



# U.S. Department of Homeland Security Annual Performance Report

Fiscal Years 2010 – 2012

Appendix – Measure Descriptions and Data Collection  
Methodologies



Homeland  
Security

## About this Report

The U.S. *Department of Homeland Security Annual Performance Report for Fiscal Years 2010 – 2012* presents the Department's proposed performance measures and applicable results, associated performance targets for FY 2011 and FY 2012, and provides information on the Department's Priority Goals.

For FY 2010, the Department is using the alternative approach as identified in the Office of Management and Budget's Circular A-136 to produce its Performance and Accountability Reports consisting of the following three reports:

- **DHS Annual Financial Report:** Publication Date – November 15, 2010
- **DHS Annual Performance Report:** Publication Date – February 14, 2011
- **DHS Summary of Performance and Financial Information:** Publication Date – February 15, 2011

When published, all three reports will be located at our public website at:  
[http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/budget/editorial\\_0430.shtm](http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/budget/editorial_0430.shtm).

For more information, contact:

Department of Homeland Security  
Office of the Chief Financial Officer  
Program Analysis and Evaluation  
245 Murray Lane, SW  
Mailstop 200  
Washington, D.C. 20528

Information may also be requested by sending an email to [par@dhs.gov](mailto:par@dhs.gov) or calling (202) 447-0333.



## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	3
Measure Descriptions and Data Collection Methodologies .....	4
Mission 1: Preventing Terrorism and Enhancing Security.....	4
Goal 1.1: Prevent Terrorist Attacks .....	4
Analysis and Operations.....	4
Departmental Management and Operations .....	4
Transportation Security Administration .....	5
Goal 1.2: Prevent the Unauthorized Acquisition or Use of CBRN Materials and Capabilities .....	6
Analysis and Operations.....	6
Domestic Nuclear Detection Office .....	7
National Protection and Programs Directorate.....	7
Office of Health Affairs.....	8
Goal 1.3: Manage Risks to Critical Infrastructure, Key Leadership, and Events .....	8
National Protection and Programs Directorate.....	8
Transportation Security Administration .....	9
U.S. Secret Service .....	10
Mission 2: Securing and Managing Our Borders .....	12
Goal 2.1: Secure U.S. Air, Land, and Sea Borders .....	12
U.S. Customs and Border Protection.....	12
Goal 2.2: Safeguard Lawful Trade and Travel.....	13
Transportation Security Administration .....	13
U.S. Coast Guard .....	14
U.S. Customs and Border Protection.....	14
Goal 2.3: Disrupt and Dismantle Transnational Criminal Organizations .....	16
Mission 3: Enforcing and Administering Our Immigration Laws.....	16
Goal 3.1: Strengthen and Effectively Administer the Immigration System .....	16
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services .....	16
Goal 3.2: Prevent Unlawful Immigration.....	18
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services .....	18
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.....	19
Mission 4: Safeguarding and Securing Cyberspace .....	21
Goal 4.1: Create a Safe, Secure, and Resilient Cyber Environment .....	21
Analysis and Operations.....	21
National Protection and Programs Directorate .....	21
U.S. Secret Service .....	23
Goal 4.2: Promote Cybersecurity Knowledge and Innovation .....	23
National Protection and Programs Directorate .....	23
Mission 5: Ensuring Resilience to Disasters .....	24
Goal 5.1: Mitigate Hazards .....	24
Federal Emergency Management Agency.....	24
Goal 5.2: Enhance Preparedness .....	25
Federal Emergency Management Agency.....	25
Goal 5.3: Ensure Effective Emergency Response.....	26

Federal Emergency Management Agency.....	26
National Protection and Programs Directorate.....	28
Goal 5.4: Rapidly Recover.....	28
Federal Emergency Management Agency.....	28
National Protection and Programs Directorate.....	29
Mission 6: Providing Essential Support to National and Economic Security .....	30
Goal 6.1: Collect Customs Revenue and Enforce Import/Export Controls .....	30
U.S. Customs and Border Protection.....	30
Goal 6.2: Ensure Maritime Safety and Environmental Stewardship .....	30
U.S. Coast Guard.....	30
Goal 6.3: Conduct and Support Other Law Enforcement Activities .....	32
U.S. Secret Service .....	32
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center .....	32
Goal 6.4: Provide Specialized National Defense Capabilities .....	32
Cross-Cutting Performance Measures .....	33
Analysis and Operations.....	33
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center .....	33



## Introduction

This Appendix provides, in tabular format, a detailed listing of all performance measures in the Annual Performance Report with their respective measure descriptions and data collection methodologies. Performance measures are listed by Component within each mission area.

The Department recognizes the importance of collecting complete, accurate, and reliable performance data, as this helps determine progress toward achieving program and Department goals and objectives. Program Managers are responsible for the reliability of performance measurement information for programs under their direction. 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.

The Department has reviewed performance measures for conformance to the standard of completeness and reliability as specified for federal agencies in *OMB Circular A-136, Financial Reporting Requirements, Section II.3.4.4 Assessing the completeness and reliability of performance data*; and *OMB Circular A-11, Preparation, Submission and Execution of the Budget, Section 230.5, Assessing the completeness and reliability of performance data*. Performance information contained within this report is complete and reliable in accordance with these standards.



## Measure Descriptions and Data Collection Methodologies

### Mission 1: Preventing Terrorism and Enhancing Security

#### *Goal 1.1: Prevent Terrorist Attacks*

##### Analysis and Operations

Performance Measure	Percent of intelligence reports rated “satisfactory” or higher in customer feedback that enable customers to understand the threat
Description	This measure gauges the extent to which the DHS Intelligence Enterprise is satisfying their customers’ needs related to understanding the threat. The survey results are defined by the currently available Office of Management and Budget vetted tool.
Data Collection Methodology	Members of the DHS Intelligence Enterprise will attach an electronic survey instrument to each intelligence product disseminated to customers. The survey instrument will provide DHS Intelligence Components with a standard data collection instrument and method to aggregate the results throughout the Agency. For data aggregation purposes, customer satisfaction is defined as responsiveness and timeliness of product. The DHS Intelligence Enterprise will provide the Office of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A) with Component results on the second Friday following the end of each quarter. Upon receipt of the data, I&A will average the data across the Intelligence Enterprise for each of DHS mission area and report the total.

##### Departmental Management and Operations

Performance Measure	Percent of law enforcement officials trained in methods to counter terrorism and other violent acts that rate the training as effective
Description	This measure assesses the effectiveness of DHS training to state and local law enforcement officials offered by the DHS Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. This training covers three components: 1) Cultural Competency, 2) Community Engagement, and 3) Understanding and Countering Violent Radicalization. A post training survey is administered to assess effectiveness. A pre- and post-test of topic familiarity will also be administered.
Data Collection Methodology	At completion of the training course, attendees are asked to complete a 10-12 item questionnaire. A five-point rating scale is used to provide feedback on various aspects of the training, including a rating for each of the three topics on the effectiveness of the training presentation style and the usefulness of the information as applied to the respondent’s professional work; qualitative questions include queries on the least and most helpful aspects of the training, suggestions for changes in the content or presentation style, etc. The responses to the quantitative and qualitative evaluation questions in the end-of session evaluations are tabulated and analyzed. The self-assessed pre- and post-test of topic familiarity will also be analyzed and training session outcomes will be compared by geographic area and general audience characteristics. Those who rate the overall effectiveness of the training as a “4” or a “5” are used to calculate the percent for this measure.



## Transportation Security Administration

Performance Measure	Average number of days for DHS Traveler Redress Inquiry Program (TRIP) redress requests to be closed
Description	This measure describes the average number of days for the processing of Traveler Redress Inquiry Program forms, excluding the time DHS waits for all required documents to be submitted.
Data Collection Methodology	Redress program specialists pull data weekly from the Redress Management System (RMS) and convert the data to a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet using an automated program. Data is then sorted by month. Specialists pull a 10% sampling of current month closed cases and then subtract days the case was pending because of incomplete traveler data to arrive at the average processing time.

Performance Measure	Percent of air cargo screened on commercial passenger flights originating from the United States and territories
Description	This measure captures the percent of air cargo screened on commercial passenger flights originating from the United States and territories. Screening methods approved in the Certified Cargo Screening Program include: physical search (includes opening boxes, removing and opening all inner cartons), X-ray, explosives trace detection, explosives detection system, canine teams, and the use of other approved detection equipment. The air cargo screening strategy uses a multi-layered, risk-based approach to securing air cargo by permitting indirect air carriers, shippers, and other entities further up the supply chain to screen cargo closer to its point of origin through the Certified Cargo Screening Program and allow air carriers to accept pre-screened certified cargo.
Data Collection Methodology	Air carriers operating domestically report data electronically each month pursuant to their security programs on the amount of cargo screened at each airport for the total number of Master Air Waybills (MAWBs) and pounds screened to include sensitive cargo subject to alternative security measures. Indirect air carriers, shippers, and other entities screening cargo for uplift on domestic originating passenger flights as Certified Cargo Screening Facilities in the Certified Cargo Screening Program also report cargo screening data pursuant to their program requirements. Total weight and MAWB numbers include cargo subject to alternative security measures. This data is collected from regulated entities and analyzed each month to determine the amount of cargo screened at each screening facility.

Performance Measure	Percent of air carriers operating from domestic airports in compliance with leading security indicators
Description	This measure identifies air carrier compliance for U.S. flagged aircraft operating domestically with leading security indicators. These critical indicators are derived from security laws, rules, regulations, and standards. A leading security indicator is a key indicator that may be predictive of the overall security posture of an air carrier. Identifying compliance with the key indicators assesses air carrier's vulnerabilities and is part of an overall risk reduction process. Measuring compliance with standards is a strong indicator of system security.
Data Collection Methodology	Compliance Inspections are performed in accordance with an annual work plan. That plan specifies frequencies and targets for inspection based on criteria established by the Office of Compliance. When inspections are completed, the results are entered into the Performance and Results Information System which are subsequently used to calculate the results for this measure. The result for this measure is reported quarterly and annually and is calculated as the total of "in compliance" inspections divided by the total inspections for the reporting period.

Performance Measure	Percent of domestic air enplanements vetted against the terrorist watch list through Secure Flight
Description	This measure provides the enplanement percentage of domestic Flag carriers vetted by Secure Flight versus the total number of domestic Flag enplanements covered by the Secure Flight rule. The Secure Flight program compares passenger information to the No Fly and Selectee List components of the Terrorist Screening Database (TSDB), which contains the Government's consolidated terrorist watch list, maintained by the Terrorist Screening Center. The No Fly and Selectee Lists are based on all the records in the TSDB, and represent the subset of names who meet the criteria of the No Fly and Selectee designations. Secure Flight will also match data against additional subsets of the TSDB as determined by emerging intelligence.
Data Collection Methodology	TSA requires covered aircraft operators to collect information from passengers, transmit passenger information to TSA for watch list matching purposes, and process passengers in accordance with TSA boarding pass printing results regarding watch list matching results. Covered aircraft operators must transmit to TSA the information provided by the passenger in response to the request described above. Calculation is percentage of U.S. Flag Carriers enplanements vetted by Secure Flight divided by total U.S. Flag enplanements covered under the Secure Flight rule. Secure Flight produces a report that provides the number enplanements by U.S. Flag carrier and the estimated number of enplanements covered by the Secure Flight rule for that year.

Performance Measure	Percent of international air enplanements vetted against the terrorist watch list through Secure Flight
Description	This measure provides the enplanement percentage of Foreign Flag carriers vetted by Secure Flight versus the total number of Foreign Flag enplanements covered by the Secure Flight rule. The Secure Flight program compares passenger information to the No Fly and Selectee List components of the Terrorist Screening Database (TSDB), which contains the Government's consolidated terrorist watch list, maintained by the Terrorist Screening Center. The No Fly and Selectee Lists are based on all the records in the TSDB, and represent the subset of names who meet the criteria of the No Fly and Selectee designations. Secure Flight will also match data against additional subsets of the TSDB as determined by emerging intelligence.
Data Collection Methodology	TSA requires covered aircraft operators to collect information from passengers, transmit passenger information to TSA for watch list matching purposes, and process passengers in accordance with TSA boarding pass printing results regarding watch list matching results. Covered aircraft operators must transmit to TSA the information provided by the passenger in response to the request described above. Calculation is percentage of Foreign Flag Carriers enplanements vetted by Secure Flight versus all Foreign Flag enplanements covered under the Secure Flight rule. Secure Flight produces a report that provides the number of Foreign Flag enplanements through the Secure Flight system as well as the estimated enplanements by Foreign Flag carriers covered by the rule.

## ***Goal 1.2: Prevent the Unauthorized Acquisition or Use of CBRN Materials and Capabilities***

### **Analysis and Operations**

Performance Measure	Percent of intelligence reports rated “satisfactory” or higher in customer feedback that enable customers to anticipate emerging threats
Description	This measure gauges the extent to which the DHS Intelligence Enterprise is satisfying their customers' needs related to anticipating emerging threats. The survey results are defined by



	the currently available Office of Management and Budget vetted tool.
Data Collection Methodology	Members of the DHS Intelligence Enterprise will attach an electronic survey instrument to each intelligence product disseminated to customers. The survey instrument will provide DHS Intelligence Components with a standard data collection instrument and method to aggregate the results throughout the Agency. For data aggregation purposes, customer satisfaction is defined as responsiveness and timeliness of product. The DHS Intelligence Enterprise will provide the Office of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A) with Component results on the second Friday following the end of each quarter. Upon receipt of the data, I&A will average the data across the Intelligence Enterprise for each of DHS mission area and report the total.

## Domestic Nuclear Detection Office

Performance Measure	Percent of high-risk cargo conveyances that pass through radiation detection systems upon entering the nation via land border and international rail ports of entry
Description	This measure gauges the amount of cargo conveyances scanned by radiation detection equipment deployed to the Nation's land border crossing ports of entry and international rail ports of entry. It is expressed in terms of the percent that is scanned by fixed, mobile, and hand-held radiation detection equipment of the total number of cargo conveyances entering the nation through land ports of entry and by international rail.
Data Collection Methodology	Weekly progress reports are provided by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and sent to both DNDO and CBP which summarize installation progress for the last week and any changes to the overall number of conveyances being scanned. The percent of conveyances passing through portal monitors is calculated by the DNDO Mission Management Directorate, based on the number of deployed portals, to determine the percent of scanned cargo containers and railroad cars out of the total entering through U.S. land and rail ports of entry.

Performance Measure	Percent of high-risk containerized cargo conveyances that pass through fixed radiation portal monitors at sea ports of entry
Description	This measure gauges the amount of containerized cargo scanned by the radiation detection equipment deployed to the Nation's sea ports of entry. It is expressed in terms of the percent that is scanned by fixed radiation portal monitors of the total number of containerized cargo conveyances entering the nation through sea ports of entry.
Data Collection Methodology	Weekly progress reports are provided by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and sent to both the DNDO and CBP which summarize installation progress for the last week and any changes to the overall number of conveyances being scanned. The percent of cargo containers passing through portal monitors is calculated based on the number of such conveyances through seaports, where portals are deployed, compared to the total entering through U.S. sea ports of entry.

## National Protection and Programs Directorate

Performance Measure	Percent of inspected high-risk chemical facilities in compliance with the Chemical Facility Anti-terrorism Standards
Description	Measures onsite inspections, conducted by Infrastructure Protection, that provide regulatory oversight of the Nation's high-risk chemical facilities and verify compliance with the Chemical Facility Anti-terrorism Standards (CFATS). This program is in the early stage of implementation.
Data Collection	Chemical facility compliance information is maintained in the Chemical Security

Methodology	Management System. The compliance percentage is determined by the number of sites found to be in compliance with CFATS, as compared to the number of sites selected for inspection each year. For a facility to be found in compliance, it must meet each of the 18 risk based performance standards established by CFATS. The total number of proposed chemical sites to be inspected for compliance is determined from a designated subset of the sites that have completed a Security Vulnerability Assessment and developed a Site Security Plan that meets the CFATS standards. The period between inspections is based on a risk based priority, with the highest risk facilities inspected more frequently. It is expected that at full operational capability, Tier 1 facilities will be inspected annually, Tier 2 facilities every 2 years, and a prioritized selection of 10% of Tier 3 and Tier 4 facilities each year.
-------------	---

## Office of Health Affairs

Performance Measure	Percent of targeted urban areas that are monitored for biological threats using BioWatch technology
Description	This measure examines the number of areas in which BioWatch technology has been deployed compared to those that were targeted for deployment by the Office of Health Affairs.
Data Collection Methodology	The BioWatch Program has a deployment plan that expands current coverage to the top Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) metropolitan areas. Data are collected through activity reports from existing jurisdictions and will be collected from deployment reports as new jurisdictions come on line. The metric is expressed as a percentage calculated by dividing the number of operational jurisdictions by the target number.

## *Goal 1.3: Manage Risks to Critical Infrastructure, Key Leadership, and Events*

### National Protection and Programs Directorate

Performance Measure	Percent of countermeasures that are determined to be in compliance with standards when tested in federal facilities
Description	This measure determines what percent of countermeasures deployed, when tested, are in compliance with standards, based on established testing protocols and informed by Interagency Security Committee standards, designed to prevent harm and destruction to the building and its contents. This applies only in those federal buildings where the Federal Protective Service provides security and law enforcement services. Countermeasures include systems such as cameras, x-ray equipment, magnetometers, alarms, and security guards. These tests occur on a regular basis and provide the program decision makers a means of assessing the compliance of existing countermeasures.
Data Collection Methodology	Program field personnel conduct the countermeasure compliance tests on a regular basis. Field personnel test five systems during the assessment-cameras, alarms, x-ray equipment, magnetometers, and guard effectiveness. Typically multiple devices are tested within each of the five system areas. Test results by device are gathered by the inspectors and then entered into the database. The results by device are aggregated and the percent in compliance score is calculated based on the number of devices that passed the countermeasures test compared to the number of devices tested.
Performance Measure	Percent of facilities that have implemented at least one security enhancement that raises the facility's protective measure index score after receiving an Infrastructure Protection vulnerability assessment or survey

Description

This measure will show the percent of facilities that have enhanced their security after



	receiving an Infrastructure Protection vulnerability assessment or survey. Only enhancements, changes or additional protective measures that count towards this measure are ones that result in an increase to the facility's Protective Measures Index (PMI); a set of rigorous criteria that the impact of security and protective measures. Infrastructure Protection recommendations are represented by security gaps or weaknesses identified by low PMI scores in a security assessment. Improvements done "soon after" the recommendations mean that they have occurred within 180 days of a survey or 365 days after a vulnerability assessment. This measures a program that is in the early stage of implementation.
Data Collection Methodology	Data is gathered by Infrastructure personnel in the field with input into the central database. Argonne National Labs personnel extract data on the implementation of security improvements from the follow-up interviews conducted within the last reporting period/year.

Performance Measure	Percent of owner/operators of critical infrastructure and key resources who report that the products provided by Infrastructure Protection enhance their understanding of the greatest risks to their infrastructure
Description	This measure will show the percent of Level 1 and Level 2 critical infrastructure and key resources owner/operators (e.g., state, local, private) who indicate, via a customer survey administered by Infrastructure Protection (IP), that the products that IP provided them contributed to and/or resulted in their understanding of the greatest risks (prioritized in terms of threat, vulnerability, consequence) posed to their infrastructure. This program is in the early stage of implementation.
Data Collection Methodology	A customer satisfaction survey, administered via a web link/electronic survey to a statistically significant survey sample, is used to collect data for this measure. Responses are due two weeks to one month following receipt of the survey. Once responses are reported, data is analyzed and composite results are derived as a percentage of the total sample based on the response selected. In addition, the results may be further segmented to differentiate between owners and operators and state and local government officials. All responses are confidential. To overcome sample bias, IP will randomly select survey respondents from the entire IP stakeholder population and only rely on contacts received from valid sources. The survey has initial questions to ensure that only individuals involved in the security and protection of infrastructure can access the survey and can restrict the number of times a respondent can take the survey.

Performance Measure	Percent of tenants satisfied with the level of security provided at federal facilities
Description	This measure assesses the effectiveness of security services provided by the Federal Protective Service (FPS) to the Government Services Agency (GSA) tenants through the use of a formal customer satisfaction survey. FPS uses the feedback from this survey to identify opportunities for improvement in the security services provided to its customers.
Data Collection Methodology	Using the data from the PBS survey, FPS records the level of satisfaction regarding security services provided in an Excel spreadsheet. These data are averaged to derive the results of this measure. These results are analyzed at the Headquarters level and then submitted to FPS leadership.

## Transportation Security Administration

Performance Measure	Percent of domestic airports that comply with established aviation security indicators
Description	This measure provides the percent of domestic airports assessed that comply with established security standards and practices related to aviation security. Security indicators are key indicators that may be predictive of the overall security posture of an airport. Identifying compliance with the key indicators assesses airport vulnerabilities and is part of

	an overall risk reduction process. Measuring compliance with standards is a strong indicator of system security.
Data Collection Methodology	Compliance Inspections are performed in accordance with an annual work plan. That plan specifies frequencies and targets for inspection based on criteria established by the Office of Compliance. When inspections are completed, the results are entered into the Performance and Results Information System which are subsequently used to calculate the results for this measure. The result for this measure is reported quarterly and annually and is calculated as the total of "in compliance" inspections divided by the total inspections for the reporting period.
Performance Measure	Percent of mass transit and passenger rail agencies that have effectively implemented industry agreed upon Security and Emergency Management Action items to improve security
Description	This measure reflects the percent of the 100 largest mass transit, light and passenger rail, bus, and other commuter transportation agencies that have taken recommended steps to improve security. The program evaluates the 100 largest mass transit and passenger rail agencies based on passenger volume through the Baseline Assessment for Security Enhancement (BASE) program. The BASE program assesses whether comprehensive Security and Emergency Management Action Items that are critical to an effective security program, including security plans, training, exercises, public awareness, and other security areas, are in place. Transportation Security Inspectors conduct the assessments in partnership with the mass transit and passenger rail security chiefs and directors approximately every 18-24 months to measure progress in the enhancement of security.
Data Collection Methodology	Transportation Security Inspectors conduct BASE assessments jointly with transit system personnel using a standardized checklist to ensure that each system is assessed and scored using the same criteria. The assessment contains approximately 235 equally-weighted questions, scored using a 5-point scale, in 17 action item categories. Category scores are averaged, and reported as a percentage out of 100. The category scores are then averaged for the total score. Achieving an Effectively Implementing rating requires a total score above 70 and no single category score below 70. All scores are averaged to get a national average score. The national average is a rolling score based on the previous 12 months with the most recent agency score replacing a previous score. Results are stored in a central database, which is analyzed by staff members at Headquarters. The data is analyzed to determine trends and weaknesses within the Security and Emergency Management Action Item areas.

## U.S. Secret Service

Performance Measure	Financial crimes loss prevented through a criminal investigation (in billions)
Description	An estimate of the direct dollar loss to the public that was prevented due to Secret Service intervention or interruption of a criminal venture through a criminal investigation. This estimate is based on the likely amount of financial crime that would have occurred had the offender not been identified nor the criminal enterprise disrupted, and reflects the Secret Service's efforts to reduce financial losses to the public attributable to financial crimes. The Investigative program provides manpower on a temporary basis to support protective assignments; a role that is both purposeful and efficient. Field agents provide a "surge capacity" of protective manpower, without which the Secret Service could not accomplish its protective mandate in a cost-effective manner. Although these temporary assignments occur every year, they increase significantly during a presidential campaign requiring the Secret Service to decrease its investigative performance measure targets in campaign years.
Data Collection Methodology	The Secret Service collects data on its multitude of criminal investigations through its case management system known as the Master Central Index. Data is input to the Master Central Index system via Secret Service personnel located in field offices throughout the United



	States and overseas. Data pertaining to this particular measure (loss prevented) are extracted from the Master Central Index system by designated financial crime case violation codes and the dates these cases were closed. The data is then aggregated up to the highest levels by month, year, office, and Service-wide. This information is then reported through various management and statistical reports to Secret Service headquarters program managers, field offices, and the Department of Homeland Security.
--	--

Performance Measure	Percent of currency identified as counterfeit
Description	The dollar value of counterfeit notes passed on the public reported as a percent of dollars of genuine currency. This measure is calculated by dividing the dollar value of counterfeit notes passed by the dollar value of genuine currency in circulation. This measure is an indicator of the proportion of counterfeit currency relative to the amount of genuine U.S. Currency in circulation, and reflects our efforts to reduce financial losses to the public attributable to counterfeit currency.
Data Collection Methodology	The Secret Service collects data on global counterfeit activity through the Counterfeit Tracking Application database. Data is input to the Counterfeit Tracking Application via Secret Service personnel located in field offices throughout the United States and overseas. Data pertaining to this particular measure are extracted from the Counterfeit Tracking Application by designated counterfeit note classifications, their dollar value, and the dates the counterfeit data was recorded in the system. The counterfeit data (dollar value of notes passed on the public) is then aggregated up to the highest levels by month, year, office, and Service-wide and then compared to the amount of US dollars in circulation (reported from the US Department of the Treasury). This information is then calculated as a percent and reported through various management and statistical reports to Secret Service headquarters program managers, field offices, and the Department of Homeland Security.

Performance Measure	Percent of National Special Security Events that were successfully completed
Description	This measure is a percentage of the total number of National Special Security Events (NSSEs) completed in a Fiscal Year that were successful. A successfully completed NSSE is one where once the event has commenced, a security incident(s) inside the Secret Service protected venue did not preclude the event's agenda from proceeding to its scheduled conclusion.
Data Collection Methodology	The Secret Service completes an After-Action Report following every National Special Security Event. This comprehensive report depicts all aspects of the event to include any and all incidents that occurred during the event. Subsequently, the After-Action reports are reviewed to determine the number of National Special Security Events that were successfully completed. This information is then calculated as a percentage and reported through various management and statistical reports to Secret Service headquarters program managers.

Performance Measure	Percent of total U.S. Secret Service protection activities that are incident-free for protection of national leaders, foreign dignitaries, designated protectees and others during travel or at protected facilities
Description	This measure gauges the percent of instances where incident free protection is provided to leaders, dignitaries, and persons (protectees, staff/employees, guests, and the public) during travel and inside the White House Complex or the Vice President's Residence.
Data Collection Methodology	Results from Protective Operations, as well as any incident that may occur, are immediately reported by detail leaders to the Special Agent in Charge, who submits an After Action Report to Protective Operations program managers, and are disseminated within the organization for further analysis.



## Mission 2: Securing and Managing Our Borders

### ***Goal 2.1: Secure U.S. Air, Land, and Sea Borders***

#### **U.S. Customs and Border Protection**

Performance Measure	Amount of currency seized on exit from the United States
Description	This measure provides the total dollar amount of all currency in millions seized during outbound inspection of exiting passengers and vehicles, both privately-owned and commercial. The scope of this measure covers both the southwest and northern borders and includes all modes of transportation, (land, air, and sea).
Data Collection Methodology	All CBP officers effecting outbound currency seizures enter seizure data into TECS via the Seized Assets and Case Tracking System (SEACATS) subsystem, using the proper codes to denote the seizure was made at exit during outbound operations. The SEACATS subsystem analyzes all seizure data and extracts currency seized data for the different categories of currency violations.

Performance Measure	Number of apprehensions on the Southwest Border between the ports of entry
Description	Protection of our Southwest border against threats from illicit cross-border activity is a key element needed to secure our country. This measure calculates the number of apprehensions made of those attempting entry along the Southwest border between an official port of entry. DHS's border security strategy is based on a layered approach of strategically positioning personnel, technology, and defensive infrastructure; developing strong partnerships with law enforcement partners on both sides of the border; and increasing consequences to repeat offenders to provide a deterrent effect . Collectively, these efforts are intended to reduce apprehensions.
Data Collection Methodology	Apprehension data is entered into a database, the e3 (Enforce next generation) processing application, by Border Patrol Agents at the Station level. Data input can be made by the apprehending agent, or by another agent who obtains details concerning the apprehension from the apprehending agent. The e3 Processing application continuously updates the Enforcement Integrated Database with the apprehension data. This data can be reviewed at the station, sector or Headquarters level in a variety of reporting formats.

Performance Measure	Number of joint operations conducted along the Southwest Border by CBP and Mexican law enforcement partners
Description	Bi-lateral law enforcement efforts between CBP and our Mexican partners at local, state, and federal levels are essential for having a secure border that allows for legal trade and travel, and addresses threats in the border area, including border violence and illicit activity caused by drug cartels and smugglers of people, narcotics, and other contraband. This measure tracks the number of joint operations that include Government of Mexico law enforcement agencies as partners formalized by operations orders that define levels of participation and dedication of resources.
Data Collection Methodology	All operations are documented in an operations order, which is recorded in the Border Patrol Enforcement Tracking System. Operations orders are designed and conducted according to operational need. The measure is calculated by counting the number of operations that meet the criteria for a joint operation.

Performance Measure	Number of weapons seized on exit from the United States
Description	This measure provides the total number of illegal weapons seized during outbound inspection of exiting passengers and vehicles, both privately-owned and commercial.



Data Collection Methodology	All CBP officers effecting outbound weapons seizures enter the seizure data into TECS via the Seized Assets and Case Tracking System (SEACATS) subsystem, using the proper codes to denote the seizure was made at exit during outbound operations. The SEACATS subsystem analyzes all seizure data and extracts weapons seized data for the different categories of weapons violations.
-----------------------------	--

Performance Measure	Percent of detected conventional aircraft incursions resolved along all borders of the United States
Description	This measure shows the percent of conventional aircraft that – once detected – are brought to a successful law enforcement resolution. The Office of Air and Marine (OAM) determines whether an incursion is legal or illegal. If illegal, the Office of Air and Marine operations continue through the apprehension phase to successfully resolve the incursion. The measure reflects efforts in reducing and denying the use of border air space for acts of terrorism or smuggling.
Data Collection Methodology	Airspace incursions are identified by the Air and Marine Operations Center. Once identified, this information is transmitted to the closest air branch for air support. The results are then entered into the TECS and the Air and Marine Operations Report systems, and tallies of all incursions are summarized on a monthly basis.

Performance Measure	Percent of projected deployments of Border Patrol agents to the Southwest border completed
Description	This measure assesses Border Patrol's effectiveness at strategically deploying additional agents to areas that currently have the highest illegal alien activity in a timely manner between the ports of entry to reduce the illicit trafficking of people, drugs, currency, and weapons in the areas of greatest need.
Data Collection Methodology	New hire information records are initially entered into the National Finance Center (NFC) system. The Consolidated Personnel Reporting On-line (CPR) System then accesses the NFC system and pulls relevant data to add new hires to the CPR System. Border Patrol Sector assignments are documented via personnel actions and added by the Office of Human Resources Management (HRM) to CPR. To arrive at the percent of projected deployments completed, we divide the number of Border Patrol agents on the Southwest Border accounted for in CPR by the allocated agent strength level for the Southwest Border.

## Goal 2.2: Safeguard Lawful Trade and Travel

### Transportation Security Administration

Performance Measure	Percent of air carriers operating flights from foreign airports that serve as last point of departure to the U.S. in compliance with leading security indicators
Description	This measure identifies air carrier operating from foreign airports serving as Last Point of Departure compliance with leading security indicators. A leading security indicator is a key indicator that may be predictive of the overall security posture of an air carrier. These critical indicators are derived from security laws, regulations, and standards and are applied to both U.S.-flagged aircraft operators (operating from foreign airports to any destination) and foreign air carriers operating from foreign airports serving as Last Point of Departure. Identifying compliance with the key indicators assesses air carriers' vulnerabilities. Assessing air carriers' vulnerabilities is part of an overall risk reduction process. Measuring compliance with standards is a strong indicator of system security.
Data Collection Methodology	Compliance Inspections are performed in accordance with an annual work plan. That plan specifies frequencies and targets for inspection based on criteria established by TSA's Office of Global Strategies, in accordance with its risk methodology. When inspections are completed, the results are entered into the Performance and Results Information System and are subsequently used to calculate the results for this measure.

Performance Measure	Percent of foreign airports serving as last point of departure in compliance with leading security indicators
Description	TSA is responsible for evaluating security at foreign airports with service to the United States, those airports from which U.S. air carriers operate, and other sites as directed by the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. Using a 5-point scale, each foreign airport that serves as a last point of departure to the U.S. is evaluated against critical International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) aviation and airport security standards. This measure assesses the percent of foreign airports serving as the last point of departure to the U.S. in compliance with these aviation and security standards.
Data Collection Methodology	Transportation Security Specialists use a standard template for collecting and reporting data on the assessments. The template is contained in a TSA Standard Operating Procedure and is reviewed annually to ensure currency and standardization. Each foreign airport is evaluated against the ICAO critical aviation and airport security standards. Following submission of the assessment report, vulnerability ratings are assigned by TSA International Operations senior leadership to ensure consistent application of the relative ratings (1 through 5, with 1 indicating no shortfalls and 5 identifying instances of egregious noncompliance). Results are entered into the Office of Global Strategies (OGS) database at TSA headquarters. Each quarter, the measure is calculated by OGS headquarters staff who run a query of the database to identify the airports receiving values of 1 or 2 in any of the ICAO standards.

## U.S. Coast Guard

Performance Measure	Percent of maritime facilities in compliance with security regulations as they have not received a notice of violation and/or civil penalty
Description	This measure reports the percentage of Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) regulated facilities did not receive a notice of violation and/or civil penalty, as a result of U.S. Coast Guard annual inspections.
Data Collection Methodology	Results of MTSA compliance examinations and security spot checks are entered into the Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement database. Data is collected centrally by a HQ-level office responsible for compliance. The percent is calculated by dividing the number of facilities who did not receive a notice of violation and/or civil penalty by the total number of facilities inspected.

## U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Performance Measure	Compliance rate for Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT) members with the established C-TPAT security guidelines
Description	This measure provides the overall compliance rate achieved for all validations performed during the Fiscal Year. After acceptance into the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT) program, all C-TPAT members must undergo a periodic validation in which U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) examiners visit company locations and verify compliance with an industry-specific set of CBP security standards and required security practices. These validations are prepared using a weighted scoring system that is used to develop an overall compliance rate for each company. Compliance with security guidelines enhances the security of cargo shipped to the U.S.
Data Collection Methodology	The Supply Chain Security Specialist collects data in a variety of ways to include review of the Company Supply Chain Security Profile which each member must submit and conducting validation visits of member supply chains throughout the world. The results of



	the validation visit are documented in the C-TPAT Portal utilizing the Validation Report. The compliance rate can be determined at any given time by identifying total number of companies suspended / removed as a result of a validation and dividing by total number of validations performed to date.
--	---

Performance Measure	Percent of cargo by value imported to the U.S. by participants in CBP trade partnership programs
Description	This measure describes the percent of all cargo that is imported from CBP trade partnership programs based on the value compared to total value of all imports. Partnership programs include both Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT) and Importer Self Assessment (ISA). CBP works with the trade community through these voluntary public-private partnership programs, wherein some members of the trade community adopt tighter security measures throughout their international supply chain and in return are afforded benefits. A variety of trade actors are included in these partnership programs, such as importers, carriers, brokers, consolidators/third party logistic providers, Marine Port Authority and Terminal Operators, and foreign manufacturers.
Data Collection Methodology	Importers, or brokers acting on their behalf, submit data electronically, which is captured by the Automated Commercial System (ACS). The Office of International Trade (OT) pulls this data from their systems of record (ACS and the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE)) once a month. After the line value data is extracted, the measure is calculated by dividing the import value associated with ISA or C-TPAT importers by the total value of all imports.

Performance Measure	Percent of imports compliant with applicable U.S. trade laws
Description	This measure reports the percent of imports that are compliant with U.S. trade laws including customs revenue laws.
Data Collection Methodology	At the start of each fiscal year, an analysis of import data is conducted to help design a statistical survey program, which is implemented in the Automated Targeting System (ATS). The population covers consumption entry types, excluding informal and low value import lines valued less than \$2000, in accordance with Census materiality standards for reporting imports into the United States. Field offices are notified of which entries to review as part of this program by automatically created the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) validation activities which also serve as the system of record for summary findings when reviews are completed. Data is extracted weekly by HQ analysts, and reports are produced monthly and annually.

Performance Measure	Percent of requested cargo examinations conducted at foreign ports of origin in cooperation with host nations under the Container Security Initiative
Description	The measure is an indication of the extent to which potential higher-risk cargo is satisfactorily inspected before it leaves the foreign port of origin. This measure is the percent of requested container examinations resolved or conducted by foreign Customs officials meeting CBP examination standards and requirements divided by the total number of examinations requested by CBP Container Security Initiative (CSI) officials. These examinations would otherwise have taken place at U.S. ports of entry.
Data Collection Methodology	CSI officials at the CSI ports track host port examination data daily by using the Automated Targeting System (ATS), including the number of requests and completed examinations. ATS identifies the potential high-risk cargo shipments to be examined and, once the host port completes the examination in a manner meeting CSI requirements, a CSI team member at the host port enters the completed examination data using the intranet-based CSI web portal. CSI supervisors track the examination statistics on an on-going basis using the ATS Examination Findings module.

### ***Goal 2.3: Disrupt and Dismantle Transnational Criminal Organizations***

DHS is in the process of creating measures to assess results in *Goal 2.3: Disrupt and Dismantle Transnational Criminal Organizations*, and will focus on this goal in future measure development efforts.

## **Mission 3: Enforcing and Administering Our Immigration Laws**

### ***Goal 3.1: Strengthen and Effectively Administer the Immigration System***

#### **U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services**

Performance Measure	Average customer satisfaction rating with information provided about legal immigration pathways from USCIS call centers
Description	This measure gauges the average satisfaction rating with the information provided to assist prospective immigrants through the citizenship process from USCIS call centers
Data Collection Methodology	U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) conducts quarterly surveys of those seeking information about the immigration process to determine their satisfaction with the information provided by USCIS call centers. Using the results of 900 complete surveys each quarter, USCIS calculates the average customer satisfaction rating for this measure. The survey uses a 5-point scale and responses of a “4 - Satisfied” or “5 – Highly Satisfied” are included in the calculation. The quarterly data are then aggregated at the end of the year for the fiscal year calculation. Data from the surveys are also used to identify improvement opportunities for USCIS to enhance its customer satisfaction rating.

Performance Measure	Average of processing cycle times for adjustment of status to permanent resident applications (I-485)
Description	An I-485, Application to Register for Permanent Residence or to Adjust Status, is filed by an individual to apply for permanent residence in the United States or to adjust their current status. This measure assesses the program's effectiveness in processing complete I-485 to provide immigration benefit services in a timely manner, which excludes categories such as those applications in which no visa number is available or other data is pending.
Data Collection Methodology	On a monthly basis, USCIS collects performance data on I-485 applications received, completed, and pending through its Performance Analysis System (PAS). Receipts are entered into case management systems through lockbox processing or 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. This data is then used to calculate the average cycle time.

Performance Measure	Average of processing cycle times for naturalization applications (N-400)
Description	An N-400, Application for Naturalization, is filed by an individual applying to become a United States citizen. This measure assesses the program's effectiveness in processing N-400 applications, while controlling for a number of external factors that can affect the timeline.



Data Collection Methodology	On a monthly basis, the program collects performance data on N-400 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. This data is then used to calculate the average cycle time.
-----------------------------	--

Performance Measure	Number of significant citizenship outreach events
Description	This measure describes the number of significant outreach events designed to support immigrant integration. These actions serve a multitude of purposes to assist in accomplishing this goal, such as educating immigrants and encouraging their civic integration, informing stakeholders about the Offices mission and the importance of promoting civic integration, educating counterparts from outside the U.S. government about Federal integration efforts, and bringing on new partners to help encourage integration. Significant outreach events could include conferences, ceremonies, meetings, media appearances, trainings, and presentations. Outreach efforts encourage immigrants to become more integrated into American civic culture.
Data Collection Methodology	The Offices Weekly Information Coordination (WIC) Report is compiled weekly. Events mentioned in the WIC Report in the Top Projects Accomplished Past Week section, falling under the previously defined category of significant outreach action are totaled. The total number of significant outreach events is aggregated quarterly and is rolled up to report annual results.

Performance Measure	Overall customer service rating of the immigration process
Description	This measure gauges the overall rating of the immigration process and is based on the results from the following areas: 1) Accuracy of information; 2) Responsiveness to customer inquiries; 3) Accessibility to information; and 4) Customer satisfaction.
Data Collection Methodology	U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) uses four sources to determine the results of this measure. First, USCIS controlled anonymous call approach to determine the accuracy of information provided by the call centers. Second, responsiveness to customer inquiries is determined from an analysis of abandoned calls to the call center (calls that have been put on hold and then abandoned by the customer). Third, USCIS conducts an analysis of web portal activity to determine accessibility to information. Last, customer satisfaction is determined by conducting surveys of those seeking information about the immigration process to determine their satisfaction with the information provided by USCIS. On a quarterly basis, the results of these four sources of information are combined on an equal basis to determine the overall service rating.

Performance Measure	Percent of Form I-485, Application to Register for Permanent Residence or to Adjust Status, decisions determined by quarterly quality reviews to have been adjudicated correctly
Description	An I-485, Application to Register for Permanent Residence or to Adjust Status, is filed by an individual to apply for permanent residence in the United States or to adjust their current status. The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) conducts quality reviews on a quarterly basis to determine the accuracy rate of final adjudication decisions. Quality reviews are conducted using a team of experienced adjudicators and subject matter experts. This measure assesses the program's ability to process the I-485 to provide immigration benefit services in a complete (fully supportable) and accurate manner. Additionally, the results of this quality review process are used to improve the training of adjudicators and the processes used in conducting adjudications.

Data Collection Methodology	A team of Adjudicators and/or subject matter experts conduct the review of the applicant's original request. The review is documented on a Decisional Quality Review checklist. Questionable decisions are set aside. Once all files have been reviewed, the reviewers discuss any flagged applications as a group. The group, via a majority rule, determines if documentation in the file supports the adjudication decision. Any split decision is deemed a questionable decision. If it is determined the decision is fully supported, the check sheet is completed and the file is returned to the National Records Center. If it is determined the decision is questionable, the checklist, a form letter, and the file are sent back to the adjudicating office. That office is required to advise the HQ Quality Management Branch (QMB) of action taken within 10 working days. QMB analysts gather final results and enter them into a spreadsheet. A report is published quarterly documenting the review results.
-----------------------------	---

Performance Measure	Percent of Form N-400, Application for Naturalization, decisions determined by quarterly quality reviews to have been adjudicated correctly
Description	An N-400, Application for Naturalization, is filed by an individual applying to become a United States citizen. The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) conducts quality reviews on a quarterly basis to determine the accuracy rate of final adjudication decisions. Quality reviews are conducted using a team of experienced adjudicators and subject matter experts. This measure assesses the program's ability to process the N-400 to provide immigration benefit services in a complete (fully supportable) and accurate manner. Additionally, the results of this quality review process are used to improve the training of adjudicators and the processes used in conducting adjudications.
Data Collection Methodology	A team of Adjudicators and/or subject matter experts conduct the review of the applicant's original request. The review is documented on a Decisional Quality Review checklist. Questionable decisions are set aside. Once all files have been reviewed, the reviewers discuss any flagged applications as a group. The group, via a majority rule, determines if documentation in the file supports the adjudication decision. Any split decision is deemed a questionable decision. If it is determined the decision is fully supported, the check sheet is completed and the file is returned to the National Records Center. If it is determined the decision is questionable, the checklist, a form letter, and the file are sent back to the adjudicating office. That office is required to advise the HQ Quality Management Branch (QMB) of action taken within 10 working days. QMB analysts gather final results and enter them into a spreadsheet. A report is published quarterly documenting the review results.

### ***Goal 3.2: Prevent Unlawful Immigration***

#### **U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services**

Performance Measure	Percent of initial mismatches for authorized workers that are later determined to be "Employment Authorized"
Description	This measure assesses the accuracy of the E-verify process by assessing the percent of employment verification requests that are not positively resolved at time of initial review.
Data Collection Methodology	The data are recorded by the Verification Division's Verification Information System (VIS) and collected through standard quarterly reports. When an inquiry is made, if a prospective employee disagrees with the information, USCIS begins the process of checking the reliability of the information. If the initial information obtained is incorrect, and it is determined that the employee is designated employment authorized, this result is recorded in the VIS. Quarterly, USCIS runs a report to determine the number of mismatches that were corrected and is then used to calculate the percent of mismatches that were later determined to be employment authorized.



Performance Measure	Percent of non-immigrant worker (H1-B) site visits conducted that result in a finding of fraud
Description	This measure reflects how many H1-B fraud incidents have been discovered by the Administrative Site Visit Verification Program (ASVVP). This information begins the process to identify and counter systematic vulnerabilities that exist in our immigration system.
Data Collection Methodology	Result will reflect the number of FDNS-DS H1-B cases identifiable as ASVVP cases where a Statement of Findings indicates "Fraud," as a percentage of all ASVVP H1-B cases where a Statement of Findings exists.

Performance Measure	Percent of religious worker site visits conducted that result in a finding of fraud
Description	This measure reflects how many religious worker fraud incidents have been discovered as part of the Administrative Site Visit Verification Program (ASVVP). This information begins the process to identify and counter systematic vulnerabilities exist in our immigration system.
Data Collection Methodology	Result will reflect the number of FDNS-DS religious worker cases identifiable as ASVVP cases where a Statement of Findings indicates "Fraud," as a percentage of all ASVVP religious worker cases where a Statement of Findings exists.

## U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

Performance Measure	Average length of stay in detention of all convicted criminal aliens prior to removal from the United States
Description	This measure provides an indicator of efficiencies achieved in working to drive down the average length of stay for convicted criminals. Decreases in the average length of stay can significantly reduce the overall costs associated with maintaining an alien population.
Data Collection Methodology	Enforcement and Removals Operations field offices are responsible for the entry and maintenance of data regarding the removal/return of illegal aliens. Officers track the status of administrative processes and/or court cases and indicate when actual removals occur in the Alien Removal Module of the ENFORCE database. When an alien is removed/returned from the United States, case officers in the field will indicate the case disposition and date the removal/return occurred in the database. Reports generated from the Alien Removal Module are used to determine the total number of illegal aliens removed/returned from the country during the specified time.

Performance Measure	Dollar value of fines assessed for employers who have violated the I-9 requirements
Description	The fines are a product of Form I-9 inspections, where an employer has violated the I-9 requirements. This fine amount if the final number, reported only after the appeals process or court hearings are concluded.
Data Collection Methodology	This financial data represents the total final order amount of the employer worksite enforcement fine and billed by the Burlington Finance Center. This data is calculated and reported weekly by the Burlington Finance Center.

Performance Measure	Number of convicted criminal aliens removed per fiscal year
Description	This measure includes removals from the U.S. under any types of removal order as well as voluntary returns of immigration violators to their country of origin. This measure reflects the full impact of program activities to ensure that criminal aliens identified in the country, that are amenable to removal do not remain in the U.S. (statistical tracking note: Measure equals the case status with a departure date within the fiscal year, filtered by criminality and exiting ERO Criminal Alien Program codes.)

Data Collection Methodology	Enforcement and Removals Operations field offices are responsible for the entry and maintenance of data regarding the removal/return of illegal aliens. Officers track the status of administrative processes and/or court cases and indicate when actual removals occur in the Alien Removal Module of the ENFORCE database. When an alien is removed/returned from the United States, case officers in the field will indicate in the database the case disposition and date the removal/return occurred in the database. Reports generated from the Alien Removal Module are used to determine the total number of illegal aliens removed/returned from the country during the specified time.
-----------------------------	---

Performance Measure	Number of employers arrested or sanctioned for criminally hiring illegal labor
Description	This measure indicates the number of employers that are arrested or have sanctions imposed against them as a result of criminally hiring illegal labor into our workforce. Fines and sanctions serve as an important deterrent against employers hiring illegal labor.
Data Collection Methodology	A data request will be sent to the HSI Executive Information Unit (EUI) from the Budget Formulation and Strategic Planning Unit. The EUI will return an excel spreadsheet with the number of criminal arrests and/or amount of monetary fines levied against companies for a specific time period.

Performance Measure	Number of visa application requests denied due to recommendations from the Visa Security Program
Description	This measure captures the instances in which a Visa Security Officer (VSO) provides input, advice, or information during adjudication that results in a consular officer's decision to deny a visa to an ineligible applicant.
Data Collection Methodology	This data is collected in a tracking system at each Visa Security Program office during the visa vetting process. At the end of each month, the VSOs will run a monthly report that queries for this metric and the results are exported to an excel spreadsheet. These spreadsheets are sent electronically to Visa Security Program Headquarters to be manually consolidated into a master Excel document with a pivot table for analysis.

Performance Measure	Percent of aliens arrested or charged who will be electronically screened through the Secure Communities
Description	This measure gauges the percent of illegal aliens that are arrested or charged that are subsequently screened through the Secure Communities program to prioritize those who are the most dangerous for removal from the United States. Biometric information sharing between the Department of Justice fingerprint database (Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS)) and the DHS immigration database, (Automated Biometric Identification System (IDENT)) allows a single query by a participating local law enforcement agency to check both systems and confirm the identification and immigration status of a subject.
Data Collection Methodology	The data is calculated based on a merge of Law Enforcement Support Center data and ICE enforcement data. The data is compiled to remove individuals who have their fingerprints submitted through IDENT/IAFIS Interoperability multiple times for the same encounter (e.g., an individual who is transferred from one correctional facility to another correctional facility and has fingerprints submitted at both locations). The totals for this measure are produced by applying the non-citizen arrest coverage projections by jurisdiction to the activated jurisdictions: the percentage coverage achieved during each quarter, plus the cumulative percent.

Performance Measure	Percent of detention facilities found in compliance with the national detention standards by receiving an inspection rating of acceptable or greater on the last inspection
Description	This measure gauges the percent of detention facilities that have received an overall rating of



	<p>acceptable or above within the Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) National Detention Standards Program. The National Detention Standards were originally issued in September 2000 to facilitate consistent conditions of confinement, access to legal representation, and safe and secure operations across the immigration detention system. The standards have been updated into a performance based format known as the Performance Based National Detention Standards. Through a robust inspections program, the program ensures facilities utilized to detain aliens in immigration proceedings or awaiting removal to their countries do so in accordance with the Performance Based National Detention Standards.</p>
Data Collection Methodology	<p>Data for this measure is collected by annual inspections, which are then evaluated by ERO inspectors. These inspections review the current 38 National Detention Standards that apply to all facilities, and rate whether the facility is in compliance with each standard. Based on these ratings, the compliance for each facility is calculated. This information is communicated in formal reports to the program and the ERO Inspections and Audit Unit and the Detention Standards Compliance Unit at ERO Headquarters, which oversees and reviews all reports. The program reports semi-annually on agency-wide adherence with the Detention Standards based on calculating the number of facilities receiving an acceptable or better rating, compared to the total number of facilities inspected.</p>

## Mission 4: Safeguarding and Securing Cyberspace

### *Goal 4.1: Create a Safe, Secure, and Resilient Cyber Environment*

#### Analysis and Operations

Performance Measure	Percent of intelligence reports rated “satisfactory” or higher in customer feedback that enable customers to manage risks to cyberspace
Description	This measure gauges the extent to which the DHS Intelligence Enterprise is satisfying their customers’ needs related to managing risk to cyberspace. The survey results are defined by the currently available Office of Management and Budget vetted tool.
Data Collection Methodology	Members of the DHS Intelligence Enterprise will attach an electronic survey instrument to each intelligence product disseminated to customers. The survey instrument will provide DHS Intelligence Components with a standard data collection instrument and method to aggregate the results throughout the Agency. For data aggregation purposes, customer satisfaction is defined as responsiveness and timeliness of product. The DHS Intelligence Enterprise will provide the Office of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A) with Component results on the second Friday following the end of each quarter. Upon receipt of the data, I&A will average the data across the Intelligence Enterprise for each of DHS mission area and report the total.

#### National Protection and Programs Directorate

Performance Measure	Percent of Federal Executive Branch civilian networks monitored for cyber intrusions with advanced technology
Description	This measure assesses DHS’s increased vigilance for malicious activity across Federal Executive Branch civilian agency networks. Federal Executive branch network monitoring uses EINSTEIN 2 intrusion detection system sensors, which are deployed to Trusted Internet Connections locations at agencies or Internet Service Providers. These sensors capture network flow information and provide alerts when signatures, indicative of malicious activity, are triggered by inbound or outbound traffic. The Federal government’s situational

	awareness of malicious activity across its systems will increase as more networks are monitored and the methodology will require data normalization to account for the addition of large numbers of networks. This measures a program that is early stages of implementation.
Data Collection Methodology	For the 19 Trusted Internet Connection Access Providers (TICAPs): Once EINSTEIN installations are successfully tested (including a formal Installation Test & Checkout Review) notification is provided to the respective program managers. The number of installations is tracked and published by the National Cybersecurity & Protection System (NCPS) program managers. For the 97 Departments and Agencies with EINSTEIN 2 coverage at Internet Service Provider (ISP) locations: To begin EINSTEIN 2 coverage through an ISP, a Department or Agency and the participating ISP sign a "Banner Language" Memorandum of Agreement providing a formal agreement. These agreements are tracked by NCPS, and used to monitor the number of Departments and Agencies with ISP coverage.
Performance Measure	Percent of unique vulnerabilities detected during cyber incidents where mitigation strategies were provided by DHS
Description	This measure indicates the percent of unique, known cyber vulnerabilities, detected during cyber incidents, where DHS provides a mitigation strategy to address the vulnerabilities and prevent the incident from recurring.
Data Collection Methodology	When United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT) becomes aware of a unique high vulnerability, the person who receives the information will check it against the Priority Information Requirements (PIRs). If it meets one of the criteria, they will inform the US-CERT Senior Watch Officer who will record it in the PIR spreadsheet, and follow up with US-CERT analysts and the production team. The Industrial Control Systems Cyber Emergency Response Team (ICS-CERT) collects information in its ticketing system and will track vulnerabilities for which mitigations are issued to the community.
Performance Measure	Average amount of time required for initial response to a request for assistance from public and private sector partners to prevent or respond to major cyber incidents
Description	This measure assesses the average amount of time it takes DHS to initially respond to a request for technical assistance from a public (.gov) or private (.com) sector partner in order to prevent or respond to a major cyber incident.
Data Collection Methodology	To determine the average time required for initial response to a request for assistance, the United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT) will use its internal Request for Technical Assistance (RTA) process which tracks the date and time of a request for technical assistance and the date and time US-CERT and the Industrial Control Systems Cyber Emergency Response Team (ICS-CERT) initially responds to the requestor, i.e. provides the RTA template. The amount of time between the request for technical assistance and the initial response to the requestor will be calculated and the average across all requests will be used to calculate the actual result reported.
Performance Measure	Percent of cybersecurity mitigation strategies provided by DHS for unique vulnerabilities that are timely and actionable
Description	The DHS National Cyber Security Division will follow up with cyber customers, to whom mitigation strategies were provided, in order to determine the timeliness and effectiveness of those strategies. A customer survey will be used to acquire data on areas such as timeliness, clarity, effectiveness, and sufficiency of mitigation strategies. This measures a program that is early stages of implementation.
Data Collection Methodology	The United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT) and The Industrial Control Systems Cyber Emergency Response Team (ICS-CERT) attach a survey to the bottom of the following products: Security Awareness Reports, Critical Infrastructure Information Notices and ICS-CERT Advisories. Two questions will be used to collect data



	for this measure: "Was this product timely?" and "Was this product actionable?" The responses are weighted and the answers to the two questions will be averaged and then divided by the total number of responses. A third question will be included in the survey to identify stakeholders for whom the vulnerability and associated mitigation strategy are not applicable (i.e. the vulnerability applies to an application or operating system that a given stakeholder does not use). The denominator will be adjusted to account for stakeholders who self-identify with the population for whom the vulnerability and associated mitigation strategy are not applicable.
--	--

## U.S. Secret Service

Performance Measure	Financial crimes loss prevented by the Secret Service Electronic Crimes Task Forces (in millions)
Description	An estimate of the direct dollar loss to the public prevented due to investigations by Secret Service Electronic Crimes Task Forces (ECTFs) throughout the United States. The estimate is based on the likely amount of electronic financial crime that would have occurred had the offender not been identified nor the criminal enterprise disrupted. It reflects the Secret Service's efforts to reduce financial losses to the public attributable to electronic crimes. The Investigative program provides manpower on a temporary basis to support protective assignments; Field agents provide a "surge capacity" of protective manpower, without which the Secret Service could not accomplish its protective mandate in a cost-effective manner. Although these temporary assignments occur every year, they increase during a presidential campaign requiring the Secret Service to decrease its performance measure targets in campaign years.
Data Collection Methodology	The Secret Service collects data on its multitude of criminal investigations through its case management system known as the Master Central Index. Data is input to the Master Central Index system via Secret Service personnel located in field offices throughout the United States and overseas. Data pertaining to this particular measure (loss prevented) are extracted from the Master Central Index system by designated Electronic Crimes Task Force case violation codes and the dates these cases were closed. The data is then aggregated up to the highest levels by month, year, office, and Service-wide. This information is then reported through various management and statistical reports to Secret Service headquarters program managers, field offices, and the Department of Homeland Security.

## Goal 4.2: Promote Cybersecurity Knowledge and Innovation

### National Protection and Programs Directorate

Performance Measure	Percent of young adults with sufficient level of cybersecurity awareness
Description	This measure gauges the percent of young adults with a sufficient level of cybersecurity awareness. A sufficient level of awareness is characterized by a basic level of knowledge about identity theft, cyber bullying, and how to protect oneself online. The measure targets teens and young adults in order to raise awareness in these areas. This measures a program that is early stages of implementation.
Data Collection Methodology	The data used to report on this measure is acquired from the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and National Cyber Security Alliance. These organizations have established processes/surveys in place through which they report on cyber awareness within a number of focus populations, one of which is "young adults." DHS has established relationships/agreements with these organizations and, as a result, will have direct access to the data on young adults; which the DHS National Cyber Awareness Campaign will then analyze, process, and report on annually.



## Mission 5: Ensuring Resilience to Disasters

### *Goal 5.1: Mitigate Hazards*

#### Federal Emergency Management Agency

Performance Measure	Percent of communities in high earthquake, flood, and wind-prone areas adopting disaster-resistant building codes
Description	This measure will target the number of communities adopting building codes containing provisions that adequately address earthquake, flood, and wind hazards. FEMA works with code adoption and enforcement organizations to support community implementation of disaster resistant building codes, defined as being in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program regulations, equivalent to the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program recommended provisions, and in compliance with the provisions of the International Codes as designated by the International Codes Council. FEMA also works with the Insurance Services Office (ISO) Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEG <sup>TM</sup> ) data to track the number of high-risk communities subject to flood, wind, earthquake, and combined perils that have adopted a disaster resistant building codes over time.
Data Collection Methodology	FEMA Mitigation leverages data from the ISO, a leading national source of information about property/casualty insurance risk. ISO collects information on the building codes in effect in a particular community, as well as how the community enforces its building codes. This information is stored in the BCEG <sup>TM</sup> database. For FY 2010, BCEG <sup>TM</sup> data from September 15, 2009, were used to establish the baseline number of jurisdictions located in hazard-prone regions that have adopted commercial, residential, and both commercial and residential building codes with disaster-resistant provisions. Data is collected quarterly, under contract with ISO, and reported annually as a percentage of the total at-risk communities. FEMA tracks both changes in total numbers of jurisdictions and the number of communities with disaster-resistant codes.
Performance Measure	Percent of households surveyed reporting they have taken steps to mitigate damage to property and protect themselves in the event of a disaster
Description	This measure tracks the percent of surveyed households who have responded that they have taken action to reduce the impact of an earthquake, flood, hurricane and /or tornado, to their household.
Data Collection Methodology	The measure calculates the percent of households surveyed who respond they have taken one of the following steps to protect the value of their property: 1) purchased flood insurance; 2) elevated the furnace, water heater, and/or electric panel; 3) sealed the walls in your basement with waterproofing compounds; 4) installed storm shutters; 5) installed roof straps or clips; 6) built a safe room. The Citizen Corps National Survey collects individual disaster preparedness data biennially from a sample of households across the nation. The survey is conducted by FEMA's Individual and Community Preparedness Division. Data will be collected by relevant demographic factors in order to provide information on significant differences by factors such as income, age, education, race/ethnicity, disability, and English proficiency. The results are then calculated by dividing the number of households that have taken action in at least one of the areas divided by the number of people surveyed.
Performance Measure	Percent of U.S. population (excluding territories) covered by planned mitigation strategies
Description	This is a point in time metric that determines the percent of U.S. population (excluding territories) covered by approved or approvable local Hazard Mitigation Plans. The population of each community with approved or approvable local Hazard Mitigation Plans is



	used to calculate the percentage of the national population. FEMA Mitigation gathers and analyzes critical data to aid in future mitigation efforts and enable communities to be better informed—and better protected. FEMA Mitigation helps communities reduce risk through sound land-use planning principles (such as planned mitigation strategies), floodplain management practices, and financial assistance.
Data Collection Methodology	FEMA regional staff review each mitigation plan based on the regulations found in 44CFR Part 201. Plans are not approved until they demonstrate that the affected jurisdiction(s) engaged in a planning process, identified and evaluated their risks from natural hazards, create overarching goals, and evaluate a range of specific actions that would reduce their risk, including a mitigation strategy that describes how the plan will be implemented. Data on the approved plans is stored by FEMA Headquarters (HQ) Risk Analysis Division in a MS Excel spreadsheet which is maintained on redundant networks drives. The HQ spreadsheet is populated monthly by FEMA Regional Risk Analysis staff who record, report, and store the names and locations of the jurisdictions that have received FEMA approval of mitigation plans. FEMA HQ consolidates this information, and validates through the monthly reporting request to Regional staff.

Performance Measure	Reduction in the potential cost of natural disasters to communities and their citizens
Description	This measure reports the estimated dollar value of losses to the American public which are avoided or averted through a strategic approach of natural hazard risk management.
Data Collection Methodology	The methodology used to estimate the annual flood losses that are avoided resulting from the National Flood Insurance Programs mitigation requirements are based on estimates of the number of Post-Flood Insurance Rate Map structures in Special Floodplain Hazard Areas, the estimated level of compliance with those requirements, and an estimate of average annual damages that are avoided. Through FEMA grant programs, losses avoided are determined by adding all Federal Share obligations and multiplying by 2 (based on estimated historical average benefit to cost ratio of 2 for projects). All mitigation activities, except for Management Costs/Technical Assistance, are included.

## *Goal 5.2: Enhance Preparedness*

### **Federal Emergency Management Agency**

Performance Measure	Number of corrective actions completed to improve performance following National Level Exercises
Description	This measure will count completed corrective actions assigned to DHS for action resulting from National Level Exercises. A National Level Exercise (NLE) helps the federal government prepare and coordinate a multiple-jurisdictional integrated response to a national catastrophic event. An NLE is the capstone exercise conducted as the final component of each National Exercise Program cycle and requires the participation of all appropriate department and agency principals, other key officials and all necessary staffs and operations centers and operational elements at both the national and regional/local levels. The capstone exercise satisfies the biennial national exercise requirement established in 6 U.S.C. § 748(b)(3). Corrective actions identified from the exercise are assigned to the respective Agency for completion and validation.
Data Collection Methodology	The Corrective Action Program (CAP) is a component of FEMA's Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP). HSEEP serves as the doctrine for design, conduct and evaluation of National Exercise Program exercises. Each DHS component has a designated Action Officer who is responsible for tracking and updating the implementation status of a corrective action for his/her respective organization. The number of completed Corrective Actions assigned to DHS is calculated by adding the total number of corrective actions listed in the Improvement Plans for the National Level Exercise which have been assigned to DHS since FY 2006 and marked as "Completed" within the CAP System.

Performance Measure	Percent of households surveyed reporting they have taken steps to be prepared in the event of a disaster
Description	This measure tracks the percent of surveyed households who report that they have taken specific actions, such as attend skills training, gathered disaster supplies, and/or developed a disaster plan to prepare for disasters relevant to their community.
Data Collection Methodology	This measure calculates the percent of households surveyed who reported taking steps in 3 of the 5 identified areas of preparedness behaviors. Response data is gathered for the following 5 areas of preparedness: supplies, planning, community awareness, exercise, and training. Data will be collected through a household survey conducted by the Individual and Community Preparedness Division, currently a biennial survey. Calculation is based on a random telephone/cell national household survey of 2,400 respondents that are weighted to match U.S. population distributions according to U.S. Census population estimates. Data will be collected by relevant demographic factors in order to provide information on significant differences by factors such as income, age, education, race/ethnicity, disability.

### ***Goal 5.3: Ensure Effective Emergency Response***

#### **Federal Emergency Management Agency**

Performance Measure	Percent of the U.S. population directly covered by FEMA connected radio transmission stations
Description	This measure tracks the percentage of U.S. residents that will be capable of receiving an emergency alert message from a broadcast station that is connected and enhanced by FEMA to provide resilient, last resort capability for the President to address the American people. Executive Order 13407 requires the Integrated Public Alert Warning System (IPAWS) to implement a capability to alert and warn the American people in all hazards and "to ensure that under all conditions the President can communicate with the American people." The program goal is greater than 90% of the U.S. population be in the direct coverage footprint of a FEMA Primary Entry Point (PEP) radio station.
Data Collection Methodology	An accounting of the Continental United States population that can receive alert and warning messages directly from an initial delivery system is calculated using service contours for stations participating in the PEP program based on standard Federal Communications Commission (FCC) methodology. Reference signal levels follow recommendations of the Primary Entry Point Advisory Committee. Station power and antenna specifications used were extracted from the FCC's online data resource. Served population is based on the most current U.S. Census data aggregated into one kilometer tiles. As additional delivery systems/pathways utilizing television cable and personal communications devices are developed their contribution to the total directly served population will be assessed and factored in.

Performance Measure	Percent of time that critical communications for response operations are established within 12 hours
Description	This measure reflects the percent of time that critical communications are established for FEMA's on-site emergency responders within 12 hours of the deployment of Mobile Emergency Response Support (MERS). MERS is FEMA's critical communications capability for response operations and provides self-sufficient, mobile telecommunications, life support, logistics, operational support and power generation for all-hazards disaster response activities. The six MERS Detachments are located throughout the U.S. to rapidly respond to all incidents. Detachments support National Special Security Events as well as other planned special events and activities and provide a cost-effective solution to National



	Response Framework requirements allowing staff at the Joint Field Offices to focus on immediate response and recovery activities. MERS Operations Centers specialists support FEMA's network of operations centers providing situational awareness down to the incident site level.
--	---

Data Collection Methodology	Upon notification, the MERS Operations Center (MOC) tracks the capability movement. Once the capability is in place, the status is updated in the MOC activity log and distributed via e-mail to key FEMA personnel.
-----------------------------	--

Performance Measure	Percent of essential incident command functions (enabled through response teams and operations centers) that are established within 12 hours
Description	This measure gauges the percent of time that response teams and operations centers are established in order to successfully perform essential incident command functions to respond to disasters effectively and in a unified manner within 12 hours of being notified of deployment.
Data Collection Methodology	The teams are notified of deployment and FEMA's National Response Coordination Center (NRCC) documents the notification. Once the team arrives on scene, the team chief contacts the NRCC to update their status in FEMA's Activities Log Database. FEMA's Activities Log Database is used and maintained as the system of record for all incidents and is archived for historical reference. FEMA's Response staff at HQ extracts data from the database related to on-scene arrival times of any (or all) teams deployed to one or more incidents and compares to when teams were notified of deployment for corresponding incidents. The data is based on the total number of actual real-world or exercise deployments, rather than a specific number of deployments throughout the year.

Performance Measure	Percent of urban search and rescue teams arriving on scene within 12 hours of deployment notification
Description	Urban Search and Rescue (US&R) teams have a requirement to arrive on scene within 12 hours of deployment notification to save and sustain lives and minimize suffering in a timely manner in communities overwhelmed by acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies. This standard applies to task forces travelling by ground and by air. The optimum traveling method for the task forces is determined at the time of mobilization. This measure includes both the task force members and their support equipment as well as the commanding element (Incident Support Team).
Data Collection Methodology	National Response Coordination Center (NRCC) Emergency Support Function staff records arrival times in FEMA's National Response Coordination Center (NRCC) database. Additionally, FEMA uses a vehicle tracking capability to provide visual real-time data of team location/arrival times.

Performance Measure	Percent of jurisdictions with access to the FEMA National Shelter System which allows users to locate and monitor open congregate shelters
Description	This measure reflects the percent of states with a signed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to utilize the FEMA's National Shelter System (NSS) to monitor disaster shelter activity. The NSS is a comprehensive, web-based database that emergency managers at any jurisdictional level can use to identify, track, analyze, and report on the status of shelter facilities, shelter openings and closings, shelter capacity, shelter population counts, and other critical information. This national database is available to federal, state, and local government agencies and voluntary organizations to evaluate and report on any facility associated with the congregate care of people or household pets following a disaster.
Data Collection Methodology	The program uses the number of MOAs executed with states as a percentage of the 50 states. The number of MOAs is based upon executed MOAs as indicated by the date of the last signature by the parties on the signature page of the MOA and the date specified in the MOA as the period the MOA will remain in effect.

Performance Measure	Percent of orders for required life-sustaining commodities (meals, water, tarps, plastic sheeting, cots, blankets and generators) and key operational resources delivered by the agreed upon date
Description	This measurement evaluates the percentage of orders from FEMA Distribution Centers or logistics partners that arrive at the specified location by the validated and agreed upon delivery date. Orders include but are not limited to: meals, water, tarps, plastic sheeting cots, blankets and generators.
Data Collection Methodology	Orders for disaster assets are entered into Logistics Supply Chain Management System (LSCMS) by supply chain managers at FEMA HQ or regional staff. When Shipments are received at designated locations (either FEMA or state sites), the Receipt is recorded in LSCMS by FEMA staff (State representatives report data to FEMA). FEMA analysts extract Tier I (life-saving/life-sustaining resources) and Tier II (key operational resources) data from LSCMS: (1) the number of orders arriving by the required delivery date (RDD) and (2) the number of shipments in an order meeting the RDD. Since an order may be comprised of multiple shipments, an order is not considered "complete" until the arrival of all shipments at agreed upon destination by RDD. For each tier, FEMA staff tabulates the percent of orders arriving by the RDD using both the total number of orders arriving by the RDD and the total number of shipments in an order meeting the RDD.

## National Protection and Programs Directorate

Performance Measure	Percent of high-risk urban areas designated within the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) able to demonstrate increased Emergency Communications capabilities
Description	This measure gauges the percent of high-risk urban areas within the UASI that display a five percent or more increase in their overall communications capabilities, based on the SAFECOM Interoperability Continuum. This measures a program that is early stages of implementation.
Data Collection Methodology	This measure will account only for those UASIs (out of 60) that display a five percent or more increase in their overall communications capabilities, based on the SAFECOM Interoperability Continuum. The Office of Emergency Communications (OEC) utilizes the SAFECOM Interoperability Continuum to identify key capabilities that we believe enable successful emergency communications. The capability factors are 1) utilization of strong governance structures, 2) utilization of SOPs and formal agreements, 3) what technology is used, 4) whether the technology is used regularly, and 5) training and exercises. OEC has a 3-year PRA approval for data collection starting in FY 2011. During FY 2011, OEC will work to establish baselines, against which UASI progress will be assessed starting in FY 2012.

## Goal 5.4: Rapidly Recover

### Federal Emergency Management Agency

Performance Measure	Percent of eligible applicants provided temporary housing (including non-congregate shelters, hotel/motel, rental assistance, repair and replacement assistance, or direct housing) assistance within 60 days of a disaster
Description	This measure tracks the percent of eligible applicants seeking temporary housing assistance and provided temporary housing assistance within 60 days of a disaster. FEMA temporary housing assistance includes transitional sheltering assistance (hotel/motel), rental assistance, repair and replacement assistance, or direct housing (temporary housing units).



Data Collection Methodology	<p>Data is collected from the National Emergency Management Information System to identify the number of survivors receiving Rental Assistance, Transitional Sheltering Assistance, Home Repair Assistance, Replacement Assistance and Temporary Housing Units. Applicants are counted only once using the following hierarchy of assistance category: Rent – Financial assistance for rental of alternate housing unit; Transitional Sheltering – Direct assistance in the form of hotel lodging; Home Repair – Financial assistance for repair of primary residence; Replacement – Financial assistance for replacement of primary residence; Temporary Housing Unit – Direct assistance in the form of temporary housing units (manufactured housing, etc.). The number of eligible applicants provided temporary housing assistance within 60 days is determined by the number of days between the date of registration and the date housing assistance was enabled.</p>
-----------------------------	--

Performance Measure	Percent of Federal Departments and Agencies that have viable continuity programs to maintain essential functions in case of disaster
Description	This measure enables FEMA to track the percent of Category 1, 2, and 3 Federal Departments and Agencies with viable Continuity of Operations (COOP) plans and to identify the status and capability of those organizations to stand up operations in the event of a disaster. In addition, this measure allows for FEMA National Continuity Programs to track which agencies are in compliance with current Federal requirements and guidance.
Data Collection Methodology	Internal and Inter-Agency exercises provide the ability to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the overall continuity programs by using the COOP self-assessment tool. This information is noted in After Action Reports generated after training and exercises. The FEMA Operations Center generates a Qualification and Exception Report that gives the percentage of responses/non-responses from the alert and notification testing. Readiness is calculated based on responses to continuity questions. Responses are grouped into 3 weighted categories. A certain percentage of positive responses results in a Green, Yellow, or Red continuity status.

## National Protection and Programs Directorate

Performance Measure	Government Emergency Telecommunications Service call completion rate during emergency communication periods
Description	This measure gauges the Government Emergency Telecommunications Service (GETS) call completion rate. The GETS call completion rate is the percent of calls that a National Security/Emergency Preparedness (NS/EP) user completes via public telephone network, landline, or wireless, to communicate with the intended user/location/system/etc, under all-hazard scenarios. Hazard scenarios include terrorist attacks or natural disasters such as a hurricane or an earthquake.
Data Collection Methodology	Data is captured during the reporting period when the public switched network communication experiences major congestion. The information is collected within the priority service communications systems and provided to NS/EP communications government staff and integrated by the GETS program management office. Based on information from these reports, the program calculates call completion rate.



## Mission 6: Providing Essential Support to National and Economic Security

### ***Goal 6.1: Collect Customs Revenue and Enforce Import/Export Controls***

#### **U.S. Customs and Border Protection**

Performance Measure	Percent of revenue directed by trade laws, regulations, and agreements successfully collected
Description	This measure estimates the collected duties expressed as a percent of the all collectable revenue due from commercial imports to the United States directed by trade laws, regulations, and agreements. The total collectable revenue is defined as total collection plus the estimated net undercollection (also called revenue gap or loss) due to non-compliance with U.S. trade laws and regulations. The revenue gap is a calculation of uncollected duties based on statistical sampling, expressed as both a dollar estimate and a percent of undercollections.
Data Collection Methodology	At the start of each fiscal year, an analysis of import data is conducted to help design a statistical survey program, which is implemented in the Automated Targeting System (ATS). Field offices are notified of which entries to review as part of this program by automatically created Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) validation activities which also serve as the system of record for summary findings when reviews are completed. Data is extracted weekly by HQ analysts, and statistics are produced monthly as well as annually by the resident statistician within the Trade Analysis and Measures Division.

### ***Goal 6.2: Ensure Maritime Safety and Environmental Stewardship***

#### **U.S. Coast Guard**

Performance Measure	Percent of people in imminent danger saved in the maritime environment
Description	This is a measure of the percent of people who were in imminent danger on the oceans and other waterways and whose lives were saved by U.S Coast Guard. The number of lives lost before and after the U.S Coast Guard is notified and the number of persons missing at the end of search operations are factored into this percentage. Several factors hinder successful response including untimely distress notification to the U.S Coast Guard, incorrect distress site location reporting, severe weather conditions at the distress site, and distance to the scene.
Data Collection Methodology	Operational units input Search and Rescue data directly into the Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) database. Program review and analysis occurs at the Districts, Area, and Headquarters levels. First, one hundred percent of the maritime distress incidents reported to the U.S. Coast Guard are collected in the MISLE database. Then, these reports are narrowed to include only cases where there was a positive data element in the fields lives saved, lives lost before notification, lives lost after notification, or lives unaccounted for. The scope of this data is further narrowed by excluding any case reports with eleven or more lives saved and/or lost in a single incident, which would overweight and mask other trends. After the data is properly scoped, the percentage of people in imminent danger saved in the maritime environment is calculated by dividing the number of people saved by the total number of people in imminent danger.

Performance Measure	Five-year average number of commercial and recreational boating deaths and injuries
Description	This measure reports the sum of the five-year average numbers of reportable commercial mariner, commercial passenger, and recreational boating deaths and injuries. It is an indicator of the long-term performance trend of the Coast Guard's Prevention Program



	impact on boating fatalities and injuries.
Data Collection Methodology	For commercial mariner and passenger deaths and injuries, only investigations recorded in the Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement database are counted. Passenger deaths and injuries include casualties from passenger vessels operating in U.S. waters and passenger deaths; disappearances or injuries associated with diving activities are excluded. Mariner deaths and injuries include casualties of crewmembers or employees aboard U.S. commercial vessels in U.S. waters. For recreational boating deaths and injuries, only casualties recorded in the Boating Accident Report Database are counted. Boating fatalities include deaths and disappearances caused or contributed to by a vessel, its equipment, or its appendages. The 5-year average for a given year is calculated by taking the average of the deaths and injuries for the most recent 5 years, which is used to show the long-term trend.

Performance Measure	Availability of maritime navigation aids
Description	This measure indicates the hours that short range federal Aids to Navigation are available. The aid availability rate is based on an international measurement standard established by the International Association of Marine Aids to Navigation and Lighthouse Authorities (IALA) (Recommendation O-130) in December 2004. A short range Aid to Navigation is counted as not being available from the initial time a discrepancy is reported until the time the discrepancy is corrected.
Data Collection Methodology	Trained personnel in each District input data on aid availability in the Integrated Aids to Navigation Information System (I-ATONIS) system. The total time short range Aids to Navigation are expected to be available is determined by multiplying the total number of federal aids by the number of days in the reporting period they were deployed, by 24 hours. The result of the aid availability calculation is dependent on the number of federal aids in the system on the day the report is run. The calculation is determined by dividing the time that Aids are available by the time that Aids are targeted to be available.

Performance Measure	Fishing regulation compliance rate
Description	The Coast Guard uses the percentage of fishing vessels observed at-sea complying with domestic regulations as a measure of the Coast Guard's activities and their impact on the health and well-being of U.S. fisheries and marine protected species. This specific measure reflects the percent of boardings at sea by the U.S. Coast Guard during which no significant violations of domestic fisheries regulations are detected.
Data Collection Methodology	U.S. Coast Guard units enter their enforcement data directly into the Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement database after completion of fisheries enforcement boardings. Each year a compliance rate is calculated for the data quality. This is determined by dividing the total number of Living Marine Resources boardings without a significant number of violations by the total number of Living Marine Resources boardings.

Performance Measure	Number of detected incursions of foreign fishing vessels violating U.S. waters
Description	This measure is the number of detected illegal fishing incursions into the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone. Incursions detected by both the U.S. Coast Guard and other sources are included when the reports are judged by operational commanders as being of sufficient validity to order resources to respond.
Data Collection Methodology	Data for the measure are collected through the Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement system and from U.S. Coast Guard units patrolling the Exclusive Economic Zone. The information is consolidated at U.S. Coast Guard HQ through monthly messages from the Area Commanders. The number of incursions is calculated by including incursions of foreign fishing vessels detected by the U.S. Coast Guard or other sources that results in: significant damage or impact to U.S. fish stocks (based on volume extracted or status of stock targeted); significant financial impact due to volume and value of target fish stocks; significant sovereignty concerns due to uncertainty or disagreement with foreign neighbors over the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone border.



### ***Goal 6.3: Conduct and Support Other Law Enforcement Activities***

#### **U.S. Secret Service**

Performance Measure	Percent of National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) examinations requested that are conducted
Description	This measure represents the percentage of Secret Service computer and polygraph forensic exams conducted in support of any investigation involving missing or exploited children in relation to the number of computer and polygraph forensic exams requested.
Data Collection Methodology	The Secret Service collects computer and polygraph forensic exam data that relate to missing or exploited children investigations through an application in its Field Investigative Reporting System. Data is input to Field Investigative Reporting System via Secret Service personnel located in field offices. Data pertaining to this particular measure are extracted from Field Investigative Reporting System by designated missing or exploited children violation codes and the dates these exams were completed. The data is then aggregated up to the highest levels by month, year, office, and Service-wide and then compared to the number of computer and polygraph forensic exams requested by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. This information is then reported as a percent through various management and statistical reports to Secret Service headquarters program managers.

#### **Federal Law Enforcement Training Center**

Performance Measure	Number of Federal law enforcement training programs and/or academies accredited or re-accredited through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation process
Description	This performance measure reflects the cumulative number of Federal law enforcement training programs and/or academies accredited or re-accredited through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation (FLETA) process. Accreditation ensures that training and services provided meet professional training standards for law enforcement. Re-accreditation is conducted every three years to remain current. The results of this measure provide on-going opportunities for improvements in Federal law enforcement training programs and academies.
Data Collection Methodology	As accreditations/re-accreditations are finalized, the results are provided to the FLETA Office of Accreditation. Program personnel update the FLETA Office of Accreditation applicant tracking database and generate a report from the database to tabulate the number of Federal law enforcement training programs that have a current accreditation or re-accreditation.

### ***Goal 6.4: Provide Specialized National Defense Capabilities***

DHS is in the process of enhancing measures to assess the attainment of Goal 6.4: Provide Specialized National Defense Capabilities, and will focus on this goal in future development efforts.



## Cross-Cutting Performance Measures

### Analysis and Operations

Performance Measure	Percent of breaking homeland security situations integrated and disseminated to designated partners within targeted timeframes
Description	This measure assesses the rate at which DHS provides executive decision makers inside and outside DHS immediate situational reports to notify leaders of breaking homeland security situations of national importance. By providing these reports, DHS increases the situational awareness of leaders to support effective decision making. The targeted timeframes are: 1) within 10 minutes of being made aware of a breaking homeland security situation, the National Operations Center notifies DHS leadership and initiates an inter/intra-agency conference call; and, 2) within 25 minutes, relevant federal, state, and local partners are informed of the situation.
Data Collection Methodology	Each incident and report is logged into the program's tracking log by the desk officer. Data is extracted to calculate the percent of time reports are disseminated within the targeted timeframe.

### Federal Law Enforcement Training Center

Performance Measure	Percent of Partner Organizations satisfied that the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center training programs address the right skills needed for their officers/agents to perform their law enforcement duties
Description	This performance measure reflects the satisfaction of Partner Organizations that Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) training programs address the right skills needed for their officers/agents to perform their law enforcement duties such as the prevention of the introduction of high-consequence weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and other criminal activity against the U.S. and our citizens. The results of the measure provide on-going opportunities for improvements that are incorporated into FLETC training curricula, processes and procedures.
Data Collection Methodology	The FLETC Partner Organizations (POs) are surveyed using the Partner Organization Satisfaction Survey. The measure uses an average of survey Item 27 and 28. Item 27 begins "The FLETC's basic training programs"; Item 28 begins "The FLETC's advanced training programs." Each item ends with "address the right skills needed for my officers/agents to perform their law enforcement duties." The survey uses a modified six-point Likert scale. Program personnel import the survey data as saved by survey respondents from Perseus into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences to generate descriptive statistics and then into Excel to generate data charts and tables. The percent is calculated as the average of the number of POs that responded "strongly agree" or "agree" to Items 27 and 28 divided by the number of POs that responded to each of the respective items. POs that responded "Not Applicable" to either Item 27 and/or 28 were excluded from the calculations for the respective item(s).







# Homeland Security