Federal Aviation Administration

FY2022 Portfolio of Goals

Table of Contents

Background

An accurate and detailed explanation of how a goal is measured, and what success entails, is an important component for any performance management program. Accordingly, the FAA's Portfolio of Goals (PoG) provides key technical information on how progress is measured for the agency's most critical and highest profile goals. The agency's PoG is comprised of profiles based on the agency's approved corporate goals for the year such as the Organizational Success Increases/Measures (OSI/M), Corporate Short-Term Incentives (CSTI), and DOT strategic goals (for example, Annual Performance Plan (APP) goals, S2 Performance Management Review goals, and Agency Priority Goals). The information for each goal's profile is updated annually, and as new goals are developed, their profiles are added to the agency's "portfolio" or "Portfolio of Goals" as the title of this document indicates.

The PoG supports FAA's internal verification review, Performance and Accountability Report, the Data Completeness and Reliability section of DOT's budget submission, and other agency and departmental performance documents.

Safety Pillar Profiles

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Performance Measure Information</th></tr>
<tr><td>Performance Measure:</td><td>General Aviation Fatal Accident Rate</td></tr>
<tr><td>Performance Goal:</td><td>Reduce the general aviation (GA) fatal accident rate to no more than 0.89 fatal accidents per 100,000 flight hours by FY 2028.</td></tr>
<tr><td>FY22 Performance Target(s):</td><td>No more than 0.95 fatal accidents per 100,000 flight hours</td></tr>
<tr><td>Performance Narrative</td><td>The General Aviation Joint Steering Committee (GAJSC) will continue to analyze the top safety risks, develop risk mitigations (safety enhancements (SE)) and implement the agreed-upon SEs with participation of the FAA and general aviation industry/community.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Lead Organization:</td><td>Office of Accident Investigation and Prevention (AVP)</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">Definition of Metric</th></tr>
<tr><td>Metric Unit:</td><td>Number of fatalities per 100 million persons on board.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Computation:</td><td>Number of GA Fatal Accidents / (GA Flight Hours/100,000)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Formula:</td><td>Number of GA Fatal Accidents / (GA Flight Hours/100,000)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Scope:</td><td>This metric includes U.S. registered on-demand (non-scheduled Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 135) and general aviation flights to include everything not Part 121 or Scheduled Part 135. General aviation comprises a diverse range of aviation activities, from single-seat homebuilt aircraft, helicopters, and balloons, single and multiple engine land and seaplanes, to highly sophisticated, extended range turbojets.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Method of Setting Target(s):</td><td>The three safest years in general aviation history (FY 2014 – FY 2016) were used as the baseline. Government and industry consensus was to target a 10 percent reduction in 10 years from this baseline. Each year’s annual target is a one percent reduction to achieve the overall goal.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Historical Data:</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>FY 2019</th><th>FY 2020</th><th>FY 2021</th></tr>
<tr><td>Target</td><td>0.98</td><td>0.97</td><td>0.96</td></tr>
<tr><td>Actual</td><td>0.95</td><td>0.91</td><td>0.73*</td></tr>
</table>
* Preliminary - FY 2021 will not be considered final/complete until December 31, 2022.
</td></tr>
</table>

Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	The data for general aviation fatal accidents comes from the National Transportation Safety Board's (NTSB) Aviation Accident Database. Aviation accident investigators, under the auspices of the NTSB, develop the data. Annual flight hours are derived from the FAA's annual General Aviation and Part 135 Activity Survey. The FAA's Forecast and Performance Analysis Division provides current year estimates.
Statistical Issues:	The NTSB finalizes the actual number of general aviation fatal accidents. Since this is a simple count of accidents, there are no statistical issues relevant to this data. The general aviation community and the GAJSC, as part of the Safer Skies initiative, recommended development of a data collection program that will yield more accurate and relevant data on general aviation demographics and utilization. Improved GA Survey and data collection methodologies have been developed. As a result of these efforts, FAA, working with the General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA), the NTSB, and other aviation industry associations, has made many improvements to the survey. An improved survey was initiated in FY 2004. These annual surveys created, for the first time, a statistically valid report of activity on which the general aviation community could agree. First, the sample size has significantly increased. Second, a reporting form has been created to make it much easier for organizations with large fleets to report. Third, the agency worked with the Aircraft Registry to improve the accuracy of contact information. Each year, significant improvements are being made to substantially improve the accuracy of the data. The General Aviation Joint Steering Committee (GAJSC) and General Aviation Data Improvement Team (GADIT) worked closely with the general aviation community and industry to develop this performance metric and target. There was unanimous support and consensus for the metric and target.
Completeness:	The number of general aviation fatal accidents, even when reported as preliminary, is very accurate. NTSB and the Office of Accident Investigation and Prevention confer periodically to validate information on the number of fatalities. Accident data are considered preliminary. NTSB usually completes investigations and issues reports on accidents that occur during any fiscal year by the end of the next fiscal year. Results are considered final when all those accidents have been reported in the NTSB press release published early in the

	following year. FY 2021 results will therefore be final after the 2023 press release. In general, however, the numbers of fatalities are not likely to change significantly between the end of the fiscal year and the date they are finalized. General Aviation Survey calendar hours are finalized by December 31 of the following year. Hence, the fatal accident rate for FY 2021 will not be considered final/complete until December 31, 2022.
Reliability:	Results are considered preliminary based on projected activity data. Most accident investigations are a joint undertaking. NTSB has the statutory responsibility to determine probable cause, while FAA has separate statutory authority to investigate accidents and incidents in order to ensure that FAA meets its broader responsibilities. The FAA's own accident investigators and other FAA employees participate in all accident investigations led by NTSB investigators. The FAA uses performance data extensively for program management, and personnel evaluation and accountability.
Verification & Validation:	The NTSB finalizes the actual number of general aviation fatal accidents as the authoritative source. The FAA's Forecast and Performance Analysis Division provides current year flight hour estimates. Annual flight hours used to compute the final result are derived from the FAA's annual General Aviation and Part 135 Activity Survey.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	By tracking the rate of fatal accidents per flight hours, FAA can more accurately identify trends, indicating a decrease or increase of potential safety risks.
Partners:	Partners include the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), FAA Office Aviation Policy and Plans (APO), and the FAA and Industry General Aviation Joint Steering Committee (GAJSC): Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA), General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA), National Business Aircraft Association (NBAA), Experimental Aircraft Association (EAA), academia, etc.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Commercial Air Carrier Fatality Rate
Performance Goal:	Reduce the commercial air carrier fatalities per 100 million persons on board U.S. carriers by 50% over 18-year period of FY 2008-2025.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	5.2 fatalities per 100 million persons on board
Performance Narrative	The FAA will continue its efforts to work with stakeholders to address and reduce risk within their operations and the National Airspace System, and encourage voluntarily investing in safety enhancements that reduce the fatality risk.
Lead Organization:	Office of Accident Investigation and Prevention (AVP)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Number of fatalities per 100 million persons on board
Computation:	The Commercial Air Carrier Fatality Rate equates to the number of fatalities (including ramp accidents and other fatalities as a result of the accident) per 100,000,000 persons on board.
Formula:	Number of Fatalities (including ramp accidents and other fatalities as a result of the accident) Per 100,000,000 Persons on Board
Scope:	This metric includes both scheduled and nonscheduled flights of U.S. passenger and cargo air carriers (14 CFR Part 121) and scheduled passenger flights of commuter operators (14 CFR Part 135). It excludes on-demand (i.e., air taxi) service and general aviation. Accidents involving passengers, crew, ground personnel, and the uninvolved public are all included.
Method of Setting Target(s):	The annual targets were calculated to reflect a linear reduction based on the long-term strategic target to reduce fatalities per 100 million persons on board to 4.4 fatalities per 100 million persons on board by the year 2025. The baseline of 8.9 fatalities per 100 million persons on board was established during the 1997-2006 timeframe.

<table>
<tr><td>Historical Data:</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Target</th><th>Actual</th></tr>
<tr><td>FY 2015</td><td>6.9</td><td>0.1</td></tr>
<tr><td>FY 2016</td><td>6.7</td><td>0.6</td></tr>
<tr><td>FY 2017</td><td>6.4</td><td>0.3</td></tr>
<tr><td>FY 2018</td><td>6.2</td><td>0.1</td></tr>
<tr><td>FY 2019</td><td>5.9</td><td>0.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>FY 2020</td><td>5.7</td><td>0.9</td></tr>
<tr><td>FY 2021</td><td>5.4</td><td>0.1</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Data Completeness and Reliability</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source(s):</td><td>The data on commercial fatalities come from NTSB’s Aviation Accident Database. All but a small share of the data for persons on board comes from the air carriers, who submit information for all passengers on board to the Office of Airline Information (OAI) within Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS). In addition, FAA estimates crew on board based on the distribution of aircraft departures by make and model, plus an average of 3.5 persons on board per Part 121 cargo flight.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Statistical Issues:</td><td>Both accidents and passengers on board are censuses, having no sampling error. Crew on board is an estimate with a small range of variation for any given make and model of aircraft. Departure data and enplanements for Part 121 are from the BTS. The crew estimate is based on fleet makeup and crew requirements per number of seats. For the current fleet, the number of crew isequal to about seven percent of all Part 121 enplanements. The average number of cargo crew on board is 3.5 per departure, based on data from subscription services such as Cirium, a proprietary database used by insurers to obtain information such as fleet mix, accidents, and claims. Cargo crews typically include two flight crew members, and occasionally another pilot or company rep, or two deadheading passengers.

Part 135 data also comes from the BTS and Cirium databases, but is not as complete. The Office of Aviation Policy and Plans (APO) verifies with the operators when it identifies gaps in the data. Based on previous accident and incident reports, the average Part 135 enplanement is five per departure. Crew estimates for Part 135 are based on previous accident and incident data. Any error that might be introduced by estimating crew will be very small and will be overwhelmed by the passenger census.</td></tr>
</table>

	Importantly, the fatality rate is low and could significantly fluctuate from year to year due to a single accident.
Completeness:	The FAA does comparison checking of the departure data collected by BTS. This data is needed for crew estimates. However, FAA has no independent data sources against which to validate the numbers submitted to BTS. FAA compares its list of carriers to the Department of Transportation (DOT) list to validate completeness and places the carriers in the appropriate category (i.e., Part 121 or Part 135). The number of actual persons on board for any given period is considered preliminary for up to 18 months after the close of the reporting period. This is due to amended reports subsequently filed by the air carriers. Preliminary estimates are based on projections of the growth in departures developed by the Office of Policy, International Affairs and Environment (APL). However, changes to the number of persons on board should rarely affect the annual fatality rate. To overcome reporting delays of 60 to 90 days, FAA must rely on historical data, partial internal data sources, and Official Airline Guide (OAG) scheduling information to project at least part of the fiscal year activity data. The FAA uses OAG data until official BTS data are available. The final result for the air carrier fatality rate is not considered reliable until BTS provides preliminary numbers. Due to reporting procedures in place, it is unlikely that the calculation of future fiscal year departure data will be markedly improved. This lack of complete historical data on a monthly basis and independent sources of verification increases the risk of error in the activity data.
Reliability:	Results are considered preliminary based on projected activity data. Most accident investigations are a joint undertaking. NTSB has the statutory responsibility to determine probable cause, while FAA has separate statutory authority to investigate accidents and incidents in order to ensure that FAA meets its broader responsibilities. The FAA's own accident investigators and other FAA employees participate in all accident investigations led by NTSB investigators. The FAA uses performance data extensively for program management, personnel evaluation, and accountability.
Verification & Validation:	NTSB and AVP confer periodically to validate information on the number of fatalities. Accident data is considered preliminary. NTSB usually completes investigations and issues reports on accidents that occur during any fiscal year by the end of the next fiscal year. Results are considered final when all those accidents have been reported in the NTSB press release published early in the following year. FY 2021 results will therefore be final after the 2023 press release. In general, however, the number of fatalities are not likely to change significantly between the end of the fiscal year and the date they are finalized.

Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	As fatal air carrier accidents have declined in terms of average fatalities per accident, this metric will sharpen FAA's focus on helping air travel become even safer.
Partners:	Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Cirium, and National Transportation Safety Board

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	FAA Alaska Aviation Safety Initiative (FAASI)
Performance Goal:	Reduce the fatal and serious accident rate in the State of Alaska with emphasis on Part 135 air carrier accidents.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Establish a cross-organization tiger-team to develop a roadmap to enhance aviation safety in Alaska based on the recommendations in the FAASI report focusing on and balancing greatest impact to aviation safety and ability to quickly integrate in the national airspace system. Due January 17, 2022 **Target 2:** Tiger team will develop a roadmap to address the recommendations in the FAASI Final Report focusing on balancing greatest impact to aviation safety and ability to quickly integrate in the NAS. Due February 15, 2022 **Target 3:** Roadmap will be presented to the external stakeholders and tiger team engages stakeholders to receive feedback on roadmap. Due May 30, 2022 **Target 4:** Tiger team will incorporate stakeholder feedback into a FAASI progress report released to the stakeholders. Due September 30, 2022
Performance Narrative	The tiger team will meet regularly to develop the roadmap to address the recommendations in the FAASI Final Report. They will also solicit and incorporate stakeholder feedback at appropriate milestones, focusing on and balancing greatest impact to aviation safety and ability to quickly integrate in the national airspace system.
Lead Organization:	Office of National Engagement and Regional Administration (ARA)/Alaskan Region
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	The tiger team is developing a roadmap that will move along the recommendations from the final FAASI report, developed last year. We will use the roadmap to engage stakeholders on timelines in the roadmap. Stakeholder engagement is a priority of FAASI and will be incorporated at least annually as we move FAASI forward.

Method of Setting Target(s):	AOA directive for FAASI was derived from recommendations of NTSB's 2019 roundtable, "Charting a Safer Course." FY 2022 targets were established in the FY 2021 final FAASI report. FY 2022 targets outline the plans to make progress toward accomplishing the recommendations in the FY 2021 final FAASI report. The FY 2022 roadmap is the agency's plan to address the NTSB recommendations.
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	FAASI Final Report; NTSB Charting Safer Course 2019
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	Regular tiger team collaboration will result in a final report.
Reliability:	Meaningful stakeholder engagement will result in a reliable product aimed at enhancing aviation safety in Alaska.
Verification & Validation:	N/A
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	Public benefit is derived from FAA focusing and allocating financial, infrastructure, and human capital resources consistent with stakeholder priorities. Stakeholders and the FAA goals are focused on enhancing aviation safety in Alaska.
Partners:	Alaska Air Carriers Association (AACA), Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA), Alaska Airmen's Association, Alaska Aviation Safety Foundation, Airport Owners, Sponsors, and Operators, Air Operators, Education Institutions, Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT&PF) and elected officials.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Dangerous Goods Air Cargo Safety Messaging
Performance Goal:	Promote a positive aviation safety culture by educating travelers and air shippers on their responsibilities for proper identification and preparation of dangerous goods cargo. Proper identification and preparation of dangerous goods protects transportation workers across the supply chain by mitigating the severity of cargo incidents, and communicating necessary information to first responders during incidents.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Identify and carry out cross-platform PackSafe and SafeCargo safety messaging campaigns with messaging delivered throughout the year utilizing social media, website, and/or events engaging directly with relevant audiences. The target for FY22 is an overall 5% increase across the Office of Hazardous Materials Safety (AXH) messaging, to include social media posts, website updates, and events.
Performance Narrative	AXH will work with the Office of Communications (AOC) to develop and carry-out cross-platform safety messaging for the PackSafe for Air Travelers and SafeCargo for Air Shippers and E-Commerce safety campaigns to educate relevant audiences on their responsibilities to properly identify and prepare dangerous goods cargo (also known as hazardous materials) for air transportation. AXH will develop an annual stakeholder engagement plan by December 31, 2022, outlining plans for messaging through social media, multimedia and events, ensuring continuous, timely messaging throughout the year. FAA will provide quarterly reports measuring the total volume of messaging reaching target audiences using metrics that are appropriate to each platform; including the number of 1) website updates, 2) the number of social media posts, and 3) the number of virtual and in-person events targeting relevant audiences (e.g., workshops, presentations, tradeshows).
Lead Organization:	AXH and AOC
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	On a quarterly basis, FAA measures the total volume of PackSafe for Air Travelers and SafeCargo for Air Shippers messaging with metrics for Website updates, social media posts, and events.

Computation:	AXH will use the following computations: **Website:** Measures the numbers of updates to FAA's Dangerous Goods website, including PackSafe and SafeCargo pages. **Social Media:** Measures total number of FAA's social media posts across all FAA social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, LinkedIn, etc.) for social media messages using hashtags identified in communications plan for the PackSafe and SafeCargo safety messaging campaigns. **Events:** FAA's Office of Hazardous Materials identifies and tracks the number of both virtual and in-person events, such as presentations, tradeshows, or conferences held to promote PackSafe and/or SafeCargo safety campaigns.
Formula:	As messaging may support more than one campaign, the total volume of PackSafe and SafeCargo messaging will be combined for each platform to provide a single metric for Website updates, social media posts, and events, respectively.
Scope:	On a monthly basis, FAA reports on the use of different platforms to deliver the dangerous goods safety messaging for the PackSafe for Air Travelers and SafeCargo for Air Shippers and E-Commerce campaigns, identified in the annual stakeholder engagement plan. On a quarterly basis, FAA measures the total volume of PackSafe for Air Travelers and SafeCargo for Air Shippers messaging with metrics for Website updates, social media posts, and events according to established metrics.
Method of Setting Target(s):	This target was selected to align with the Safe Workers' Initiative of DOT's Strategic Plan.
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	AOC tracks content on FAA's website and social media accounts, using appropriate, automated third-party tools for each platform. FAA's AXH uses a database to track both in-person and virtual events where the staff provides PackSafe and/or SafeCargo safety messaging.
Statistical Issues:	Identification of website and social media updates are limited by the software used to identify and track updates. Events are tracked in a database inputted by FAA staff, with potential for human error.
Completeness:	Data is only available for the volume of messaging provided directly by FAA. Stakeholders may further download content and share content outside of direct volume of messaging measured on FAA platforms. As messaging may support more than one campaign, the total volume of

	PackSafe and SafeCargo messaging will be combined for each FAA platform.
Reliability:	Measures are consistent with figures tracked in FAA's FY 2021 and FY 2022 business plan for FAA's Security and Hazardous Materials Line of Business, and were selected for consistency. Website updates and social media post tracking are generated using analytic tools for the appropriate platform. The results are evaluated by subject matter experts. All PackSafe and SafeCargo events are tracked in a FAA database, which is used for internal FAA performance reporting.
Verification & Validation:	FAA's AXH and AOC organizations review and analyze website and social media data. All PackSafe and SafeCargo events are tracked in a FAA database, following internal processes with manager review and approval of event entries.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	Supports DOT FY22-26 Strategic Initiative for "Safe Workers" to support the health and safety of transportation workers and first responders. Specifically, proper identification and preparation of dangerous goods protects transportation workers across the supply chain by mitigating the severity of cargo incidents, and communicating necessary information to first responders during incidents.
Partners:	N/A

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Safely Incorporate Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Dangerous Goods Operations into the National Airspace System
Performance Goal:	Strengthen the Safe Integration of Dangerous Goods into UAS Operations
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Identify the research necessary to evaluate the safety performance of existing dangerous goods packaging in a UAS environment. Develop a research plan that covers UAS operational conditions specific to the carriage of dangerous goods and the corresponding hazards, safety performance of existing packaging, and appropriate risk mitigations by September 30, 2022. **Target 2:** Develop recommendations for a certification basis that provides criteria for the integration of dangerous goods into the design of unmanned aircraft by September 30, 2022.
Performance Narrative	The research plan will identify the methods used to protect cargo in flight and offload cargo during UAS package delivery operations. Based on current package-delivery operations, it has become clear that each UAS operation is unique in how the package is loaded, stowed and offloaded from the aircraft. At the delivery point, methods of placing a package on the ground include tethering, parachuting, dropping and landing to place the package. Operator procedures for package delivery directly influence the integrity of dangerous goods packaging. Dangerous goods packaging regulations were established 30 years ago and did not envision UAS. In a UAS environment, the package performance is the key mitigation to protect people and the environment from the dangerous goods it contains. For example, current package performance testing includes a package drop test that is conducted at an average height of 4.1 feet, which is about the height of a drop from the rear of a semi-trailer or a drop by a package handler. The research plan will explore whether the packaging used in existing UAS operations is adequate to mitigate potential hazards and inform future research to provide the baseline performance of conventional packaging in a UAS environment. From there, UAS operators can rely on SRM or a safety risk assessment to increase package performance or implement other controls to mitigate residual risks.

	In collaboration, the Office of Aircraft Certification (AIR) will develop recommendations for a certification basis that provides criteria for the integration of dangerous goods into the design of unmanned aircraft. This work will promote safety in UAS operations and provide a clear line of sight for aircraft manufacturers as they continue to explore the incorporation of dangerous goods (e.g., explosive-fired parachutes, lithium batteries) into the aircraft design.
Lead Organization:	Office of Hazardous Materials Safety (AXH)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	Project plan for completion has been developed, with future metrics to be determined.
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	In a UAS environment, the package is the key mitigation to protect people and the environment from the dangerous goods it contains. To determine the level of protection provided by the packaging being used in UAS package delivery operations, AXH will examine UAS Dangerous Goods operators' existing dangerous goods packaging for every FAA-approved UAS "Will Carry" operator, and develop a research plan to evaluate the safety performance of that packaging. As recognized by Target 2, the certification basis of unmanned aircraft, to include approval of dangerous goods incorporated into the design of unmanned aircraft, promotes aviation safety. For special aircraft operations and the transportation of unmanned aircraft as cargo (e.g., shipping a drone), the dangerous goods requirements in Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations point to FAA certification as a means to ensure safety and mitigate safety risks. AIR will work to provide clarity surrounding a certification basis for aircraft manufacturers integrating the carriage of dangerous goods into the design of UAS.
Method of Setting Target(s):	Both AXH and AIR recognize that dangerous goods may pose hazards in an aviation environment. Through these targets, the FAA is working to provide clarity to operators and manufacturers of unmanned aircraft regarding potential safety hazards of dangerous goods and tools to mitigate potential risks.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	

Source(s):	Data will come from certificate holder applicants, operations observations, and the FAA's Safety Assurance System (SAS).
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	The targets will be met by providing the research plan for dangerous goods packaging and the certification basis for the integration of dangerous goods into the design unmanned aircraft. Looking beyond FY22, these deliverables will inform additional work and provide operators with tools to mitigate risks related to dangerous goods in the UAS operational environment.
Reliability:	The research plan and certification basis will be focused on the FAA's understanding of current UAS operations and aircraft. It will rely on the principles of SMS and be performance-based to ensure reliability and adaptability as the UAS operational environment continues to evolve.
Verification & Validation:	The research plan and certification basis are a critical first step in the comprehensive management of dangerous goods safety risks in the UAS operational environment. Once the FY22 targets are delivered, the FAA will continue to evaluate the level of safety in UAS operations through operational observations and data. This is the same approach that is utilized to assure the safety of crewed operations. The FAA will work with UAS operators to implement controls that mitigate dangerous goods safety risks.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	Identifying the research necessary to evaluate the level of protection provided dangerous goods packaging in the UAS environment is a critical first step in evidence based management of potential safety risks. It allows the FAA to build the capacity for proactive risk management that enables UAS operators implement mitigations in advance of aviation incidents and accidents. Similarly, establishing the basis for the incorporation of dangerous goods into the design of unmanned aircraft is a proactive approach that connects FAA's knowledge of dangerous goods hazards to the design of unmanned aircraft to promote safety in aircraft operations and when these aircraft are shipped as cargo.
Partners:	Aircraft Certification Service (AIR)

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Performance Measure Information</th></tr>
<tr><td>Performance Measure:</td><td>Commercial Space Launch and Reentry Accidents</td></tr>
<tr><td>Performance Goal:</td><td>Maintain the Commercial Space Transportation (AST) goal of ZERO fatalities, serious injuries, or property damage resulting from an AST-licensed or permitted launch or reentry activity.</td></tr>
<tr><td>FY22 Performance Target(s):</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Performance Narrative</td><td>Achieve zero fatalities, serious injuries, or property damage resulting from an AST-licensed or permitted launch or reentry activity.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Lead Organization:</td><td>AST</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">Definition of Metric</th></tr>
<tr><td>Metric Unit:</td><td>Report the number of fatalities or serious injuries or dollar damage in excess of $1 incurred by the public as a result of AST to the uninvolved public.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Computation:</td><td>This metric is a raw number. It includes the actual number of people killed or seriously injured, and property damage as a result of launch and reentry operations licensed or permitted by AST.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Formula:</td><td>This is a raw number of fatalities, injuries, or dollar damage greater than zero. There is no further calculation.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Scope:</td><td>This metric applies to all members of the uninvolved public, i.e., those not directly participating in the launch or reentry effort; either as flight crew, spaceflight participants, or support crew and staff.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Method of Setting Target(s):</td><td>This target was established as the baseline safety metric for AST and has been in place since 1984.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Historical Data:</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>FY 2019</th><th>FY 2020</th><th>FY 2021</th></tr>
<tr><td>Target</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Actual</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">Data Completeness and Reliability</th></tr>
<tr><td>Source(s):</td><td>Data is derived from reported deaths, physical injuries, or damage resulting from launch or reentry operations as reported by Federal, state, and local emergency response personnel.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Statistical Issues:</td><td>This is a raw number so statistical issues aren’t a consideration</td></tr>
<tr><td>Completeness:</td><td>This metric provides the ultimate determination of our success in executing the commercial spaceflight safety mission. Since this goal is</td></tr>
</table>

	a measure of raw data (not interpreted through statistical analysis) and is of such high visibility, its veracity is beyond reproach.
Reliability:	To date, there have been no fatalities, serious injuries, or property damage to the uninvolved public. If an accident involving the uninvolved public occurred, there would be an investigation to determine the number of fatalities and injuries, as well as the cost of the property damage. The time to validate the data depends on all relevant investigation to conclude and all parties concurring with the findings.
Verification & Validation:	Commercial space operators are required to report fatalities, casualties, and property damage to the FAA when they occur. AST safety inspectors verify the information through direct observation, emergency responder reports, and affected party interviews.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The public benefits in multiple ways. First, protection of the public from death, injury or financial loss from property damage is an immediate public good. However, the public also benefits greatly from the provision of space-based services that rely on assured access to space provided by AST-licensed launch operations. These include long-haul communications, geophysical observation and mapping, navigation, weather, entertainment, and the Global Positioning System (GPS) timing signal that provides enabling technology for cell phones and banking services. Any disruption in launch services, assured access to space, or launch and reentry capability directly impacts the ability of space-based service providers to maintain these capabilities which are essential to the U.S. national and economic security, as well as the general public.
Partners:	To achieve this goal, AST coordinates with Federal, state, and local launch site operators, the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security, and the FAA's Air Traffic Organization (ATO), Airports (ARP), and Aviation Safety (AVS) lines of business.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Enterprise Safety Culture Program
Performance Goal:	Establish the organizational infrastructure across the agency to support an Enterprise Safety Culture program. Provide a forum to connect, coordinate, and collaborate on Safety Culture activities currently happening in isolation across the agency, and integrate best practices from other agencies, international organizations, industry, and academia. Establish user-centric tools and practices to identify and access the information, services, and resources needed to accomplish the mission.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Establish a cross-LOB/SO team to support collaboration; oversee the capture and sharing of information; and the management, evaluation, and gap analysis of Safety Culture activities across the agency. Due January 31, 2022 **Target 2:** Establish a governance structure, roles and responsibilities, and future activities for the Enterprise Safety Culture Team. Due September 30, 2022 **Target 3:** Recommend set of desired Safety Culture Behaviors to Safety Culture Steering Committee. Due September 30, 2022
Performance Narrative	Each FAA organization will conduct biennial assessments to measure improvement. The Federal Employee View Point Survey will continue to improve on the Safety Culture related questions. The agency will look to identify additional Safety Culture metrics that will be responsive to results of the enhancements to safety culture. Leaders promote safety culture in their communications and the agency incorporates the concepts into its videos and webpages. As the first year progresses, additional success indicators will be identified including surveys of the workforce.
Lead Organization:	Air Traffic Organization (ATO)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A

Scope:	Safety Culture is a critical driver of safety performance in a Safety Management System (SMS). Since culture starts at the top, the imperative to change and sustain the agency's safety culture is the responsibility of the Administrator and senior leadership across the agency to continuously support this effort. Two key efforts have been identified for the FAA: 1. Perform organization wide assessments, conduct Assessments of the Safety Culture across the FAA, and implement success measurement mechanism. 2. Lead and coordinate activities to raise awareness of safety culture as it relates to safety as a core value at all levels of the enterprise and beyond. Leadership's conscious and deliberate actions will improve the FAA's safety culture and have a direct linkage to the enhancement of the safety culture with our partners throughout the aviation industry.
Method of Setting Target(s):	Milestones were identified and coordinated to support Flight Plan 21, FAA's FY22-26 Strategic Plan.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	N/A
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	This initiative will be completed once all targets have been met to establish the Enterprise Safety Culture program. Specifically, Target 1 will be successfully completed once the Enterprise Safety Culture Team representatives have been identified. Target 2 will be successfully accomplished when the governance structure has been defined. Target 3 will be successfully completed once the Safety Culture Behaviors have been delivered to the Enterprise Safety Culture Team, which also serves as the Safety Culture Steering Committee.
Reliability:	N/A
Verification & Validation:	The completion of this initiative will be validated by reviewing the following documents: **Target 1:** The organizations that will provide representatives will be captured in the Governance document. The specific representatives will be named in a separate document as a participant contact list.

	Target 2: The governance structure, roles and responsibilities, and future activities for the Enterprise Safety Culture Team will be captured in the Governance document. **Target 3:** The Safety Culture behaviors will be captured in a document titled, Desired Safety Culture Behaviors, and will be presented to the Enterprise Safety Culture Team.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The number one mission of the FAA is to secure and maintain the safest aviation system in the world thereby providing maximum safety to the American flying public. Safety Culture is a critical driver of safety performance. Since culture starts at the top, the imperative to change and sustain the agency's safety culture is the responsibility of the Administrator and senior leadership across the agency to continuously support this effort. Leadership's conscious and deliberate actions to facilitate a positive and proactive safety culture will directly enhance the Safety Culture with our partners throughout the aviation industry.
Partners:	The FAA Safety Culture Team will draw on its contacts and associations with the Department of Energy, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NASA and similar agencies that rely heavily on strong and evolving Safety Culture practices. FAA will maintain collaboration with the safety culture community to help identify potential models and to maintain essential networking and shared ideas with our safety culture partners.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Commercial and Non-Commercial Surface Safety
Performance Goal:	Surface Safety
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Commercial Surface Safety:** Maintain the weighted surface safety risk index at or below 0.35 per million operations for Commercial Aviation. **Non-Commercial Surface Safety:** Maintain the weighted surface safety risk index at or below 0.60 per million operations for Non-Commercial Aviation.
Performance Narrative	The FAA continues to monitor Surface Safety to identify safety-related trends and evaluate risk. To meet the performance targets, the FAA has created mitigations such as Runway Status Lights (RSL), Runway Guard Lights (RGL), the Airport Surface Detection Equipment-X (ASDE-X)/Airport Surface Surveillance Capability (ASSC), Taxiway Arrival Prediction (ATAP) and the Approach Runway Verification (ARV) tools. Additionally, the FAA collaborates with stakeholders for better outreach toward and education of the pilot community. This includes Pilot/Controller forums, online videos, and presentations to flight schools. Additionally, through Special Focus Runway Safety Action Team meetings at airports with higher risk of surface incidents, the FAA meets with representatives from local airports and pilot groups to emphasize locality-specific problems to include runway incursions, vehicle pedestrian deviations and wrong surface incidents. The FAA will continue improving data collection and automation to more quickly and accurately evaluate metric trends.
Lead Organization:	Air Traffic Organization (ATO)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	**Commercial Metric:** A measure of overall airport surface operations safety risk per million operations. **Non-Commercial Metric:** A measure of overall Non-Commercial surface operations safety risk per million operations.
Computation:	**Commercial Computation:** For each commercial accident, a penalty term is calculated by aggregating weights corresponding to the various effects of the accident (i.e. severity of injury or airframe damage). A credit term, calculated as the fraction of lesser injured people and/or less-damaged airframes, is deducted from the penalty term to get the final score for the accident. For each commercial incident, only a penalty term corresponding to the incident type is

	calculated and becomes that incident's score. All event (accident and incident) scores are aggregated over time and normalized by 1,000,000 operations. All rates used in the Commercial Surface Safety Risk Index calculation are derived from a Bayesian network model trained using a supervised algorithm, which essentially assigns a weight value to each event outcome indicative of its closeness to a fatal outcome. **Non-Commercial Computation:** For each accident, a penalty term is calculated by aggregating weights corresponding to the various effects of the accident (i.e. severity of injury or airframe damage). A credit term, calculated as the fraction of lesser injured people and/or less-damaged airframes, is deducted from the penalty term to get the final score for the accident. For each incident, only a penalty term corresponding to the incident type is calculated and becomes that incident's score. All event (accident and incident) scores are aggregated over time and normalized by 1,000,000 operations. All weights used in the Non-Commercial Surface Safety Risk Index calculation are derived from a Bayesian network model trained using a supervised algorithm, which essentially assigns a weight value to each event outcome indicative of its closeness to a fatal outcome.
Formula:	**Commercial Formula:** $$\frac{\text{Sum of individual Commercial event scores}}{\text{(Commercial Aviation Operations} \div 1{,}000{,}000)}$$ **Non-Commercial Formula:** $$\frac{\text{Sum of individual Non-Commercial event scores}}{\text{(Commercial Aviation Operations} \div 1{,}000{,}000)}$$
Scope:	The Surface Safety Metric measures the overall safety performance of the NAS in the runway environment. It includes all manner of operations (commercial and other types), aircraft, and vehicle/pedestrian movement that occur in that environment. It includes runway collision accidents, runway excursion accidents, taxiway collision accidents, runway incursion incidents, runway excursion incidents, and taxiway surface incidents. The definition of operations is total takeoffs and landings. Commercial and Non-Commercial operations are measured separately. The ATO considers operations under FAR Parts 121, 129, and 135 commercial operations and all other operation types as non-commercial.

<table>
<tr><td>Method of Setting Target(s):</td><td>Forecast modeling was used to attain challenging but reasonable targets based on past performance of the metric. Targets for commercial and non-commercial operations were set separately.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Historical Data:</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Commercial</th><th>FY 2019</th><th>FY 2020</th><th>FY 2021</th></tr>
<tr><td>Target</td><td>0.35</td><td>0.35</td><td>0.35</td></tr>
<tr><td>Actual</td><td>0.105</td><td>0.053</td><td>0.037</td></tr>
</table>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></tr>
<tr><td>Target</td><td>0.60</td><td>0.60</td><td>0.60</td></tr>
<tr><td>Actual</td><td>0.537</td><td>0.204</td><td>0.146</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Data Completeness and Reliability</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source(s):</td><td>The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) database is the primary source of runway accident data. Runway excursion data is supplemented by FAA’s Aviation System Analysis and Sharing (ASIAS) database, which aggregates runway excursion data from multiple sources. Air traffic controllers and pilots are the primary source of runway incursion and surface incident reports. The data are recorded in the Comprehensive Electronic Data Analysis Reporting (CEDAR) system. CEDAR replaced the FAA Air Traffic Quality Assurance (ATQA) database for the Air Traffic Organization. Preliminary incident reports are evaluated when received and evaluation can take up to 90 days. Operations data used to calculate the runway incursion rate are provided via Operations Network (OPSNET), and are downloaded directly from the FAA Operations and Performance Data database.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Statistical Issues:</td><td>Categorization of the various accidents is performed using statistical modeling, which is prone to sampling error.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Completeness:</td><td>The FAA verifies and validates the accuracy of runway incursion and surface incident data through the initial validation process followed by quality assurance and quality control reviews. Reconciliation of the databases is conducted monthly and anomalies are explored and resolved. In cases where major problems are identified, a request to re-submit is issued. The FAA conducts annual reviews of reported data and compares them with data reported from previous years. Annual runway incursion incident data are used to provide a statistical basis for research, analysis, and outreach initiatives.

The Surface Safety metric will be recalculated if accidents or incidents are reported late or if operations data are retroactively adjusted.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Reliability:</td><td>A classification algorithm with approximately 95% accuracy is used to classify NTSB events as runway collisions, taxiway collisions, or runway excursions. Given this classification error, there is a small chance that</td></tr>
</table>

	irrelevant accidents will be included in the Surface Safety Metric calculation or relevant accidents will be excluded. External Factors: Runway accidents and incidents are the result of an error by an air traffic controller, pilot, and/or vehicle/pedestrian event. The FAA has direct influence on air traffic controller performance, but indirect influence on pilots and airport personnel.
Verification & Validation:	The FAA verifies and validates the accuracy of runway incursion and surface incident data through the initial validation process followed by quality assurance and quality control reviews. Reconciliation of the databases is conducted monthly and anomalies are explored and resolved. In cases where major problems are identified, a request to re-submit is issued.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The Surface Safety Metric represents potential for fatal accidents on the runway or taxiway surface. A reduction in the Surface Safety Metric score is an indication of overall safety performance improvements for the flying public in the surface environment.
Partners:	The FAA co-chairs the Runway Safety Council (RSC) with the Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA). Other Council members include National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA), Airlines for America (A4A), Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA), National Association of Flight Instructors (NAFI), National Business Aviation Association (NBAA), Regional Airline Association (RAA), Airport Councils International-North America (ACI), the American Association of Airport Executives, along with FAA Flight Standards, Office of Airports, and Air Traffic. The RSC collaborates government and industry leadership to develop and focus implementation of an integrated, data-driven strategy to reduce the number and severity of runway incursions.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Top 5 Safety Risks
Performance Goal:	The Top 5 Safety Risks are a quantifiable list of hazards that contribute to the highest risk in the National Airspace System (NAS). It is the culmination of the Air Traffic Organization's (ATO) proactive safety management activities—valuing input from the frontline employees, deploying technology to gather data, improving analysis to identify risk and embracing correction to implement risk mitigations.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Implement 85% of approved mitigation activities in association with ATO's Top Five (5) identified trending safety issues in the NAS.
Performance Narrative	The ATO has established corrective action teams for each of the Top 5 safety issues, led by the ATO Top 5 program office. These teams include all members with mitigation activities assigned to them. Each activity is discussed, tracked and reported on monthly via a monthly report produced by the ATO Top 5 program office. Monthly reports are reviewed by an executive steering committee and other relevant stakeholders. Any concerns regarding potential for missing the fiscal year completion for each activity are discussed with Top 5 program office leadership.
Lead Organization:	ATO
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	The metric counts the number of activities implemented to address the Top 5 issues/hazards. Each activity is a defined action.
Computation:	Implementation of 85% of the activities identified for the fiscal year.
Formula:	$\frac{100 \times (\text{Number of Activities Completed})}{(81 \text{ Activities Identified for FY2022})}$
Scope:	This metric measures ATO's success in implementing mitigations to address trending issues in the NAS, as well as the impact of those mitigations on the originally identified trend. The list of FY2021 issues are Traffic Advisories / Safety Alerts, Altitude Compliance, Wrong Surface Landings, Pilot Reports (PIREP) Solicitation / Dissemination and Notice to Airmen.
Method of Setting Target(s):	There will be five phases of the Top 5 process: candidate selection, Corrective Action Plan (CAP) development, CAP implementation, monitoring, and close-out. Metrics have been set that will measure success in each of those phases, all of which are deadline-driven. Each

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>major deadline that is coming up in a fiscal year will count as an activity toward the metric.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Historical Data:</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>FY 2018</th><th>FY 2019</th><th>FY 2020</th><th>FY 2021</th></tr>
<tr><td>Target</td><td>80%</td><td>80%</td><td>85%</td><td>85%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Actual</td><td>89%</td><td>93%</td><td>86%</td><td>89%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Data Completeness and Reliability</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source(s):</td><td>ATO Safety and Technical Training reaches out to responsible organization points of contact to track the implementation progress of the approved activities and distributes monthly progress reports.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Statistical Issues:</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Completeness:</td><td>The activities (for example, corrective action and monitoring plans) to address the Top 5 trending safety issues are formed using specific subject matter experts who are led through a data-driven process. Safety data are comprehensively reviewed to select well-defined issues to the list. Then, CAPs are developed and reviewed by the pertinent responsible organizations to ensure they address the identified issue and can be feasibly accomplished. The monitoring plans measure against safety performance targets to determine whether or not the mitigations are in place and reduce the observed trend. Once those targets are met, the issue is eligible for close-out, and the process begins again to review safety data to select/add a new issue to the list.

This cycle is broken down for each Top 5 into a plan for the coming fiscal year. Once the plans are signed, they represent specific and comprehensive plans that, when executed, should contribute to improved safety in the NAS. Safety and Technical Training solicits status updates regularly from responsible organizations to ensure the work is meeting the intent of the original action and will be completed on time. The activity is not closed until a deliverable confirms its completion. Additionally, a Director-level ATO Top 5 Steering Committee oversees the prioritization and decision-making needs of the Top 5. This committee ensures awareness, transparency, and buy-in at the highest levels.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Reliability:</td><td>There is no reliability issue with this metric. The activity is either implemented during this fiscal year or not. ATO Safety and Technical Training considers an activity implemented when the requirements associated with the activity are met. Each activity has a point of contact that provides the implementation status to the program manager. There are no external factors for this metric.</td></tr>
</table>

Verification & Validation:	Activities that the Top 5 Program Office deems closed must be accompanied by a deliverable that demonstrates completion. The Top 5 Program Office will review these deliverables to ensure the original intent of the CAP activity has been met.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The adoption of this metric benefits the public by identifying and reducing trending safety issues within the NAS.
Partners:	ATO Safety and Technical Training works collaboratively with stakeholders including other ATO service units (Mission Support, Tech Ops, Air Traffic, etc.), the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA), the pilot community (A4A, NBAA, AOPA, etc.), and other FAA organizations (Airports, Flight Standards, etc.) to develop comprehensive activities to address the issues identified in the NAS.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Certification & Safety Oversight Reform
Performance Goal:	The FAA will implement a majority of provisions in the Aircraft Certification, Safety, and Accountability Act (ACSAA) with due dates throughout the fiscal year.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Implement a majority of provisions in ACSAA that have a due date on or before September 30, 2022.
Performance Narrative	The FAA is committed to thorough and complete implementation of ACSAA and addressing recommendations from recent investigations and independent reviews. Progress is monitored through quarterly reviews with FAA leadership, the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (OST), and Congressional staff.
Lead Organization:	Aviation Safety's Organization Designation Authorization Office (AVS-6)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Individual provisions of the Aircraft Safety, Certification and Accountability Act.
Computation:	$\frac{\text{Implemented provisions with a due date on or before 09/30/2022}}{\text{Total provisions with a due date on or before 09/30/2022}}$
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	The performance measure includes efforts to address requirements of ACSAA across the Office of Aviation Safety (AVS). This performance measure demonstrates the FAA's commitment to pursuing comprehensive and meaningful certification & safety oversight reform. The agency remains committed to improving the certification process, including its oversight of functions delegated to aircraft designers and manufacturers.
Method of Setting Target(s):	With over 100 unique legislative requirements, the agency's implementation of ACSAA is a large and complex undertaking. The target is an achievable goal.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	The information is generated by the various Services and Offices within AVS.
Statistical Issues:	N/A

Completeness:	AVS has high confidence in the completeness of the data.
Reliability:	Quarterly updates will be provided to the FAA Administrator, OST, and Congressional staff based on input provided by the Offices of Primary Responsibility (OPR) for the various provisions. AVS has high confidence in the reliability of the data.
Verification & Validation:	The information is generated by the various Services and Offices within AVS, reviewed by a tiger team spearheading AVS's efforts related to certification & safety oversight reform, and then signed-off by AVS senior leadership.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	In addition to being a Congressional mandate, this performance measure demonstrates the FAA's commitment to pursuing comprehensive and meaningful certification & safety oversight reform. The agency remains committed to improving the certification process, including its oversight of functions delegated to aircraft designers and manufacturers.
Partners:	The FAA engages closely with various external stakeholders, including OST, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA), international aviation authorities and more, to implement provisions under ACSAA.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	FAA Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Engine Ingestion Test Preparation
Performance Goal:	Conduct research to determine the potential severity of the ingestion of a small UAS (sUAS) into a commercial, high-bypass, turbofan aircraft engine within the National Airspace System (NAS).
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Validate and approve the DoD/Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC) Test Plan for the FAA's UAS Engine Ingestion Test with FAA/Aircraft Certification (AIR) and FAA/NextGen (ANG).
Performance Narrative	Aviation Safety's UAS Integration Office (AUS) plans to meet the performance targets by tracking the development of the draft plan by NAWC, with technical support from the FAA's Center of Excellence for UAS Research: Alliance of System Safety through Research Excellence (ASSURE) and NASA, during monthly Technical Interchange Meetings. Once the draft plan is delivered, AUS will coordinate review with Aircraft Certification (AIR) and NextGen (ANG), followed by comment adjudication to approve the Test Plan.
Lead Organization:	Aviation Safety's UAS Integration Office (AUS)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of target.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	Engine ingestion of sUAS into a commercial, high-bypass, turbofan aircraft engine is of significant concern to the FAA. Although models of engine ingestion provide a valuable tool to evaluate the safety impacts to manned aircraft; the models can be enhanced, assumptions can be verified, and our understanding of such events can be vastly improved by the inclusion of data gathered from a single, live test.
Method of Setting Target(s):	AUS planned and scheduled the tracking of the engine acquisition and the development of the Test Plan alongside the UAS launch capability to ensure that engineers were ready to conduct testing in FY 2022. FAA/AUS validation and acceptance of the Test Plan will be completed in a timely manner to maintain the NAWC schedule for FY 2022 testing. This will include completing the Test Plan review and comment adjudication.

Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	ANG and NAWC will report data on the progress of scheduled targets monthly to FAA/AUS. Based on AUS-planned schedules, AUS will collect data on the progress of FAA review of the draft Test Plan and NAWC adjudication of comments.
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	Completeness is based on the Agency's acceptance of the Test Plan prior to the targeted Test Event. The quality of performance will be assessed by continuous tracking of sub-task delivery schedules to ensure that all targets are on track for completion in accordance with the agreed-upon schedule. Successful performance will consist of the on-time completion of these tasks.
Reliability:	Based on the world-class expertise of the FAA's COE for UAS Research: ASSURE and the extensive experience of the DoD (specifically NAWC) and NASA with executing live destructive engine tests, the FAA has complete confidence in the consistency and quality of the data being provided.
Verification & Validation:	The completion of key project deliverables to ensure they meet the targeted date of delivery will be supported through monthly FAA/NAWC/ASSURE/NASA Technical Interchange Meetings, along with monitoring of the delivery of key milestone targets.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The live engine ingestion Test Plan will employ scientific methodology to yield empirical data necessary to effectively evaluate the severity of risk posed by the ingestion of a sUAS into a commercial, high-bypass, turbofan aircraft engine within the NAS. The data will inform repeatable, scalable, and safe Beyond Visual Line of Sight (BVLOS) operations of UAS in the NAS.
Partners:	DoD/Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC), FAA's Center of Excellence for UAS Research, ASSURE, NASA

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Enabling Beyond Visual Line of Sight (BVLOS) Operations
Performance Goal:	Initiate the development of the regulatory framework for BVLOS operations in order to enable the safe and secure integration of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) into the National Airspace System (NAS) by leading efforts toward enabling beyond visual line of sight operations.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Develop an Application for Rulemaking for Rulemaking Management Council (RMC) concurrence within six months of receipt of the UAS Beyond Visual Line of Sight (BVLOS) Aviation Rulemaking Committee (ARC) report. The Application for Rulemaking will outline the expected schedule for transmittal of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to the Department of Transportation in Fiscal Year 2023.
Performance Narrative	Upon receiving the UAS BVLOS ARC Report, a team will review the ARC report, draft proposed scopes for potential rulemaking(s), coordinate the proposals more broadly, and develop the Application for Rulemaking for submission to the RMC.
Lead Organization:	Aviation Safety's UAS Integration Office (AUS)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of the target.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	The performance measure aims to capture a progression of BVLOS operations, from limited operations to fully integrated BVLOS operations in the NAS.
Method of Setting Target(s):	The FAA established this target by following the natural progression of policymaking. AUS has enabled limited BVLOS operations, and has recently shared the lessons learned with an ARC to provide recommendations to the FAA on BVLOS rulemaking. The next step is to assess the ARC recommendations to determine where the Agency can potentially develop rulemaking activities. These efforts will lead to drafting proposed scopes for potential rulemaking(s), coordinating the proposals more broadly, and to the development of the Application for Rulemaking for submission to the RMC.
Historical Data:	N/A

Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	N/A
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	Establishment of normalized safe, scalable, economically viable, and environmentally advantageous UAS BVLOS operations that are not under positive air traffic control (ATC).
Reliability:	Through the natural progression of policymaking, AUS enabled limited BVLOS operations.
Verification & Validation:	Consider the various lessons and insights gained from pilot programs, partnership arrangements, and other activities to inform the FAA on performance-based criteria to enable safe, scalable, economically viable, and environmentally advantageous BVLOS operations in the NAS. Throughout the process, feedback from Congress and the public will also be considered.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	Significant safety, economic, and environmental value associated with BVLOS unmanned aircraft operations.
Partners:	Department of Transportation (DOT), Industry

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Beyond Visual Line of Sight (BVLOS) UAS Policymaking
Performance Goal:	Enable the safe and secure integration of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) into the National Airspace System (NAS) by engaging with the public regarding BVLOS UAS policymaking.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Host two public meetings to socialize the recommendations from the BVLOS Aviation Rulemaking Committee.
Performance Narrative	AUS plans to meet the target by adhering to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, through the Federal Register Notice.
Lead Organization:	FAA, Aviation Safety (AVS), UAS Integration Office (AUS)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Completing the target binary.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	The UAS BVLOS Operations ARC Report will provide recommendations to the FAA for performance-based regulatory requirements to normalize safe, scalable, economically viable, and environmentally advantageous UAS BVLOS operations that are not under positive air-traffic control (ATC).
Method of Setting Target(s):	As defined per the ARC charter, establishes the Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Beyond Visual Line-of-Sight (BVLOS) Operations Aviation Rulemaking Committee (ARC), according to the Administrator's authority under Title 49 of the United States Code (49 U.S.C.§ 106(p)(5)). Also referenced in the FAA AVS 2022 Business Plan as part of the Safety Pillar of the FAA Strategic Plan 2019-2022.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	UAS BVLOS Operations Aviation Rulemaking Committee Report
Statistical Issues:	N/A

Completeness:	This activity will be completed upon the occurrence of the final meeting.
Reliability:	No hindrances of outside factors are foreseen to accomplishing this goal as all meetings are virtual, via Zoom.
Verification & Validation:	The information is credible as it comes directly from the UAS BVLOS Operations ARC Report which per the charter establishes the Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Beyond Visual Line-of-Sight (BVLOS) Operations Aviation Rulemaking Committee (ARC) Charter under the FAA Administrator authority under Title 49 of the *United States Code* (49 U.S.C.§ 106(p)(5)). Sources: UAS BVLOS Operations Charter: https://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/rulemaking/committees/documents/index.cfm/document/information/documentID/5023/ FACA guidance: https://www.gsa.gov/policy-regulations/policy/federal-advisory-committee-act-faca-management-overview
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	This will be the first opportunity outside the ARC where the public will be able to review and provide comments, if it wishes to do so, to the FAA to consider in the future process of rulemaking which affects communities in the United States of America.
Partners:	N/A

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	ICAO Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) Target--U.S. National Aviation Safety Plan (NASP)
Performance Goal:	Publish the U.S. NASP.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Coordinate the first draft of U.S. NASP content with stakeholders and publish on FAA.gov or other agreed-upon web location.
Performance Narrative	AQS-600 will collaborate with FAA and U.S. Government stakeholders to coordinate, finalize, and publicly release (via FAA.gov) the first U.S. NASP to achieve a target in the International Civil Aviation Organization's (ICAO) Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP).
Lead Organization:	AQS-600
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Estimated percentage toward completion of one (1) U.S. NASP document, including publication on FAA.gov
Computation:	Percentage toward completion using milestones associated with finishing the project NLT September 30, 2022.
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	The annual target was established to ensure the United States achieves an international target promulgated by ICAO in the GASP, in alignment with the timing of the 41st ICAO Assembly in September-October 2022. The purpose of the GASP is to continually reduce fatalities, and the risk of fatalities, by guiding the development of a harmonized aviation safety strategy, regional aviation safety plans, and national aviation safety plans. To meet this objective, the United States should produce a U.S. NASP. The target includes coordination, finalization, and publication of this document.
Method of Setting Target(s):	The metric reflects a linear progression toward 100% completion of a U.S. NASP.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	The data will come from AQS-600, who is leading the development of the U.S. NASP.
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	Publishing of the U.S. NASP on FAA.gov or other agreed-upon web location.

Reliability:	The U.S. NASP is a joint FAA-U.S. Government undertaking. Delays in coordination and approval of the U.S. NASP content by AOC and organizations outside of the FAA/AVS could delay completion beyond the target date of September 2022. Such delay is not anticipated to jeopardize meeting the GASP target, which calls for States to produce a NASP by 2024. However, the United States would lose the opportunity to highlight or promote the U.S. NASP in conjunction with the 41st ICAO Assembly.
Verification & Validation:	Measurements are considered preliminary, based on completion of milestones against a projected timeline. The FAA uses performance data extensively for program management, personnel evaluation, and accountability. AQS-600 is leading, coordinating, and participating in the development of the U.S. NASP and is well positioned to evaluate progress. Ultimately, completion of the annual target will be reliably determined by the presence or lack of a U.S. NASP on FAA.gov as of October 1, 2022, which can be easily verified.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	As public and legislative attention to aviation safety performance has increased, this metric will sharpen FAA focus on helping to make information accessible to the public and promoting U.S. leadership in championing and meeting ICAO GASP goals.
Partners:	FS, AVP, AUS, AOV, AIR, AAM, API, AOC, DOT/OST, NTSB, NASA, NOAA, DHS (including TSA and USCG), DoD, GSA

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Develop a Global Safety Information Management Platform
Performance Goal:	Plan for the implementation of a global safety information management platform. This activity has a due date of September 30, 2022.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	• Identify existing platforms and available data. • Determine what additional data is required or what gaps exist in the baseline environments and platforms. • Evaluate cost and feasibility of future platform options. • Finalize plan for building consensus.
Performance Narrative	The purpose of this initiative is to develop a global safety information management platform that will be leveraged for global safety analysis and will include multiple international partner data.
Lead Organization:	API – International Affairs
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Successful completion of the four FY22 Performance Targets.
Computation:	Not Applicable.
Formula:	Not Applicable.
Scope:	Not Applicable.
Method of Setting Target(s):	Not Applicable.
Historical Data:	Not Applicable
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	Data for the platform will be sourced from the FAA as well as global stakeholders of the aviation community.
Statistical Issues:	Not applicable.
Completeness:	A significant component of the overall effort is an engagement strategy. The more participation that is achieved, the more complete the information on the platform will be. To encourage broad participation by FAA and international stakeholders, use cases have been proposed by the Management Board for consideration. Successful demonstration of these use cases through FAA-

	International tabletop exercises will foster participation and collaboration in the FY22 Business Plan (BP) Performance Targets.
Reliability:	By capitalizing on the subject matter expertise of the FAA's Flight Plan 21 team, other FAA resources, and existing relationships with global stakeholders, the FP21 team will ensure reliable completion of the four FY22 Performance Targets and, ultimately, a finalized plan for building consensus.
Verification & Validation:	• Data Discovery • Governance Plan • Engagement Strategy • Platform Identification/Development • Platform Use
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	Sharing of relevant safety information with the global community will ultimately improve safety worldwide, benefiting the traveling public.
Partners:	The FAA and global stakeholders of the aviation community.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Utilize Predictive Data Analytics to Proactively Identify and Take Action to Reduce Emerging Safety Risk
Performance Goal:	Define an enterprise-level process for determining and re-evaluating safety measures for a 21st-century NAS. This activity has a due date of September 30, 2022.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Develop a process for identifying and evolving enterprise-level safety measures. This will be achieved by baselining and cataloging existing FAA safety measures.
Performance Narrative	This activity will define a transparent and repeatable process to determine enterprise-level safety measures using a holistic approach that considers potential risks and hazards. This process will also include mechanisms to ensure safety measures continue to evolve as risk evolves, especially as emerging entrants operate more frequently within the NAS. Furthermore, use cases for predictive analytics will be better defined by associating potential use cases with defined safety measures.
Lead Organization:	AVS – Office of Accident Investigation & Prevention (AVP) is currently the Interim Lead Organization.
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Upon completion of the FY22 Performance Target, a Technical Report will be produced that provides a recommended process for nominating and documenting enterprise-level safety metrics and measures within the NAS.
Computation:	Not Applicable.
Formula:	Not Applicable.
Scope:	Not Applicable.
Method of Setting Target(s):	Not Applicable.

Historical Data:	Not Applicable.
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	Sources include, but are not limited to, FAA stakeholders from the FAA Safety Community of Interest, as well as other Line of Business, Staff Office, and FAA affiliate subject matter experts.
Statistical Issues:	Not applicable.
Completeness:	The completed Technical Report will provide a knowledge management inventory and assessment of known safety performance measures generated and reported throughout the FAA.
Reliability:	An assessment will be conducted by experts across the Safety Data Community of Interest (COI) to understand what system-level safety performance measures exist in the FAA. The current state of capturing and addressing safety performance in the NAS will be evaluated for reliability. Shared knowledge and recommendations will be documented.
Verification & Validation:	• Create a process to identify and evolve the agency's safety measures. • The agility to modify safety measures will increase the likelihood that the FAA will identify and mitigate critical areas of risk.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The FAA will improve its safety intelligence by embracing a systemic approach and holistic view for measuring safety performance. The improved safety intelligence will ultimately benefit the traveling public.
Partners:	The FAA and its aviation safety stakeholder communities.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Certification & Safety Oversight Reform
Performance Goal:	The FAA will implement a majority of provisions in the Aircraft Certification, Safety, and Accountability Act (ACSAA) with due dates on or before the end of the fiscal year.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Implement a majority of provisions in ACSAA that have a due date of on or before 09/30/2022.
Performance Narrative	The FAA is committed to thorough and complete implementation of ACSAA and addressing recommendations from recent investigations and independent reviews. Progress is monitored through quarterly reviews with FAA leadership, OST and Congressional staff.
Lead Organization:	AVS-6
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Individual provisions of the Aircraft Safety, Certification and Accountability Act.
Computation:	Implemented provisions with a due date on or before 09/30/2022 divided by total provisions with a due date on or before 09/30/2022.
Formula:	Implemented provisions with a due date on or before 09/30/2022 / total provisions with a due date on or before 09/30/2022.
Scope:	The performance measure includes efforts to address requirements of ACSAA across AVS.
Method of Setting Target(s):	With over 100 unique legislative requirements, the agency's implementation of ACSAA is a large and complex undertaking. The target is an achievable goal.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	Quarterly updates provided to AOA-1, OST, and Congressional staff that are based on input provided by the OPRs for the various provisions.
Statistical Issues:	We do not anticipate any statistical issues with the data.
Completeness:	We have high confidence in the completeness of the data.
Reliability:	We have high confidence in the reliability of the data.
Verification & Validation:	The information is generated by the various Services and Offices within AVS, reviewed by a tiger team spearheading AVS's efforts

	related to certification & safety oversight reform, and then signed-off on by AVS senior leadership.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	In addition to being a Congressional mandate, this performance measure demonstrates the FAA's commitment to pursuing comprehensive and meaningful certification & safety oversight reform. The agency remains committed to improving the certification process, including our oversight of functions delegated to aircraft designers and manufacturers.
Partners:	The FAA engages with and works closely with various external stakeholders, including OST, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA), international aviation authorities and more, to implement provisions under ACSAA.

People Pillar Profiles

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Performance Measure Information</th></tr>
<tr><td>Performance Measure:</td><td>Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Scorecard</td></tr>
<tr><td>Performance Goal:</td><td>On behalf of FAA, the Office of Civil Rights (ACR) will establish a DEIA Scorecard relevant to recruiting, retaining, development and promotion of traditionally underrepresented groups.</td></tr>
<tr><td>FY22 Performance Target(s):</td><td>Target 1: ACR will develop, distribute and implement scorecard template and metrics. Due April 30, 2022

Target 2: LOB/SOs will submit the initial scorecard report covering the first two quarters of FY22 to ACR for review. Due April 30, 2022

Target 3: The heads of each line of business/staff office (LOB/SO) will report and discuss their results at a Management Board meeting, LOB/SO heads will be expected to discuss plans on addressing deficiencies that may exist. Due May 31, 2022

Target 4: LOB/SOs will submit their 3rd quarter scorecard to ACR for review. Due July 31, 2022

Target 5: The heads of each LOB/SO will report and discuss their results at a Management Board meeting, LOB/SO heads will be expected to discuss plans on addressing deficiencies that may exist. Due August 31, 2022</td></tr>
<tr><td>Performance Narrative</td><td>ACR will develop a DEIA scorecard and train LOB/SO representatives on how to complete the form. The heads of each LOB/SO will be required to discuss results, including deficiencies and plans of action to address those deficiencies.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Lead Organization:</td><td>ACR</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">Definition of Metric</th></tr>
<tr><td>Metric Unit:</td><td>The benchmarks for the race, national origin, gender, disability, and veteran groups below include the Civilian Labor Force (CLF), the permanent workforce, and the relevant feeder-pools. The chart below provides the identifying benchmarks for each of the workforce snapshots. A brief discussion of each workforce snapshot follows the chart.
<table>
<tr><th>INITIATIVES</th><th>WORKFORCE SNAPSHOT</th><th>TYPICAL BENCHMARK</th></tr>
<tr><td>Employment</td><td>Total Workforce</td><td>National Civilian Labor Force/Section 501 Goals</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

	Recruitment	Qualified External Applicants	Voluntary External Applicants
	Recruitment	New Hires	Qualified External Applicants
	Career Development	Selections	Applicant Pool
	Promotion	Selections	Qualified Internal Applicants
	DEIA Training	Current Quarter	Previous Quarter

Computation:

Employment: LOB/SO should compare their total workforce (including permanent and temporary employees) to the demographic group's availability in the national CLF/Section 501 Goal.

Recruitment: As to the applicant flow data, LOB/SO should evaluate the effectiveness of their recruitment and selection processes for each demographic group using the external new hires. The comparator for the qualified external applicants is the applicants and for external selections, the LOB/SO should use the respective qualified applicant pool as the comparator.

Career Development: As to the career development opportunities, the comparators are the applicant pool for selectees. Monitor the selections with lower than expected participation rates in the Career Development Programs. LOB/SO will populate their total career development programs from their master list to determine performance improvement needs.

Promotion: LOB/SO should evaluate their promotion opportunities. The comparator for the internal selections is the respective qualified applicant pool. LOB/SO should address the disparities by each pay grade group, Supervisors/First-Level (Equivalent Grades 12 and Below), Managers/Mid-Level (Equivalent Grades 13-14), Executive/Senior Level (Equivalent Grades 15 and Above).

DEIA Employee Training: LOB/SO should encourage their managers and employees to participate in DEIA training throughout the fiscal year. Employees are encouraged to participate in at least one approved DEIA related training each year.

Formula:

Measure Rating:

Green = Met or Exceeded Benchmark
Yellow = Below benchmark by 0.01-1.99%
Red = Below benchmark by 2.00% or more

	If your current number meets or exceeds the benchmark, you are green. If your current number is below the benchmark by .01-1.99% you are yellow. If your current number is below the benchmark by 2% or more, you are red. Measure provides an analysis for each race, national origin, gender, disability, and veteran groups to identify issues, respectively. **Review recommendation:** Evaluate the recommendations to address the potential issues in areas where they may be a need to facilitate an inclusive work environment.
Scope:	The DEIA Scorecard is utilized to report on employment, recruitment, career development, promotion, and DEIA training data to identify underrepresented groups. All LOB/SOs must complete and submit a scorecard to ACR quarterly. The scorecard provides the agency with a tool to analyze the progress of its DEIA initiatives, which is a reflection of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) Management Directive 715 (MD-715) program.
Method of Setting Target(s):	National Civilian Labor Force (CLF) – Each LOB/SO should compare their total workforce (including permanent, temporary, and non-appropriated fund employees) to the EEO group's availability in the National CLF. The NCLF percentage for each EEO group reflects people 16 years of age and older, employed, or actively seeking employment, but not serving in the military or institutionalized. Section 501 Goals - The term Section 501 refers to section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. 791). In 29 C.F.R. § 1614.230(d)(7), EEOC has established Federal goals for persons with reportable disabilities and targeted disabilities: (1) 12% for persons with reportable disabilities; and (2) 2% for persons with targeted disabilities.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	U.S. Census, Federal Personnel Payroll System (FPPS), FAA's Online Job Application System (AVIATOR), and FAA's e-Learning Management System (eLMS)
Statistical Issues:	FAA does not have a centralized data collection system that is accessible to LOB/SOs.

Completeness:	The creation of the scorecard involves the collaborative effort of all LOB/SOs in support of the DEIA programs. The scorecard ensures the reporting progress in establishing and maintaining continuous programs of equal employment opportunity for underrepresented groups.
Reliability:	The reliability of this metric will be based on the completion of the EEOC MD-715 yearly report.
Verification & Validation:	The MD-715 was issued by the EEOC on October 1, 2003. MD-715 contains policy guidelines and standards for establishing and maintaining effective affirmative employment programs. It requires agencies to take appropriate steps to ensure that policies, practices, and procedures are conducted in a discrimination free manner for employees and applicants. The MD-715 calls for periodic agency self-assessments and the identification and elimination of barriers that prevent equal employment opportunities in the workplace. Additionally, the MD-715 requires Federal agencies to work toward meeting the six essential elements of a model EEO program.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The Scorecard will provide a snapshot of how the agency is performing as it relates to diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility measures for all LOB/SOs. This ensures that the agency is adequately employing and representing the best interest of the public.
Partners:	ACR will work with all LOB/SO to achieve this metric.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	DEIA Gender-Inclusive Policy Development
Performance Goal:	To ensure a diverse, equitable, and inclusive environment, adopt a gender-neutral language policy to be implemented across the agency.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Conduct research to identify gender-specific terminology used in FAA policies and programs. Identify alternate terms to be used that align with diverse, equitable, and inclusive practices. Due November 30, 2021 **Target 2:** Host a national symposium with internal and external stakeholders to socialize effort on the use of gender-neutral language at FAA. Due January 30, 2022 **Target 3:** Obtain AOA approval of policy statement and begin facilitation and development in support of the draft order. Due May 31, 2022 **Target 4:** Working in collaboration with all LOB/SOs, refine draft order to utilize gender-neutral language references as appropriate in agency documents. Due September 30, 2022
Performance Narrative	To lead the aerospace industry into the next century, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must actively promote diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility (DEIA) values. The words and language that we use in communications, both internally and with external stakeholders, must match this objective. The FAA has zero tolerance for discrimination in the workplace. The use of gender-inclusive language will continue to expand a workplace environment based on equality. As we work to hire the next generation of talent into the agency and encourage the next generation to join the aviation community, we must ensure we create a foundation for a successful future. The Office of Aviation Policy and Plans (APO) has developed a plan of action for accomplishing the project this performance goal is associated with. APO will meet the targets primarily through coordination of meetings and document preparation. The first target is background research which will be completed by staff. A working group of contacts from across the agency has been assembled to provide the expertise and direction related to the other targets. The second target, hosting a national symposium, will provide an opportunity to discuss the issues of inclusivity with a broad audience and receive input. The final two targets, preparation of a policy

	statement and preparation of an Order, will include document preparation and refinement. The majority of work is expected to be conducted via email, video conferencing, and document review. As of February 2022, we have carried out a successful campaign of background research. A number of industry partners have recognized this as an important issue and provided input. FAA developed foundational documents, including a policy statement that confirms the objectives. The statement was signed by the Administrator and Deputy Administrator in October 2021. The symposium was held on November 5, 2021. The program included three panels: • Experts from other industries that have dealt with inclusive language issues, • Experts from the aviation industry who have dealt with inclusive language issues, and • Staff from within FAA discussing why this is such an important topic for our agency. This performance measure requires a culture change from all corners of the agency, and change is not easily implemented overnight. The working group is using the discussion and input from the symposium to begin to craft an Order. That document will direct lines of business to review and update their programs to align with the spirit of the Administrator's policy statement. This dynamic process is still being carried out, and includes points of contact from across the agency. The outcome is likely to include the Order, and an associated guidance document. An outreach plan is in development to brief offices on the goals of this effort and how they can prepare to make changes.
Lead Organization:	Policy, International Affairs, and Environment (APL)/Office of Civil Rights (ACR)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	This performance measure is an element of the broader DEIA efforts across the Department. The aerospace field has developed over 100 years, however, many of the terms and processes originate from a past era. The FAA must evolve with industry to keep the sector safe and vibrant.

	The scope of this performance measure is to foster an inclusive environment that eliminates bias and promotes a welcoming environment for all. The underlying principle of adopting inclusive language is equality. As such, this performance measure is subjective. It will be difficult to say the ideal of equality has been 100% achieved. However, updating the language used in our statutory authority, rules and regulations, programs, policies, procedures, practices, orders, and daily interactions is a critical step toward making equity a reality within the FAA and aviation industry.
Method of Setting Target(s):	APO is the agency's policy office, and this effort is focused around rolling out a new policy. The methods for implementing a new policy can take many forms. APO developed a draft plan of four targets (stated above) to implement agency policy on inclusive language. This process is not fixed, and the team remains flexible and adaptable.
Historical Data:	These targets were established in FY22; therefore, no historical data is available.
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	The process of completing the performance measure has included review of other related efforts and their documentation. For example, the American Psychological Association has issued inclusive language guidelines focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion. The European Union and NATO have issued guidance on gender-neutral language, and NASA has issued guidelines on how to manage gender transition in the workplace. These will all be used to shape the FAA process. Additionally, the best source for this effort comes from the diversity of people participating on the working group. The working group includes about 30 staff from various offices who bring a wealth of experience and perspective to this effort, and will help ensure we consider a broad range of issues, and do so in a fair and equitable way.
Statistical Issues:	Performance measure reflects a qualitative improvement in agency correspondence and communications. No statistics are involved.
Completeness:	As stated above, there is no perfect answer to whether the actions described here will achieve the overarching objective of inclusivity. However, it is important the FAA demonstrate its commitment to DEIA and creating a work environment that is welcoming and free of bias. Completion of the target action will go a long way towards demonstrating the agency's commitment. A successful outcome from the working group, including completion of the policy documents, will be taken as successful application of the goal.

Reliability:	This is a policy action that will be completed 'in house,' requires no budget, and is not dependent on factors outside of FAA's control. This performance measure will be completed on time. The working group will decide the extent of oversight and controls necessary in the policy to effect a heightened level of inclusivity and gender-neutral language across FAA.
Verification & Validation:	This performance measure primarily deals with the workforce environment of the FAA. There are no direct implications for aviation operations or public safety. The goal of the policy is to create a workplace free of bias and welcoming to all which, by extension, should lead to better performance of FAA in carrying out its mission.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	This performance measure is designed to improve the work environment of the FAA. The agency will be better suited to serve the public interest, and better positioned to attract talent and grow with the rapidly evolving aerospace industry.
Partners:	APO has partnered with the Office of Civil Rights to work across all lines of businesses and staff offices to effect policy and implement culture change. The symposium audience included representatives from the following external organizations: NASA, US Secret Service, FDNY, DoD, United Airlines, and Los Angeles World Airways. The changes proposed in this performance measure are internal to the agency; there are no essential external stakeholders.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Hiring Persons with Disabilities (PWD)/Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD)
Performance Goal:	The Office of Civil Rights (ACR) will lead collaboration between all lines of Business/staff offices (LOB/SO) to increase the representation of PWD/PWTD in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) workforce by 1% for FY22. For FY22, the goals will be 15% for PWD and 1% for PWTD.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Each LOB/SO will increase PWD/PWTD awareness and accountability by issuing a memorandum directing their managers to promote the PWD/PWTD by April 30, 2022. **Target 2:** In collaboration with all LOB/SOs, ACR will ensure that 75% of FAA managers with hiring authority participate in information sessions scheduled throughout the rest of the fiscal year by ACR's National People with Disabilities Program Manager to establish hiring initiatives. Due August 31, 2022 **Target 3:** Each LOB/SO will report their progress towards the PWD/PWTD goal during the bi-monthly Equity and Accessibility (EAC) meetings. Due August 31, 2022
Performance Narrative	The Federal Government shall be a model employer of individuals with disabilities. Pursuant to Title 29 United States Code (U.S.C.) Section 791, each agency shall adopt and implement a plan that provides sufficient assurances, procedures, and commitments to provide adequate hiring, placement, and advancement opportunities for people with disabilities at all levels of Federal employment. The FAA will take specific steps to gradually increase the number of persons with disabilities and targeted disabilities employed at the agency until it meets the goals established pursuant to 29 U.S.C 791, which is 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD at each grade level.
Lead Organization:	ACR
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Total percentage of PWD and PWTD employees employed in each LOB/SO at the FAA for FY22.
Computation:	**PWD:** The metric will be calculated by taking the total number of employees in each LOB/SO who have self-identified as having a disability and divide that number by the total number of employees for the LOB/SO. **PWTD:** The metric will be calculated by taking the total number of employees in each LOB/SO who have self-identified as having a targeted

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>disability and divide that number by the total number of employees for the LOB/SO.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Formula:</td><td>PWD: Total PWD Employees per LOB/SO
Total Employees per LOB/SO

PWTD: Total PWTD Employees per LOB/SO
Total Employees per LOB/SO</td></tr>
<tr><td>Scope:</td><td>This metric will only measure employees who have self-identified their disability on Standard Form 256 - Self Identification of Disability (SF-256) or through their Employee Express profile. The self-identification of disability reporting process is entirely voluntary, with the exception of employees appointed under the Schedule A Excepted Appointing Authority for People with Intellectual Disability, Severe Physical Disability, or Psychiatric Disability (5 CFR 213.3102(u)) or the FAA's On-the-Spot Hiring Authority for People with Disabilities. Agencies will request that these employees identify their disability status and, if they decline to do so, their correct disability code will be obtained from medical documentation used to support their appointment.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Method of Setting Target(s):</td><td>The targets of PWD and PWTD were selected based on the requirements from Section 501 from the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended for agencies to have specific representation goals for PWD and PWTD at each grade level.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Historical Data:</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></tr>
<tr><td>PWD</td><td>13%</td><td>13%</td><td>14%</td><td>15 %</td></tr>
<tr><td>PWTD</td><td>0.66%</td><td>0.67%</td><td>1%</td><td>1 %</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Data Completeness and Reliability</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source(s):</td><td>The data comes from the Federal Personnel Payroll System (FPPS) which is maintained by the Office of Human Resource Management. The data is compiled through the completion of the SF–256 or updating Employee Express profile.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Statistical Issues:</td><td>The completion of the SF-256 form by newly hired employees and the accuracy of entering the appropriate codes into FPPS is paramount to the statistical data that will be collected. Individuals may choose not to identify their disability or may select the wrong disability code based on their personal opinion about the severity of their disability. Also, New Employee</td></tr>
</table>

	Orientation takes place every two weeks so it may take a couple of weeks to be entered into FPPS by the HR specialist this will cause some lag time in the reporting.
Completeness:	ACR completes the annual Management Directive 715 (MD-715) report for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). The MD-715 calls for periodic agency self-assessments and the identification and elimination of barriers that prevent equal employment opportunities in the workplace. The hiring of PWDs and PWTDs is measured in the MD-715 report. The report will be completed and submitted to the EEOC during the second quarter of each fiscal year.
Reliability:	The reliability of this metric will be based on the completion of the SF-256 form and the accuracy of the reporting process.
Verification & Validation:	Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 791, Agency's Affirmative Action Plans require the FAA to perform a workforce analysis annually to determine the percentage of its employees at each grade level who have disabilities, and the percentage of its employees at each grade level who have targeted disabilities. ACR will collect and review FPPS reports on a monthly basis to verify current PWD and PWTD workforce representation at each grade level. In order to ensure validity of the workforce data, AHR will continue to provide guidance to FAA employees and new hires on completing the SF-256 form to accurately self-identify their disability. In coordination with the Department of Transportation (DOT), the FAA will continue to conduct annual campaigns encouraging DOT employees to update their disability status and provide instructions on how to update their disability status appropriately through Employee Express.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	This effort will benefit the public by increasing our hiring efforts of people with disabilities who currently have an unemployment rate of 9.1% as compared to people without disabilities who have an unemployment rate of 4.2%.
Partners:	State Vocational Rehabilitation agencies, college/university disability and career service centers, and the Workforce Recruitment Program.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Contracting with Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB)
Performance Goal:	To maximize inclusion of SDB in FAA contract opportunities.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Ensure at least 12% of the Agency's total direct procurement dollars are awarded to SDB.
Performance Narrative	Utilize market analysis and acquisition strategies to provide opportunities for small businesses to compete for, and attain FAA contracts and purchase orders, with special emphasis on procurement opportunities for socially and economically disadvantaged small businesses (including 8(a) certified firms), service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses, and women-owned small businesses.
Lead Organization:	Office of Finance and Management (AFN)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Percentage of total direct procurement dollars obligated to SDB.
Computation:	Total direct procurement dollars obligated to SDB over total direct procurement dollars obligated.
Formula:	$\frac{\text{(Total Direct Procurement Dollars to SDB)}}{\text{(Total Direct Procurement Dollars)}} \times 100$
Scope:	The scope of this measure includes FAA's percentage of direct procurement dollars towards SDB concerns, as defined by the FAA Acquisition Management System (AMS) and the Small Business Administration (SBA). This percentage is reported to the Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and publicly available through the System of Award Management (SAM).
Method of Setting Target(s):	The annual goals for the percentage of direct procurement dollars to SDB concerns are established by FAA in collaboration with DOT and SBA, based on targets established by the President and Congress.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	The System for Award Management (SAM)
Statistical Issues:	Data is based on direct procurement awards by Contracting Officers (CO) within FAA's Procurement Request Information System **(**PRISM)

	and business size standards as defined by the AMS and SBA. No sampling errors are anticipated.
Completeness:	FAA reviews and reports data related to SDB direct procurement dollars on a monthly basis, ensuring there is no data missing and that progress is consistent with established targets and goals.
Reliability:	The data from SAM used to report direct procurement dollars to SDB concerns is reliable and has a high confidence rate. At the time of an award in PRISM, data is directly shared with the Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS) reflecting elements such as obligation amount, vendor name and business size. When FAA and others generate required reports in SAM, it pulls award information directly from FPDS ensuring data and processes are consistent, reliable and repeatable.
Verification & Validation:	In addition to monthly reporting and validation of award information by the FAA Small Business Office (SBO), FAA's National Acquisition Evaluation Program (NAEP) performs annual reviews of awards and associated data to ensure award information in the official contract file and systems of record are consistent, accurate and reportable.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	Targets for direct procurement dollars to SDB concerns are established by the President and Congress, to promote equity within Government acquisition, and to provide greater access to procurement opportunities for minority communities.
Partners:	DOT, SBA, and OMB

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Operationalize Flexible Workplace Arrangements (FWA)
Performance Goal:	Program execution and management of the provisions of the Flexible Workplace Arrangements policies
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Develop short-term return to the worksite guidance. Due September 30, 2022 **Target 2:** Validate flexible work arrangement eligibility based on nature of work. Due September 30, 2022 **Target 3:** Develop remote/telework office protocol guidance. Due September 30, 2022
Performance Narrative	The pandemic has resulted in new employee expectations. This new mindset cannot be disregarded or undone if the FAA is to be successful in attracting and retaining talent. Individuals are making choices about where they want to live based on new expectations towards flexibility, working conditions, and work-life balance. Effectively,
Lead Organization:	FAA's Human Resources Worklife Division (AHB-100)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	The workplace of the future exists across the home, office, and satellite offices as technology has enabled employees to be "virtual ready." This shift in mindset has prompted a reexamination of how the agency can leverage existing tools and technology, best use in-person engagement, and make thoughtful decisions about physical space needs. To begin this review, the agency will convene employees, across Headquarters and field facilities, management and labor, to build off previous Workforce Evolution efforts to plot out a roadmap for the post-pandemic workplace. As this discussion progresses into detail-oriented subgroups, conversations should endeavor to cover the following:

- Various tools that enable remote employees to function effectively, such as Zoom and Microsoft Teams,
- Issues that may limit the productivity and efficiency of remote employees (and how they should be addressed),
- Which job functions should be eligible for what degree of telework,
- Additional tools for managing remote employees, and
- Whether updated parameters are needed across the agency.

The goal should be functional and flexible options for employees, but the agency must address head on that there are differing expectations of what this means in a post-pandemic environment.

A related topic that supports the discussion around the future of telework and in-person engagement is the development of a plan that considers what physical space, technical support, and communication technologies the agency needs to achieve sustainable, effective flexibility. This is not exclusively an effort to reduce the physical space footprint, though efficiencies are possible, rather this is a question of how to create flexible workspace and tools that reflect the different lives and workstyles of a diverse population with a variety of organizational needs. Resolving how that space is used is key to determining what exists within the walls of any space. AHB-100 will be looking at whether employees are expected to continue working in an individual cubicle each day [if time spent physically in the office will be focused on team building, training, relationship building, and collaboration] to determine how that space needs to function. Until intentional, strategic decisions about space are made, the agency should not sign any new long-term leases. This intentionally does not address any potential post-pandemic recommendations from the medical or scientific community about optimal space configuration or measures that unions may seek as employees return to the workplace, though certainly those would be critical considerations for any physical space changes.

As the agency considers its evolving space needs, a discussion should be had around how to effectively and realistically prioritize sustainability. A strategic sustainability policy will cover far more than just physical space, but it can be a critical component of both building design and transit-oriented locations (where appropriate). Sustain-ability is important in its own right, but it is also a core value for certain generational groups and can aid in attracting talent. Choosing the lease space that is transit-accessible attracts a wider pool of

	applicants, serves sustainability goals, and helps FAA as a future workforce interest. The FAA should acknowledge that there will be significant differences in how various LOB/SOs leverage a hybrid workplace, but this cannot be an excuse for thinking small. Decisions should be guided by how to achieve options that enable competent professionals to execute their jobs in a variety of ways. In an era of extreme commuting, elder care responsibilities, dual-income families, and many other daily life stressors, become factors; and supporting our employees means providing options that alleviate unnecessary burdens. The pandemic has underscored that much of work can happen remotely, functionally returning hours each week to employees who have spent years commuting. Not all jobs can be handled remotely, but the eligibility of a job series for flexibility should be led by job requirements, not differing work philosophies of individual LOB/SO leadership. Strong, centralized guidance to promote flexibility will set the tone and enable managers to provide flexibility to employees capable of working remotely. Any changes for employees must be paired with corresponding evolution in our management culture and collaborative tools. We must drive engagement, achieve organizational agility, maintain alignment, and foster teamwork across all disciplines and locations. As we consider how to leverage existing trends and pandemic lessons, the agency should be deliberate and ambitious in the effort to support and empower employees with a 21st century work environment and culture.
Method of Setting Target(s):	The post-pandemic workplace will be a blend of virtual and on-premise work. The key for the FAA is achieving a balance that embraces technology, while recognizing its limitations and understanding the value of intentional in-person connections. Based on macro-trends accelerated by the pandemic, virtual engagement may comprise two-thirds of interactions. This shift was evident pre-pandemic in workplace evolution elements such as improved technology and remote data-access, telework, and flexible workspaces, with lines of business/staff offices (LOB/SO) embracing the change to varying degrees. A culture built around proactively, collectively managing towards the realities and expectations of the future will best serve the agency and the workforce.
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	AHB-100 did a managers telework survey in December 2020. 6,735 surveys were sent directly to managers and executives via

	Govdelivery. Of that, 2,432 employees responded (response rate of 36%). The results indicated that managers' views of telework had changed, and there was an overall more positive impression. They reported better work life balance. They also reported that prolonged telework has had a positive impact on their LOB's mission efficacy. In addition, they reported that updated technology was needed to be more successful, but 51% reported that their managements' preferences needed to change, meaning that they didn't necessarily want to go back to the way things were. As a result of this survey, the Future of Work (FOW) team was created to examine reentry and work with PP on reimagine. As a part of FOW, the Office of Human Resources (AHR) was able to acquire contractors to conduct research across the agency with regard to the workplace preferences/changes given the enhanced telework due to the pandemic.
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	While this cannot be measured immediately, long-term success indicators include lower employee turnover rates; a shift in traditional office/cubical footprint to greater development and use of collaboration areas; increased use of VPN based on a pre-pandemic baseline; and higher FedView survey scores that reflect employee job satisfaction. Thus far, AHB-100 has made progress towards the completion of this goal as follows: **Target 1:** An interim plan for reentry has been drafted based on AHB-100's realization that the FWA policies would likely not be in place when reentry began, nor would a system be in place. AHB-100 developed guidance based on the agency's current telework policy. **Target 2:** A draft Standard of Operations (SOP) for remote work and an incorporated process which will validate eligibility for flexible work arrangements have been created. AHB-100 will validate eligibility for flexible work arrangements by reviewing both employee and managerial submissions. **Target 3:** Office of Personnel Management (OPM) remote/telework office protocol guidance has been shared with the workforce through the FAA Broadcast. The information will be housed on the FAA webpage.
Reliability:	N/A

Verification & Validation:	This performance measure primarily deals with the workplace flexibility of the FAA. There are no direct implications for aviation operations or public safety. The goal of the policy is to meet the expectations of flexibility of the workforce of the future.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	In order to attract and retain high quality talent, the FAA must meet the expectations of flexibility of the workforce of the future. Moreover, the FAA must use this flexibility to take advantage of that employee talent and expertise, wherever it resides. Understanding that flexible work eligibility and remote work are here to stay, the FAA must remain competitive across government and private industry.
Partners:	AHR will be working across all LOB/SOs to execute these new policies in coordination with its flexible work arrangements coordinators.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	FAA's Adopt-A-School Program
Performance Goal:	This measure launches FAA's national Adopt-A-School program to introduce students to aerospace concepts and careers. The Office of National Engagement and Regional Administration (ARA) will support the FAA Science, Technology, Education and Math/Aviation and Science Education (STEM/AVSED) Program by encouraging and enabling employees to participate, as STEM AVSED Outreach Representatives, in the Adopt-a-School Program, by establishing and providing standardized lesson plans for 100% of the schools in the program.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Ensure all regions have at least one school participate in the program in FY22. Due June 30, 2022 **Target 2:** Ensure all participating schools have high levels of underrepresented or underserved populations as outlined in the Adopt-A-School selection criteria. Due June 30, 2022 **Target 3:** Conduct educator surveys to solicit program feedback and to inform program enhancements. Due June 30, 2022 **Target 4:** Provide a final report to Senior ARA Leadership. Due September 30, 2022
Performance Narrative	ARA will identify schools eligible to participate in the program based on demographic data of school populations from the National Center of Education Statistics database. Once participating schools are identified that meet the established diversity criteria, ARA will ensure those schools are delivered standardized lessons plans to provide students with an awareness and exposure to aerospace concepts, with hopes of sparking interest in aviation-related careers. ARA will follow up with the schools by conducting educator surveys to solicit program feedback and inform future program enhancements. Finally, ARA will provide a final report of its findings to ARA Leadership and the STEM AVSED Executive Board to inform next steps.
Lead Organization:	Office of National Engagement and Regional Administration (ARA)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.

Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	FAA's success in implementing the Adopt-a-School program in FY22 will be realized through completion of the associated metrics. As the STEM AVSED program is expanding, it is also evolving to meet the changing needs of students. The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the need to connect with students in a virtual environment. To address the strategic plan goals of reaching a diverse student population and creating a pipeline of future professionals, we developed an Adopt-a-School program. For this program, volunteer employees will receive training and lesson materials, and do presentations in four classrooms in each region on aviation-related topics. In collaboration with subject matter experts, ARA developed 6 lesson plans covering topics on airports, commercial space, pilots, drones, air traffic controllers, and aviation maintenance. The desired outcomes are to have ongoing participation in the Adopt-A-School program from all regions, and to expand FAA's outreach to more schools from underrepresented or underserved populations. Additionally, survey feedback from students and educators will be used to improve program quality and effectiveness over time.
Method of Setting Target(s):	All regions must have at least one school participate in the Adopt-a-School program in FY22. In addition, all participating schools must meet at least one of the following criteria: • Schools will have a majority minority population • Schools will have majority of students in the free or reduced lunch program • Schools are classified as rural by the National Center for Education Statistics These targets were set through discussions with the STEM AVSED Steering Committee and Executive Board, both of which oversee the program.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	All the data used for statistics and definitions are contained within the National Center of Education Statistics database. Data will also be obtained from educator surveys administered upon completion of program.

Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	Measure success by successfully meeting all four targets associated with this measure. Targets 1 and 2 are complete, and Target 3 will be complete when the surveys are sent in April. Target 4 is expected to be completed by September 30 once the final report is briefed to senior ARA Leadership.
Reliability:	No challenges are anticipated. All relevant data on schools is publically available in the National Center for Education Statistics database.
Verification & Validation:	Findings of the evaluation (including stories of success and lessons learned) will be shared with ARA Leadership and FAA's STEM AVSED Executive Board. Findings will also be used to identify policy guidance for how to implement the program for broader implementation in FY23.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	As the STEM AVSED program is expanding, this measure will allow FAA to reach a diverse student population and create a potential pipeline of future professionals in aviation-related careers.
Partners:	ARA will partner with the participating schools in the Adopt-A-School program in order to successfully meet this goal.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	STEM AVSED Equity Accountability
Performance Goal:	Develop methods to ensure that all students, including those in underrepresented and/or underserved populations, have access to events and learning activities aimed at introducing them to aerospace concepts and career pathways.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Define and identify planned FAA organizationally-sponsored outreach that should be targeted for initial equitable outreach assessment. Due November 30, 2021 **Target 2:** Create and begin to implement equity assessment criteria to be used when planning STEM AVSED outreach events. Due January 31, 2022 **Target 3:** Conduct training with FAA staff on how to use equity assessment and ensure initial implementation. Due March 30, 2022 **Target 4:** Identify appropriate IT-platform to house equity assessment, allowing for broader implementation in FY23. Due September 30, 2022 **Target 5:** Provide summary of equity assessment results from FY22 activities to STEM AVSED Executive Board and the Administrator/ Deputy Administrator. Due September 30, 2022
Performance Narrative	The FAA STEM AVSED Steering Committee (SC) has a sub-committee designed specifically to focus on completing this performance goal. The Equity subcommittee has developed a scope and timeline focused on completing each target by the deadlines.
Lead Organization:	Office of National Engagement and Regional Administration (ARA)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	The goal is to create an assessment tool with a list of questions that can be used as a decision-making tool to help FAA determine (from an equity perspective) the best use of resources for STEM AVSED

	outreach at large events. A main emphasis for the tool will be to ensure we provide access for all students when planning those events. This tool will be tested in FY22 for FAA-sponsored STEM AVSED outreach that meets the following criteria: • 500+ students • FAA has participated in the past • Multiple LOBs support • Organizational goals • Target Communities (Diversity Strategies) • Demographics The tool will be used at first by the event planning teams for the AVS Symposium, the International Girls in Aviation Day, FAA ACE camps, and internal and external communication strategy for the STEM AVSED outreach. As other events come to fruition and the tool matures, the subcommittee may choose to utilize the tool for other large outreach activities in FY22. The team will find the best IT-platform to house the tool and provide a summary of results from FY22 activities to the STEM AVSED Executive Board and the Administrator/ Deputy Administrator.
Method of Setting Target(s):	These targets were set through discussions with the STEM AVSED SC and Executive Board (EB) based on agency priorities for equity, and build upon the foundation set in FY21 as described below.
Historical Data	**FY 2021 Performance Targets:** **Target 1:** Identify committed members of the STEM AVSED EB and SC from all FAA organizations involved in STEM AVSED engagement initiatives. **Target 2:** Establish recurring meetings and develop charters for STEM AVSED EB and SC. **Target 3:** Implement oversight procedures for cross-agency STEM AVSED engagement initiatives, to include development of annual agency business plan goals and activities for FY22 and identification of resources to support those goals. All targets were completed successfully. All members from all lines of business and staff offices (LOB/SO) were identified for participation on the EB and SC in support of STEM AVSED. The first EB/SC meeting was held on June 16. The first individual SC meeting was held on June 25. Recurring meetings were conducted in July, August, and September in FY21 for the SC. The EB held its quarterly meetings for FY21 in June

	(Q3) and August (Q4). Charters have been finalized and signed. The STEM AVSED Executive Board approved the proposed corporate goal for FY22 on August 25. This foundational work set the stage for work to be accomplished in the outyears.
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	N/A
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	Successful completion of targets will be measured by looking at final products produced, as well as identifying if the tool was used for each of the identified outreach events. As the team nears completion of each target, it will provide a briefing/presentation to the Steering Committee of its progress and receive feedback to ensure completion. As for the Equity Assessment questions, an internal review was done by ARA and ACR leadership prior to finalizing the target. Lastly, the STEM AVSED Executive Board will receive briefings on all targets and make the final determination as to whether the targets are met.
Reliability:	N/A
Verification & Validation:	Performance information is based upon assessment of internal actions taken. There is minimal risk of any performance information being inaccurate.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The FAA's STEM AVSED program has been in existence for decades but had atrophied in recent years. With the renewed focus on aviation workforce issues and projected shortages in critical professions such as pilots and aviation mechanics, the FAA STEM AVSED Steering Committee and Executive Board are committed to address workforce issues through the STEM AVSED program. The aerospace industry as a whole has traditionally suffered, and continues to suffer from a lack of diversity. Recognizing the value of diversity, one of the four main goals of the FAA's STEM AVSED strategic plan is STEM For Every Student, which aims to "create opportunities for students of all backgrounds to learn about and pursue aerospace careers." Initiatives under that goal include: • Develop methods to identify student populations with demographics which are currently underrepresented in the aerospace industry • Form strategic partnerships with organizations focused on outreach to diverse populations

	• Develop methods to ensure the largest number of students possible have access to aerospace events and learning activities • Increase cultural competency/awareness/literacy within the FAA workforce engaged in STEM outreach The equity assessment tool will help ensure that access is provided for all kids at large events. This aligns with our strategy goal of stem for every student.
Partners:	Internal to the FAA, work is being conducted collaboratively by all LOB/SOs through their representation on the STEM AVSED Steering Committee, where the work is being on conducted by a sub-committee. Additionally, as the sub-committee conducts its work, it is also collaborating with additional subject matter experts across the FAA, including those representing employee associations and special emphasis groups.

Global Leadership Profiles

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	OneFAA Approach to International Training
Performance Goal:	Development of an FAA International Outreach and Training Program Process for ensuring a "OneFAA" approach to international training and outreach.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Develop internal processes and procedures to ensure a "OneFAA" approach to international training and outreach by March 31, 2022.
Performance Narrative	In FY21, the FAA introduced its agency strategic plan, Flight Plan 21, which contains a Global Leadership pillar. A key initiative, Global Outreach and Training (GOaT) was introduced to align all FAA international training efforts and create an enterprise level strategy. One of the GOaT's mandates is to ensure that international training and outreach activities are provided in a consistent manner with a OneFAA approach. To support this objective, the GOaT team is developing an FAA International Outreach and Training Program Process that aligns with the FAA's International Strategy and streamlines international outreach and training program coordination at the enterprise level. This overarching process document will introduce consistency in FAA international program activities by explaining how our work supports the international strategy, identifying enterprise-level procedures and outlining the procedural requirements for development, approval and promulgation. The FAA International Training Program Process will be vetted through the Flight Plan 21 GOaT team and submitted to the International Governance Board (IGB) for consensus. The result of this work will ensure a OneFAA approach to the development of international procedures that align with the FAA's international strategy and provide consistent outreach and training activities to our global partners.
Lead Organization:	Office of International Affairs (API)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	N/A

Formula:	N/A
Scope:	The FAA currently maintains a total training portfolio of over 1,000 FAA courses and workshops that are offered through multiple delivery points, processes and pricing structures. In 2021, a Flight Plan 21 GOaT initiative team, comprised of cross-agency participants, reviewed this portfolio and identified a need for a set of corporate processes and procedures that provide a consistent approach for outreach and training activities. The FAA International Outreach and Training Program Process describes our work, identifies areas that need consistency and outlines the process for introducing new procedures to ensure a OneFAA approach to international outreach and training.
Method of Setting Target(s):	This is a foundational process for establishing a corporate approach to international outreach and training and was selected as an organizational goal in the FAA FY22 Priority Plan.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	N/A
Statistical Issues:	Procedures reflected in the FAA International Outreach and Training Program Process will be limited to those identified during the first phase of work by the Flight Plan 21 GOaT team. In the event additional procedures are identified, the FAA International Outreach and Training Program Process would need to be updated.
Completeness:	FAA International Outreach and Training Program Process developed, vetted, and submitted for consensus by March 31, 2022.
Reliability:	The procedures included in the FAA International Outreach and Training Program Process reflect the extensive research conducted by the GOaT cross-agency team over the course of a full year. While these procedures address the requirements identified, it is anticipated that additional procedures may be required in the future. The FAA International Outreach and Training Program Process provides a framework for future identification and development of new procedures.
Verification & Validation:	API and the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and International Training Office (APT) will monitor progress and verify that FAA International Outreach and Training Program Process is developed, vetted, and submitted for consensus by March 31, 2022.

Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	This measure promotes the efficient use of government resources and promotes safety of international travel by establishing a uniform, consistent standard for FAA outreach and training activities around the globe.
Partners:	API will work with representatives across the agency for input to get this measure achieved.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Revise International Governance Structure
Performance Goal:	Revise international governance structure to improve senior-level agency engagement and involvement on corporate decisions involving the FAA's international programs.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Propose an International Governance structure for Leadership Review. Due January 31, 2022 **Target 2:** Determine membership and leadership of the new structure. Due June 30, 2022 **Target 3:** Draft establishing documents for the governance structure and provide for leadership review. Due September 30, 2022
Performance Narrative	In support of the FAA's Flight Plan 21 strategic plan, the FAA formed a Governance Working Group to develop a proposal for a revised international governance structure. This proposal was briefed to the Administrator and FAA Management Board in December 2021, and FAA Deputies in January 2022; all of whom agreed to the proposal. The agency is currently working on implementation of the proposal which initially details a transition from the International Advisory Board (IAB) to the new International Governance Board (IGB). In January – March 2022, the IGB's chair (API-1) will meet with the relevant lines of business to solidify membership for the new board. Additionally, the Offices of International Affairs (API) and Global Strategy and Mission Support (APX) will coordinate with the Governance Working Group to establish an FAA Order and Charter for the new IGB. To support this effort, the Governance Working Group has created a matrix for decision-making that provides guidance on which decisions will be made at which level/boards under the new structure.
Lead Organization:	Office of International Affairs (API)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A

Scope:	This metric was identified as a priority initiative during the FAA Flight Plan 21 planning process to address the Administrator's need for greater senior-level involvement in international strategic engagement decisions to ensure broader reflection from a corporate perspective. It was noted that at times the agency's decisions on international programs were not made with a corporate focus in mind. This new structure increases collaboration across lines of business and promotes cross-organization cooperation.
Method of Setting Target(s):	The target was selected after a designated working group was created to develop a proposal to address the Administrator's concerns.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	The sources involved in this project include initial input, reports and information from the Flight Plan 21 Global Leadership Focus Group and Governance Working Group.
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	Success of this performance measure will include more direct input from senior leadership (Deputies Board and Management Board) on strategic international engagement decisions, as defined by the Governance Decision-Making Matrix, as well as the frequency of International Governance Board meetings and the number of key decisions made/issues addressed by the group. Limitations could occur in the development of this measurement. If the IGB does not meet as frequently as proposed and/or the required senior level executives do not participate in the meetings, key decisions may not be made as requested by the Administrator.
Reliability:	IGB leadership and its Secretariat will consistently need to monitor the amount of meetings and decisions made by the respective boards involved (IGB, Deputies Board, and Management Board). External factors that could positively or negatively influence the measurement include whether or not senior-level executives actively participate in the meetings and ensure follow through and implementation of key decisions. Additionally, the IGB Secretariat will need to be adequately staffed to ensure implementation of projects and communication from board to board.
Verification & Validation:	With robust staffing, the IGB Secretariat will help ensure success and implementation of projects, as well as communication of information from one board to another (ex., from the IGB to the Deputies Board). As IGB chair, API-1 will help drive success of the projects by ensuring

	IGB members participate in meetings and not delegate to lower level personnel. Target 1, completion of a proposed new governance structure and acceptance by the Management Board, was completed ahead of schedule on December 31, 2021. Target 2 will be completed following API-1's meetings with the relevant lines of business and a specific determination made on membership from each of these respective organizations. Lastly, Target 3 will be completed by the end of the fiscal year when a new draft order has been drafted.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	This initiative supports the agency's goal of increasing and maintaining the FAA's preeminence as a global aviation leader. Ultimately, this benefits the American public by strengthening the FAA's ability to engage international organizations, governments, and industry to consistently improve the safety, efficiency and environmental sustainability of the global aviation system.
Partners:	API will work with the following organizations across the agency to achieve this measure: Governance Working Group, which consists of representatives from API, Aviation Safety (AVS), Flight Standards (AFS), Air Traffic Organization (ATO), Environment and Energy (AEE), Airports (ARP), Commercial Space Transportation (AST), and the Office of National Engagement and Regional Administration (ARA). External stakeholders include the Department of Transportation (especially OST), the Management Advisory Council (to provide input and advice on the FAA's global leadership) and State Department (which will provide guidance on key decisions affecting global aviation policies).

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Develop a Global Safety Information Management Platform
Performance Goal:	Plan for the implementation of a global safety information management platform (GSIMP). Due September 30, 2022
FY22 Performance Target(s):	• Identify existing platforms and available data, • Determine what additional data is required or what gaps exist in the baseline environments and platforms, • Evaluate cost and feasibility of future platform options, and • Finalize plan for building consensus.
Performance Narrative	The purpose of this initiative is to develop a global safety information management platform that will be leveraged for global safety analysis and will include data from multiple international partners.
Lead Organization:	Office of International Affairs (API)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	FAA is planning an engagement strategy to work with key partners around the world and plan for the implementation of a global safety information management platform that shares operational safety data. This effort will help further establish the FAA as a global leader in aviation, allowing for a much greater volume of robust data from international partners that will provide greater insights into safety issues and an overall improved state of safety worldwide. A significant component of the overall effort is an engagement strategy. The more participation that is achieved, the more complete the information on the platform will be. To encourage broad participation by FAA and international stakeholders, use cases have been proposed by the FAA Management Board for consideration.
Method of Setting Target(s):	Milestones were identified and coordinated to support Flight Plan 21, FAA's FY22-26 Strategic Plan. This goal recognizes the benefits of data sharing and resulting increased safety of the National Airspace System.
Historical Data:	N/A

Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	Data for the platform will be sourced from the FAA as well as global stakeholders of the aviation community.
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	A significant component of the overall effort is an engagement strategy. The more participation that is achieved, the more complete the information on the platform will be. To encourage broad participation by FAA and international stakeholders, use cases have been proposed by the FAA Management Board for consideration. Successful demonstration of these use cases through FAA-International tabletop exercises will foster participation and collaboration in the FY22 Business Plan Performance Targets.
Reliability:	By capitalizing on the subject matter expertise of the FAA's Flight Plan 21 team, other FAA resources, and existing relationships with global stakeholders, the FP21 team will ensure reliable completion of the four FY22 Performance Targets and, ultimately, a finalized plan for building consensus.
Verification & Validation:	There will be various stages that can be verified and validated during the fiscal year [that will lend toward future platform use] to include: • Data Discovery, • Governance Plan, • Engagement Strategy, • Platform Identification/Development, and • Finalized Plan for Building Consensus.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The sharing of relevant safety information with the global community will ultimately improve safety worldwide, benefiting the traveling public.
Partners:	API/Flight Plan 21 Global Leadership team will work across the agency and with global stakeholders of the aviation community to achieve this measure.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	ICAO Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) Target--U.S. National Aviation Safety Plan (NASP)
Performance Goal:	Publish the U.S. NASP, which is also a target of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) GASP.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Coordinate the first draft of U.S. NASP content with stakeholders and publish on FAA.gov or other agreed-upon web location.
Performance Narrative	Aviation Safety International (AQS-600) will collaborate with FAA and U.S. Government stakeholders to coordinate, finalize, and publicly release (via FAA.gov) the first U.S. NASP to achieve a target in the ICAO GASP.
Lead Organization:	AQS-600
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Estimated percentage toward completion of one (1) U.S. NASP document, including publication on FAA.gov
Computation:	Percentage toward completion using milestones associated with finishing the project no later than September 30, 2022.
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	The annual target was established to ensure the United States achieves an international target promulgated by ICAO in the GASP, in alignment with the timing of the 41st ICAO Assembly in September-October 2022. The purpose of the GASP is to continually reduce fatalities, and the risk of fatalities, by guiding the development of a harmonized aviation safety strategy, regional aviation safety plans, and national aviation safety plans. To meet this objective, the United States should produce a U.S. NASP. The target includes coordination, finalization, and publication of this document.
Method of Setting Target(s):	The metric reflects a linear progression toward 100% completion of a U.S. NASP.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	The data will come from AQS-600, who is leading the development of the U.S. NASP.
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	Publishing of the U.S. NASP on FAA.gov or other agreed-upon web location.

Reliability:	The U.S. NASP is a joint FAA-U.S. Government undertaking. Delays in coordination and approval of the U.S. NASP content by the FAA's Office of Communications (AOC) and organizations outside of the FAA's Aviation Safety (AVS) organization could delay completion beyond the target date of 30 September 2022. Any such delay would cause the United States to lose its opportunity to highlight or promote the U.S. NASP in conjunction with the 41st ICAO Assembly in 2022. However, AQS-600 does not anticipate delay in meeting the GASP target, which calls for States to produce a NASP by 2024.
Verification & Validation:	Measurements are considered preliminary, based on completion of milestones against a projected timeline. The FAA uses performance data extensively for program management, personnel evaluation, and accountability. AQS-600 is leading, coordinating, and participating in the development of the U.S. NASP and is well positioned to evaluate progress. Ultimately, completion of the annual target will be reliably determined by the presence or lack of a U.S. NASP on FAA.gov as of October 1, 2022, which can be easily verified.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	As public and legislative attention to aviation safety performance has increased, this measure will sharpen FAA focus on helping to make information accessible to the public and promoting U.S. leadership in championing and meeting ICAO GASP goals.
Partners:	AQS-600 will work across the agency and with external stakeholders to achieve this measure. FAA organizations include Flight Standards (AFS), Accident Investigation and Prevention (AVP), UAS Integration (AUS), Air Traffic Safety Oversight (AOV), Aircraft Certification (AIR), Aerospace Medicine (AAM), Office of International Affairs (API), and AOC. External stakeholders include: Department of Transportation (DOT), National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Transportation Security Administration (TSA), United States Coast Guard (USCG), Department of Defense (DoD), and General Services Administration (GSA).

Operational Excellence Profiles

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Domestic Aviation CO_2 Emissions Reduction
Performance Goal:	Reduce CO_2 emissions from domestic aviation, as defined in the U.S. Aviation Climate Action Plan.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Quantify annual CO_2 emissions for NAS-wide domestic operations at or below 216 Megatonnes of CO_2 emissions (2019 levels)
Performance Narrative	Carbon dioxide (CO_2) is the primary greenhouse gas emitted through human activities and it is directly related to the fuel burned during the aircraft's operation. Calculating and tracking NAS-wide CO_2 emissions from domestic operations allows FAA to monitor improvements in aircraft/engine technologies and operational procedures, the rollout and use of sustainable aviation fuels (SAF), and enhancements in the air transportation system. This information provides an assessment of their influence on reducing aviation's emissions contribution.
Lead Organization:	Office of Environment and Energy (AEE)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Megatonnes (Mt) of annual CO_2 emissions
Computation:	Use FAA's Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) to calculate CO_2 emissions from a full year of domestic operations in the National Airspace System.
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	Carbon dioxide (CO_2) is the primary greenhouse gas emitted through human activities, and it is directly related to the fuel burned during the aircraft's operation. Calculating and tracking NAS-wide CO_2 emissions from domestic operations allows FAA to monitor improvements in aircraft/engine technologies and operational procedures, the rollout and use of SAF, and enhancements in the air transportation system. This information provides an assessment of their influence on reducing aviation's emissions contribution.
Method of Setting Target(s):	The DOT/FAA has selected this target because calculating and tracking NAS-wide CO_2 emissions reductions from domestic operations allows FAA to monitor efficiency improvements in aircraft and engine technologies and operational procedures, the rollout and use of SAF, and enhancements in the air transportation system. This information

	provides an assessment of their influence on reducing aviation's emissions contribution.
Historical Data:	2019: 216 Megatonnes of CO_2 emissions
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	The AEDT model uses satellite-based data from the Global Positioning System (GPS), the Enhanced Traffic Management System (ETMS), and the Official Airline Guide (OAG) schedule information to generate annual inventories of CO_2 emissions and total distance flown data for all U.S. domestic operations in the NAS. The Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS) provides the payload factors for commercial aircraft.
Statistical Issues:	Potential seasonal variability and variability from year-to-year can be expected when analyzing air traffic data and commercial domestic operations. The extent to which enhancements are incorporated to improve model accuracy, for example via more robust aerodynamic performance modeling algorithms and database of aircraft/engine fuel burn information, will impact the overall results and thus the performance target. This could create some statistical variability from year-to-year if not properly taken into account. In cases where such enhancements have the potential to create a significant shift in baseline, annual inventories may need to be re-processed and/or adjusted to ensure consistency and accuracy of results. The extent to which aircraft fleet improvements cannot be sufficiently modeled because of a lack of manufacturer proprietary data may also influence the performance target results. In this case, attempts will be made to characterize such aircraft with the best publicly available information, recognizing that newer aircraft types in the fleet will likely exist in significantly lesser numbers, thus minimizing the influence upon the results.
Completeness:	Data used for this performance goal is assessed for quality control purposes. Input data for the AEDT model are validated before proceeding with model runs. Both satellite and radar data are assessed to remove any anomalies, check for completeness, and pre-processed for input to the AEDT model. Aircraft movement data are verified against the OAG information in order to avoid any duplication of flights in the annual inventory. In some cases, aircraft movement data lack appropriate fields to conduct quality control and in these cases the data is removed. Data from the AEDT model is verified by comparing output from previous

	years and analyzing trends to ensure that they are consistent with expectations. In other cases monthly inventories may be analyzed to validate the results. Model output is subsequently post-processed through excel worksheets to perform the calculations for the performance target. Formulae and calculations are checked in order to ensure accuracy. Full documentation of this target is determined when the annual inventories have been accomplished and the post-processing calculations have been completed, resulting in the current year's total annual CO_2 emissions for domestic operations. The standard for this documentation is set by AEE, which is separate from the organization responsible for input and output associated with the AEDT model runs and annual inventories (i.e., DOT Volpe National Transportation Systems Center).
Reliability:	Calculating the annual CO_2 emissions from NAS-wide domestic operations is heavily dependent on commercial airline operating procedures and day-to-day operational conditions. This includes the airline's operating fleet and route assignments, air traffic conditions, weather, airport operating status, congestion in the system, and any disruptions that introduce delay in scheduled flights. For example, a major sustained disruption or enhancement in air traffic and/or a significant shift in commercial operations amongst airlines, including changes in fleet composition and missions could have a profound impact upon achieving the performance target. The use of SAF by industry will also affect the performance metric and the adoption and consumption of these fuels by industry will need to be accounted for.
Verification & Validation:	The processing of data through FAA's AEDT model including the performance of algorithms is not subject to random factors that could influence the results. AEDT has also gone through extensive validation through an ICAO workgroup and through its own design review group.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	Today's commercial jet aircraft are over 70% more efficient than early commercial jet aircraft. However, there is concern over aviation's impact on the environment and public health. Aviation is currently viewed as a relatively small contributor to emissions that have the potential to influence air quality and global climate. CO_2 is the primary greenhouse gas emitted through human activities, and it is directly related to the fuel burned during the aircraft's operation. As air traffic grows, this contribution will increase unless there are improvements in fuel-efficient technologies, optimized air traffic operations, and the use of SAF. The goal of year-on-year CO_2 emissions reduction for domestic operations supports the

	development of these improvements to reduce aviation's impact on the environment and thereby improve public health and welfare. In addition, more fuel-efficient aircraft should contribute to improving the financial well-being of commercial airlines and a growing economy.
Partners:	Partners include government agencies worldwide and the aviation industry through the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), who periodically update aircraft and engine emissions standards and methodologies. The FAA has also partnered with NASA in the development of advanced noise and emissions reduction technologies. FAA has the industry-government partnership of the Continuous Lower Energy, Emissions and Noise (CLEEN) program to promote acceleration of quieter and cleaner technologies into the fleet to help achieve NextGen goals to increase airspace system capacity by reducing significant community noise and air quality emissions impacts in absolute terms; and reducing aviation greenhouse gas emissions impacts on the global climate. The DOT Bureau of Transportation Statistics provides aircraft load factors. The DOT Volpe National Transportation Systems Center provides technical support in data processing and running the AEDT on behalf of the FAA.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Global Leadership on Aviation and Climate Change
Performance Goal:	Demonstrate renewed global leadership on climate change through international engagement, action at the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), and preparation of a U.S. Aviation Climate Action Plan.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Incorporate interagency feedback received on the draft United States Aviation Climate Action Plan and brief OST leadership. Due November 30, 2021 **Target 2:** Publish a revised United States Aviation Climate Action Plan. Due March 31, 2022
Performance Narrative	The U.S. Aviation Climate Action Plan is a submission by the United States to ICAO that reflects the actions as well as specific future plans taken domestically to address aviation's climate impacts.
Lead Organization:	Office of Environment and Energy (AEE)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	The U.S. Aviation Climate Action Plan is an all-encompassing document that examines all aspects of aviation (i.e., aircraft, airports, operations, fuels, policies). The document examines the contribution of each component to the overall CO_2 emissions from aviation as well as the means that are in place (or will be in place) to reduce those emissions.
Method of Setting Target(s):	Each ICAO Member State is directed to submit a revised Aviation Climate Action Plan every three years. The United States has not submitted an Aviation Climate Action Plan since 2015. In an effort to reassert U.S. international leadership on both aviation and environment, revising the Aviation Climate Action Plan provides a key signal of a path forward for the United States on this front.
Historical Data:	The United States (through FAA) submitted an initial Aviation Climate Action Plan in 2012, and a revised Aviation Climate Action Plan in 2015.

Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	The data used to develop the Aviation Climate Action Plan is taken from publicly available information as well as information from FAA, industry, and ICAO.
Statistical Issues:	The data for the Aviation Climate Action Plan is based on CO_2 emissions, so statistical issues are minimal other than those related to the forecasting of future technology development and deployment.
Completeness:	The completeness would come from a final, USG approved Aviation Climate Action Plan. The final plan should showcase a commitment to combating the climate crisis and concrete actions the United States is taking. The only limits to the Action Plan will be related to the forecasting of the growth of CO_2 emissions and traffic from aviation, in particular as it recovers from COVID-19.
Reliability:	Much of the action taken to reduce CO_2 emissions from aviation will require efforts from aircraft manufacturers (incorporating new technologies into designs), airlines (incorporating new aircraft into their fleets), and producers of sustainable aviation fuels. Each of these actors have a significant role in the realization of the Action Plan. However, the Aviation Climate Action Plan itself has no issues with reliability. FAA will coordinate with other agencies to ensure completeness of actions and data.
Verification & Validation:	FAA serves as the initial drafter and final submitter of the Aviation Climate Action Plan to ICAO. In order to ensure we are providing the best and most accurate data, FAA will work with all relevant U.S. agencies to ensure that data, sources, and information are the most accurate and up-to-date available.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The public is increasingly concerned about the climate crisis. Aviation is seen as an industry that is a significant polluter and there is often little public information available on what the industry is doing to address the crisis. The benefit of a publicly-available Aviation Climate Action Plan is to provide an outline of actions being taken as well as an accurate assessment of aviation's role in contributing and addressing the climate crisis.
Partners:	FAA will consult with all relevant U.S. agencies, including the Department of Transportation, Department of Energy, Department of State, EPA, Department of Agriculture, and NASA. If information directs FAA to other agencies with relevant information, FAA will consult with those agencies as well.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Aircraft Noise
Performance Goal:	Lead efforts in collaboration with aviation stakeholders to address aircraft noise in the United States and ensure up-to-date and effective noise policies.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Initiate public and stakeholder engagement in the FAA noise policy review process. Due May 31, 2022. **Target 2:** Complete initial noise policy review and identify potential policy options. Due September 30, 2022.
Performance Narrative	FAA's Executive Noise Working Group (ENSG) and its members are overseeing the progress of this project. FAA has also signed an Interagency Agreement (IAA) with the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS) to support FAA's effort in reviewing its noise policy.
Lead Organization:	Office of Environment and Energy (AEE)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	The Aircraft Noise performance measure highlights that aircraft noise and associated community concerns remain an Agency priority. The FAA is initiating a policy review to assess the state of the FAA's civil aviation noise policies, the effectiveness of the agency's efforts to address noise (including community engagement efforts and research advancing noise mitigation) and to identify the need for any changes to existing policy. The aviation sector's recovery from the impact of COVID-19 provides an excellent opportunity for the FAA to develop and implement new policies and management approaches using existing authority to address noise impacts as manned air traffic recovers to pre-pandemic levels over time. This will be particularly important because as manned air traffic recovers (and continues to grow) and new entrants increase operations, it will likely be perceived as new unwanted noise that will generate new noise complaints.
Method of Setting Target(s):	The two targets were selected based on anticipated progress of the policy review before the project had begun.

Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	N/A
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	The goal of this measure is engage the public and aviation stakeholders in the initial review of the Agency's noise policy. Once that initial review is complete, AEE will identify potential noise policy options.
Reliability:	The key factor that could influence the outcome of this measure is engagement within FAA and with Agency stakeholders. A lack of engagement could extend the timescale needed to complete policy review.
Verification & Validation:	FAA's ENSG and its members are overseeing the progress of this project. FAA has also signed an Interagency Agreement (IAA) with the FMCS to support the Agency's noise policy review.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	There is substantial public and congressional interest in Aviation Noise, and any changes that result from the noise policy review are expected to provide benefit to the public.
Partners:	AEE will work collaboratively across the agency with the following organizations to achieve this measure: Air Traffic Organization (ATO), National Engagement and Regional Administration (ARA), Office of Airports (ARP), Commercial Space Transportation (AST), Aviation Safety (AVS), Aircraft Certification (AIR), Flight Standards (AFS), and Unmanned Aircraft Systems Integration (AUS). AEE also anticipates collaboration with the following stakeholders: Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN), Industry, Airlines, Airports, Roundtables, and the public.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Sustainability – FAA Facilities and Operations
Performance Goal:	Demonstrate leadership on climate and sustainability by increasing the energy efficiency of FAA facilities and reducing the overall carbo footprint of the FAA.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Include all new construction/modernization projects impacting more than 25k square feet at FAA facilities in the Sustainability Report and Implementation Plan (referred to as the Sustainability Plan). Due May 31, 2022 **Target 2:** Designate at least two FAA facilities and 42k square feet as Sustainable Federal Buildings. Due September 30, 2022 **Target 3:** Assess five FAA facilities for "DOE 50001 Ready" certification pursuant to the Energy Act of 2020. Due September 30, 2022
Performance Narrative	Executive Order (EO) 14057, signed December 2021, requires all new or renovated facilities greater than 25k square feet to have Net-Zero Emissions. The EO also requires all new facilities to meet the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Buildings (referred to as the Guiding Principles). The Energy Act of 2020 requires applicable facilities (per the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007) (EISA) to consider the use of an energy management system (i.e., DOE 50001 Ready). The FY22 performance targets put the FAA on the correct path towards compliance. Note: EO 14057 was signed after the FY22 performance targets were established. The EO replaced legacy requirements that required a percentage of FAA facilities meet the Guiding Principles.
Lead Organization:	Office of Environment and Energy (AEE)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	All new construction, entering the design phase in FY22, will be included on the Sustainability Plan. A building is designated as a Sustainable Federal Building by meeting the Guiding Principles. This is accomplished by assessing the facility, usually during the commissioning phase. The Federal Real Property

	Profile Management System is updated to reflect the status of the facility. Facilities assess for 50001 Ready certification by analyzing current energy management systems.
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	All new construction projects, regardless of size, entering the design phase in FY22 and beyond will need to be included on the Annual Sustainability Plan along with projected status of compliance with the Guiding Principles. New or modernized facilities completing construction and undergoing commissioning in FY22 will be assessed for compliance with the Guiding Principles. Facilities covered under EISA 2007 are required to consider the use of energy management systems, such as DOE 50001 Ready.
Method of Setting Target(s):	The first two targets were selected from EOs that are now cancelled EOs. EO 14057 established new goals for federal agencies. The first two targets still assist the FAA in establishing a culture of identifying all new construction and reviewing designs for sustainability and net-zero emission compliance. The target of "Five DOE 50001 Ready facilities" was selected due to this new requirement in the Energy Act (2020) and unfamiliarity with the assessment and certification process. FAA may set more aggressive targets towards this initiative in the out years.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	Federal Real Property Profile Management System
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	Organizations assess their facilities to determine if the building meets the Guiding Principles. There is no value assigned, or credit given, for facilities that fail to meet all of the principles. The target for DOE 50001 Ready will be complete when five facilities have completed their assessments. Facilities will then complete the required tasks to be certified as DOE 50001 Ready as feasible.

Reliability:	There are no anticipated factors or influences that should prevent new construction, in the design phase, from being added to the Sustainability Plan. This target can be impacted by the timely completion and commissioning of a facility. Construction delays will cause a subsequent delay in assessing and designating a facility as sustainable. However, designs can be used to forecast compliance. Energy management systems require participation from field-level facility staff. Operational needs, facility maintenance, or project implementation may prevent field level staff from participating in 50001 Ready assessments.
Verification & Validation:	The Guiding Principles and associated guidelines for assessment are established by the Council on Environmental Quality. Agencies are afforded the responsibility to self-certify their facilities as compliant with each of the principles. AEE and Aviation Property Management (APM) reviews assessment documentation to help ensure the facility is accurately certified as sustainable. Documentation is available for OST or OMB review, upon request.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The Federal government is the largest purchaser of energy in the United States. All agencies are charged with reducing energy and water consumption in order to make these resources more available for the general public.
Partners:	AEE will work collaboratively with the following organizations to achieve this measure: Mike Monroney Aeronautical Center (AFN/MMAC), Air Traffic Technical Services (ATO/AJW), Aviation Safety (AVS), and the Office of National Engagement and Regional Administration (ARA). External stakeholders include: Department of Transportation and Department of Energy (Federal Energy Management Program).

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Critical Acquisitions Milestones on Schedule
Performance Goal:	90% of the critical acquisition milestones (94) are achieved by their scheduled due dates.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	90% of the critical acquisition milestones are achieved by their scheduled due dates.
Performance Narrative:	FAA tracks and reports the status of all scheduled targets using the Strategic Planning, Implementation, Reporting, and Evaluation (SPIRE) Portal tool, an automated database. FAA lines of business and staff offices (LOB/SO) provide a monthly red, yellow, or green assessment that indicates their confidence level in meeting their established milestones. Commentary is provided monthly that details problems, issues, and corrective actions to ensure milestones meet their planned target dates. The performance status is reported monthly during the AFN's monthly Performance Management Review and FAA's Performance Committee meetings.
Lead Organization:	Office of Finance and Management (AFN)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	The number of milestones completed by their target due date, compared to the number of milestones selected as the starting baseline of measurement, results in the percentage of milestones completed by their target due date.
Computation:	Performance is measured by dividing the total number of milestones for the fiscal year that are completed on or before their target due dates by the total number of milestones planned.
Formula:	$\frac{\text{(Total Number of Critical Acquisition Milestones) Met}}{\text{Total Number of Critical Acquisition Milestones Tracked}} \times 100$
Scope:	The designation of "critical acquisition programs" in the title of the performance target expresses the critical value of the program to the FAA. Critical Acquisition Programs are defined as strategically important to the FAA and/or programs with approved Acquisition Management System (AMS) Acquisition Categories (ACAT) of new investment, software enhancements, technology refreshment portfolio, technology refreshment, variable quantity, non-material, and facility programs. FAA organizations in coordination with the Capital Program Formulation Branch (ABP-310) select annual milestones and completion dates based on established criteria. The

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>schedule measure is set to only those milestones selected for the fiscal year. Once the selected milestones are approved, no milestones are added, deleted, or changed during the year unless unforeseen circumstances arise.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Method of Setting Target(s):</td><td>Maintaining the 90 percent target each year ensures that the FAA demonstrates its commitment to meet cost and schedule goals and benchmarks using a 90% target parameter that is well established across government agencies.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Historical Data:</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>FY 2018</th><th>FY 2019</th><th>FY 2020</th><th>FY 2021</th></tr>
<tr><td>Target</td><td>90%</td><td>90%</td><td>90%</td><td>90%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Actual</td><td>95.16%</td><td>97.50%</td><td>97.00%</td><td>93%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Data Completeness and Reliability</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source(s):</td><td>The FAA tracks and reports the status of all schedule targets using the SPIRE Portal tool, an automated database. FAA LOB/SOs provide a monthly status in the SPIRE Portal tool indicating their progress towards meeting their milestones.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Statistical Issues:</td><td>The programs and milestones that are selected each fiscal year represent a cross-section of programs within the Agency. There is no bias with the selection of milestones, and there are established criteria for selecting milestones included in the annual goal. The milestones selected represent the program offices’ determination as to what efforts they deem “critical” or important enough to warrant inclusion in the performance goal for the year.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Completeness:</td><td>This measure is current with no missing data. Reporting begins 30 days after the finalization of the milestones included in this measure.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Reliability:</td><td>Each FAA organization uses the data during periodic acquisition program reviews to determine resource requests. They are also used during the annual budget preparation process, for reporting progress made in the President’s budget and for making key program management decisions. The monthly status is reported through the automated databases and included in monthly high-level management reviews. Since the “Critical Acquisition Milestone on Schedule” target is a fiscal year performance measure, the specific milestones and date selected are not changed (unless external factors impact the programs’ ability to accomplish the milestone). Some external factors that may affect the achievement of this performance target include funding limitations, unanticipated political developments, legislative constraints, global pandemics, or policy changes. Once the milestone is approved, it is reported on with</td></tr>
</table>

	detailed commentary each month and assigned a red, yellow, green, purple, or blue confidence indicator that the milestone will be met on schedule. These detailed reports are reviewed at all levels of the appropriate organization, executive levels up to the Performance Committee.
Verification & Validation:	Programs provide monthly updates of the critical acquisition milestones using the SPIRE Portal tool. A rigorous assessment and review process is conducted monthly to ensure status and appropriate commentary are completed. Baseline milestones statuses are analyzed against data in the SPIRE Program Information and Reporting (PIR) Tool. Each completion is cross-checked against success criteria that were pre-determined at the beginning of the fiscal year.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The FAA's ability to keep acquisitions within specific schedule dates demonstrates the Agency's commitment and accountability to meet key schedule commitments. These commitments also indicate the FAA's ability to manage programs that will allow for a timely transition of NextGen programs. The transition involves acquiring numerous systems to support precision satellite navigation, digital, networked communications, integrated weather information, layered adaptive security, and more.
Partners:	ABP-310 works with the LOB/SOs across the agency responsible for the programs selected.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Cybersecurity: Remediate 90% of Critical and High Vulnerabilities
Performance Goal:	Vulnerability Management provides services related to the monitoring and remediation of vulnerabilities within the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Federal Information Security Management Act reportable systems. This includes monitoring and tracking Plan of Action & Milestones (POAM), managing vulnerability mitigation and remediation, and coordinating the scheduling and remediation of vulnerabilities.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	To comply with DHS BOD 19-02, remediate 90% of critical and high vulnerabilities detected on Internet accessible systems or complete the required remediation plan with the concurrence of the Cybersecurity Steering Committee (CSC).
Performance Narrative	To ensure effective and timely remediation of critical and high vulnerabilities identified through routine Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Cyber Hygiene (CyHy) reports, the FAA will remediate critical vulnerabilities within 15 calendar days and high vulnerabilities within 30 calendar days of initial detection. If vulnerabilities are not remediated within the specified timeframes, the FAA shall submit a remediation plan to the DHS for each vulnerability. In addition, the FAA shall ensure cyber hygiene scanning access by removing cyber hygiene source internet protocols (IP) addresses from block lists and notify the DHS/Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) of any modifications to the agency's internet-accessible IP addresses.
Lead Organization:	Office of Finance and Management (AFN), Information and Technology Services (AIT)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Percentage of critical and high vulnerabilities as identified by the DHS/CISA CyHy report associated with agency determined, external facing, High Value Assets (HVA) and remediated in accordance with Binding Operational Directive (BOD) 19-02.
Computation:	The performance target is measured by dividing the number of critical and high vulnerabilities from the CyHy report associated with the external facing HVA remediated within the timeframes specified by BOD 19-02, by the total number of critical and high vulnerabilities associated with external facing HVA identified.
Formula:	$\frac{\text{(HVA CyHy vulnerabilities remediated within BOD-19-02 timeframes)}}{\text{(Total Number HVA CyHy vulnerabilities identified)}} \times 100$
Scope:	Critical and high value vulnerabilities associated with external facing HVA are detected across the three FAA domains: the National Airspace System (NAS), Mission Support (MS), and Research and Development (R&D). These risks are identified through the DHS CyHy Vulnerability scanning.

<table>
<tr><td>Method of Setting Target(s):</td><td>90% Goal: The FAA’s vulnerability management branch in AIT executes the process to identify critical and high vulnerabilities on external facing HVA, tracks the disposition by establishing a baseline and notifying domain points of contact (POC) with high value risk information. FAA domain POCs will address risks within BOD 19-02 timeframes and report disposition to the vulnerability management branch. The CSC will review for consistent risk acceptance decisions.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Historical Data:</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>FY 2018</th><th>FY 2019</th><th>FY 2020</th><th>FY 2021</th></tr>
<tr><td>Target</td><td>80% of high value risks within 30 days</td><td>80% of high value risks within 30 days</td><td>80% of high value risks within 30 days</td><td>80% of the FAA’s Internet accessible high value assets with critical and high vulnerabilities in accordance with DHS BOD 19-02.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Actual</td><td>100%</td><td>99.7%</td><td>100%</td><td>100%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Data Completeness and Reliability</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source(s):</td><td>Critical and high vulnerabilities are identified by the DHS via weekly vulnerability scans of all federal civilian agency internet-accessible systems. These scans identify known critical vulnerabilities and configuration errors and capture the total number of critical vulnerabilities communicated in the DHS CyHy report. Critical systems are rated as Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS)-199 “HIGH” in the Cyber Security Assessment and Management (CSAM) system and support mission-essential services identified in the FAA Continuity of Operations Plans.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Statistical Issues:</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Completeness:</td><td>The FAA’s vulnerability management branch in AIT executes the process to identify high value risks and track their disposition by establishing a baseline and notifying FAA domain POCs with high value risk information. Domain POCs will address high value risks within BOD 19-02 timeframes and report the disposition to FAA Security Operations Center (SOC). The CSC reviews high value risks monthly to ensure consistent risk acceptance decisions. For high value risks not addressed within BOD 19-02 timeframes, a detailed justification must be submitted to DHS within a 30-day period, outlining any barriers, planned steps for resolution, and a timeframe for mitigation.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Reliability:</td><td>DHS leverages multiple sources to determine the validity of the critical and high vulnerability designations. The FAA Authorizing Officials designate the systems in their scope of responsibility as HVAs, which are so critical to their organization that the loss or corruption of the information or loss of access to the system</td></tr>
</table>

	would have serious impact to the FAA's ability to perform its mission or conduct business.
Verification & Validation:	On a monthly basis, AIT takes the following steps to ensure performance reliability: 1. Provides information to the CSC to assure consistent risk acceptance decisions by the appropriate Authorizing Official within each of the three operating domains for security incidents and/or vulnerabilities with residual risks. 2. Monitors FAA information systems vulnerabilities through the deployment of a visualization dashboard, in conjunction with the implementation of continuous diagnostics and mitigation (CDM) capabilities, provides near, real-time information about agency hardware, software, and vulnerabilities. *3.* Support to other Information Security Continuous Monitoring (ISCM) activities, such as integrating information from the NAS domain.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	AIT is dedicated to providing the highest level of cybersecurity available and is committed to the security and protection of personally identifiable information.
Partners:	AIT continues to strengthen ties with partners at the Department of Transportation (DOT) and DHS. DOT and DHS support the agency's cyber-defense strategy to harden the internal backbone of FAA systems and networks to avoid disruptions to services. Collaboration, both internally and externally, will help mitigate risks to an acceptable level. The SOC, a 24x7x365 day operation, is the central reporting point for all cyber events occurring within the FAA and as well as all other modes within the DOT. The SOC is the single source provider of the cyber "big picture" when reporting to the DHS.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Data Access & Digital Transformation - Big Data
Performance Goal:	Improving FAA data infrastructure, technical, and staff capabilities are crucial to supporting key strategic initiatives. Big data and advanced analytics can support all lines of business and staff offices (LOB/SO) initiatives.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Advanced Analytics & Data Integration. Use the Enterprise Information Management (EIM) platform for two use cases involving advanced analytics by completing data integrations that support the safety, operational excellence and global leadership mission. **Target 2:** Data Champions within LOB/SOs will lead the effort of building a data plan through collaboration across their organization. Must complete three plans.
Performance Narrative	Leveraging information management services, big data and integrated data analysis across the agency will drive safety and efficiency, key drivers of FAA's Data Strategy. The Chief Data Office (CDO) will work with LOB/SO Data Champions to identify opportunities to partner and to explore the use of advanced analytics to derive business insights. The use cases identified from this partnership will serve as examples to others on the benefits that can be achieved when data is accessible and tools are available to transform it into meaningful information for decision-makers. Data Champions, in close collaboration with the CDO, will lead the effort of building their respective LOB/SO data action plans to ensure alignment between the Federal data strategy, EIM initiative, and organizational priorities. This will require input from business leaders and data stewards across each organization.
Lead Organization:	Office of Finance and Management (AFN), Office of Information and Technology Services (AIT), Chief Data Office (CDO).
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	**Target 1:** Use the EIM platform for two use cases involving advanced analytics by completing data integrations that support the safety, operational excellence and global leadership mission. **Target 2:** Creation of three data plans built through collaboration across the LOB/SO organizations.
Computation:	N/A

Formula:	N/A
Scope:	**Target 1:** By leveraging tools, training and data resources within the EIM data platform, the scope of the activity and targets will grow the advanced analytics skills at the agency and speed up the adoption of advanced analytics to derive business insights. The performance measurement is two use cases. **Target 2:** Data Champions will create an actionable plan that aims to increase collaboration, integration and inform the LOB/SO decision-making process. Data Champions within LOB/SOs serve a critical role in leading the effort of building the plan and promoting alignment through the agency. The performance measurement is three plans from agency LOB/SOs.
Method of Setting Target(s):	The activity focuses on actionable deliverables (use cases and data action plans) that further strengthen the overarching goals to enable innovation, efficiencies and access to data to inform business insights that strengthen the mission of the FAA. The two targets were selected to increase agency capacity building under the EIM program to enhance the LOB and SO capabilities that transform, share and integrate the rich data and data infrastructure at the agency.
Historical Data:	The FY21 target challenged participants throughout the agency to enhance data analysis capabilities and integration to inform decision-making by leveraging the EIM platform. The FY21 EIM target was met.
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	**Target 1:** The use cases demonstrating the feasibility of data integration to support the safety, operational excellence and global leadership mission will use the EIM platform as a source for these deliverables. **Target 2:** The Data Champions within LOBs and SOs will lead the effort to build their data action plan and promote alignment through collaboration across their organization. The sources that the Data Champions will rely on to create these plans will be business leaders, data stewards, and existing information from our FAA data catalog, strategic plans, and project documentation.
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	With the completion of the use cases and data action plans, the LOB/SO will track progress and implementation of the plan through the EIM Steering Committee and other organizational leadership forums.

Reliability:	N/A
Verification & Validation:	**Target 1:** The CDO will support the use cases by providing access to needed data and analytical tools. The results of the analysis and deliverables will be reviewed and validated by the project lead. **Target 2:** Once drafted, the action plans will be reviewed by the CDO and endorsed by the organizational leads.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The investments in advanced analytics, data integration of critical data assets and detailed action plans to develop and use data effectively will further strengthen the FAA mission. Creating an environment where resources and information are shared promotes collaboration and accelerates innovation. As teams in the agency develop and own their data action plans, they drive continuous improvement in alignment with their mission and support of the overall FAA Data Strategy.
Partners:	AFN, AIT, and the CDO will work collectively with all LOB/SOs across the agency.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Performance Measure Information</th></tr>
<tr><td>Performance Measure:</td><td>Unmodified Audit Opinion</td></tr>
<tr><td>Performance Goal:</td><td>Obtain an unmodified audit opinion on the FAA’s fiscal year (FY) 2022 financial statements. This goal requires an unmodified audit opinion identified by external independent auditors.</td></tr>
<tr><td>FY22 Performance Target(s):</td><td>Obtain an unmodified audit opinion on the FAA’s FY 2022 financial statements identified by external independent auditors.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Performance Narrative</td><td>Although the Office of Financial Management (AFN) takes the lead in achieving this goal, all FAA organizations have key roles. There are monthly meetings with lines of business to ensure appropriate activities are being completed to ensure the audit's success (see Partners narrative below).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Lead Organization:</td><td>AFN</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">Definition of Metric</th></tr>
<tr><td>Metric Unit:</td><td>Unmodified independent auditors’ opinion rendered on FAA’s annual financial statements.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Computation:</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Formula:</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Scope:</td><td>The scope of this measure includes FAA’s annual audited financial statements, which include several required elements such as related footnotes, required supplementary information, and management’s discussion and analysis. The financial statements, together with the auditors’ report (the audit opinion referenced in this goal), are published by FAA in its annual Performance and Accountability Report (PAR).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Method of Setting Target(s):</td><td>This measure was set as “unmodified.” This means that in the opinion of independent auditors, FAA’s financial statements are fairly stated in all material respects, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Historical Data:</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>FY 2018</th><th>FY2019</th><th>FY2020</th><th>FY2021</th></tr>
<tr><td>Target</td><td>Unmodified Audit Opinion W/NMW</td><td>Unmodified Audit Opinion W/NMW</td><td>Unmodified Audit Opinion</td><td>Unmodified Audit Opinion</td></tr>
<tr><td>Actual</td><td>Unmodified Audit Opinion W/NMW</td><td>Unmodified Audit Opinion W/NMW</td><td>Unmodified Audit Opinion</td><td>Unmodified Audit Opinion</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	The data used to evaluate FAA's measure against this target comes from the independent auditors' report, issued at the conclusion of their audit of FAA's annual financial statements. The auditors' report is published annually in FAA's PAR. The PAR is the agency's annual public-facing document that includes the agency's financial statements, the auditors' report on those financial statements, as well as a summary of performance against agency-wide performance measures.
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	Because of the nature of this measure and how the outcome is reported, there is virtually no possibility that the result could be reported inaccurately or incompletely. FAA reports the outcomes of this goal in its annual PAR together with a full copy of the auditors' official report (called the audit "opinion letter"). The auditors' opinion letter is the official "ruling" from the independent third-party source (the auditors) of the outcome of this measure. The auditors' opinion is published on the letterhead stationery of the audit firm and bears the signature of the audit partner on behalf of the audit firm. Therefore, the FAA does not have an opportunity to interpret the results, translate data, make projections, or perform calculations, in order to identify whether this goal was met or not. The auditors tightly control the publication of the PAR and will not allow FAA to publish or release the report until they have verified that it includes the official and final version of their audit report. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-136, Financial Reporting Requirements, specifies that agency financial statements, together with the auditors' report on those financial statements be published no later than November 15th annually. Finally, the financial statements audit is the responsibility of the independent Office of Inspector General (OIG). The OIG must perform sufficient quality control procedures over the contract auditors' work, so that the OIG can accept the conclusion reached as its own. As evidence of the OIG's quality control review over the work and conclusions reached by the third-party auditors, the OIG issues a quality control memorandum, on the OIG's letterhead, under the signature of the Inspector General. The OIG's quality control memorandum is also fully published in FAA's PAR. For these reasons, the performance of this measure that is reported by FAA is beyond reproach. There is virtually no method of

	erroneously reporting this measure because both the third-party auditors and the OIG provide the final outcome in written documents that they each issue and that FAA publishes without any summarization or interpretation.
Reliability:	The outcome of this measure is reliable because it is reported by a third-party auditor and the OIG in the PAR. This document is closely scrutinized by both the contract auditors and the OIG before it is published; therefore, it is virtually impossible that this result could be reported inaccurately.
Verification & Validation:	The outcome of this measure is reliable because it is reported by a third-party auditor and the OIG in the PAR. This document is closely scrutinized by both the contract auditors and the OIG before it is published; therefore, it is virtually impossible that this result could be reported inaccurately.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The public benefits because an unmodified opinion by independent auditors is a critical indicator of financial condition. It is an independent and objective assessment of the fair presentation of FAA's financial statements, and in connection with that process, considers the internal controls over financial reporting.
Partners:	Although the Office of Financial Services takes the lead in achieving this goal, all FAA organizations have key roles. They have responsibility for initiating only bona fide transactions, entering accurate and timely source data into the accounting system, and following accounting policy properly. These are essential components to achieving an unmodified audit opinion. The following activities, in particular, are required from all lines of business and staff offices to accomplish this goal (but this is not an all-inclusive list): • Financial and budgetary transactions (e.g., obligations and expenditures) must be accurate, timely, and for bona fide needs. This also includes removing assets, liabilities, and budgetary balances from the books and records accurately and timely (e.g., de-obligating, losing out contracts, recording asset retirements, etc.). • The Enterprise Services Center (ESC) must achieve a good audit result on its service provider audit so that any information technology and systems security-related findings are insignificant. Similarly, the Office of Information and Technology (AIT) must adopt and enforce appropriate information technology controls to protect the data that is processed through FAA's business systems.

	• Lines of business and staff offices must continue to review their aged obligations (defined as no activity for 12 months) quarterly and de-obligate amounts no longer needed. They must also take the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) vulnerability assessment process seriously to identify and mitigate any significant financial control weaknesses. • Program offices must process paperwork for asset acquisitions and deployments in a timely manner. Also, they must report asset transfers and disposal activities timely so that the financial effects of those activities can be recorded into the FAA's financial statement.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Use Modern, Open Technology to Increase User Satisfaction and Access to Data
Performance Goal:	Use modern, open technologies to communicate and help the public and FAA employees operate safely and make informed decisions.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Increase user satisfaction and publicly accessible information by 25% from FY21 by making more information and data available to a wider and non-traditional audience by routinely webcasting public meetings and safety summits, deploying tools that work on mobile devices, and providing data outside of the FAA's network through modern platforms such as application programming interfaces (API), geographic information systems (GIS), and data visualizations.
Performance Narrative	AOC plans to meet the performance targets by increasing the number of opportunities for user satisfaction and publicly accessible information to provide feedback and Q&A.
Lead Organization:	Office of Communications (AOC)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	The number of actual events.
Computation:	Increase in webcasting public meetings, safety summits, and educational webinars; and increase in using data visualization tools and GIS to engage the public and employees.
Formula:	Increase user satisfaction and publicly accessible information by 25% each fiscal year.
Scope:	All external and publicly-available live events to be held using modern technology as well as streamed on digital platforms.
Method of Setting Target(s):	25% increase based on the previous year.

Historical Data:

	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Target	5	5	10	20	30	40
Actual	3	7	16	22	75	50

Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	User satisfaction surveys, social media metrics, website metrics.
Statistical Issues:	The FAA does not have a central location for the exchange of data. This could delay the exchange of data for public opportunities in reporting.
Completeness:	Data will be verified for data completeness, accuracy, consistency, timeliness.

Reliability:	Purchasing a platform to hold live events and using modern technology could get held up in the Office of Finance and Management (AFN) for approval or the Office of the Chief Counsel (AGC) if the cost exceeds $100,000. Also, the Office of Information and Technology Services (AIT) would need to grant access to the technology, and not disable functionality due to InTune.
Verification & Validation:	AOC is responsible for the policy, direction, and management of the agency's communications with the public and FAA employees. We embrace the core values of the FAA and relate them to our everyday responsibilities in supporting the FAA and the public. AOC contributes to FAA's mission by delivering timely and accurate safety information to the public and FAA workforce.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	AOC strives to ensure the public has full and easy access to information critical to safe operations within the National Airspace System. AOC ensures the audience is connected and engaged using modern digital platforms. As a data-driven organization, AOC examines the return on investment for every project, and makes adjustments to ensure we provide maximum value.
Partners:	DOT, aviation stakeholders, and various offices in the FAA.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Align FAA Investments in Airport Infrastructure and FAA-Owned Facilities
Performance Goal:	Develop a coordinated FAA national infrastructure strategy to help define, prioritize, align where possible Airport Improvement Program (AIP) and Facilities and Equipment (F&E) infrastructure investments, and inform future budget requests.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	**Target 1:** Implement ARP/ATO/APL Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) approved in FY 2021 and process the MOU for publication as an Order. Due March 31, 2022 **Target 2:** Develop performance-based national airport system strategic goals, objectives, and a Plan of Actions and Milestones (POAM) designed to inform, shape, and align where possible AIP and F&E infrastructure investments. Due September 30, 2022
Performance Narrative	The ARP/ATO/APL MOU signed in FY 2021 resulted in formation of an ARP-ATO co-chaired Airport Infrastructure Coordination Board (AICB). The AICB is fully staffed and meeting regularly in accordance with the MOU and actively pursuing the tenets of the MOU; therefore, the first part of Target 1 above (Implement the MOU) has been completed. The AICB is currently processing the MOU for publication as an Order, which essentially completes Target 1. The Strategic Framework required for Target 2 was completed in FY 2021. The AICB will form a working group with appropriate cross-line of business (LOB) representation to add recommended Agency goals, objectives, and a POAM to the framework.
Lead Organization:	Office of Airports (ARP) and Air Traffic Organization (ATO)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of the targets.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	This effort applies to nearly 3,300 airports included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) and over $8B annually in airport infrastructure and National Airspace System (NAS) investment.
Method of Setting Target(s):	The demand for airport infrastructure investment far exceeds available FAA grant funding. Therefore, it is necessary to look at the FAA's overall infrastructure and plan to help formulate future budget

	requests and resource investments. To this end, a comprehensive national airport strategy that defines, identifies, and prioritizes infrastructure investments is needed. The FY 2022 performance targets were selected as the second necessary, and evolutionary, steps in this multi-year, dynamic effort.
Historical Data:	**FY 2021 Targets:** **Target 1:** Develop a process to ensure appropriate cross-line of business (LOB) coordination and approval of infrastructure investments. Completed June 30, 2021 **Target 2:** Develop an implementation plan for a national airport strategy to provide a top-down framework for AIP investments in airport infrastructure; including resiliency, unmanned aircraft systems (UAS), and spaceport integration. Completed September 30, 2021
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	Both the MOU and strategic framework completed in FY21 provide the foundation for FY22 efforts.
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	This year's targets will be complete when 1) the provisions of the FY 2021 ARP/ATO/APL MOU are implemented, 2) the MOU is processed for publication as an Order, and 3) the goals, objectives, and a POAM is designed to inform, shape, and align where possible AIP and F&E infrastructure investments are developed.
Reliability:	Historical, current, and anticipated interests indicate strong and continued support for this initiative. Shifting priorities, resources, special interests, and other factors could affect or slow full realization of the long-term objectives of the strategic vision.
Verification & Validation:	N/A
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	There are nearly 3,300 public-use airports in the NPIAS, including more than 500 airports that support commercial airline service and another 2,800 general aviation airports that support flight training, emergency medical services and disaster response, law enforcement support, agricultural activities, and business/corporate activities. This effort will help to prioritize and synchronize limited national resources to ensure a safe, efficient, sustainable, and resilient national system of airports, which is key to connecting local, national, and international communities and economies. It will provide a flexible, efficient process that successfully and safely integrates traditional and

	emerging aviation operations, advanced air mobility, and space launch and recovery operations without considerable additional funding.
Partners:	The FAA AICB provides oversight, direction, and guidance for this multi-year effort. The AICB is co-chaired by ARP (APP-1) and ATO (AJW-2) and permanent membership includes AJW-1 (Operations Support), AJM-1 (PMO Integrated Services & Analysis Director), and AJV-S (Mission Support Strategy Director). Rotational membership includes ARP Regional Director, AJW E/C/W/B (Service Area Director), APL (Regional Administrators), and AJV E/C/W (Service Center Director). The multi-year strategy development and successful execution will likely encompass other FAA LOBs, FAA senior leadership, Department of Transportation, Congress, American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE), Airports Council International-North America (ACI-NA), Airport Consultants Council (ACC), National Association of State Aviation Officials (NASAO), Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA), and other affected or interested organizations, associations, and groups.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Runway Pavement Condition
Performance Goal:	Maintain runway pavement in excellent, good, or fair condition for 93% of the paved runways in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS).
FY22 Performance Target(s):	93%
Performance Narrative	The System of Airports Reporting (SOAR) from NASR provides monthly runway condition reports. After analysis, the Airports Design and Construction Branch, AAS-110, provides a monthly summary of runway conditions to each FAA region with the recommendation to distribute as necessary, review their respective region's data and take any necessary action to ensure pavement conditions continue in fair or better condition.
Lead Organization:	Office of Airports (ARP)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	This metric tracks, on an annual basis, the number of open and paved runways at public use airports included in the federal airport system that meet FAA's standard for safe operation of aircraft with runway pavement considered to be in excellent, good, or fair condition. The metric covers all paved runways at federally funded NPIAS airports.
Computation:	Runway Pavement Condition data is collected annually by FAA Airport Certification Safety Inspectors during their physical inspection of all certificated airports in the U.S. and its territories. Other public-use airports are inspected by airports or airport safety data inspectors under an FAA contract every three years. Information is collected through visual inspection of runway pavement in accordance with existing FAA guidance, resulting in a condition rating for each runway of excellent, good, fair, poor, or failed. The number of paved runways in the NPIAS with surface ratings in each of the five conditions (excellent, good, fair, poor, and failed) is totaled. Paved runway ratings are then numbered by condition: excellent = 5; good = 4; fair=3; poor=2; failed=1.
Formula:	$\frac{(\text{\# condition 5 runways} + \text{\# condition 4 runways} + \text{\# condition 3 runways})}{\text{Total \# NPIAS paved runways}}$
Scope:	The runway pavement condition goal applies for all open and paved runways at federally funded NPIAS airports.
Method of Setting Target(s):	Maintaining runway pavement conditions requires careful coordination, often years in advance, of a runway rehabilitation project. The airport and

	FAA carefully time projects, regardless of whether they involve the phased reconstruction of a single-runway airport or the sequential resurfacing of multiple runways over a period of several years. If too many runways are under reconstruction at one time, system-wide capacity is lost. On the other hand, if we reconstruct too few in any given year laying the groundwork for catching up in a subsequent year, it simply defers the impact to system-wide capacity. Due to the length of time required to plan and implement major pavement projects and in order to maintain the overall condition of the system, 93% of the system in excellent, good or fair condition is a long established standard that sponsors understand and support. With a goal of 93%, this means no more than 7% of the runways should be undergoing reconstruction at a time. Some of the nation's largest airports resurface their runways on an established revolving basis. As a result, at times the FAA is able to exceed the goal. However, this does not necessarily represent a sustainable trend. For major reconstruction, runways must typically be taken out of service for a full construction season or longer. It can be particularly challenging to rehabilitate one runway while keeping intersecting runways operational. FAA works with airports to ensure that the system never has too many runways out of service at any given time.
Historical Data:	

Paved Runways in the NPIAS in Excellent, Good, or Fair Condition

	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Target	93.0%	93.0%	93.0%	93.0%
Actual	97.9%	97.9%	97.6%	97.8%

Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	Data is collected through visual inspection of runway pavement in accordance with existing FAA guidance; including Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5380-7, Airport Pavement Management Program, and AC 150/5320-17A, Airfield Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating Manuals, which provides uniformity to field observations. The pavement condition is reported in the Airport Master Record database and inspection results are entered into FAA's National Airspace System Resource (NASR).
Statistical Issues:	Due to variable reporting cycles, the total number of runways displayed in each month's SOAR report varies slightly.
Completeness:	A small number of runways do not report a condition each month. These runways represent on average less than 0.5% of the total runways in the NPIAS.

Reliability:	Runway conditions are reported locally. Currently, there is no method for confirming a date as to when the condition was reviewed or updated. However, it is possible to identify a general trend if conditions change over a period of time. Airport infrastructure, particularly airfield facilities at commercial service airports, is exposed to constant heavy use and harsh environmental conditions. Runways, taxiways, and aprons are designed to withstand the heavy equipment that operates on them, but even so these facilities require frequent maintenance and rehabilitation in order to remain in good working condition. Runways and taxiways have to be kept clear of snow, ice, and ponding water that can jeopardize aircraft directional control or braking action. Chemicals and plowing, as well as freeze-thaw cycles, all take a toll on runways, taxiways, and other paved areas. Even at smaller, non-commercial airports, pavement degradation due to meteorological conditions quickly leads to more serious damage if periodic maintenance and resurfacing is not completed in a timely manner. At the same time, limited financial resources can lead airport operators to try to defer needed capital projects, which both increases costs and may impact operational capacity if runways and taxiways require more in-depth reconstruction. Funding constraints may significantly affect when the airport sponsor is able to fund pavement rehabilitation. This is why it is so crucial that the FAA can offer airports financial assistance in the form of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grants, in order to ensure infrastructure is properly protected and preserved at the lowest possible cost.
Verification & Validation:	A summary of runway conditions is prepared monthly and distributed to each FAA region with the recommendation to distribute as necessary, review their respective region's data, and take any necessary action to ensure pavement conditions continue in fair or better condition. Additionally, at the conclusion of each fiscal year, a summary of condition changes will be presented that identifies specific runways that could be targeted for improvement due to a deteriorating condition.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	Significantly deteriorated runway pavement can cause damage to airframes, engines, and landing gear; unnecessarily compromising safety, and leading to higher rehabilitation costs. Periodic maintenance of runways, particularly resurfacing, has proven a cost effective way to delay the need for major runway rehabilitation. The FAA funds a broad range of capital infrastructure development at most NPIAS airports; however, airports are generally responsible for funding periodic and ongoing maintenance. More significant rehabilitation, resurfacing or reconstruction projects may be funded through a variety of funding sources, including Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grants, Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) revenues, airport revenues, and/or other funding sources. Deferred or delayed maintenance creates an

	increased risk of damage to aircraft and is a safety concern for the travelling public, increasing both the scope and cost of eventual rehabilitation or reconstruction.
Partners:	FAA's Regional Airports Division and Airports District Offices partner with individual airports to identify poor or failed pavements. Three other FAA entities support this effort: the Air Traffic Organization (ATO), which helps evaluate and minimize the capacity and delay impacts resulting from runway reconstruction projects and helps communicate temporary closures; the Aircraft Certification Service (AIR), which helps assess the impact of pavement conditions on aircraft; and the William J. Hughes Technical Center, which assists with a broad range of pavement research. External partners include State aeronautical agencies and other aeronautical user groups.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Maintain an Average Daily Airport Capacity of at Least 58,962 Arrivals and Departures at Core Airports
Performance Goal:	On-Time Performance--Average Daily Capacity (ADC)
FY22 Performance Target(s):	58,962
Performance Narrative	The Core airports' individual ADC targets are set after a thorough review of all known projects that can potentially affect capacity and using continuous communication with the four Deputy Directors of System Operations (DDSO) and the facilities. FAA monitors individual airports' targets throughout the year and hosts ADC 101 briefings for the DDSO offices and facilities in order to ensure staff has thorough understanding of ADC, and to highlight the importance of accurate reporting of arrival and departure rates. These briefings have been well received by FAA facilities. ADC is tracked continuously and any changes in a facility's ADC that were not anticipated are discussed with the facility. An example of an unanticipated reduction in a facility's Ay is a non-scheduled runway/ taxiway construction or repair project that is initiated after the beginning of the fiscal year.
Lead Organization:	Air Traffic Organization (ATO)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Average of daily arrival and departure rates during reportable hours.
Computation:	ADC for a given airport and month is the sum of Airport Arrival Rate (AAR) and Airport Departure Rate (ADR) computed over the entire month divided by the number of days in the month during reportable hours. The reportable hours capture periods when at least 90% of Core Airports operations take place and generally exclude overnight hours. The monthly ADC for Core 30 airports is the sum of the individual airports' monthly ADC. The annual ADC is calculated by taking a weighted average of the monthly values.
Formula:	$\frac{\text{Sum of Hourly Airport Arrival and Airport Departure Rates during Reportable Hours}}{\text{Number of Days in the Month}}$

Scope:

Only the Core airports are included in this metric. The Core airports are those which have 1% or more of total U.S. enplanements (the DOT large hub airports) or 0.75% or more of total U.S. non-military itinerant operations.

Reportable hours are based on a review of actual flight counts for each of the Core airports and represent a consecutive period when at least 90 percent of an airport's operations take place.

Number of Reportable Hours	Airports
15	IAH
16	ATL, CLT, DCA, DEN, DFW, DTW, IAD, LGA, MCO, MDW, MSP, ORD, PHL, PHX, SAN, SLC, TPA
17	BOS, BWI, EWR, FLL, HNL, LAS, MIA, SEA, SFO
18	JFK, LAX
21	MEM

Each airport facility determines the number of arrivals and departures it can handle for each hour of each day, depending on conditions, including weather. These numbers are the arrival and departure rates of the airport for that hour. Data are summed for daily, monthly, and annual totals.

Annual ADC targets are set prior to the beginning of a fiscal year using historical trend data for the previous three years, information on upcoming construction impacts, procedure changes, etc., and inputs from individual Air Traffic Control facilities.

Method of Setting Target(s):

Annual targets are set using historical trend data for the previous three years, information on upcoming construction impacts, procedure changes, etc., and inputs from individual Air Traffic Control facilities.

Historical Data:

	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Target	59,136	59,303	56,771	58,193
Actual	60,448	59,446	58,755	60,370

Data Completeness and Reliability

Source(s):

The Aviation System Performance Metrics (ASPM) database, maintained by the FAA's Office of Performance Analysis, provides the data for this metric. The individual air traffic facilities for the Core Airports provide arrival and departure rates through the National

	Traffic Management Log (NTML). FAA staff feed this information into the ASPM database.
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	Fiscal year data are finalized approximately 90 days after the close of the fiscal year.
Reliability:	The reliability of ASPM is verified on a daily basis by the execution of a number of audit checks, comparison to other published data metrics, and through the use of ASPM by over 1,300 active registered users. External factors: Arrival and departure rates at airports, which are adjusted in real time throughout the day, are primarily impacted by weather, construction/maintenance impacts, procedural changes, and equipment outages.
Verification & Validation:	FAA leadership reviews the data each month. Data are reviewed at the ATO level on a weekly basis.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	The public benefits from increased capacity by experiencing a decrease in delays and improved on-time performance.
Partners:	ATO Service Units and Office of Airports (ARP)

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Achieve a NAS On-time Arrival Rate of 88% at Core Airports
Performance Goal:	On-Time Performance--NAS On-Time Arrivals
FY22 Performance Target(s):	88%
Performance Narrative	The FAA continues to closely monitor NAS On-time Arrivals to measure the impact of increased traffic levels. The FAA's Air Traffic Organization (ATO) briefs this metric monthly at the NAS Collaboration Forum. This is hosted jointly by National Airspace System (NAS) Operations and the air carriers. It is also reported weekly at the FAA's System Operations 7am stand up meeting. FAA produces the Quarterly Construction Report and conducts modeling and analysis on impactful projects as a mitigation tool.
Lead Organization:	ATO
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Percentage of flights arriving no more than 15 minutes late.
Computation:	General Computation: NAS On-Time Arrivals is the percentage of all flights arriving at the Core Airports equal to or less than 15 minutes late, based on the carrier flight plan filed with the FAA, and excluding minutes of delay attributed by air carriers to extreme weather, carrier action, security delay, and prorated minutes for late arriving flights at the departure airport. The number of flights arriving on or before 15 minutes of flight plan arrival time is divided by the total number of completed flights, and the result is multiplied by 100 to convert it to a percentage. NAS Delayed Flights: The time of arrival of completed passenger flights to and from the Core Airports is compared to their flight plan scheduled time of arrival. For delayed flights, delay minutes attributable to extreme weather, carrier caused delay, security, and a prorated share of delay minutes due to a late arriving flight at the departure airport are subtracted from the total minutes of delay. If the flight is still late, it is counted as a delayed flight attributable to the National Aviation System (NAS) and the FAA.
Formula:	$\frac{\text{(NAS On-Time Flights)}}{\text{(Total Flights)}} \times 100$

<table>
<tr><td>Scope:</td><td>A flight is considered on time if it arrives no later than 15 minutes after its published, scheduled arrival time. This definition is used in both the DOT Airline Service Quality Performance (ASQP), and Aviation System Performance Metrics (ASPM) reporting systems. Air carriers, however, also file up-to-date flight plans for their services with the FAA that may differ from their published flight schedules. This metric measures on-time performance against the carriers' filed flight plan, rather than what may be a dated published schedule. Only the Core Airports are included in this metric. The Core airports are those which have 1% or more of total U.S. enplanements (the DOT large hub airports) or 0.75% or more of total U.S. non-military itinerant operations.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Method of Setting Target(s):</td><td>The target is set at 88%.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Historical Data:</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>FY 2018</th><th>FY 2019</th><th>FY 2020</th><th>FY 2021</th></tr>
<tr><td>Target</td><td>88%</td><td>88%</td><td>88%</td><td>88%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Actual</td><td>89.80%</td><td>88.31%</td><td>93.03%</td><td>93.60%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Data Completeness and Reliability</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source(s):</td><td>The ASPM database, maintained by the FAA's Office of Performance Analysis, in conjunction with DOT's ASQP causation database, provides the data for this metric. By agreement with DOT, certain major U.S. carriers file ASQP flight data for flights to and from most large and medium hubs. Flight records contained in the Traffic Flow Management System (TFMS) supplement the flight data.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Statistical Issues:</td><td>Data are not reported for all carriers; at present, 21 operating carriers report monthly into the ASQP reporting system.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Completeness:</td><td>Fiscal year data are finalized approximately 90 days after the close of the fiscal year.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Reliability:</td><td>The reliability of ASPM is verified on a daily basis by the execution of a number of audit checks, comparison to other published data metrics, and through the use of ASPM by over 1,300 active registered users. ASQP data is filed monthly with DOT under 14 CFR Part 234, Airline Service Quality Performance Reports, which separately requires reporting by major U.S. air carriers on domestic flights to and from Core airports. External factors such as weather, airline scheduling practices, runway construction/maintenance, and ramp/airport congestion may all effect on time performance.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Verification & Validation:</td><td>Each month, FAA senior leadership reviews ASQP data under 14 CFR Part 234, Airline Service Quality Performance Reports, which separately requires reporting by major U.S. air carriers on domestic flights to and from Core airports.</td></tr>
</table>

Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	This metric helps members of the flying public reach their destinations on time.
Partners:	FAA, Airlines for America (A4A), National Business Aviation Association (NBAA), and commercial airlines.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Identify Existing Service Levels and System Services
Performance Goal:	Identify existing Service Levels, System Services, and related criteria to develop a common definition for National Airspace System (NAS) services.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Identify existing Service Levels, System Services, and related criteria to develop a common definition for NAS services. Due June 30, 2022
Performance Narrative	The identification of existing service levels and system services aims to help transform NAS services. Seven synopsis threads have been documented and are working though the four planned phases for completion in June. The seven threads are the FAA Contract Tower (FCT) Program, National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS), Airspace Infrastructure Modernization, Very-High-Frequency Omnidirectional Range (VOR) Minimum Operational Network (MON), Space Integration Strategy, Air Traffic Organization (ATO) Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Services Plan, and Advanced Air Mobility (AAM) which includes electric Vertical Take Off and Landing (eVTOL) vehicles. Consequently, four phases were defined: Program Information Capture, Services Identification, Service Categories Identification, and Existing Services & Service Levels with related metrics.
Lead Organization:	Air Traffic Organization (ATO)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of targets.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	FAA's current paradigm struggles to keep pace with the strain of evolving traditional NAS stakeholder demands while also introducing new entrants for supersonic, commercial space, and Advanced Air Mobility operations, as other emerging technologies further stress our legacy systems. The seven synopsis threads (which are in scope for this effort) continue to inform the future framework through identification of processes, methods, and criteria that are working and applicable across the agency today, but also through identifying gaps that need to be resolved for the future framework (based on evolving NAS stakeholder needs). Going forward, a common definition of "NAS Services" will enable FAA to develop data-driven methods to evaluate

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>current systems and services compared against evolving stakeholder demands.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Method of Setting Target(s):</td><td>Milestones were identified and coordinated to support Flight Plan 21, FAA’s FY22-26 Strategic Plan. This initiative will help to propel the FAA through the 21st century by shifting its approach and prioritizing resources for investment in – and sustainment of – the NAS. The development of a tiered service level approach assures the right services and systems are provided to the right stakeholders at the right time. Additionally, this approach will lead to a repeatable data driven and operationally contextualized framework for evaluating current systems and services compared against evolving stakeholder demands.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Historical Data:</td><td>This effort will leverage historical metrics and data identified through working with the individual lead offices for each of the seven synopsis threads.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Data Completeness and Reliability</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source(s):</td><td>The seven synopsis thread data sources are listed below:
<table>
<tr><th>Source Material</th><th>Data Source Lead Office</th></tr>
<tr><td>FCT data</td><td>Air Traffic Services (AJT)</td></tr>
<tr><td>NPIAS data</td><td>Office of Airports (ARP)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Airspace Infrastructure Modernization data</td><td>Strategy Directorate (AJV-S) and Next Generation (ANG) Air Traffic System</td></tr>
<tr><td>VOR MON data</td><td>Program Management Office (AJM)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Space Integration Strategy</td><td>Commercial Space Transportation (AST) and ATO System Operations</td></tr>
<tr><td>ATO UAS Services Plan</td><td>AJV-S</td></tr>
<tr><td>Advance Air Mobility data</td><td>UAS Integration Office (AUS)</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>Statistical Issues:</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Completeness:</td><td>By leveraging the NAS Enterprise Architecture Service Groups, this effort will identify any changes needed as synopsis threads complete the four initial phases: Program Information Capture, Service Identification, Service Categories Identification, and Existing Services & Service Levels with related metrics. The synopsis threads will inform the future framework through identification of processes, methods, and criteria that are working and applicable across the agency today but also through identifying gaps that need to be resolved for the future framework (based on evolving NAS stakeholder needs). Ultimately, this approach will support some “early win” opportunities with current service decisions the agency is facing for FY23.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Reliability:</td><td>The FAA safely and efficiently integrates traditional, new/advanced, and/or non-traditional operations into the NAS without significant resource expenditure. The agency establishes a flexible and collaborative process to adjust levels of service based on data analysis.</td></tr>
</table>

	The level of detail varies based on the organization that provides each data source. Where appropriate and available, external stakeholder processes are factored into the data. Ultimately, this future framework will leverage past lessons learned and metrics applied to future considerations for emerging entrants to drive the FAA to consistent, repeatable, and defendable decisions on service provisioning across the NAS.
Verification & Validation:	The workgroup plans to execute trial use cases to verify the content of the data and validate its accuracy in FY23.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	As more Americans move to different parts of the country, airline services have followed those trends. For example, airlines scheduled many more flights to Florida after the widespread adoption of air conditioning in the 1950s contributed to the state's rapid population growth. Similar shifts in demand will likely occur in the future due to the growth of emerging entrants. This initiative seeks to prepare the NAS for such upcoming changes in service levels.
Partners:	ATO's Mission Support Services will perform extensive collaboration across the agency to accomplish this goal. See "Source" table for more information.

Performance Measure Information	
Performance Measure:	Operational Performance Reporting Roadmap
Performance Goal:	Develop a roadmap to success that includes documenting and validating current efforts, identifying gaps and critical milestones in the evolution of Operational Performance Reporting.
FY22 Performance Target(s):	Develop a roadmap to success that includes documenting and validating current efforts, identifying gaps and critical milestones in the evolution of Operational Performance Reporting. Due March 31, 2022
Performance Narrative	To better harness data as we strive to advance the safest, most efficient airspace in the world, we aim to integrate reporting across the Air Traffic Organization Business units to ensure a fuller understanding of the operation. The Operational Performance Reporting Roadmap is an important milestone and the starting point of the integration process. Understanding and documenting the current reporting mechanisms is the first step in creating a roadmap to better align and improve these reporting mechanisms.
Lead Organization:	Air Traffic Organization (ATO)
Definition of Metric	
Metric Unit:	Binary [yes/no] completion of target.
Computation:	N/A
Formula:	N/A
Scope:	The FAA is already the foremost data driven air navigation service provider in the world, but opportunities exist to better harness data as we strive to advance the safest, most efficient airspace in the world. To accomplish this goal, we will: • Move next day reporting to near real time, • Integrate operational reporting across the agency and onto stakeholders across the National Airspace System (NAS), • Improve the FAA's predictive analytics, and • Transition from reporting outcomes to assessing performance. The Operational Performance Reporting Roadmap is key to assessing current opportunities and define a strategy for integrated reporting.

	It will guide FAA's actions for future work on establishing an Enterprise Operational Database to support the Roadmap's integrated reporting.
Method of Setting Target(s):	Milestones were identified and coordinated to support Flight Plan 21, FAA's FY22-26 Strategic Plan.
Historical Data:	N/A
Data Completeness and Reliability	
Source(s):	The completion of this roadmap relies on multiple data sources, in particular WILBUR. Those data sources are currently primarily located in the NAS Data Warehouse.
Statistical Issues:	N/A
Completeness:	The completeness of the data is assessed based on the content of the NAS Data Warehouse data sources that are in scope for Operational Performance Reporting.
Reliability:	N/A
Verification & Validation:	The content of the data used for the Operational Performance Reporting Roadmap is verified through workgroup discussions with the data stewards and subject matter experts. The nature of the data varies in granularity between reporting topics, and this validation step is performed to ensure high quality inputs and uniformity across Operational Performance Reporting topics.
Additional Information on Metric	
Public Benefit:	Improved reporting on the operational performance of the NAS will provide a mechanism through which the operation of the NAS is more efficient: reducing delays, increasing safety and reducing fuel burn. The NAS is a constantly changing environment that encounters dynamic weather constraints, equipment outages, stakeholder requests, safety emergencies, excess volume to name a few. It is too complex a system to rely on human-only decision making. The agency must get to that next level of human/machine teaming to continue to provide the safest and most efficient aerospace system in the world. To get to that next level of human/machine teaming, FAA requires timely and better-governed data to create those metrics that provide a deeper understanding of the inefficiencies inherit in the current NAS operation.

	This roadmap provides the timeline and necessary actions to achieve these goals and allows us to identify gaps, which need to be addressed to allow the operation of the NAS to get to the next level.
Partners:	Internally, System Operations (AJR) will be working with other FAA offices to ensure success in the formulation of this roadmap including Nextgen (ANG), Airports (ARP), Aviation Safety (AVS), and other offices in ATO such as Technical Operations (AJW) and Safety and Technical Training (AJI).