Department of Homeland Security

Performance Budget Overview
Appendix A
Verification and Validation of Measured Values

Fiscal Year 2006
Congressional Budget Justification

A. Verification and Validation of Measured Values

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

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

Table of Contents

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

Performance Measure	Percentage of recommended National Biosurveillance Integration System (NBIS) process improvement actions that are actually accepted and implemented into the NBIS operating procedures.
Organization and Program	Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate - Biosurveillance (BIO)
Scope	Protective Security Division (PSD) will implement the National Biosurveillance Integration System (NBIS) in FY05 and achieve Initial Operating Capability (IOC). The program team will employ a lessons - learned approach to identify, capture and assess NBIS process improvement ideas based on actual operating experience. Ideas deemed appropriate for implementation into the NBIS Operating Procedures will be submitted for consideration by the NBIS Operations Team to the appropriate approval authority. Each proposed process improvement action submittal will include a statement explaining the proposed action along with any other information deemed appropriate to support the decision process (such as the benefits and drawbacks associated with the action and an estimate of the costs and/or cost savings). The total number of these proposed NBIS process improvement actions forms the baseline for this performance measure. Approved process improvement actions will be tasked and a target completion date and close - out criteria established.
Data Source	The NBIS integrates data from the Center for Disease Control (CDC), the Federal Drug Administration (FDA), the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) and DHS' Science and Technology (ST). This information is used for capability assessment and strategic planning and will also provide real time information to aid in the response to threats and incidents. The status of all proposed actions will be tracked and reported. Status will be categorized as rejected, approval pending (i.e. proposed process improvement actions submitted but awaiting a decision), approved, implementation in progress or implementation complete (i.e. close - out criteria met).Only actions that have met the specified implementation close - out criteria will be credited toward meeting this performance measure. The FY05 target value for this measure is 50%. However, due to a potentially significant time lag between proposal submission and actual action implementation completion, all approval pending actions and approved actions not yet implemented will also be reported for information purposes.
Collection Method	A computer - based tracking log, maintained by Protective Security Division (PSD), on an on - going basis, will be used to track the status of each process improvement idea submitted.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Performance measure data will be available for reporting within 3 months of the National Biosurveillance Integration System (NBIS) achieving IOC.

Performance Measure	Number of information analysis products that address or directly support requirements of the Department.
Organization and Program	Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate - Infrastructure Vulnerability Risk Assessment (IVRA)
Scope	For Official Use Only (U//FOUO) Contact Department of Homeland Security's Program Analysis and Evaluation (PAE) Division at (202)772 - 4484 for further information.
Data Source	For Official Use Only (U//FOUO) Contact Department of Homeland Security's Program Analysis and Evaluation (PAE) Division at (202)772 - 4484 for further information.
Collection Method	For Official Use Only (U//FOUO) Contact Department of Homeland Security's Program Analysis and Evaluation (PAE) Division at (202)772 - 4484 for further information.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	For Official Use Only (U//FOUO) Contact Department of Homeland Security's Program Analysis and Evaluation (PAE) Division at (202)772 - 4484 for further information.

Performance Measure	Number of information assessments that will help designers of exercises and crisis simulations create realistic scenarios.
Organization and Program	Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate - Threat Determination Assessment (TDA)
Scope	For Official Use Only(U//FOUO) Contact Department of Homeland Security's Program Analysis and Evaluation (PAE) Division at (202)772 - 4484 for further information.
Data Source	For Official Use Only(U//FOUO) Contact Department of Homeland Security's Program Analysis and Evaluation (PAE) Division at (202)772 - 4484 for further information.
Collection Method	For Official Use Only(U//FOUO) Contact Department of Homeland Security's Program Analysis and Evaluation (PAE) Division at (202)772 - 4484 for further information.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	For Official Use Only(U//FOUO) Contact Department of Homeland Security's Program Analysis and Evaluation (PAE) Division at (202)772 - 4484 for further information.

Performance Measure	Percentage of Federal, State and local agencies that maintain connectivity with the Homeland Security Operations Center (HSOC) via Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN) and participate in information sharing and collaboration concerning infrastructure status, potential threat and incident management information.
Organization and Program	Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate - Homeland Security Operations Center (HSOC)
Scope	A direct information sharing capability with county level governments is required to achieve the Homeland Security Operations Center's (HSOC) mission. The data to be collected and measured is a count of federal, state and local agencies connected via the HSIN network. There are 3,066 Emergency Operation Centers (EOCs) distributed among 50 states. In 2005, HSOC will work to establish connectivity to approximately 1/3 of these counties. State - level EOCs is already complete.
Data Source	The data results from counting each organization as it becomes connected to the HSIN network. Source of the data is each individual organization that HSOC reaches out to and establishes a connection.
Collection Method	Data will be collected manually and tracked manually using an Excel - based tracking log.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Reliable data may be available by FY 2005 Q3. At that time, the data can potentially be verified manually (telephone calls to each HSIN user to verify that they are in fact connected). Other potential cross - checking methods include verifying collected numbers against paid HSIN - user invoices, or printing a copy of available users by search of an HSIN address file via the network.

Performance Measure	Percentage of candidate Critical Infrastructure/Key Resource (CI/KR) data call responses (on an asset basis, new and updates) that are reviewed, researched, and cataloged into the National Asset Data Base (NADB) within 120 days of receipt.
Organization and Program	Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate - Critical Infrastructure Identification and Evaluation (CIIE)
Scope	Submissions (on an asset basis, new and updates) for the National Asset Database (NADB) are made through state and territory Homeland Security Officials, generally in response to a DHS data call. These submissions are logged in by Protective Security Division (PSD) indicating the date of receipt of the submittal at PSD. This date of receipt is the performance measure baseline date for each of the assets that are included in that particular submittal. The data submitted for each asset is compared to the specific data call requirements. Specific data elements not meeting the data call requirements are identified and documented. Processes for correction of these data element deficiencies are then initiated by PSD. When all data elements for a given asset are in full compliance with data call requirements, the asset, along with the associated data elements, is cataloged into the NADB. The date that this cataloging is completed is the completion date relative to this performance measure. For FY05, the target value for this measure is 60% of the assets being cataloged within 120 calendar days of receipt.
Data Source	The primary source of information for this performance measure will be the NADB FY05 Data Call Summary Report. This report is used to track the receipt and status of NABD data call submissions from state and territory Homeland Security Officials. Adjustments to this reporting mechanism may be necessary if, or when, NADB asset data is submitted to PSD through alternative channels.
Collection Method	Data for this performance measure will be taken directly from the NADB FY05 Data Call Summary Report. This report was developed by PSD and is maintained by PSD for internal use. It is updated as needed, but at least monthly.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Protective Security Division (PSD) data collection processes include steps to ensure accuracy and reliability of the asset - specific data used to populate the National Asset Database (NADB). PSD researchers routinely and consistently quality check not only the information received directly from the State Homeland Security Officials (SHSO) submitted in response to a PSD data call, but also any missing information about the assets that are obtained directly by the PSD researchers themselves through open - source research efforts. Upon completion of the PSD research effort for a given group of assets, the asset - specific data sets are submitted for a quality review, internal to PSD. The asset - specific data research steps are repeated for a selected sample set taken from that particular group of researched assets. Any errors found are corrected. If the error rate exceeds a pre - established limit, a larger sample is reviewed and steps are taken to identify and eliminate the cause(s) of the errors. If deemed necessary, PSD will submit the researched asset data to the appropriate SHSO for their concurrence prior to releasing the data for entry into the NADB. Only those groups of data sets that have successfully gone through this sample quality check are released for entry into the NADB. This verification process ensures the accuracy and reliability of the information entered into the NADB.

Performance Measure	Number of Cyber Security work products disseminated.
Organization and Program	Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate - Cyber Security (CS)
Scope	The data to be collected is simply a count of the number of pieces of informational products distributed by the National Cyber Security Division. The following is the list of products that CS will track in FY05: Number of Technical Alerts issued through the National Cyber Alert System; Number of Non - Technical Alerts issued through the National Cyber Alert System; Number of Vulnerability Notes Created; Number of Vulnerability Notes Published; Number of times Vulnerability Notes are updated; Number of Incident Notes published; Number of times Incident Notes are updated; Number of times the Current Activity portion of the US - CERT web site (www.uscert.gov) is updated; Number of portal - wide forums created on the HSIN/US - CERT portal; Number of posting to portal - wide forums on the HSIN/US - CERT portal; Number of Security Tips published; Number of Cyber Security Bulletins; Number of secured messages sent to members of the HSIN/US - CERT portal; Number of times the Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVE) list is updated; Number of times the Common Malware Enumeration (CME) list is updated; Number of DHS/US - CERT Dailey Unclassified Briefings published; and Number of HSIN/US - CERT Portal Newsletters published..
Data Source	The data will be collected from within the National Cyber Security Division, from the operational component of the National Cyber Security Division, Production Branch.
Collection Method	The data collected shall be entered manually into an excel spreadsheet. As FY05 progresses, the National Cyber Security Division will look to automate this process, if necessary.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	With each reporting period, the Division will review the reliability of the information to determine what, if any, improvements are required. The Division believes that the data will be reliable in Q2 FY05.

Performance Measure	Number of IAIP personnel assigned to the Intelligence Community member organizations.
Organization and Program	Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate - Evaluations and Studies (ES)
Scope	For Official Use Only(U//FOUO) Contact Department of Homeland Security's Program Analysis and Evaluation (PAE) Division at (202)772 - 4484 for further information.
Data Source	For Official Use Only(U//FOUO) Contact Department of Homeland Security's Program Analysis and Evaluation (PAE) Division at (202)772 - 4484 for further information.
Collection Method	For Official Use Only(U//FOUO) Contact Department of Homeland Security's Program Analysis and Evaluation (PAE) Division at (202)772 - 4484 for further information.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	For Official Use Only(U//FOUO) Contact Department of Homeland Security's Program Analysis and Evaluation (PAE) Division at (202)772 - 4484 for further information.

Performance Measure	The percentage of major IT projects that are within 10% of cost/schedule/performance objectives.
Organization and Program	Management Directorate - Office of the Chief Information Officer
Scope	This measure pertains to the information from the OMB Exhibit 300's for Major IT investments. These projects are considered major because of high cost or importance to the Agency. First report will be the comparison from FY05 Exhibits and FY06 Exhibits. Beginning in FY05, Quarterly reviews of all Level 1 investments will be reported on.
Data Source	The OMB Exhibit 300's, Section I.H.2 - I.H.4. This information is input by the individual Project Managers at the DHS Organizational Level.
Collection Method	Exhibit 300s containing the information are submitted to the DHS Office of the CIO. The CIO office will conduct a manual analysis from the Business Cases for cost and schedule data contained in the Exhibit 300 for the first report. Comparison of what was reported in the FY05 Exhibit 300 versus actual in the FY06 Exhibit 300 is the determining criteria.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The data collected from the Exhibit 300 is prepared by Project Managers and certified by the CFO of the Organizational Element submitting the Exhibits. This information is then sent to OMB for further review and inclusion in the President's budget each year. Future interfaces from operational systems will populate these Exhibits assuring continued and even more precise reliability.

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

Performance Measure	Development of protocols for the highest priority toxic industrial chemicals (TICs) and toxic industrial materials (TIMs).
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Chemical Countermeasures
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 including 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 data 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	Improvement in the national capability to assess threats and vulnerabilities to terrorist attacks: 10 categories to be assessed.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Threat and Vulnerability, Testing Assessments
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), research and development 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 data is verified	Expert review is a widely used and reliable method of evaluating research and development programs.

Performance Measure	Improved capabilities to detect threats in urban areas (Urban Monitoring Program).
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Biological Countermeasures
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 ST 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 data is verified	These reports are verified by ST oversight of the program, review of invoices, and audits as necessary.

Performance Measure	Number of Federal, state and local sites that are integrated into an operational secondary reachback architecture to resolve radiological and nuclear alarms.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Domestic Nuclear Detection
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 data is verified	The integration among various DHS entities ensures that the determination of number of sites will be straightforward.

Performance Measure	Percent of critical infrastructure prioritized for threat vulnerability.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Critical Infrastructure Protection
Scope	The Critical Infrastructure Protection Decision Support System (CIP/DSS) is a research and development program within the Science and Technology (ST) Directorate. The goal of the CIP/DSS is to develop, implement, and evolve a rational, scientifically - informed approach for prioritizing critical infrastructure protection strategies and resource allocations using modeling, simulation, and analyses to assess vulnerabilities, consequences, and risks; develop and evaluate protection, mitigation, response, and recovery strategies and technologies; and provide real - time support to decision makers during crises and emergencies
Data Source	The sources of the data are programmatic status and technical reports.
Collection Method	Reports are submitted monthly. The ST 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 data is verified	These reports are verified by ST oversight of the program, review of invoices, and audits as necessary.

Performance Measure	Percent of assessed surface critical transportation assets or systems that have identified mitigation strategies to improve their ability (from baseline) to detect, deter, or prevent scenario - based threats as measured by vulnerability assessments
Organization and Program	Transportation Security Administration - Transportation Security Enterprise
Scope	All surface transportation assets or systems that have been deemed critical through prior assessments.
Data Source	Spreadsheet kept by program manager, in the future will be derived from Risk Management data base (RMRS).
Collection Method	Data is collected through onsite inspections performed by MLS Risk Staff or contractors working for MLS Risk Staff.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Program manager is interviewed and data is reviewed by Performance Staff.

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

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

Performance Measure	Compliance Rate in the Vehicle Passenger Environments (percent of travelers compliant).
Organization and Program	United States Customs and Border Protection - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at POE's
Scope	Individual inspectors working at the 12 largest land Ports of Entry in gather compliance rate data while processing vehicles entering the U.S. Vehicles are selected in a random sample, for roughly 1/4000 vehicles totaling approximately 12,000 vehicles annually at each of the 12 land POEs.
Data Source	The percent of compliant passengers in the Air/Land Passenger environment is obtained from Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS).
Collection Method	Individual inspectors working at land Ports of Entry in gather compliance rate data while processing vehicles entering the U.S. These data are entered into the Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECs) by each Inspector. Individual compliance rate data entered in TECs is then extracted by a specialist at CBP - HQ to an Excel spreadsheet where the compliance rate is calculated by applying a statistically valid formula (including confidence intervals on the results)to determine the rate of compliance.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Verification of the data is conducted by making extractions from the Operations Management Report (OMR), Automated Targeting System (ATS), and the Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECs). These data extractions are then reviewed by the headquarters program officers against hard copy records to verify the accuracy of the reported data and identify any anomalies or inconsistencies.

Performance Measure	Number of Pounds of Cocaine Seized (thousands of pounds at the ports of entry)
Organization and Program	United States Customs and Border Protection - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at POE's
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). A consistent drug flow was assumed in establishing these targets; however, changes in drug flow to U.S. borders may impact targets. An outcome measure that quantifies CBP's contribution to the removal of available cocaine can be calculated with the data from this current measure, in conjunction with flow estimates, when they are available from the Office of Drug Control Policy (ONDCP). CBP will collaborate throughout FY06 with ONDCP and its partners to further explore implementation of such a measure.
Data Source	This data is drawn from reports that are compiled on the basis of seizure information entered into the Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS). A Report Generating Function (RPG) is used to extract the data from TECS.
Collection Method	Search, Arrest, Seizure (S/A/S) data entered into TECS.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Seizure reports are used by both Headquarters and field management to assess enforcement activity. Anomalies in these reports are researched and resolved through use of an audit trail, facilitated by a seizure identification number, used to track and substantiate each seizure.

Performance Measure	Number of Pounds of Marijuana Seized (thousands of pounds at the ports of entry)
Organization and Program	United States Customs and Border Protection - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at POE's
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). A consistent drug flow was assumed in establishing these targets; however, changes in drug flow to U.S. borders may impact targets. An outcome measure that quantifies CBP's contribution to the removal of available marijuana can be calculated with the data from this current measure, in conjunction with flow estimates, when they are available from the Office of Drug Control Policy (ONDCP). CBP will collaborate throughout FY06 with ONDCP and its partners to further explore implementation of such a measure.
Data Source	Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS).
Collection Method	Search, Arrest, Seizure (S/A/S) data entered into TECS. A Report Generating Function (RPG) is used to extract the data from TECS.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Seizure reports are used by both Headquarters and field management to assess enforcement activity. Anomalies in these reports are researched and resolved through use of an audit trail, facilitated by a seizure identification number, used to track and substantiate each seizure.

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

Performance Measure	International Air Passengers in Compliance with Agricultural Quarantine Regulations (percent compliant).
Organization and Program	United States Customs and Border Protection - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at POE's
Scope	The percent of passengers in the air 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 reported are the midpoint of the range. The program collects data used to measure this performance goal through Agricultural Quarantine Inspection (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 data is verified	National and regional managers are working with specific ports to improve data quality, support issues, and equipment problems. Identified data quality issues will be addressed by the appropriate managers. Progress in resolving data quality will be reviewed by senior managers on a quarterly basis. Based on these efforts, the validity of the data for this measure will be reliable by the end of FY05.

Performance Measure	Border Vehicle Passengers in Compliance with Agricultural Quarantine Regulations (percent compliant).
Organization and Program	United States Customs and Border Protection - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at POE's
Scope	The percent of passengers in the 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 reported 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	The compliance rates are based on statistical sampling; the margin of error is 0.5 percent. The actual performance results reported are the midpoint of the range. The program collects data used to measure this performance goal through Agricultural Quarantine Inspections (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.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	National and regional managers are working with specific ports to improve data quality, support issues, and equipment problems. Identified data quality issues will be addressed by the appropriate managers. Progress in resolving data quality will be reviewed by senior managers on a quarterly basis. Based on these efforts, the validity of the data for this measure will be reliable by the end of FY05.

Performance Measure	Number of Pounds of Heroin Seized (thousands of pounds at the ports of entry)
Organization and Program	United States Customs and Border Protection - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at POE's
Scope	The amount 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). A consistent drug flow was assumed in establishing these targets; however, changes in drug flow to U.S. borders may impact targets. An outcome measure that quantifies CBP's contribution to the removal of available heroin can be calculated with the data from this current measure, in conjunction with flow estimates, when they are available from the Office of Drug Control Policy (ONDCP). CBP will collaborate throughout FY06 with ONDCP and its partners to further explore implementation of such a measure.
Data Source	Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS).
Collection Method	Search, Arrest, Seizure (S/A/S) data entered into TECS. A Report Generating Function (RPG) is used to extract the data from TECS.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Seizure reports are used by both Headquarters and field management to assess enforcement activity. Anomalies in these reports are researched and resolved through use of an audit trail, facilitated by a seizure identification number, used to track and substantiate each seizure.

Performance Measure	Number of foreign mitigated examinations by category
Organization and Program	United States Customs and Border Protection - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at POE's
Scope	The measure will be the number of examinations waived due to host nation intelligence.
Data Source	A Container Security Initiative (CSI) port team member inputs this data into an Excel spreadsheet daily. Total numbers are extracted weekly from this spreadsheet for required reports to the CSI Division. In FY05 the Automated Targeting System (ATS) will be used by the port members to input this data.
Collection Method	CSI Port Team Leaders track statistics using an existing Excel spreadsheet. Data is collected daily and reported weekly. In FY05 these statistics will be collected using a new Automated Targeting System (ATS) Exam Findings module available to the port team.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Reliability of the data is verified and evaluated by the CSI Port Team Leader. Reliable data is available currently.

Performance Measure	Percent of worldwide U.S. destined containers processed through Container Security Initiative (CSI) ports
Organization and Program	United States Customs and Border Protection - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at POE's
Scope	This measure will utilize the annual volume of U.S. destined containers processed through all CSI ports prior to lading and divide it by the annual worldwide number of U.S. destined containers.
Data Source	Two sources are used to develop this statistic. The first is the Excel spreadsheet used by each port to document the shipping volume (as expressed through Bills of Lading) processed through the port. The second is the total annual volume arriving in the U.S. as tracked by the Port Import Export Reporting Service (PIERS) subscription service. A third source is under development; the Automated Targeting System (ATS).
Collection Method	CSI Port Team already tracks and documents the shipping volume processed through each port using an Excel spreadsheet. Data on the total annual volume arriving in the U.S. will be extracted from PIERS and/or ATS by EAB.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The CSI Port Team Leader is responsible for verifying the statistics regarding shipping volume in their respective port. The PIERS data is a subscription service with independently verified data.

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

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

Performance Measure	Percent of Sea Containers Examined using Non - Intrusive Inspection Technology (NII)
Organization and Program	United States Customs and Border Protection - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at POE's
Scope	The percentage of NII examinations performed of the total number of sea containers arriving at U.S. ports.
Data Source	Operations Management Reports (OMR) Data Warehouse
Collection Method	Customs Officers enter the data into Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS), a comprehensive database maintained by the Office of Field Operations. Data are migrated to a permanent OMR data warehouse where they are verified and compiled.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Once the data is entered into the Port Tracking System (PTS) by officers, verification is done by their supervisors. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) personnel at the Headquarters level (OFO, Liaison Branch, Measurement Team) review the data for anomalies, and adjustments are made as necessary before the Operations Management Reports Data Warehouse updates are published. Additionally, NII Utilization Reports are submitted by officers in the field on a daily basis. These reports are compiled and reviewed at the Headquarters level (OFO, Interdiction Security) on a monthly basis and feedback is provided to the Directors of the Field Offices so that they can verify their accuracy and resolve problems.

Performance Measure	Percent of Truck and Rail Containers Examined using Non - Intrusive Inspection (NII) Technologies
Organization and Program	United States Customs and Border Protection - Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation at POE's
Scope	The percentage of NII examinations performed at land border crossing out of the total number of truck and rail containers crossing U.S. land borders.
Data Source	Operations Management Reports (OMR) Data Warehouse
Collection Method	Customs Officers enter the data into Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS), a comprehensive database maintained by the Office of Field Operations. Data are migrated to a permanent OMR data warehouse where they are verified and compiled.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Once the data is entered into the Port Tracking System (PTS) by officers, verification is done by their supervisors. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) personnel at the Headquarters level (Office of Field Operations (OFO), Liaison Branch, Measurement Team) review the data for anomalies and adjustments are made as necessary before the Operations Management Reports Data Warehouse updates are published. Additionally, NII Utilization Reports are submitted by officers in the field on a daily basis. These reports are compiled and reviewed at the Headquarters level (OFO, Interdiction Security) on a monthly basis and feedback is provided to the Directors of the Field Offices so that they can verify their accuracy and resolve problems.

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

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

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

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

Performance Measure	Percent (%) of time the Treasury Enforcement Communication System (TECS) is available to end users.
Organization and Program	United States Customs and Border Protection - Automation Modernization
Scope	As a new measurement initiative within ISD, the scope (range) of data is a sample population. Toward that end ISD has implemented and has operational end - user availability data collection capability at two baseline sites (NDC1 and Miami International Airport) and is in the process of deploying this capability to the 20 busiest airports as defined by US VISIT Ports of Entry Documentation.
Data Source	Topaz (a COTS software solution developed by Mercury Interactive). Topaz is a web - based application that enables users to track and analyze the performance of business processes and network infrastructure, and diagnose the cause of end - user performance problems.
Collection Method	"Utilizing data collected from its monitoring components, Topaz will: 1. Capture typical US VISIT passenger query session into a script.2. Parameterize the script for general use.3. Establish thresholds for service levels. 4. Eliminate unnecessary hardware components.5. Capture metrics (Topaz transactions)6. Develop a baseline site for comparison.7. Employ distributed monitoring.8. Implement reporting and notification processes.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Verification and validation of TECs availability is assessed by a specially designed system called TOPAZ which measures TECs availability to all end users by making continuous contact attempts (called 'pings') to ascertain whether the system is available at locations around the country. Identified failures are confirmed by TECs managers.

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

Performance Measure	Number of Accreditation Managers Trained
Organization and Program	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center - Accreditation
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 data is verified	The OAC personnel verify the data through periodic manual reviews. No known data integrity problems exist.

Performance Measure	Total number of programs accredited and re - accredited through Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation (FLETA).
Organization and Program	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center - Accreditation
Scope	Most Significant Program Measure. This measure identifies the number of programs accredited through FLETA. The application process begins when the organizational leader (CEO) submits a completed application identifying a specific federal law enforcement training program or course for accreditation and an individual designated as the Accreditation Manager (AM). The process initiates commitment from both the submitting organization and the Executive Director of the OAC, who issues the start - up materials, the FLETA Standards Manual, and assigns a program specialist (OAC staff member) to assist the AM through the process. The training and services provided by the OAC are at no charge to the applicant. Accredited Federal Law Enforcement Training programs ensure the programs are well - developed, delivered and evaluated. Program graduates are expected to have the knowledge and skills to fulfill their responsibilities in a safe and highly proficient manner.
Data Source	The source for this measure is a file containing completed application forms.
Collection Method	The Executive Director (OAC) collects the information from the Applications File and compiles it into the Applicant Tracking Report which shows where each applicant is in the Accreditation process. The report is provided to the FLETA Board for review at regularly scheduled meetings.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data will be available during the 1st Quarter FY 2006. At that time, the method to determine reliability will be in place.

Performance Measure	Percentage of requested training programs conducted (Capacity Measure)
Organization and Program	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center - Construction and Improvement
Scope	This measure compares the number of programs scheduled during the fiscal year to the number requested training programs by our POs. quirements.
Data Source	The data is captured as part of the Student Information System (SIS).
Collection Method	Calculation. The SIS identifies and tracks all scheduled, conducted and cancelled training programs.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Training Innovation and Management Directorate (TIM) verifies 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)
Organization and Program	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center - State and Local Law Enforcement Training
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. Surveys are under development to identify state and local student responses.
Data Source	The Student Quality of Training Survey (SQTS) is used to determine the level of student satisfaction for this measure. Students respond to a modified 5 - point Likert scale (Outstanding, Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Poor). The ratings of outstanding and excellent were combined to form the measure of excellence to which the Center aspires.
Collection Method	The SQTS is part of the FLETC Automated Testing and Evaluation System (FATES), which entails the (1) the collection, analysis and presentation of student feedback information (SQTS); (2) development, maintenance, scoring, and analysis of all written tests; and (3) collection and analysis of feedback from graduates and their supervisors regarding the effectiveness of training programs in preparing graduates to perform their law enforcement duties.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The survey was developed using contemporary survey methods comparable to those used by the military services and other major training organizations. Training programs begin and end continually throughout the fiscal year; the data analysis for statically significant changes is also conducted on a continual basis. No known data integrity problems exist.

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

Performance Measure	Percentage of information sharing and collaboration activities among DHS operational organizational elements and with key Federal, State, local, tribal, international, and private sector partners that are timely.
Organization and Program	Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate - Information Sharing and Collaboration Program (ISC)
Scope	An initial difficulty has been in gathering a complete listing of the systems (both new and legacy; i.e., in use or in development prior to the creation of DHS) present in DHS. This baseline discovery process will be important to determining the correct sample size. The As Is information sharing report (updated on a quarterly basis) will describe the state of information sharing within the Department, and to a certain extent throughout the Federal Government.
Data Source	Although some of the initial data was obtained via the DHS Enterprise Architecture (EA) effort sponsored by the DHS Office of the Chief Information Officer(OCIO), it did not have the granularity required. In conjunction with the DHS OCIO, a formal survey was developed and will be used to gather information from DHS employees who use information sharing systems (either to gather information for analysis or in the production of final products). A new tool (see Collection Method) will be used to facilitate the gathering of information, allow for the expansion of the audience (thus providing a more diverse input set), and gives the Project Managers more time to follow - up with comprehensive face - to - face interviews when necessary for clarification purposes. The recipients of DHS information and products (whether they be internal decision makers, or other members of the homeland security community at the Federal, State, local, or tribal government) will also be formally surveyed and interviewed to ascertain the quality.
Collection Method	Data will be collected by several different methods. The ISCP is implementing an e - Survey process to provide the capability to continually receive information sharing input. Additionally, each DHS Directorate and major office has an assigned Project Manager (PMs) to the ISCP; these PMs will be providing continuous updates as to the state of information sharing within their organizational elements (much of their information will be obtained through face - to - face interviews). Finally, as part of the Departments quality control process, information will be gathered from stakeholders, customers, and partners as to the value (i.e., quality) of DHS information, products, and reports.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	A multi - pronged approach (as discussed above) will be used to ensure the reliability of the information. Data will be compiled either via the automated eSurvey tool or through face - to - face interviews. The compiled data will then be reviewed by the organizational elements Project Managers to ensure it accurately reflects their organizations. Additionally, the customers and organizational element stakeholders will also be integral parts of the review process by obtaining their views of the same DHS information and products. Looking at the value and timeliness from the producers and users points - of - view will minimize the amount of bias that can be found by using only one data set. This double check process consists of person - to - person outreach to survey participants, and survey data corrected and normalized as appropriate. Baseline information sharing data will be available in early FY05 and will be continually reviewed and updated.

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

Performance Measure	Percentage level in meeting Federal Air Marshal Service (FAMS) mission and flight coverage targets for each individual category of identified risk.
Organization and Program	United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement - Federal Air Marshal Service
Scope	Addresses general flight FAM coverage. Target performance is a uniform percentage level in meeting each individual coverage level for the risk categories, e.g., actual coverage reached (SSI - classified)% of coverage target.
Data Source	Systems Operation Control Division (SOCD) and Mission Operations Center (MOC).
Collection Method	The Systems Operations Control Division (SOCD) automated scheduling system employs aviation industry accepted SABRE systems that archives all information on the Targeted Critical Flights covered on a daily basis. On a monthly basis (or as needed) the SOCD accesses the SABRE database through SQL queries and Crystal Reports to identify FAMS performance in both scheduling and flying missions on each cover level of the Targeted Critical Flights. FAMS leadership reviews the previous month performance by the 5th of each month and validates the coverage levels and/or provides guidance on any actions that should be taken to increase any performance measure if deemed appropriate.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Targeted coverage data is contained in the Service's automated scheduling system. Once a month, these scheduled targets are compared to actual performance data that are generated to support activities of FAMs to assess the completion rates that support targeted objectives.

Performance Measure	Number of aliens with a final order removed in a quarter/Number of final orders that become executable in the same quarter (demonstrated as a percent).
Organization and Program	United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement - Detention and Removal
Scope	The number of final order removals refers to the number of aliens removed from the United States after receiving an order of removal (final order) 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 that some aliens receiving removal orders during one reporting period will be removed during a subsequent reporting period. Therefore, this measure will demonstrate Detention and Removal Operation's (DRO) 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, these data are collected from the Deportable Alien Control System (DACS), then compared with data from the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR). When the ENFORCE Removal Module (EREM) deploys, data for this measure will be collected from EREM and then compared against data from EOIR.
Collection Method	Data are entered into DACS (soon to be ENFORCE Removal Module (EREM)) at field offices. The compiled data is then retrieved from DACS/EREM and Headquarters, Detention and Removal Operations (HQDRO). For quality control, data from DACS are matched against case records from EOIR.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	While there are data integrity concerns with DACS, they fall well within the acceptable limits of any IT system. Statistically speaking DRO drops data outside the norms 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. New policies and procedures will be implemented to require greater supervisory oversight of data within the system. Supervisors will be required to review more cases within the system for accuracy and completeness.

Performance Measure	Percent of completed investigations which have an enforcement consequence (arrest, indictment, conviction, seizure, fine or penalty).
Organization and Program	United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement - Office of Investigations
Scope	Percent of completed 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)
Collection Method	TECS will be used to retrieve and mine the data elements for the number of completed cases and to produce the number of enforcement consequences in relation to the cases worked.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Ad hoc reports generated through TECS are saved and repeated, as necessary, to ensure consistency of reporting. Results are compared with prior like reports to check for anomalies. Any geographic specific information with significant deviation is verified through the entering location.

Performance Measure	Percentage of Border and Transportation Security (BTS) activities attaining performance targets
Organization and Program	Office of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security - Office of the Under Secretary, Border Transportation Security
Scope	Data will cover all the main performance measures as presented in the annual Performance Budget for every Border and Transportation Security organizational unit; Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Transportation Security Administration, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and the Office of Screening Coordination.
Data Source	Source of data is the DHS FYHSP System, the system of record for DHS performance measures information.
Collection Method	Data is entered into the FYHSP system by organizational entities owning the program to which the measure is associated. The FYHSP system produces reports which provide the information.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Each program manager must ascertain the completeness and reliability of information entered into the FYHSP system, and indicate its reliability as either reliable, inadequate, or t.b.d. new measure. The method by which the classification is made is reviewed by staff of the DHS headquarters to ensure the method described would produce reliable information. The review consists of determining if the procedures for data reliability check are adequate.

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
Organization and Program	Office of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security - Screening Coordination and Operations (SCO)
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	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 APIS 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.
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 APIS 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	Reliable
How data is verified	APIS data is initially entered by air carriers, verified by CBP officers during daily operations and further assessed for accuracy by National APIS Account Managers on a weekly basis.

Performance Measure	Improve emergency response interoperability and compatibility to strengthen public safety preparedness and response.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Interoperability Compatibility
Scope	FY 05 target: Methodology for baseline under development (completion target date: August 2005)FY 06 target: National baseline assessment to be completed and future targets determined (completion target date: December 2005)
Data Source	public safety agencies
Collection Method	survey and interviews
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	December 2005

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.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Support to Department of Homeland Security Components
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 data is verified	Accepted survey processes will be used to ensure the objectivity and reliability of the data.

Performance Measure	Number of pilot tests of standoff detection technologies.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Explosives Countermeasures
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 data is verified	Pilot test data result from well - specified procedures and include instrument measurements as well as inspection data.

Performance Measure	Percentage of system - wide airport compliance with security regulations
Organization and Program	Transportation Security Administration - Compliance and Enforcement
Scope	All reported regulatory inspections for the fiscal year, including: domestic carriers; domestic carriers at foreign ports; domestic cargo carriers; domestic security integration program; domestic indirect carriers; foreign air carriers at domestic ports; foreign air carriers at foreign ports; cargo security; domestic port inspections; domestic carriers; domestic cargo carriers; corrective actions and assessment reports; and Local Inspection Plans.
Data Source	Performance and Results Information System (PARIS)
Collection Method	This index will provide a quantitative means to both target resources and measure effectiveness of performance. If findings of non - compliance remain within the target range of the RCI of 15%, the inference will be that the risk - managed inspection approach is effective in minimizing security gaps. If, on the other hand, findings exceed the RCI, which is the measure of the overall success of the regulatory inspection program, the inference will be that this approach is less effective. Gaps of >15% to 30% will indicate serious security gaps. The RCI is determined by calculating the average of the total number of regulatory inspections performed (N 1) during the inspection cycle by dividing the number of findings of noncompliance (N 2) discovered during that inspection cycle. The RCI may be expressed as follows: (N 1)/(N 2)=RCI
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	For quality control, PARIS entries are reviewed and approved by local Assistant Federal Security Director (AFSD) or designee.

Performance Measure	Percent of screeners scoring 85% or greater on annual performance recertification on first attempt
Organization and Program	Transportation Security Administration - Screener Support
Scope	To ensure that the screener workforce has the knowledge and skills needed to perform the screener function, ATSA requires TSA to conduct and document an annual proficiency review of each individual who is assigned screening duties. TSA has termed this effort Screener Recertification Program and has set a long - term goal of approximately 98%, or an outstanding rating with annual incremental targets (35% annual improvement) to facilitate a structured approach to move the screener workforce from above average (or 85%) to the outstanding (or 98%) long - term goal. In an effort to sustain data validity and eliminate test memorization, proficiency is based solely on first attempt evaluation scores. Baseline performance and incremental targets are as follows:FY2004 - 67.4 (baseline performance)FY2005 - 78.8%FY2006 - 86.2%FY2007 - 91.0%FY2008 - 94.2%FY2009 - 96.2%FY2010 - 97.5%
Data Source	Screener Recertification Module 1 - Standardized Proficiency Review (SPR): Job Knowledge Test per SOPs and Screener Recertification Module 3 - Practical Skills Demonstration (PSD): Functional Demonstrations.
Collection Method	Local site test outcome data entry uploaded into the TSA Headquarters data warehouse for generated test results.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data warehouse systemic controls and TSA Headquarters profile accessibility to analysis generated test results against local site test outcome data.

Performance Measure	Passenger Screening Program Index that measures overall program performance through a weighted composite of indicators encompassing effectiveness, cost management, and customer satisfaction. Note: The 2004 baseline data was for a small sample, and are subject to further development, after which better targets can be set for future years based with more comprehensive data.
Organization and Program	Transportation Security Administration - Screener Workforce
Scope	The Passenger Screening Program Index is a composite performance index that tracks overall passenger screening program performance in the areas of security screening, cost management and customer satisfaction. This index is designed to be a measure of the overall success of TSAs passenger screening program and is tracked periodically to assess progress.
Data Source	The Passenger Screening Program Index is a composite of: 1. The Probability of Detection Index (Effectiveness) weighted at 50% of the total; plus 2. The Customer Satisfaction Index for Aviation (Satisfaction) weighted at 25% of the total; plus 3. The Cost Per Person Screened Index (Efficiency) weighted at 25% of the total.
Collection Method	Effectiveness - Probability of detection of contraband, either in possession of the passenger or in carry - on baggage, is determined through the use of covert testing and Threat Image Projection (TIP). The screener probability of detection is determined by the percentage of time the screener correctly identifies an item when either covert testing or TIP technology is employed. Therefore, the Effectiveness Index is derived from the following calculation: % of time the WTMD correctly identifies contraband on the person being screened multiplied by the % of time the screener correctly identifies the contraband on the person, weighted by the percentage of passengers out of the total number of passengers plus carry - on baggage, plus % of time the X - ray correctly identifies contraband in carry - on multiplied by the % of time the screener correctly identifies the contraband in the carry - on baggage weighted by the percentage of carry - on pieces out of the total number of passengers plus carry - on baggage Satisfaction - The Customer Satisfaction Index for Aviation Operations (CSI - A) is created from data obtained from customer feedback cards distributed to passengers following their screening, along with responses to telephone surveys and compliments/complaints received at airports and the TSA calling center. Efficiency - The Cost Per Passenger Screened Index is compiled using an average cost per person screened derived through activity - based costing (ABC). The cost per person screened will then be reported indexed against a baseline. Each successive period can be then compared against baseline costs.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The data contained in the Effectiveness Index are based on two sources: Machine data, which are obtained from testing the equipment and are updated as new equipment comes on line, and screener performance data, which are based on statistically - sound sampling of screeners through covert and Threat Image Projection (TIP) testing. The data in the Satisfaction Index are compiled from customer satisfaction surveys and from information received at the TSA Contact Center. Those data are based on statistically valid surveys and are expected to be updated periodically. The data from the Efficiency Index are based on cost surveys utilizing Activity Based Costing methodology and will be regularly updated. Explanation The three sub - indices (Effectiveness, Satisfaction and Efficiency) will be weighted according to their relative importance, as established by TSA, to determine the overall Passenger Screening Program Index. The Effectiveness, or Probability of Detection Index, is weighted at 50%, indicating its relative position as the most important sub - index. While recognizing their importance in the overall program index, albeit less than the Effectiveness Index, the CSI - A and Cost Per Person Indices are given weights of 25% each.

Performance Measure	Percent of known shipper cargo inspected on passenger aircraft
Organization and Program	Transportation Security Administration - Air Cargo
Scope	The percentage of cargo inspected is representative of only the freight eligible for inspection on each flight; certain freight is excepted from the inspection requirement. Some flights may have no eligible cargo. 10% is the regulatory minimum; some carriers may exceed this threshold. Data will be reflective of the selected flights that are inspected for compliance; not every flight of each carrier at each airport is inspected.
Data Source	Ideally, the source of the data will be inspections by TSA Aviation Security Inspectors. Documentation from the passenger air carriers may supplement the TSA inspections.
Collection Method	Inspection data is complied in the Performance and Results Information System (PARIS).
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	For quality control, PARIS entries are reviewed and approved by local Assistant Federal Security Director (AFSD) or designee.

Performance Measure	Baggage Screening Program Index that measures overall program performance through a weighted composite of indicators encompassing effectiveness, cost management, and customer satisfaction. Note: The 2004 baseline data was for a small sample, and are subject to further development, after which better targets can be set for future years based with more comprehensive data.
Organization and Program	Transportation Security Administration - Screening Technology
Scope	The Baggage Screening Program Index is a composite performance index that tracks overall baggage screening program performance in the areas of security screening, cost management and customer satisfaction. This index is designed to be a measure of the overall success of TSAs baggage screening program and is tracked periodically to assess progress.
Data Source	The Baggage Screening Program Index is a composite of: 1. The Probability of Detection Index (Effectiveness) weighted at 50% of the total; plus 2. The Customer Satisfaction Index for Aviation (Satisfaction) weighted at 25% of the total; plus 3. The Cost Per Bag Screened Index (Efficiency) weighted at 25% of the total.
Collection Method	Effectiveness Index The Effectiveness Index is compiled from machine and screener probabilities of detection. As such, the Effectiveness Index for all checked baggage is derived from the following calculation: EDS Probability of Detection multiplied by the Screener/ETD Probability of Detection weighted by the % of baggage screened first by EDS machines, plus ETD Probability of Detection multiplied by the Screener Probability of Detection weighted by the % of baggage screened first by ETD technology, plus Other (i.e., K9, Hand Screening) Probability of Detection weighted by the % of baggage screened first by an Other system. The EDS Probability of Detection is derived through laboratory testing that mimics scenarios where various types and configurations of explosives are sent through EDS equipment. These tests determine the percent that an EDS machine successfully identifies the explosives. In contrast, Screener Probability of Detection utilizing ETD technology is obtained by covertly placing explosive material in baggage, and measuring the percentage where screeners successfully identify the material. Satisfaction - The Customer Satisfaction Index for Aviation Operations (CSI - A) is created from data obtained from customer feedback cards (using an intercept methodology) distributed to passengers following their screening, along with responses to telephone polls and compliments/complaints received at airports and the TSA Contact Center. Efficiency - The Cost Per Bag Screened Index is compiled using an average cost per person screened derived through activity - based costing (ABC).
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The three sub - indices (Effectiveness, Satisfaction and Efficiency) will be weighted according to their relative importance, as established by TSA, to determine the overall Baggage Screening Program Index. The Effectiveness, or Probability of Detection Index, is weighted at 50%, indicating its relative position as the most important sub - index. While recognizing their importance in the overall program index, albeit less than the Effectiveness Index, the CSI - A and Cost Per Bag Indices are given weights of 25% each.

Performance Measure	Percent of time that Coast Guard assets included in the Combatant Commander Operational Plans are ready at a Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) rating of 2 or better.
Organization and Program	United States Coast Guard - Defense Readiness
Scope	The overall combat readiness of particular Coast Guard assets as determined by the established SORTS criteria. (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."
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.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Requests for U.S. Coast Guard core competencies are made by Department of Defense and the Department of State to U.S. Coast Guard Area Commands and U.S. Coast Guard headquarters. The Defense Operations program keeps request files. Data obtained from the Status of Readiness and Training System (SORTS) maintained by the Department of Defense.

Performance Measure	Maritime Injury and Fatality Index.
Organization and Program	United States Coast Guard - Marine Safety
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 data 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. Data is obtained from the U.S. Coast Guard Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) database. The metric is the average of the current calendar year and previous four calendar years' combined total number of maritime worker deaths, maritime worker injuries, passenger deaths, and passenger injuries. Maritime Worker fatalities include reportable marine casualties resulting in the death or disappearance of a crewmember or employee aboard U.S. commercial vessels. Deaths or disappearances from recreational craft, government vessels, foreign flag vessels, and fixed platforms and facilities are excluded. Deaths or disappearances determined to be from natural causes or the result of an intentional act - such as suicide, heart attack, altercation, or the like - are also excluded. Maritime Worker Injuries include reportable marine casualties, other than death or disappearance, of a crewmember or employee aboard U.S. commercial vessels. Injuries from recreational craft, government vessels, foreign flag vessels, and fixed platforms and facilities are excluded. Injuries determined to be the result of natural causes or intentional acts - such as heart attack, altercation, or the like - are also excluded. Passenger Fatalities include deaths or disappearances of passengers on all U.S. vessels and foreign flag vessels operating in U.S. waters. Deaths or disappearances determined to be from diving, natural causes, or the result of an intentional act - such as suicide, heart attack, altercation, or the like - are also excluded.

Performance Measure	Percentage of undocumented migrants who attempt to enter the U.S. via maritime routes that are interdicted or deterred.
Organization and Program	United States Coast Guard - Migrant Interdiction
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 the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services.
Collection Method	The success rate is an indicator of the number of migrants entering the U.S. by maritime routes compared against the number of migrants that would attempt to enter with no interdiction presence.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The numbers of illegal migrants entering the U.S. and the numbers of potential migrants are derived numbers subject to estimating error. Because of the speculative nature of the information used, and the secretive nature of illegal migration, particularly where professional smuggling organizations are involved, the estimated potential flow of migrants may contain significant error.

Performance Measure	Average Ports, Waterways, and Coastal Security Risk - Based Index.
Organization and Program	United States Coast Guard - Ports Waterways and Coastal Security (PWCS)
Scope	The Coast Guard is currently developing a risk - based index to measure the performance of the PWCS mission program. Neither a baseline nor targets have been established yet.
Data Source	TBD
Collection Method	TBD
Reliability When reliable data will be available	TBD New Measure TBD - Available 4th Quarter Fiscal 2005

Performance Measure	Removal rate for cocaine that is shipped via non - commercial maritime means.
Organization and Program	United States Coast Guard - Drug Interdiction
Scope	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 accounts 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	Reliable
How data is verified	Removal rate includes cocaine seized as well as that confirmed as jettisoned, sunk or otherwise destroyed. Jettison, sunk and otherwise destroyed cocaine data is verified through the consolidated counter - drug data base run by the United States Interdiction Coordinator. CG Seizure data continues to be tracked and verified by Federal Drug Identification Numbers. The non - commercial maritime flow data continues to be provided by the annual Interagency Assessment of Cocaine Movement report. Therefore, we are confident that the measure is accurate, materially adequate and the data sources are reliable.

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

Performance Measure	(A) Non - cumulative percentage of (A1) State, (A2) Tribal, and (A3) county jurisdictions assessed under the National Emergency Management Baseline Capability Assessment Program (NEMB - CAP); (B) percentage of (B1) FEMA and DHS, (B2) Federal Agencies, (B3) State and local governments compliant with the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and (B4) State and local governments in compliance with enhanced effectiveness criteria; (C) percentage of respondents reporting that they are better prepared to deal with disasters and emergencies as a result of the training they received; (D) percentage reduction in the rate of loss of life from fire - related events from the 2000 baseline of 3,809.
Organization and Program	Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate - Preparedness
Scope	(A) 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. (B) Data is collected from 32 Federal agencies and the 56 State governments in order to assess NIMS compliance. Limitations of the data include State self - assessments, performed in NIMCAST, which can reflect a level of subjectivity. The reliability of assessment data will improve over time as NIC establishes a National Baseline for NIMS compliance. This baseline will evolve as standards are upgraded to reflect improved effectiveness criteria development. (C)Approximately 16 thousand students attend courses at US Fire Administration (USFA) resident training facilities every year. Participants include Federal, State, local and tribal officials and responders. Typically, 60% of the long - term follow - up evaluation questionnaires are completed and returned. (D) The annual loss of life from fire - related events is the estimated total number of fire deaths that occur within the United States and Washington, D.C. during the calendar year. A death is defined as a direct result of a fire that is fatal or becomes fatal within one year. The annual percentage of loss of life reduction is based on a ten year best - fit linear trend analysis (starting with the 2000 baseline figure of 3,809) that presents the change over time based on this trend line. The National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) mortality data has the benefit of being a census of all deaths in the U.S. and is therefore virtually complete. However, as with any census, there are limitations in its completeness and accuracy. The certificates are filled out by a range of physicians, medical examiners, and coroners whose detail and methodology in documenting each condition on the death certificate will vary. This variation will lead to occasional errors in assigning condition codes or in the determining of the underlying cause of death, but overall the NCHS system is considered accurate. Data are subject to results from the prevention program area strategic review.
Data Source	(A) 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 fire fighting community. Data sources include interviews, field reports, the review of incident reports, and input from the Federal, State, and Local incident managers. (B) At the Federal level all agencies must submit to the NIC a NIMS implementation plan. The State governments data is obtained from self - assessments performed in NIMCAST. (C)Data are obtained from post - course evaluations sent to students and their supervisors. (D) The data source is the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) mortality data. The strategic program review includes survey data verified by stakeholders, reviews and inputs cross walked with subject matter experts and includes reviews of literature and published needs analysis.
Collection Method	(A) 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. (B) Homeland Security Presidential Directive 5 directs all Federal Agencies to submit a NIMS implementation plan by December 31, 2004. State governments in order to receive Federal Preparedness Grants are required to perform self - assessments in NIMCAST. (C) All students are asked to complete post - course or end - of - course evaluation questionnaires at the conclusion of their training. Approximately 3 - 6 months following the training course, students and their supervisors are asked to complete a long - term evaluation questionnaire. (D) The mortality data are obtained annually from all death certificates in the United States. The information from each death certificate is coded by NCHS based on the International Classification of Diseases (ICD), which is both a set of codes and a system of rules for assigning the codes. The NCHS mortality data system uses the ICD rules to identify one condition from each death certificate as the underlying cause of death. The underlying cause is the first condition that began the chain of events leading to death. The designated underlying cause is most commonly used to tabulate causes of death. NCHS has a fairly sophisticated quality assurance process based on trained data entry personnel and computer systems that have been continuously improved over two decades.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	(A) 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. (B) The Assistant to the President for Homeland Security will review all Federal agency implementation plans and advise the President on whether such plans effectively implement NIMS. All self - assessments by State governments will be reviewed by the NIC for completeness. All lower level governmental self - assessments will be progressively reviewed by the next higher level governmental unit, and to be finally reviewed by the NIC. (C) Typically, 60% of the long - term follow - up evaluation questionnaires are completed and returned. The data is reliable because it is collected directly from the students receiving the training. All data is collected and reviewed by a contractor for completeness prior to report compilation and production. (D)Loss of life data from the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) are also compiled and reviewed by the National Fire Data Center. Statistical weighting and comparison of these data are done in conjunction with the National Fire Protection Associations data to check for accuracy. A comparison with these data to the NCHS mortality data is conducted for consistency and relative veracity. Strategic program review will be verified by USFA stakeholders and subject matter experts.

Performance Measure	(A) Potential property losses, disasters, and other costs avoided; (B) Percentage of the population whose safety is improved through availability of accurate flood risk data in Geographic Information System "GIS" format; (C) Number of communities taking or increasing action to reduce their risk of natural or manmade disaster.
Organization and Program	Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate - Mitigation
Scope	(A) The measurement of potential property losses, disasters, and other costs avoided is drawn from the flooplain 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 (5) that implement post - disaster mitigation projects.
Data Source	(A) Data for the flood plain management cost avoidance estimate is 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 data is	(A) For NFIP flood plain management activities: verification and validation of the cost

verified	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	Percentage of (A) Federal Departments and Agencies with fully operational Continuity of Operations (COOP) capabilities and (B) fully operational Continuity of Government (COG) capabilities.
Organization and Program	Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate - National Security
Scope	FEMA will determine the percentage of federal departments and agencies with fully operational COOP and COG capabilities based on criteria 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 (TE) 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.
Data Source	The data for the assessments comes from a number of sources and it will eventually be compiled into the Readiness Reporting System (RRS) currently under development within FEMA's Office of National Security Coordination. The sources for the percentage of federal departments and agencies with fully operational capabilities include: (1) self - assessments by the Federal D/As, (2) participation in training events and exercises, (3) real world events and activities such as 9/11/01, and (4) assessments conducted by FEMA.
Collection Method	Federal agency - wide exercises provide the ability to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the overall continuity programs. The initial fielding and successful testing and validation of the RRS in FY05 will allow data transmission on a regular basis through secure computers by the Federal D/As as events and activities occur which impact their operational capabilities. This data will be verified through periodic assessments involving interviews with the Federal D/As to analyze the validity and accuracy of the self - generated reports and through regularly scheduled government wide evaluated COOP exercises, such as Forward Challenge.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Reliable data will be available in FY06 with the initial fielding of the RRS and its related assessments once the system has been validated and is fully operational.

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

Performance Measure	Percent reduction in the number of general warnings issued as compared to the number of sector specific or geographic specific at risk warnings issued.
Organization and Program	Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate - National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center (NISAC)
Scope	The Homeland Security Advisory System is designed to target our protective measures when specific threat information is received. It combines this threat information with vulnerability assessments and provides security - related communications to public safety officials and the public. Homeland Security Threat Advisories contain actionable information intended to initiate a change in readiness posture, protective actions, or response regarding the nations CI/KR. Advisories are targeted to Federal, state, and local governments, private sector organizations, and international partners. General advisories issued through the system apply throughout the nation, where as at risk advisories generally apply to a smaller set of CI/KR. These at - risk advisories generally have a lower adverse impact on the nation as a whole and are therefore preferred over the general advisories. These targeted at - risk advisories are possible, in part, as a direct result of the CI/KR analyses conducted by the NISAC. The ratio of the total number of general advisories (i.e. warnings) issued to the total number of targeted sector - specific and geographic - specific at risk advisories issued is the basis for this performance measure. The ratio for FY05 data is compared to the ratio of the same measures for FY04 to obtain a percent change.
Data Source	The NISAC mission will be accomplished in part through the development, validation and deployment of a suite of consequence analysis and decision support tools. These tools will provide sector - specific as well as cross - sector modeling, simulation and analytic capabilities. They will also enable national/regional as well as urban/metropolitan regional analytic capabilities. NISAC leadership will promote nation - wide involvement in modeling efforts to enable contributions from a wide range of sources. All advisories issued during FY04 through the Homeland Security Advisory System will form the baseline for this performance measure. This includes all of the general advisories as well as all of the targeted sector - specific and geographic - specific at risk advisories. This same data will be tracked throughout FY05. The FY05 target value for this measure is 5%.
Collection Method	PSD will obtain threat advisory data throughout FY05, on a monthly or as - needed basis, directly from HSOC.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	News media reports on advisories can be used to verify HSOC reports.

Performance Measure	Percentage of completed Technology Application Pilot projects having a successful proof of concept and determined to be suitable for further implementation.
Organization and Program	Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate - Protective Actions (PA)
Scope	The issuance of a PSD Technology Application (TA) Pilot Project Close - out Report and the acceptance of that report by the PSD Director will be used to designate that a pilot project has been completed. The close - out date will be the date that the report is accepted by the division director. The baseline for this measure will be the total number of PSD TA Pilot Projects completed in FY05. The project close - out process will include an assessment of the suitability of the technology application for reducing infrastructure vulnerability. The completed projects will be classified, based on a pre - defined criteria, as suitable for implementation as is, suitable for implementation but with modifications and not suitable for implementation. This classification will be documented in the PSD Technology Application (TA) Pilot Project Close - out Report. Projects having a successful proof of concept will be those projects receiving a classification of suitable for implementation as is or suitable for implementation but with modifications. Only projects receiving either of these two classifications will be credited toward meeting this performance measure.
Data Source	The PSD FY05 Program Plan will be used as the source of information on approved, active TA Pilot Programs. The PSD Technology Application (TA) Pilot Project Close - out Reports will be used to determine the status (i.e. active vs. closed out) and classification of each program.
Collection Method	PSD Performance Management staff will solicit TA Pilot Program status information from Program Managers on a monthly basis to support performance reporting requirements. A computer - based tracking log will be developed and maintained by PSD on an on - going basis to track the status of each program.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Although this is a new measure, mechanisms are being put in place to collect and tracked the limited data needed for assessing progress related to this performance measure. As a result, reliable data is expected throughout FY05.

Performance Measure	Percent of targeted critical sector infrastructure owner/operators, that are Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN)users.
Organization and Program	Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate - Critical Infrastructure Outreach Partnerships (CIOP)
Scope	The data used to measure the percent of targeted critical infrastructure sector owner/operators that are Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN) users is a comparison between the number of registered HSIN users relative to a target number of critical infrastructure stakeholders for each of the three features of HSIN by sector. An increasing number of HSIN users by sector for each feature, up to a targeted number mutually determined by DHS, Sector Specific Agencies (SSAs) and the appropriate Sector Coordinating Council would indicate greater participation by targeted owners and operators.
Data Source	The HSIN System Administrator has an up - to - the - day record of how many total users are currently registered. To develop the percentages of participation, these can be compared for each sector against the data obtained from a profile of each sector and target numbers mutually determined by DHS, the SSA and each Sector Coordinating Council appropriate for each core HSIN feature. The connectivity between the HSIN network and participants is verified through message testing (e.g., periodically sending a test message to various users) to ensure messages are being received in an accurate and timely manner.
Collection Method	Information is collected through registration and computer usage and recorded by HSIN System Administrators in addition to agreements made between DHS, the SSAs and the Sector Coordinating Councils.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Connectivity and accuracy are checked through periodic message testing. HSIN System Administrators perform the message testing and collect the resulting data. Corrections to the HSIN user accounts (i.e., connectivity reestablished, rerouted, etc.) are made as data is received. Reliable data is available at any time for an accurate accounting up to the previous days usage.

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

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

Performance Measure	Facility Security Index
Organization and Program	United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement - Protection of Federal Assets - Federal Protective Service
Scope	The Federal Facilities Security measure quantifies the effectiveness in reducing threats and vulnerabilities to criminal and terrorist acts at Federal buildings. The measure will determine how secure federal facilities are from crime and terrorism. Implementation and actual countermeasure plans will assess the extent to which deployed countermeasures are functioning as expected, operating in a way to reduce facility security risks.
Data Source	Federal Protective Service regional offices, Headquarter surveys, and quality assurance audits
Collection Method	On a quarterly basis, there will be a collection of data: the countermeasure implementation plans, actual implementation success, self assessments, and field estimates of countermeasure effectiveness. Data will be evaluated by trained evaluators using standardized protocols.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Verification/validation of countermeasures implementation will be done against implementation records. The countermeasures effectiveness will be verified against surveys and quality assurance audits to ensure that the procedures and scoring criteria are accurately applied. Data should be available at the end of FY 2005 third quarter.

Performance Measure	Percent of recommendations made by reviewing authorities (i.e., IG, OMB, GAO) that are implemented within 1 year
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - Evaluation and National Assessment Program
Scope	SLGCP programs that have been reviewed by GAO, IG,and OMB.
Data Source	An independent evaluation will be conducted on all ODP/SLGCP programs in FY05. As well as PARTs recommendations from OMB and recommendations from IG and GAO reports will be reviewed.
Collection Method	Data collection methodology will include interviews with ODP staff as well as on - site interviews in the field with State and local personnel. Reviewing GAO reports, IG, and OMB PARTs data.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data will be reviewed and collected from already existing sources such as GAO and IG reports. Tabulation is made by headquarters analysts and is reviewed by supervisors before being released.

Performance Measure	The number of state and local homeland security preparedness professionals trained each year.
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - State and Local Training
Scope	Reviewing 48 ODP/SLGCP training courses and curriculum.
Data Source	Training classes administered to state and local constituents. The ODP Training Providers send ODP a Microsoft Access database monthly with student names and agencies that took the training classes.
Collection Method	reviewing training courses/classes evaluations and assessments.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The Central Schedule Desk in the Office of Domestic Preparedness (ODP) receives an access Microsoft database that lists all the students and agencies that actually attended training courses and met the training requirements. This access database is periodically checked by supervisors in ODP against hard copy records to verify the accuracy of the data.

Performance Measure	Percent of jurisdictions demonstrating acceptable performance on applicable critical tasks in exercises using SLGCP approved scenarios.
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - State and Local Training
Scope	National - level, Federal, State and local exercises funded under the Homeland Security Grant Program, as well as some incidents of national significance.
Data Source	After - Action reports and Improvement Plans submitted to ODP that follow ODP's Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation (HSEEP) doctrine.
Collection Method	SLGCP will reviewing the After - Action Reports submitted by States that follow the HSEEP methodology and Exercise Evaluation Guides (EEGs)which describes the critical tasks that have been performed in the exercise. In 2005, DHS Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)guidance requires States to conduct an exercise using the Improvised Explosive Device Scenario. The AARs are submitted electronically to the SLGCP secure portal for SLGCP's review.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is the first year that the approved scenarios are required to be used in conducting exercises. By June'06 SLGCP plans to have in place an After - Action Report/Improvement Plan database. The future vision is implementing The Assessment and Reporting System component of the National Preparedness System to evaluate demonstrated performance of capabilities and critical tasks through exercises and real world operations.

Performance Measure	Average percentage increase in WMD and other knowledge skills, and abilities of state and local homeland security preparedness professionals receiving training from pre and post assessments.
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - State and Local Training
Scope	Pre and Post evaluations for all participants completing any of the 48 currently offered ODP courses.
Data Source	Evaluation forms that are completed by each individual prior to the beginning of the course and at its conclusion
Collection Method	Students are given a form and asked to rate their current knowledge against a set of skills, abilities, and knowledge and are given the same form at the conclusion of the class and asked to rate their post course skills, abilities, and knowledge. Data is entered either manually by the training partner or can be transmitted electronically to ODP's contractor for input into the database.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The data is very reliable in terms of students opinion. It is highly subjective data, but it covers 100% of the persons taking ODP courses. Tabulation is made by headquarter analysts is reviewed by supervisors before being released.

Performance Measure	Percentage of action items identified in After Action Reports that were implemented.
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - National Exercise Program
Scope	National - level, Federal, State and local exercises funded under the Homeland Security Grant Program, as well as some incidents of national significance
Data Source	After - Action Reports/Improvement Plans
Collection Method	After - Action Report/Improvement Plan System which is scheduled to be finalized by June 2006. Until this system is put in place, AAR/IPs will be reviewed individually to ensure accordance with HSEEP doctrine and guidance.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data collection methodology with be complete by June 2006.

Performance Measure	Percent of jurisdictions demonstrating acceptable performance on applicable critical tasks in exercises using SLGCP approved scenarios.
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - National Exercise Program
Scope	National - level, Federal, State and local exercises funded under the Homeland Security Grant Program, as well as some incidents of national significance.
Data Source	After - Action reports and Improvement Plans submitted to ODP that follow ODP's Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation (HSEEP) doctrine.
Collection Method	SLGCP will reviewing the After - Action Reports submitted by States that follow the HSEEP methodology and Exercise Evaluation Guides(EEGs)which describes the critical tasks that have been performed in the exercise. In 2005, DHS Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)guidance requires States to conduct an exercise using the Improvised Explosive Device Scenario. The AARs are submitted electronically to the SLGCP secure portal for SLGCP's review.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is the first year that the approved scenarios are required to be used in conducting exercises. By June'06 SLGCP plans to have in place an After - Action Report/Improvement Plan database. The future vision is implementing The Assessment and Reporting System component of the National Preparedness System to evaluate demonstrated performance of capabilities and critical tasks through exercises and real world operations.

Performance Measure	Number of firefighter injuries
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - Fire Act Program
Scope	Grant applications, AFG
Data Source	Fire Grant applications
Collection Method	To document actual reduction, we will search the database to identify any department that received a grant in FY2003 or FY2004, and also applied in FY2005. In each of those apps we ask the question, "What was the number of firefighter injuries in your department over the past two years." We will not obviously get a match on all, but with the size of applicant number (over 20,000) and awards over two years (16,000) we should get a statistically relevant sample, and we can extrapolate to the total.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	We will complete collection process by March FY06.

Performance Measure	Number of civilian deaths from fire
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - Fire Act Program
Scope	Data only from jurisdictions that have received AFG funds.
Data Source	Information from Fire Grants.
Collection Method	On civilian deaths, we do not have immediate access to those stats in our database. So, we will have to approach it statistically. We do know the "population protected" in each applicant and grantee. We will use both and determine the % of population the grants potentially could affect (it could be argued that reducing that amount to only those grants for fire prevention is appropriate, but that belies some of the AFG underlying "philosophy".
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	We will complete data collection process beginning in the summer of calendar year 05. Tabulation is made by headquarters analysts and is reviewed by supervisor before being released.

Performance Measure	Percent of jurisdictions demonstrating acceptable performance on applicable critical tasks relevant to the fire service in exercises using SLGCP approved scenarios.
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - Fire Act Program
Scope	National - level, Federal, State and local exercises funded under the Homeland Security Grant Program, as well as some incidents of national significance.
Data Source	After - Action reports and Improvement Plans submitted to ODP that follow ODP's Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation (HSEEP) doctrine.
Collection Method	SLGCP will reviewing the After - Action Reports submitted by States that follow the HSEEP methodology and Exercise Evaluation Guides (EEGs)which describes the critical tasks that have been performed in the exercise. In 2005, DHS Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)guidance requires States to conduct an exercise using the Improvised Explosive Device Scenario. The AARs are submitted electronically to the SLGCP secure portal for SLGCP's review.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is the first year that the approved scenarios are required to be used in conducting exercises. By June'06 SLGCP plans to have in place an After - Action Report/Improvement Plan database. The future vision is implementing The Assessment and Reporting System component of the National Preparedness System to evaluate demonstrated performance of capabilities and critical tasks through exercises and real world operations.

Performance Measure	Overall customer satisfaction rate for IAIP products
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - State and Local Government Coordination
Scope	This is a new program their 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	TBD 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 state and local homeland security agency grant recipients reporting measurable progress towards identified goals and objectives to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks.
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - State Formula Grants Program
Scope	All State Strategies and Assessment reports.
Data Source	To capture data about its grant programs, ODP initiated the Individual Strategy Implementation Plan (ISIP) in June 2004, which ODP grantees must complete semiannually. The ISIP is designed to collect information about the distribution of funds across grant programs and according to a set of preparedness program areas such as training, exercises, and equipment purchases. The ISIP also distinguishes among professional disciplines as to who is receiving the benefit of ODP resources. Although ODP has had other data collection procedures and reports in place since 1997, the ISIP standardizes the information that is collected semi - annually. Following the initial ISIP, localities are required to provide a Bi - Annual Strategy Implementation Review (BSIR) which updates the ISIP by providing a status on the goals, objectives, and activities accomplished over a six - month period.
Collection Method	Reviewing Individual Strategy Implementation Plans and Bi - Annual Strategy Implementation Reviews.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data collection methodology will be complete beginning in March 06.

Performance Measure	Percent of jurisdictions demonstrating acceptable performance on applicable critical tasks in exercises using SLGCP approved scenarios.
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - State Formula Grants Program
Scope	National - level, Federal, State and local exercises funded under the Homeland Security Grant Program, as well as some incidents of national significance.
Data Source	After - Action reports and Improvement Plans submitted to ODP that follow ODP's Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation (HSEEP) doctrine.
Collection Method	SLGCP will reviewing the After - Action Reports submitted by States that follow the HSEEP methodology and Exercise Evaluation Guides (EEGs)which describes the critical tasks that have been performed in the exercise. In 2005, DHS Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)guidance requires States to conduct an exercise using the Improvised Explosive Device Scenario. The AARs are submitted electronically to the SLGCP secure portal for SLGCP's review.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is the first year that the approved scenarios are required to be used in conducting exercises. By June'06 SLGCP plans to have in place an After - Action Report/Improvement Plan database. The future vision is implementing The Assessment and Reporting System component of the National Preparedness System to evaluate demonstrated performance of capabilities and critical tasks through exercises and real world operations.

Performance Measure	Percent of weaknesses addressed by Technical Assistance in fulfillment of strategic goals to prepare, prevent, and respond to terrorism incidents in the State Strategies each year.
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - Technical Assistance
Scope	Reviewing all technical assistance requests
Data Source	technical assistance requests and state strategies
Collection Method	Reviewing technical assistance requests and state strategies
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Technical requests are available for SLGCP to review. Tabulation is made by headquarter analysts and is reviewed by supervisor being released.

Performance Measure	Percent of participating urban area grant recipients reporting measurable progress made towards identified goals and objectives to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks.
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - Urban Areas Security Initiative
Scope	State Strategies and State Assessments
Data Source	To capture data about its grant programs, ODP initiated the Individual Strategy Implementation Plan (ISIP) in June 2004, which ODP grantees must complete semiannually. The ISIP is designed to collect information about the distribution of funds across grant programs and according to a set of preparedness program areas such as training, exercises, and equipment purchases. The ISIP also distinguishes among professional disciplines as to who is receiving the benefit of ODP resources. Although ODP has had other data collection procedures and reports in place since 1997, the ISIP standardizes the information that is collected semi - annually. Following the initial ISIP, localities are required to provide a Bi - Annual Strategy Implementation Review (BSIR) which updates the ISIP by providing a status on the goals, objectives, and activities accomplished over a six - month period.
Collection Method	Reviewing Individual Strategy Implementation Plan (ISIP)and Bi - Annual Strategy Implementation Reviews (BSIR.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	Data collection methodology will be complete beginning in March 06.

Performance Measure	Percent of jurisdictions demonstrating acceptable performance on applicable critical tasks in exercises using SLGCP approved scenarios.
Organization and Program	State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness - Urban Areas Security Initiative
Scope	National - level, Federal, State and local exercises funded under the Homeland Security Grant Program, as well as some incidents of national significance.
Data Source	After - Action reports and Improvement Plans submitted to ODP that follow ODP's Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation (HSEEP) doctrine.
Collection Method	SLGCP will reviewing the After - Action Reports submitted by States that follow the HSEEP methodology and Exercise Evaluation Guides (EEGs)which describes the critical tasks that have been performed in the exercise. In 2005, DHS Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)guidance requires States to conduct an exercise using the Improvised Explosive Device Scenario. The AARs are submitted electronically to the SLGCP secure portal for SLGCP's review.
Reliability	TBD New Measure
When reliable data will be available	This is the first year that the approved scenarios are required to be used in conducting exercises. By June'06 SLGCP plans to have in place an After - Action Report/Improvement Plan database. The future vision is implementing The Assessment and Reporting System component of the National Preparedness System to evaluate demonstrated performance of capabilities and critical tasks through exercises and real world operations.

Performance Measure	Percent of applications processed within 150 day application cycle.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - SAFETY Act
Scope	The SAFETY Act provides a system of risk and litigation management for the sellers of anti - terrorism technologies. The program is designed to encourage the development and deployment of anti - terrorism technologies by ensuring that the threat of liability does not deter potential manufacturers from developing and commercializing technologies that could significantly reduce the risk or mitigate the effects of terrorist events. Sellers wishing to obtain SAFETY Act protections must submit an application to the Office of SAFETY Act Implementation and undergo a technical and economic review in accordance with statutory criteria.
Data Source	Number of application received by the program office.
Collection Method	Applications are submitted electronically and via US mail. Each application is given a unique identifier and is tracked electronically.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Each application is assigned a unique tracking number through the SAFETY Act application web site. Applications submitted in hard copy are entered into the application database and tracked electronically as well. Each application stage from receipt, to completeness check, to evaluation, to requests for additional information, to submission to the Department for decision is tracked electronically and can be verified.

Performance Measure	Development of research infrastructure to provide broad - based support to government/university/private sector research communities, through development and support of a cyber security testbed and cyber security data sets collection and dissemination program.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Cyber Security
Scope	This project is already ongoing, with funding covering FY 2003 - 2005, with annual and final project reports being required under the funding agreement. Funding agreements providing outyear funding beyond FY 2005 will have similar tasking requiring annual reports to be provided to DHS ST.
Data Source	Reports submitted by the organization funded to manage the cyber security testbed.
Collection Method	The organization that manages the cyber security testbed will track the number of new projects, investigators and investigative teams that make use of the testbed. A summary of this data will be provided in annual reports submitted to DHS ST under the funding agreement that provides funding to the organization.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Project reports are required under the funding agreement.

Performance Measure	The five - year average number of U.S. Coast Guard investigated oil spills greater than 100 gallons and chemical discharges into the navigable waters of the U.S. per 100 million short tons of chemical and oil products shipped in U.S. waters.
Organization and Program	United States Coast Guard - Marine Environmental Protection (MEP)
Scope	The performance metric for Marine Environmental Protection (MEP) is the five - year average number of U.S. Coast Guard investigated oil spills greater than 100 gallons and chemical discharges into navigable waters of the United States per 100 million short tons of chemicals and oil products shipped in U.S. waters.
Data Source	Vessel or facility operators are required by 40 CFR 300 to notify the 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. Discharges onto land, into the air, into enclosed spaces, non - maritime sources (i.e. vehicles rail cars), naval public vessel, fixed platforms, pipelines as well as those from unspecified, unclassified, and unknown sources are also excluded.
Collection Method	The MEP metric is relative to the volume of Oil and Chemical shipping in U.S. waters. Data for the denominator is obtained from the annual report of the Waterborne Commerce of the United States compiled by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Coast Guard's Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement database is used to obtain spill quantities. The aggregate of all chemical spill investigations and investigations of oil spills greater than or equal to 100 gallons is used as this provides a broader indication of Marine Environmental Protection than just one or the other. It is important to note that all chemical spill investigations are counted as these are triggered by explicit reportable quantities while only investigations of oil spills greater than or equal to 100 gallons are counted, as this reduces the potential for year - to - year variability in the reporting of nominal oil spills.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	It is possible that some MISLE information is inaccurately reported to the Coast Guard. Duplicate information may occasionally be entered or an incident inadvertently omitted or incorrectly coded. Formal verification procedures strive to rectify any errors, and sophisticated program logic and comprehensive user guides ensure that data from MISLE is highly reliable.

Performance Measure	Number of incursions into the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone.
Organization and Program	United States Coast Guard - Other LE (law enforcement)
Scope	Data obtained from the Coast Guard Law Enforcement 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 data is verified	Data obtained from the Coast Guard Planning and Assessment System and validated by program managers. The data in AOPS is entered at the field level with essentially two - person integrity. One properly designated person performs the data entry but the information is not included in our AOPS numbers until the entries have gained approval by the Commanding Officer or his/her designate. Data entry at the field level provides the highest degree of reliability and confidence, can be entered shortly after it happens and is backed up by the required unit logs which detail the mission of the boat/cutter/aircraft. Once the data enters the AOPS system, it becomes visible to others within the chain of command. The responsibility for ensuring the validity of the data lies with the programs and chain of command. Although the Areas and Districts vary somewhat in their approach, they review the entries in AOPS, perform gross error checks against other reports (MISLE or trip reports for instance) and usually provide feedback to the field in the form of message traffic. HQ program managers also take advantage of the data visibility to monitor hours allocated to their mission area and can intervene where the data seems anomalous. There is a second level of data validation that occurs and that is focused on the database integrity. As mentioned earlier, the data become visible when it is approved by the Commanding Officer, so USCG HQ performs periodic (and at least monthly) checks on the database level to verify that reporting is timely, excessive mission hour attribution is not occurring and that the CO is performing his/her oversight/approval function properly. This helps to ensure the overall quality over all mission areas.

Performance Measure	Percent of fishermen complying with federal regulations.
Organization and Program	United States Coast Guard - Living Marine Resources (LMR)
Scope	The performance metric for Living Marine Resources (LMR) is the percent of fishermen complying with federal regulations.
Data Source	The compliance rate is obtained directly from the Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) database and from the Coast Guard Law Enforcement Planning and Assessment System.
Collection Method	Coast Guard units enter their enforcement data directly into this database after completion of fisheries enforcement boardings. District, Area, and Headquarters law enforcement staffs review, validate, and assess the data on a quarterly basis as part of the Law Enforcement Planning and Assessment System.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The program manager (G - OPL) reviews entries into MISLE database monthly and compares to other sources of information (i.e., after - action reports, message traffic, etc.) to assess reliability of the database.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Performance Measure	(A) Cumulative percentage of emergency teams and operations evaluated through at least one readiness evaluation or exercise (in a four - year cycle); (B) Average percentage of evaluated teams and operations achieving fully operational or better status; (C) Average percentage of evaluated teams rising one operational level in a year (considering four operational levels); and (D) Average maximum response time in hours for emergency response teams to arrive on scene.
Organization and Program	Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate - Response
Scope	Readiness of the emergency response teams will be determined by the successful execution of one exercise for each team or operation conducted either independently or simultaneously. Teams and operations include Urban Search and Rescue (US), Mobile Emergency Response Support System (MERS), National Emergency Operations Center, Domestic Emergency Support Team (DEST), Hurricane Liaison Team (HLT), and the Operations Notification System. A successful exercise is a simulated event in which the team or operation executes a proficient response within the time established in the performance target for that fiscal year (culminating in response times of 12 hours or less by FY 2009). Annual targets shown represent current evaluation capability under the assumption of straight - line funding through FY 2010. Readiness evaluations for 100% of teams and operations would require program funding above current levels. Ability to evaluate the readiness of the National Disaster Medical System (NDMS), the Nuclear Incident Response Team (NIRT), and the Domestic Emergency Support Team (DEST) is dependent on the transfer of program funding from their legacy agencies. 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, after action fro actual events and exercise results will be used to track the execution of each event. An appropriate subject matter expert will be sought to verify and evaluate information on each exercise. The exercise criteria are being developed as part of the re - engineering of the Response Program. Enhanced Automated Deployment Database stopwatch function for deployment and check in times, 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 request to response will be measured to determine the success of each exercise. Tracking of official contracts, schedules, rosters and other documents can be used to record the occurrences of the exercises, including after - action documents. 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	Reliable
How data is	The implementation of the IMTs and processes involved in their operations should provide

verified	reliable data to measure performance starting in FY 2005. The initial method listed involves only the creation and training of the teams; however, the actual operational measures will become more apparent as full staffing, training, exercises, and real event data become available. Reliable data should be available in FY 2005.

Performance Measure	Percent of mariners in imminent danger saved.
Organization and Program	United States Coast Guard - Search and Rescue (SAR)
Scope	Several factors compound the difficulty of successful SAR response, including: 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: Search and Rescue Management Information System (SARMIS) I and II, Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE)
Collection Method	Since FY 2003, operational units input SAR data directly into MISLE. Program review and analysis can be conducted at higher levels (Districts, Areas, HQ).
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data is verified quarterly by the program manager (G - OPR) via data extraction and checks for anomalies within the data. Checks on data input are also made by individual case owners during case documentation processes prior; the database includes built - in prompts to check questionable data.

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

Performance Measure	Percent of customers satisfied with (A) Individual Recovery Assistance and (B) Public Recovery Assistance; percentage reduction in program delivery cost for (C) Individual Recovery Assistance and (D) Public Recovery Assistance; and (E) reduction in Individual Recovery Assistance processing cycle time; (F) percentage completion of catastrophic disaster recovery plan.
Organization and Program	Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate - Recovery
Scope	Within baseline funding, the Recovery Program seeks to maintain current customer satisfaction while reducing cost and cycle time and focusing considerable staff time on planning for delivery of recovery assistance in catastrophic disasters, including those caused by terrorism. This performance measure covers a wide range of data measuring achievements of cost and time savings and increased customer satisfaction. The data used to measure progress toward the multi - dimensional Recovery long - term performance goal include results of surveys of random Individual Assistance customer samples; surveys of 100% of Public Assistance customers; and 100% of available unit cost and cycle time information. Successful achievement of all FY 06 performance targets will represent success for that fiscal year.
Data Source	Customer satisfaction data are derived from statistical reports from regular surveys of the customer population in both Individual and Public Assistance programs. Data describing expenditures of cost and time are derived from regular administrative reports on both Individual and Public Assistance programs.
Collection Method	Data used to measure progress against this performance measure will be collected from the National Emergency Management Information System (NEMIS) and Integrated financial Management Information System (IFMIS), the FEMA automated deployment database, telephone and mail surveys.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Survey data are collected, analyzed and reported by outside contractors using methods that guarantee both validity and reliability. Cycle time data are reliable as verified by several years experience in use and can be checked manually at various points in the application processing cycle, if wished. Improvements to the NEMIS and IFMIS systems should increase reliability of financial data by 2006.

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

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

Performance Measure	Five - Year Average of Number of Collisions, Allisions, and Groundings (CAG)
Organization and Program	United States Coast Guard - Aids to Navigation (AtoN)
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 data 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).

Performance Measure	Adjudicate refugee applications (I - 590) referred by the United States Refugee Program during a given fiscal year in a timely, accurate, consistent and professional manner.
Organization and Program	United States Citizenship and Immigration Services - Asylum and Refugee Services
Scope	In FY2003, USCIS utilized the legacy Performance Analysis System (PAS) system to ascertain its performance statistics. Each USCIS overseas district office maintains statistics in the PAS system. In PAS, 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. As a result, PAS did not effectively reflect the officer refugee processing workload within a given time period. For FY2004, USCIS relied on the World - wide Refugee Admissions Processing System (WRAPS) to capture its performance statistics. This system is maintained by the Department of State (DOS), and captures more meaningful and timely refugee processing statistics. Under the WRAPS system, unlike the PAS system, every case in which a USCIS officer interviewed an applicant for refugee status is recorded, even if the case was pending the completion of functions unrelated to USCIS responsibilities. As a result, this system better reflects the number of refugee adjudications performed within a given reporting period. In the foreseeable future, USCIS will continue to use WRAPS to generate statistical information.
Data Source	DOS' Worldwide Refugee Admissions Processing System (WRAPS).
Collection Method	WRAPS tracks every case in which a USCIS officer interviewed an applicant for refugee status, even if the case was pending the completion of functions unrelated to USCIS responsibilities, such as security advisory opinion clearances (a non - USCIS clearance). This system accurately reflects the number of refugee adjudications performed within a given reporting period. WRAPS is a web - based program and USCIS has direct access to it through the internet. In the event that data is unavailable due to technical issues, the DOS WRAPS staff is very responsive to USCIS requests for data.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	The DOS statistics are independent measures that are gathered without USCIS input. DOS implemented a new integrated data base management system known as the Worldwide Refugee Admissions Processing System (WRAPS). This system is now the prime source of refugee processing statistics for the U.S. Refugee Program that enables USCIS to obtain more complete performance statistics. Furthermore, WRAPS records information with more specific categories that differentiates between the various reasons why cases are pending completion. Because WRAPS data can be sorted in a multitude of ways, USCIS is able to verify information by comparing WRAPS data with USCIS officers experience.

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

Performance Measure	Percentage of applications more than 6 months old.
Organization and Program	United States Citizenship and Immigration Services - Backlog Initiative
Scope	Cycle time is calculated by dividing End Pending by Average Monthly Receipts (for the past fiscal year).
Data Source	Automated counts and manual case counts, which are reported monthly through the automated Performance Analysis System (PAS) database.
Collection Method	Either manually or from electronic records. Individual adjudicators count the number of applications approved and denied, and record the information. Each office subsequently aggregates individual reports and enters them into PAS. In addition, at Service Centers, most data is collected and entered into PAS from automated systems supporting casework, including the Computer Linked Application System Management Systems (CLAIMS3 CLAIMS4).
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	USCIS instituted monthly data reconciliation and review activities to maximize the integrity of the data reported. USCIS uses PAS and CLAIMS data on a daily basis. In addition, the Director meets regularly with the Director of the Performance Management Division and senior agency managers to review performance on backlog elimination and reducing case cycle times, and to provide direction for future activities. Executive staff meetings are held weekly. Performance information is used in conjunction with other data, such as application receipts and revenue projections, to manage and plan for future staffing and workload requirements and inform decisions in other areas of USCIS operations.

Performance Measure	The Immigrant Services program will achieve and maintain a cycle time goal of 6 months or less for all immigrant services applications by FY 2006.
Organization and Program	United States Citizenship and Immigration Services - Immigrant Services
Scope	Average Cycle time is calculated by dividing the End Pending by Average Monthly Receipts (for the past fiscal year).
Data Source	Automated counts and manual case counts, which are reported monthly through the automated Performance Analysis System (PAS)database.
Collection Method	On a monthly basis, USCIS collects performance data on applications received, completed and pending through its Performance Analysis System (PAS). Receipts are entered into case management systems through lockbox processing or via E - Filing. For lockbox cases, applications are scanned and data is sent electronically to the Computer Linked Application Information Management System (CLAIMS3). When cases are filed via E - filing, data elements get pushed to CLAIMS3 to populate the data fields. Individual adjudicators count the number of applications approved and denied, and record the information. Each office subsequently aggregates individual reports and enters them into PAS. At Service Centers, most data is collected and entered directly into PAS from automated systems supporting casework, including CLAIMS3.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	USCIS instituted monthly data reconciliation and review activities to maximize the integrity of the data reported. USCIS uses PAS and CLAIMS data on a daily basis. In addition, the Director meets regularly with the Director of the Performance Management Division and senior agency managers to review performance on backlog elimination and reducing case cycle times, and to provide direction for future activities. Executive staff meetings are held weekly. Performance information is used in conjunction with other data, such as application receipts and revenue projections, to manage and plan for future staffing and workload requirements and inform decisions in other areas of USCIS operations.

Performance Measure	The Nonimmigrant Services program will achieve and maintain a cycle time goal of 6 months or less for all Nonimmigrant services applications by FY 2006.
Organization and Program	United States Citizenship and Immigration Services - Nonimmigrant Services
Scope	Cycle time is calculated by dividing End Pending by Average Monthly Receipts (for the past fiscal year).
Data Source	Automated counts and manual case counts, which are reported monthly through the automated Performance Analysis System (PAS) database.
Collection Method	On a monthly basis, USCIS collects performance data on applications received, completed and pending through its Performance Analysis System (PAS). Receipts are entered into case management systems through lockbox processing or via E - Filing. For lockbox cases, applications are scanned and data is sent electronically to the Computer Linked Application Information Management System (CLAIMS3). When cases are filed via E - filing, data elements get pushed to CLAIMS3 to populate the data fields. Individual adjudicators count the number of applications approved and denied, and record the information. Each office subsequently aggregates individual reports and enters them into PAS. At Service Centers, most data is collected and entered directly into PAS from automated systems supporting casework, including CLAIMS3.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	USCIS instituted monthly data reconciliation and review activities to maximize the integrity of the data reported. USCIS uses PAS and CLAIMS data on a daily basis. In addition, the Director meets regularly with the Director of the Performance Management Division and senior agency managers to review performance on backlog elimination and reducing case cycle times, and to provide direction for future activities. Executive staff meetings are held weekly. Performance information is used in conjunction with other data, such as application receipts and revenue projections, to manage and plan for future staffing and workload requirements and inform decisions in other areas of USCIS operations.

Performance Measure	Achieve and maintain a 6 - month cycle time goal for all naturalization applications by FY 2006.
Organization and Program	United States Citizenship and Immigration Services - Citizenship Services
Scope	Cycle time is calculated by dividing End Pending by Average Monthly Receipts (for the past fiscal year).
Data Source	Automated counts and manual case counts, which are reported monthly through the automated Performance Analysis System (PAS) database.
Collection Method	On a monthly basis, USCIS collects performance data on applications received, completed and pending through its Performance Analysis System (PAS). Receipts are entered into case management systems through lockbox processing or via E - Filing. For lockbox cases, applications are scanned and data is sent electronically to the Computer Linked Application Information Management System (CLAIMS4). When cases are filed via E - filing, data elements get pushed to CLAIMS4 to populate the data fields. Individual adjudicators count the number of applications approved and denied, and record the information. Each office subsequently aggregates individual reports and enters them into PAS. At Service Centers, most data is collected and entered directly into PAS from automated systems supporting casework, including CLAIMS4.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	USCIS instituted monthly data reconciliation and review activities to maximize the integrity of the data reported.

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

Performance Measure	Percentage of recommendations made by OIG that are accepted by the Department of Homeland Security.
Organization and Program	Inspector General - Audit, Inspections, and Investigations Program
Scope	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.
Data Source	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.
Collection Method	OIG will track the formal recommendations made to the Department and whether or not the recommendations have been accepted and implemented. In tracking this information, OIG

	auditors, inspectors and investigators will employ the use of Microsoft office products, Visio, IDEA, Teammate and other software applications to collect and report their findings. The OIG is moving towards database consolidation in this arena.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	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.

Performance Measure	Percent of the DHS strategic objectives with programs that meet their associated performance targets.
Organization and Program	Management Directorate - Departmental Management and Operations
Scope	This measure is defined as the total number of DHS strategic objectives with programs that meet their associated quarterly performance targets.
Data Source	The source of information is derived from quarterly performance reports from DHS Organizational Elements (OE) regarding whether or not they have met their quarterly performance targets.
Collection Method	Quarterly data calls are made to DHS OEs to report quarterly performance targets in the FYHSP system.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Quarterly performance data is validated through the OE's Planning offices, vetted through their leadership, and coordinated by the Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation.

Performance Measure	Percent of responding recipients indicating the annual emerging threat assessment reports are valuable.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Emerging Threats
Scope	The Emerging Threats Portfolio is a research and development program conducted by the Science and Technology Directorate. Program focus is on identifying potential future threats that have not yet manifested themselves but whose potential future appearance is suggested by economic and technology trends, trends in observed terrorist behavior, intelligence and other disparate information.
Data Source	Data on the utility and value of emerging threat reports will be collected from ST decision makers responsible for making RD investments targeting potential future threats and other recipients of reports.
Collection Method	Data on the utility and value of reports will be acquired through survey, interviews, and comments from US and AS and other report recipients.
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Data will start to become available as emerging threat reports are produced and circulated.

Performance Measure	Number of scholars and fellows supported and number of University Centers of Excellence.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - University and Fellowship Programs
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 data is verified	Letters of acceptance are sent to students. Students must sign and return letters. Students are contacted on regular basis and must submit annual reports.

Performance Measure	Progression on planned capability development for Nuclear Incident Management and Recovery
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Radiological Nuclear Countermeasures
Scope	Testing of various scenarios, especially deep street canyons particularly those across the complex NYC Manhattan area
Data Source	Several tracer releases spanning three different seasons in NYC that provide crucial test data
Collection Method	Tracer detection equipment will record tracer detections during the release experiments
Reliability	Reliable
How data is verified	Tracer release data will be used as input to several urban dispersion models. Both the validity of the data and the models will be ascertained

Performance Measure	Percent of technologies prototyped or commercialized.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Rapid Prototyping
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 data is verified	Data and information regarding the results of lab tests (assess characteristics of the technology) and operational tests (assess how well the device or prototype performs in the hands of end - users) will be available at the end of the development effort and/or the operational tests. In some instances, independent testing will occur after the initial lab or operational tests. Data from lab tests and operational tests will be verified through independent tests and/or through observations of tests by independent representatives.

Performance Measure	1) Establish technical standards and test/evaluation protocols for WMD decontamination technologies and analysis tools. 2) Establish and accredit a network of private/public labs to perform testing, evaluation, and certification of WMD emergency response technologies to allow effective procurement and deployment of technologies that will substantially reduce risk and enhance resiliency of the federal, state, and local response capability.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Standards
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 data 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	Number of Effective technology/technologies for commercial aircraft to defeat man - portable anti - aircraft missiles identified. Technologies identified, and prototypes developed and tested.
Organization and Program	Science and Technology Directorate - Counter Man - Portable Air Defense System (MANPADS)
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 data is verified	Accepted science and technology procedures for designing and conducting tests will be used. Data will be validated.