data is compared to OMR data.

Performance Measure	12b).....Cocaine - number of seizures (at the ports of entry).
Scope	The number of incidents of cocaine seized at the ports of entry by or with the participation of CBP officers. (Passengers, vehicles, commercial and private aircraft, vessels, trucks, cargo vessels, and railcars entering the United States).
Data Source	This data is drawn from the CBP Enterprise Data Warehouse reports. These reports are compiled on the basis of seizure information entered into the Treasury Enforcement Communications (TECS) and the Customs Law Enforcement Activity Report (CLEAR).
Collection Method	Search, Arrest, Seizure (S/A/S) data entered into TECS. The data is reviewed/approved by supervisors. Periodically, seizure data is reviewed by CBP personnel for anomalies and adjustments are made as necessary.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	CLEAR data is compared to OMR data.

Performance Measure	12d).....Marijuana seized - thousands of pounds (at the ports of entry).
Scope	The number pounds of marijuana seized at the ports of entry by or with the participation of CBP officers. (Passengers, vehicles, commercial and private aircraft, vessels, trucks, cargo, and railcars entering the United States.
Data Source	This data is drawn from reports that are compiled on the basis of seizure information entered into the Treasury Enforcement Communications (TECS) and the Customs Law Enforcement Activity Report (CLEAR).
Collection Method	Search, Arrest, Seizure (S/A/S) data entered into TECS.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	CLEAR data is compared to OMR data.

Performance Measure	12e).....Marijuana - number of seizures (at the ports of entry).
Scope	The number of incidents of marijuana seized at the ports of entry by or with the participation of CBP officers. (Passengers, vehicles, commercial and private aircraft, vessels, trucks, cargo vessels, and railcars entering the United States).
Data Source	This data is drawn from the CBP Enterprise Data Warehouse reports. These reports are compiled on the basis of seizure information entered into the Treasury Enforcement Communications (TECS) and the Customs Law Enforcement Activity Report (CLEAR).
Collection Method	Search, Arrest, Seizure (S/A/S) data entered into TECS. The data is reviewed/approved by supervisors. Periodically, seizure data is reviewed by CBP personnel for anomalies and adjustments are made as necessary.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	CLEAR data is compared to OMR data. While this data can be considered reliable, it is subject to error, such as input errors that are not caught by the reviewing and approving supervisor or duplicate reporting that is not identified through analyst review. Generally, however, errors which went unidentified, when later detected, were found to be minor.

Performance Measure	12g).....Heroin seized - thousands of pounds (at the ports of entry).
Scope	The number of pounds of heroin seized at the ports of entry by or with the participation of CBP officers. (Passengers, vehicles, commercial and private aircraft, vessels, trucks, cargo vessels, and railcars entering the United States).
Data Source	This data is drawn from the CBP Enterprise Data Warehouse reports. These reports are compiled on the basis of seizure information entered into the Treasury Enforcement Communications (TECS) and the Customs Law Enforcement Activity Report (CLEAR).
Collection Method	Search, Arrest, Seizure (S/A/S) data entered into TECS. The data is reviewed/approved by supervisors. Periodically, seizure data is reviewed by CBP personnel for anomalies and adjustments are made as necessary.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	CLEAR data is compared to OMR data. While this data can be considered reliable, it is subject to error, such as input errors that are not caught by the reviewing and approving supervisor or duplicate reporting that is not identified through analyst review. Generally, however, errors which went unidentified, when later detected, were found to be minor.

Performance Measure	12h).....Heroin- number of seizures (at the ports of entry).
Scope	The number of incidents of heroin seized at the ports of entry by or with the participation of CBP officers. (Passengers, vehicles, commercial and private aircraft, vessels, trucks, cargo vessels, and railcars entering the United States).
Data Source	This data is drawn from the CBP Enterprise Data Warehouse reports. These reports are compiled on the basis of seizure information entered into the Treasury Enforcement Communications (TECS) and the Customs Law Enforcement Activity Report (CLEAR).
Collection Method	Search, Arrest, Seizure (S/A/S) data entered into TECS. The data is reviewed/approved by supervisors. Periodically, seizure data is reviewed by CBP personnel for anomalies and adjustments are made as necessary.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	CLEAR data is compared to OMR data. While this data can be considered reliable, it is subject to error, such as input errors that are not caught by the reviewing and approving supervisor or duplicate reporting that is not identified through analyst review. Generally, however, errors which went unidentified, when later detected, were found to be minor.

Performance Measure	13) International Air Passengers in Compliance with Agricultural Quarantine Regulations (percent compliant).
Scope	The percent of passengers in the air and vehicle environments that are in compliance with the Agricultural Quarantine Regulations.
Data Source	The compliance rates are based on statistical sampling; the margin of error is +/-0.5 percent. The actual performance results, which are listed in the table above, are the midpoint of the range. The program collects data used to measure this performance goal through AQI Monitoring activities. Program officials collect data at multiple ports of entry for the air passenger, border vehicle, and cargo pathways by applying standard statistical sampling procedures.
Collection Method	Although there is a small percentage of poor data quality (due to port personnel changes, equipment failure and nonsupport by some local management) the quality and reliability of the monitoring data continues to be acceptable.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	National and regional managers are working with specific ports to improve data quality, support issues, and equipment problems.

Performance Measure	14) Border Vehicle Passengers in Compliance with Agricultural Quarantine Regulations (percent compliant).
Scope	The percent of passengers in the air and vehicle environments that are in compliance with the Agricultural Quarantine Regulations.
Data Source	The compliance rates are based on statistical sampling; the margin of error is +/-0.5 percent. The actual performance results, which are listed in the table above, are the midpoint of the range. The program collects data used to measure this performance goal through AQI Monitoring activities. Program officials collect data at multiple ports of entry for the air passenger, border vehicle, and cargo pathways by applying standard statistical sampling procedures.
Collection Method	Although there is a small percentage of poor data quality (due to port personnel changes, equipment failure and nonsupport by some local management) the quality and reliability of the monitoring data continues to be acceptable.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	National and regional managers are working with specific ports to improve data quality, support issues, and equipment problems.

Performance Measure	Maximize targeting effectiveness of high-risk containerized cargo.
Scope	This operational performance measure identifies the goals and metrics pertinent to the daily operation of the program, i.e. bills of lading reviewed, containers examined, investigative cases opened, etc.
Data Source	The Office of Management and Budget Capital Asset Plan and the Business Case for FY 2005.
Collection Method	Data is extracted from information found within the Office of Management and Budget Capital Asset Plan and the Business Case for FY 2005 (OMB-300 Report).
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Office of International Affairs/ Measurement Division



Performance Measure	High Priority Border Corridors Demonstrating Optimum Deterrence.
Scope	Operational effectiveness is defined as apprehensions plus turn backs, divided by attempts. Attempts are compiled by adding apprehensions plus evadees plus turn backs. Evadees and turnbacks are estimated by Border patrol agents using information from video cameras, infrared scopes, helicopter patrols, sensor hits, and tracks. Optimum deterrence is further analyzed by evaluating: increase in traffic outside targeted corridors, decrease in attempted illegal entries, decrease in violent act against law enforcement, and utilization of "non-traditional" entry routes.
Data Source	Data is compiled by zones and aggregated at the Sector level into Sector corridors. Data collected includes: activity such as arrests, turnbacks, and evadees, narcotics seizures, personnel actions, technology, narrative reports, and additional monthly statistics such as IDENT?ENFORCEusage and crime rates.
Collection Method	On a monthly basis nationwide reporting occurs via the Performance Analysis System (PAS). Monthly reviews and editing of apprehension data in PAS is conducted at the Sector level and by the Border Patrol analysts.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Standardization of recording and reporting of data is ongoing. Data collection is currently an intensive manual process. The use of the intranet to extract existing data form automated systems along with unautomated data is beign tested at limited pilot sites. The national implementation of such operational data will be used to access and analyze operational effectiveness patrol strategy.

Performance Measure	Percentage of land containers screened using NII.
Scope	Information is based on OMR/ Port Tracking data extracted from the Treasury Enforcement Community System (TECS).
Data Source	OMR/ Port Tracking data
Collection Method	Data is extracted using the TECS.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Verification method is pending.

Performance Measure	Percentage of sea containers physically examined.
Scope	Information is based on OMR/ Port Tracking data extracted from the Treasury Enforcement Communication System (TECS).
Data Source	OMR/ Port Tracking data
Collection Method	Data is extracted by using the TECS.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Verification method is pending.

Performance Measure	Percentage of sea containerized cargo transported by C-TPAT carriers.
Scope	N/A
Data Source	External data based on Journal of Commerce compilation of the percentages of containerized volume transported by carriers.
Collection Method	Manually compiled by extracting from the Journal of Commerce and internally assigned a C-TPAT identifier to the information and calculated the C-TPAT percentage based on this assignment.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Reasonable accuracy, but unable to determine the exact precision level. The Journal of Commerce is a generally accepted statistical source used by private industry and government.

**United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement**

Performance Measure	Level of Federal Air Marshal coverage for each individual category of identified risk.
Scope	Classified
Data Source	Classified
Collection Method	Classified
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Classified

Performance Measure	Number of final order removals / Number of final orders issued.
Scope	The number of final order removals is the number of aliens removed from the United States after receiving an order of removal from an immigration judge. This data element has little significance by itself. To give it meaningful context, it must be shown as a percentage of the number of final orders that immigration judges issued during the same time period. Because of the time lag between issuing an order and the completion of the removal, it is assumed tht some aliens receiving removal orders during one reporting period will be removed during the subsequent reporting period. Therefore, this measure will demonstrate DRO's overall productivity toward completing its accumulated workload. When the measure equals less than one, it shows that DRO is removing fewer aliens than are issued removal orders. This creates a potential risk to public safety and national security because there are fugitives, some with criminal convictions, moving freely through the community. When the measure equals greater than one, DRO is removing those aliens who have recently received final orders as well as some that are in the fugitive population. Removals are recorded through case management at 22 DRO field offices. Because of a large clerical workload, there can be a lag between when a removal occurs and when it is entered into DRO's data system. Analysis has shown that in the year following a reporting period, the number of removals recorded for that reporting period may increase as much as 6%, as old case files are closed in the system. * FY 2003 actuals are preliminary data based only on data from the Deportable Alien Control System (DACS), and does not include data from the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR). Normally, data from DACS is compared against EOIR data.
Data Source	Currently, this data would be collected from the Deportable Alien Control System (DACS) and then compared against data from the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR). As of December 1, 2003, DACS will no longer be in use, and will have been replaced by the Removals module of the ENFORCE System (EREM). For the remainder of FY2004 and subsequent years, data for this measure will be collected from EREM and then compared against data from EOIR.
Collection Method	Data is entered into DACS (soon to be EREM) at field offices. The compiled data is then retrieved from DACS/EREM and HQDRO. For quality control, data from DACS are matched against case records from EOIR.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	While there are data integrity concerns with DACS, they are well within the acceptable limits of any IT system. Statistically speaking DRO drops data outside the norms and or that is known to be faulty. This creates files that DRO considers highly reliable. This type of "normalization or cleaning" is done every day with every type of data. DRO has enough confidence in the data to use it for executive decision-making and for Congressional reporting. Furthermore, due to recent data clean-up efforts for the move to the ENFORCE Removals Module (EREM), DRO has more confidence now in the data than any other time since DACS was deployed. As part of the migration to EREM, many known data errors in DACS will be corrected before implementation. This effort will significantly improve the overall data integrity of DACS and EREM. EREM will be implemented February 2004. New policies and procedures will be implemented to require greater supervisory oversight of data within the system. Supervisors will be required to review more cases within the system for accuracy and completeness.

Performance Measure	Reduce the number of air space intrusions within the Flight Restricted Zone (FRZ) such as the National Capital Region (NCR).
Scope	The establishment of AMO's airspace security presence in the NCR, and coordinated airspace restricted around NCR reduced airspace instructions by 96% in six months from 182 to 7. There are no significant limitations on data collected or extracted used in support of AMO's results on airspace intrusions.
Data Source	AMO inputs and extracts data from the Air & Marine Operations Reporting System (AMOR). This system is used exclusively for Operations type data entry. Data from this system is used in annual reports to OMB and in preparation of the President's Budget.
Collection Method	Data is input & reviewed daily for approval by Supervisors.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Input is routed to and approved by supervisors daily. The AMOR system and its data reliability has been reviewed by Customs, Office of Investigations and Office of Information Technology in FY 02.

Performance Measure	Reduction of Risk Factor for Federal facilities.
Scope	FPS long term goal is to achieve a 40% overall measureable reduction to the threat of federal facilities. This measure provides FPS decision makers a means of identifying and evaluating threats to the federal workplace and of assessing program efficiency in reducing these threats.
Data Source	Building Security Assessment (BSA) surveys.
Collection Method	The BSA surveys are conducted periodically on all federal controlled buildings. The surveys are used to identify and evaluate threats to the federal controlled buildings. The surveys then form the basis of the Regional Threat Assessment, which focuses on and quantifies motive, opportunity and means such workspace may provide outside groups or individuals. A threat index is calculated for each building surveyed and the buildings within a region are prioritized in descending order. A regional composite threat index is developed by summing the values of the 10 buildings with the highest indices. An evaluation of percentage change in a region composite threat index indicates program accomplishment.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	A team within Headquarters conducts a comprehensive review of the BSA program. The team traveled to all 11 regions to validate the Regional Threat Assessment of selected buildings identified within each region. The regional visits culminated with the assurances that regional operations were in fact geared toward reducing the threats to the federal workplace and the actions taken were appropriately reflected through both the building security and regional threat assessments. Following this assurance, FPS Headquarters began calculating the region's performance in terms of threat reduction and taking into account the suspended gateway measures. The BSA allowed the team to monitor the approved countermeasures, the funding, and current status (implemented or ongoing with an approximate completion date). This allows FPS to track security initiatives identified by region and funded for implementation to reduce the regional threat Assessment.

Performance Measure	Percent of completed cases which have an enforcement consequence.
Scope	Percent of criminal and administrative cases worked by the Office of Investigations in the selected fiscal year that produced an enforcement consequence (e.g., arrest, indictment, conviction, seizure, fine and/or penalty)
Data Source	Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS); Enforcement Case Tracking System (ENFORCE)
Collection Method	TECS and ENFORCE will be used to retrieve and mine the data elements for the number of cases worked and to produce the number of enforcement consequences in relation to the cases worked.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This new measure was developed to include the new investigative roles from the merger of Customs and INS offices of Investigations within the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. It will take approximately six-nine months of review to provide an accurate reliability rate. The Executive Information Unit, Mission Support Division, Office of Investigations, will validate and verify data compiled by TECS and ENFORCE by using established internal reviews and statistical sampling methodology to determine accuracy, completeness, and related quality control practices. Specifically, the data will be validated by defining data quality characteristics and quality thresholds, developing statistical sampling methods to extract population samples, analyzing samples using pre-defined validation rules, determining the prevalence of known data quality deficiencies, creating tabulations for the presentation of results, and documenting findings.

**United States Secret Service**

Performance Measure	Percentage of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely.
Scope	The security of protectees is the ultimate priority of the Secret Service. The Secret Service conducts after action reviews to gauge performance of specific protective operations. These reviews are used to measure how successfully the Secret Service performed its mission and what can be done to increase efficiency without compromising a protectee or event. There is no error rate for this measure.
Data Source	This program measure originates from the protective event or visit.
Collection Method	Results from Protective Operations, as well as any incident that may occur, are immediately reported.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Any breach of Protective Operations would be immediately known and subject to a thorough investigation.

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

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

Performance Measure	Percentage of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely.
Scope	The security of protectees is the ultimate priority of the Secret Service. The Secret Service conducts after action reviews to gauge performance of specific protective operations. These reviews are used to measure how successfully the Secret Service performed its mission and what can be done to increase efficiency without compromising a protectee or event. There is no error rate for this measure.
Data Source	This program measure originates from the protective event or visit.
Collection Method	Results from Protective Operations, as well as any incident that may occur, are immediately reported.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Any breach of Protective Operations would be immediately known and subject to a thorough investigation.

Performance Measure	Intelligence Cases Completed.
Scope	Protective intelligence cases are the highest priority cases worked by the Secret Service. Because they may directly impact the safety of our protectees, all cases are referred for investigation. Overall error rates are less than one percent. Error is due to lag time in data entry or corrections to historical data.
Data Source	The Intelligence Program measure is collected from the Master Central Index (MCI) System. This system is used by all Secret Service investigative field offices, and provides a means of record keeping for all case and subject information.
Collection Method	The MCI database is comprised of case and arrest information, which is entered by USSS personnel.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	MCI has many features built into it in order to provide the most accurate data possible. Along with the mainframe security features, there are many edit checks built into the application to ensure the accuracy and validity of the data. Only authorized headquarters and field personnel have access to the application, and they are governed by specific procedures to input case and arrest data.

Performance Measure	Financial Crimes Loss Prevented.
Scope	This measure reports an estimate of the direct dollar loss prevented due to the Secret Service's Electronic Crimes Task Forces' investigations. Error is due to lag time in data entry or corrections to historical data.
Data Source	The Financial Crimes Loss Prevented measure will be collected from the Master Central Index (MCI) System. This system is used by all Secret Service investigative field offices, and provides a means of record keeping for all case and subject information.
Collection Method	The MCI database is comprised of case and arrest information, which is entered by USSS personnel.
Reliability	T.B.D New Measure
When reliable data will be available	MCI has many features built into it in order to provide the most accurate data possible. Along with the mainframe security features, there are many edit checks built into the applications to ensure the accuracy and validity of the data. Only authorized headquarters and field personnel have access to the applications, and they are governed by specific procedures to input case and arrest data. An annual audit is conducted and recurring verification reports are generated and reviewed to reduce errors and ensure data accuracy.

Performance Measure	Percentage of Instances Protectees Arrive and Depart Safely.
Scope	The security of protectees is the ultimate priority of the Secret Service. The Secret Service conducts after action reviews to gauge performance of specific protective operations. These reviews are used to measure how successfully the Secret Service performed its mission and what can be done to increase efficiency without compromising a protectee or event. There is no error rate for this measure.
Data Source	This program measure originates from the protective event or visit.
Collection Method	Results from Protective Operations, as well as any incident that may occur, are immediately reported.
Reliability	Reliable
How reliability is verified	Any breach of Protective Operations would be immediately known and subject to a thorough investigation.